University of San Diego

Digital USD

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

1994

Leadership Training of Ministerial Students in Evangelical Institutions of Higher Education

Alan E. Nelson EdD
University of San Diego

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations>

Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

Digital USD Citation

Nelson, Alan E. EdD, "Leadership Training of Ministerial Students in Evangelical Institutions of Higher Education" (1994). *Dissertations*. 596.

<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/596>

This Dissertation: Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact digital@sandiego.edu.

LEADERSHIP TRAINING OF MINISTERIAL STUDENTS IN
EVANGELICAL INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

by

Alan E. Nelson

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education

University of San Diego

1994

Dissertation Committee

Joseph Rost, Ph.D., Director
Edward Kujawa, Ph.D.
Judith Corbin, Ed.D.

ABSTRACT

LEADERSHIP TRAINING OF MINISTERIAL STUDENTS IN EVANGELICAL INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

NELSON, ALAN, E. Ed.D. University of San Diego, 1994. 217pp.
Director: Joseph C. Rost

There exists a growing sense within evangelicalism in the United States, that more and better leaders are needed in local congregations. Traditionally, seminaries, graduate and undergraduate schools have prepared pastors to fulfill these roles and satisfy church expectations. The majority of pastoral preparation is theological in nature, augmented by ministerial skill courses. The hypothesis of this research was that little has been done in the area of leadership development and that an optimum program is needed to serve as a model.

The intent of this research was twofold. First, the researcher needed to determine to what extent pastoral preparation programs implemented leadership courses and leader training opportunities. Descriptions from 141 pastoral preparation programs from accredited evangelical institutions of higher education were reviewed from catalogs. These programs were rated according to five categories. Three programs received blue ribbon status as emphasizing leadership training, and three programs received status as supporting leadership. Clearly, leadership training for pastors is very limited and often nonexistent in many evangelical institutions according to this study.

The second phase of the research involved developing an optimum pastoral leadership training program by an expert panel via the Delphi method. Twenty

experts representing four stakeholder groups--pastors, lay leaders, administrators, and academics--participated in three Delphi rounds including an initial interview and two subsequent surveys. The emergent programs developed by the experts represented optimum training structures for undergraduate, graduate, and seminary programs. Each program included diagnostic recommendations, core courses, and internship guidelines.

©Copyright 1994 by Alan E. Nelson

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Although it may seem redundant to acknowledge one's teachers in a document such as this, this volume of work is dedicated to Joseph Rost, Ph.D. and the leadership staff at the University of San Diego. As the pastor of a local church, I know that there are many things one does which have little to do with remuneration. These are works of love. "Joe's" giving is more than mere institutional expectation or fiscal duty. He believes what he teaches and one gets the feeling that he wants you to believe as well, so that others will be positively impacted. Dr. Rost does this in his own style, integrated with concern.

Thank you, Joe, and USD, for this opportunity to immerse myself in leadership studies. I trust that those who are directly and indirectly influenced by my ideas on leadership will also appreciate some of the roots of these concepts.

I also thank Nancy, Jeffrey, Joshua, and Jesse Nelson, for their patient endurance.

Lastly, I thank my church family and employer, West Coast Wesleyan Church, who believed in me, proven by granting tuition and time away. As the great leader, the Apostle Paul said, "I thank God for all of you."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements	ii
Table of Contents	iii
List of Figures	viii
List of Tables	ix
List of Appendices	x
CHAPTER 1. THE PASTOR AS LEADER	1
Introduction	1
The Issue	2
The Purpose and Scope of the Study	10
Definitions	11
Leadership	12
Leader	12
Pastoral Leadership	15
Management and Manager	18
Ministry	23
Research Questions	23
Significance of Study	27
An Outline of This Study	28

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW	30
Introduction	30
Pastoral Leadership	31
General Leadership	34
Leader Character	36
Church Ministry	38
Ministerial Roles	39
Leadership Versus Management	44
Ministerial Preparation	51
Leadership Education	63
Summary	66
CHAPTER 3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	69
Framework For Methodology	69
Phase One: Catalog Review	70
Phase One, Step One: Investigating Current Programs	71
Phase One, Step Two: Classification	77
Phase One, Step Three: Investigating the Leadership-Oriented Programs	81
Phase Two: Expert Panel	82
Phase Two, Step One: Panel Selection	83
Phase Two, Step Two: Construct Interview Questions	86
Phase Two, Step Three: Panelist Interview	86

Phase Two, Step Four: First Panel Survey	87
Phase Two, Step Five: Second Panel Survey	88
Phase Two, Step Six: Final Programs Recommended	89
Limitations and Assumptions	90
Ethical Concerns	93
CHAPTER 4. DESCRIPTIONS AND ANALYSIS OF PASTORAL TRAINING	
PROGRAMS	94
Introduction	94
Catalog Review	96
Category 1: No Leadership	99
Category 2: Unclear Leadership	100
Category 3: Recognized Leadership	105
Category 4: Supported Leadership	108
Blue Ribbon Programs	111
Southern California College's Master of Arts in Church Leadership	
Studies	111
Center for Christian Leadership at Dallas Seminary (CCL) ...	115
Fuller Theological Seminary School of World Missions	120
Summary	126
CHAPTER 5. OPTIMUM LEADERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAMS	
Introduction	128
First Round Results	129

Diagnostic Practices	130
Core Courses	131
Practicum	133
Second Round Results	134
Diagnostic Analysis	136
Leadership Core Courses	138
Undergraduate Program	138
MDiv Program	140
MA in Christian Leadership	140
Practica	141
Rationale for Round Three	142
Third Round Results	143
Undergraduate Minor in Leadership	145
Diagnostic Evaluation	145
Core Leadership Studies	148
Practicum	151
Master of Divinity with Leadership Emphasis	152
Diagnostic Evaluation	153
Leadership Core	153
Internship	155
Master of Arts in Christian Leadership	157
Diagnostic Evaluation	158

Leadership Core	158
Internship	159
Program Evaluation	159
Optimum Programs Summary and Implementation	160
CHAPTER 6. LEADERSHIP TRAINING OF MINISTERS: A SUMMARY	163
Research Overview	163
Comparison of Blue Ribbon and Optimum Programs	167
Similarities	167
Differences	168
Recommendations	171
Objectives and Curriculum	171
Implementation Through Innovation	174
Educational Leaders	176
Learning Via Practice and Mentoring	178
Evaluation	180
Personal Epilogue	181
First Change	183
Second Change	184
Third Change	185
Future Research	186
Closing Comments	187
REFERENCES	190

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. A Continuum of Change Per Profession	19
2. Taxonomy of Supervision	21

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Results of Pastoral Training Programs Reviewed	99

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Page
A. National Association of Evangelicals Statement of Faith	202
B. Pastoral Training Programs Reviewed for Leadership Training	203
C. Expert Panel Members Consent Form	207
D. Questions for Expert Panel Interviews	208
E. Second Round Delphi Survey	209
F. Third Round Delphi Survey	213

CHAPTER 1

THE PASTOR AS LEADER

Introduction

When President Woodrow Wilson's Secretary of Labor died, one of the White House maids caught the President off guard with a request. "Mr. President, my husband runs a little store on Pennsylvania Avenue and really works hard. I wonder if you would consider making him Secretary of Labor?" Startled by her unexpected and rather unreasonable request, the President replied, "Well, Mary, that's a very critical position. It requires a big man." She replied, "Well, if you put my husband in that position, he'd be a big man."

This amusing anecdote purveys the dilemma behind an age-old leadership myth, namely that the position makes a person. Although there is much to be said for the critical response that "position does not make the person, the person makes the position," there often exist strong expectations of those in certain positions, especially when these positions are perceived as involving leadership. This is true of people who fill the position of pastor. Right or wrong, parishioners, denominational administrators, and people in general perceive that sole or senior pastors should act as leaders of local congregations. Dissonance between pastoral and parishioner expectations and behaviors often disrupts

organizational health to the point that secondary and tertiary matters take priority, eventually leading to organizational dysfunction and even death. In other words, most congregations have certain assumptions about the leadership that should be expected by pastors and these assumptions have been created by society, experiences with previous pastors, and denominational teaching and polity. Pastors as well maintain an array of expectations that are developed by personal perceptions, training, and cultural influences. When congregational and pastoral expectations are not fulfilled, conflict inevitably transpires. As in the story, many ministerial students assume that once they obtain a pastoral position, they will rise to the leadership requirements imposed upon the role. Likewise, parishioners presume one called to the ministry and ordained into full-time Christian service will be able to lead the flock.

The Issue

Researcher George Barna (1993) concluded a survey of over 1,000 pastors by stating, "During a decade of study, I have become increasingly convinced that the Church struggles not because it lacks enough zealots who will join the crusade for Christ, not because it lacks the intangible resources to do the job and not because it has withered into a muddled understanding of its fundamental beliefs. The problem is that the Christian church is not led by true leaders" (p. 136). The recent levels of exasperation between local church expectations of leadership from pastors and actual pastoral behavior are most likely exacerbated by the prolific

changes within society at large and the evolving perceptions of leadership in general. An occasional voice suggests that our dilemma is not a lack of leaders, but rather an inability to recognize them (Muck, 1987). The argument is that God calls those he needs to fill certain positions. However, this sort of explanation appears overly simplistic, pollyanish, and even spiritually irresponsible. Doctor of Ministry programs for those having years of pastoral experience have arisen around the country, several of which address these issues of leadership training. But the jury is still out as to whether this dilemma can be sufficiently solved prior to ordination. Those already in the trenches have different motivations in seeking leadership training. Often it is to reduce organizational and personal pain. The increasing average age of ministerial students in graduate schools should provide an even greater opportunity to effectively establish leadership training as students are entering seminaries for second careers and these students come with more experience in organizations than previous candidates. One question deserving recognition is to what degree leadership can be taught to those who have only limited practical experience. It is primarily the responsibility of higher education to prepare leaders for the future church. The current process appears to be flawed. For example, Barna (1993) noted that among the few pastors interviewed who felt they had the "gift of leadership," none of them said the seminary prepared them very well for the responsibilities of leadership they had encountered in their ministry (p. 121). Much of the popular literature today is based on the belief that individuals have varying degrees of

leadership aptitudes, abilities, and inclinations toward influence, whether inborn or developmental. A common evangelical belief is the recognition of spiritual gifts, special endowments of grace, including leadership (Barna, 1993; Wagner, 1979). Barna (1993) also pointed out that one-fourth of all pastors surveyed cannot list their spiritual gifts.

The system has never been perfect, but it is apparently weak at this time. A careful analysis of the major components should reveal potential trouble spots and thus hopefully point to a remedy. Many voices in society have recently sounded a cry about a felt leadership dilemma. More and better leaders is the chant. I do not think the quality or quantity of leaders has likely lapsed drastically in the last century. Perhaps it is a sense that more and better leaders are needed due to the sheer number of global and technological changes the last few decades. It may be a complex response of people who perceive organization fragility. The literature at this point only speculates. The church does not appear to be sanctified from the so-called leadership dilemma emerging in the latter part of the twentieth century. Instead of merely adding to the choir crying for more and better leadership, the response must be to rethink our concepts of pastoral leadership expectations and act appropriately.

Although education and communication strive at times to reduce and clarify assumptions in life, one must live with a certain number of basic assumptions on a daily basis. Society depends upon assumptions such as people obeying laws, basic morality, and respect for others. Assumptions can be

disappointing and even destructive when they are poorly founded. It is assumed by local churches and the laity that graduates of accredited ministerial programs are prepared for the pastorate. It is assumed by the institutions of higher education that teaching a person theology and some pastoral ministry courses are what are necessary for leadership training. The catalogs are replete with phrases about leadership training and preparing tomorrow's leaders, but the courses to match that claim are nearly nonexistent. It appears the old bait and switch phenomena are alive and well in ministerial academia today. Although that is more commentary than unbiased researcher response, the matter of integrity is at the heart of this issue. The dissonance in the church is rarely one of rational discourse, but surfaces in emotional disappointment. "A world of difference exists between training people to be theologians and training people to be pastors or leaders. The educational model we have in place in America fails to make that distinction" (Barna, 1993, p. 142). Barna's quote is the essence of this study. A quick perusal of a few Master of Divinity (MDiv) programs, the mainstay of pastoral education, shows that nearly all the courses have to do with academic, theological and historical topics. A growing number of institutions are implementing some practical courses on counseling, pastoral care, and business administration, but hardly any of these even mentioned the concept of leadership.

The assumption is that a pastor will be a leader merely by his or her position in the church and that acquiring certain theological information and specific ministerial skills so endows such a person to be a leader. There is a

significant difference between a leader and a spiritual technician. The goal of formal education should be to attain both, but we are only training people to be theologians, preachers, teachers, and ministerial managers. Granted, a leader without such spiritual technological training would not be a likely candidate for pastoral responsibilities. Rather, these tend to be prerequisites for pastoral leadership and should not be assumed to take the place of leadership training. The issue is not adding more ministerial training, rather it is training ministers to act as leaders in their respective churches. We should not assume a person is fit to be a pastor with only a ministerial foundation and no or very limited leader qualities.

We tend to be producing theologians, people who are ready to assume staff ministry positions, or pastoral roles in churches where the pastor is not considered to be the main leader. Unfortunately, these assumptions are not the same for most local churches. Those who emerge as leaders do so out of personal giftedness, experience and/or training which takes place beyond the program parameters of undergraduate and graduate ministerial degrees. Some might suggest they excel in spite of their theological education. This is not to suggest that institutions of higher education can produce finished pastors, but a negligence in the area of specific training in the discipline of leadership is a significant oversight on the part of the system which is defined as more than just institutions of higher education. The system includes local churches and denominational hierarchy, all of whom are a part of the evangelical culture.

The scientific revolution has caused us to analyze phenomena which we previously took for granted. This is true of the orbit of the planets, gravity, psychology, and leadership. Throughout the Old Testament, a leader was determined by one's anointing, election, and faith in Yahweh. Stories of great leaders persist, but little is mentioned about the process of leadership other than the selection, various traits and events, and the outcomes of leaders who failed and/or succeeded out of character issues. The only conclusion is that leadership is what leaders do, an overly simplistic explanation. The problem in studying what the Bible says about leadership is that people did not talk much about leading. Leadership seemed to happen naturally, not so much out of intention. Sometimes it happened better than other times.

The New Testament provides some lingering leader metaphors like the shepherd. But metaphors have boundaries. Shepherds are not sheep, whereas leaders are people. Followers are not sheep. Leaders often have more complex responsibilities than those entailed in shepherding. Jesus said that those desiring positions of power and priority placement should seek weakness and service, thus portraying servant leadership. As Eugene Habecker (1991) pointed out, the servant leadership literature rarely discusses what it means to be a master. To properly discuss implications of what it means to be a servant, it is essential to discuss what is meant to be a master. Those of us who talk about leadership coined the phrase "servant leadership." Jesus did not. The Epistles provide character traits applicable for leaders, but they do not tell church elders how to

lead or what leadership is all about.

The Reformation and the Wesleyan and Azusa revivals brought great changes, all without so much of a mention of leadership styles and techniques. It is not until after World War I and our immersion in the age of technology and the scientific boom that we begin to significantly discuss, label, and hypothesize about the concept of leadership. Never before in history have so many books, classes, speakers, articles, and explanations of leadership existed, and yet many scholars and practitioners say we are in a dilemma.

Metacommunication is the concept of being able to talk about one's communication with another in a relationship. For example, in marriage, a couple strives to communicate. A husband and wife can greatly enhance the quality of their communication by talking about how they talk together. Leaders and followers share a relationship with each other. It appears that the social evolution has taken us to the point of needing to talk about what is happening in the leadership process. Hopefully greater clarification on how leaders lead and how followers participate, will serve to enhance our effectiveness in leadership.

A lack of knowledge has rarely been humanity's worst enemy. It is wisdom, the judicious application of knowledge and will, the motivations of the heart, which are our Achilles' heel. In the last two decades, dozens of leadership books and articles with a Christian context have emerged, but only a handful address leadership training of ministerial students. Leadership training is different than the training of leaders. Many seminars and institutions of higher education

have jumped on the leadership bandwagon to market their programs as leadership, ultimately transforming little more than course or program titles. Most leadership classes continue to be homiletics, theology, Christian education, and other skill-based courses for Christian leaders which are necessary. Such courses would be taught regardless of a leadership dilemma. Most of these classes began when church leaders were merely known as pastors. In essence, we have changed the educational package, but have modified the contents little. Aluminum siding on a house with a cracked foundation is not going to fix the problem. A new facade on the old edifice is not enough if we are to cope with the logarithmic progressions in the world.

Doctor of Ministry courses on leadership, although still few, tend to be playing catch up. Of the essence are programs that create cutting edge leaders who from the start are skilled and resourced in leadership. Recent discussions of seminarians with large church pastors, the creation of institutional organizations like the Center for Christian Leadership associated with Dallas Seminary, and groups such as the Biblical Institute of Leadership Development (BILD) show that changes are on the horizon. Nothing exists in evangelicalism in published form like the Center for Creative Leadership's annual volume of leadership courses in the United States. Much has yet to be done to make leadership training for pastoral students an intentional and thought out process.

The Purpose and Scope of the Study

Barna (1993) suggested the leadership problem involves at least four components. They include (1) how we identify leaders, (2) how we prepare them to lead, (3) the process used to evaluate the leader, and (4) the pastoral support system. This study delves into the first two of these problems as they pertain to preparing those headed for the pastoral ministry. The purpose of this study is to analyze the leadership training of ministerial students at evangelical institutions of higher education and to develop, with the assistance of experts, an optimum leadership training program. If it was determined that sufficient training programs did not exist, this might suggest a need for such an optimum program. If programs do exist, a review of pastoral training programs would provide a basis for critique and analysis. It also makes sense to reconsider pastoral student training with regard to leadership, and to determine and recommend how a problem of insufficient preparation might best be resolved.

Such a study is appropriate as there appeared to be a growing discontentment in the evangelical realm, centering on the idea that traditional educational institutions were not sufficiently preparing ministers to fulfill congregational expectations in the context of leadership. Just as a fever usually indicates infection in a body, dissonance in an organization reveals a potential malady. An indigenous characteristic of theological institutions is the preservation of tradition and the eternal truths within religious beliefs. In and of itself this is a strength. But strengths can also become weaknesses. A weakness of such

institutions is a reticence at times to respond to vacillating cultural needs, thus creating a ministry preparation gap. Such a situation warrants further investigation into the current state of ministerial leadership training. The intent of this study is to consider the current state of affairs with regard to actually training pastors to be leaders in their undergraduate and graduate programs. Since the condition of such training is embryonic at best, this study also recommends an optimum training program developed by a panel of experts.

Definitions

Patton (1990) quoted Halcolm, an evaluation philosopher, as saying, "Because you can name something does not mean you understand it. Because you understand it does not mean it can be named" (p. 369). Perhaps the muddiness in leadership studies is best explained by Halcolm's succinct thought. We know leadership when we see it, but we have a difficult time explaining the process. The Zen approach might suggest that in recognizing and accepting the impossibility of clearly containing the concept cognitively, one is more apt to transcend into an enlightened realization of what leadership is. Regardless, a definition helps contain a term much like river banks serve to channel water. Considering the historical Midwest flooding which took place during this dissertation research, the metaphor seems appropo.

Leadership

In this context, leadership is defined as **the process whereby persons in relationship with each other grant influence to one or others to give direction, motivation, and organization, resulting in a synergistic phenomena or organizational intent toward change.** From this brief definition, one can deduce that leadership is seen primarily as a social construct. Leadership by coercion or as personal self-discipline is not included. Leadership is a dynamic reality. Power is generally the ability to act or do, the capability of doing or accomplishing something. Thus, leadership is the voluntary empowerment of individuals who serve as leaders, and who in turn empower others to accomplish more than they would or could without leadership.

Leader

A leader is **one with more responsibility.** Although this may at first appear to be a strikingly obtuse and even blunt definition, its brevity is intended to avoid the philosophical posturing so common among those debating the manager versus leader terminology. Are you a leader or a manager? Are you a leader because of your position? In order to refrain from semantic leap-frogging, a pragmatic viewpoint is taken. A real world situation is that others look toward the person with the most responsibility as the leader, especially when change and direction are desired. Such a definition gets around much of the cyclically subjective investigation of determining whether a person is a leader or not. The question of

importance becomes, "How effective is the person at leading?" or in other words, "Does this person catalyze leadership?" If the answer is negative to either question, then the person is an ineffective leader, at least in this situation. Although position may not make a person a leader, others expect leader qualities from those in certain positions.

An elementary definition of a leader is a person who has people following him or her. This may not be the case in the context of the evangelical pastorate. Formally, others look toward certain people as leaders under the assumption that they are the most responsible. Evangelical churches generally expect pastors to be congregational leaders. Informally, however, other individuals emerge as leaders by assuming responsibility for situations which in their minds necessitate leadership, whether that situation is a group of kindergartners trying to decide what to play at recess, or a group of soldiers in the heat of battle determining whether to advance or retreat.

Another idea to incorporate in this concept of a leader is that leadership tends to be episodic. Naturally, there are some responsibilities of a leader such as public relations and serving as an organizational symbol which tend to be continual, but which may or may not bring about intended change. This may be exacerbated in a religious community where a pastor is often referred to as living in a fishbowl, and where personal integrity and modeling are stronger issues than in other organizational settings. Habecker (1991) suggested that people are seldom able to get beyond the leadership nature of a relationship. This helps

explain the heavy emphasis in literature on the character of the leader so prominent in evangelicalism. Without going into an elongated social psychological description of leadership, suffice it to say that generally, one who is responsible need not lead all the time. Rather, there are key situations where leading is necessary, and the rest of the time can be invested in teaching, administrating, managing, playing golf, or in this context, doing ministerial functions. We tend to call people leaders who understand which situations require leading and strive to catalyze leadership, and who can effectively make leadership take place within an organization. It is a mistake to assume that everything such a person of responsibility does as leading.

The issue of responsibility is what helps us better understand how it is that such a person becomes known as a leader, in that he or she is responsible all the time. Just as I am not at this moment fathering, I am still considered to be my sons' father, partially because I do father at times, and partially because I am responsible for my sons' welfare all the time. The practical question is whether or not I am effective as a father. Effective leaders are those individuals who excel in recognizing and responding to leadership situations when they arise. Ineffective leaders are those who either fail to recognize when leadership is needed and/or are unable to successfully catalyze change. Regardless of what you call a person, even the President of the United States spends only a small percentage of his active work in true leadership activities. Most of the time is spent in management, protocol, public relations, etcetera.

Pastoral Leadership

Pastoral leadership is **the process whereby parishioners and pastor in relationship with each other, grant influence to the pastor to give direction, motivation, and organization, resulting in a synergistic phenomena of congregational intent toward change.** Effective pastoral leadership in turn results in an empowered laity. This definition is really a combination of the previous definitions of leadership and leader in a church context. The pastor, as the one most responsible for the organizational welfare of the church, is generally the one who must catalyze the leadership process and as a change agent, seek to initiate influence. Since most congregations consider their pastor as the one most responsible for the welfare of the flock, leading becomes an expectation whether or not it transpires. Thus the real world question is not so much, "Is a pastor a leader?", as much as it is, "How effective is the pastor at leading?" In this study, the term *pastor* refers to *those in sole or senior pastoral roles in churches.*

Because this research involved an analysis of leadership training for pastors, the emphasis of this dissertation is on the pastor as opposed to lay leaders and the church leadership process as a whole. As a result of this pastoral context, the thrust may appear to approximate the "Great Man" theories popularized in the literature. Rost (1991) noted the plethora of literature promoting this industrial model of hierarchical leadership. I want to comment briefly on this in positioning the concept of the leader.

Since its inception, the Protestant movement, of which evangelicalism is a

major part, elevated the role of laity and reduced the gap between priest and people predominately based on theological interpretations of scripture. This Reformation dogma has emerged strongly in recent years with the teaching of spiritual gifts and lay ministry. Jesus noted that seeking position was wrong, when John and James tried to position themselves next to him when he came into his kingdom. James wrote that we should avoid giving preferential treatment in the church to those with social status. Most of the church hierarchy developed subsequent to the early church. Some of this structure was due to the rapid growth of the church at Pentecost as is visible in Acts, chapter six. Various offices are noted in the Epistles, including overseers, teachers, elders, and bishops. No doubt much of the hierarchical structure was human versus Spirit spawned.

Even though Jesus and the early church appeared to avoid much hierarchy, one must recognize the unique rights and responsibilities of those designated as leaders. The sacrament of baptism evolved from the Old Testament practice of anointing a king or chosen leader with oil, symbolic of God's anointing on that person. In first Timothy, Paul provided specific qualifications for elders. Elsewhere, he suggested that people should not seek to be teachers for they will be judged more harshly because of their influence. Jesus had unique requirements for his disciples whom he was mentoring to become the church leaders. The scriptures are inundated with these sort of paradoxical one-liners. To be first, one must be last. If one wants to lead, one must become a servant or as the youngest. If a person wants to be great, that person must become least.

So, it appeared that Jesus did believe in hierarchical leadership, that is, varying status for those who chose or felt called to roles of influence. Corporate life in Western civilization is based on a pyramid. The higher one climbs in the organization, the more rights and privileges one is granted. However, the Christian model is based on the inverted pyramid in that the higher one traverses in responsibility, the fewer rights and privileges to which one is entitled.

Most denominations and local church polity recognize the need for formal hierarchical structure, whether it place the pastor or the board at the top of the chain of responsibility. This aspect of responsibility has been mentioned in defining the term *leader* in that the leader is the one who is most responsible. The scriptures and model of Jesus recognize informal hierarchy. The recognition of gifts (Romans 12, 1 Corinthians 12, Ephesians 4) and the parable of the talents (Matthew 25) suggest that there are varying degrees of anointing and blessing from person to person. Although everyone stands individually before God, those with greater talents, resources, and influence will be judged more harshly. Leaders are required to act as servants and are given the responsibility of shepherding the flock. "All people are created equal" is a quote from recent historical literature, not the scriptures. Therefore, it is the premise of this study that a significant responsibility, although not all, rests on the shoulders of the pastor as leader of the church. This position is not to be assumed lightly. It is the primary responsibility of the local church pastor to influence the congregation to work together as a body and to make sure the ministerial provisions are

available. He or she must act as a player coach to prepare the team as best as possible.

Management and Manager

Another clarification helpful at this point is to define management as compared to leadership. This distinction will receive greater attention in the review of literature chapter. Management is **the process where by an organization is maintainted and inherent structures are perpetuated**. This definition is limited in that the process of maintenance may require leadership if forces would cause the organization to deteriorate. For example, a church in an ethnically changing community will naturally tend to decline. A pastor who influences change may actually participate in effective leadership so that the result is a church which statistically maintains when it would naturally decline. The emphasis here is on maintaining status quo under normal conditions.

A manager is **a person whose primary responsibility is to maintain the existing structure of an organization**. Although numerous scholars and popular writers spend a lot of time in dialectic ventures regarding the terms *management* and *leadership*, a multitude of others use the terms *management* and *leadership* synonymously, as they do the terms *manager* and *leader*. Often, the terms *manager* and *leader* are merely labels, title differences. Leaders can participate in management and managers participate in leadership.

A leader is different than leadership, just as a manager is distinguishable

from management. The latter terms of the two dyads have to do with processes, whereas the first terms represent individuals most responsible for the process. I do not consider leadership and management as identical concepts, even though much of the literature as well as many of the college catalogs surveyed use the terms interchangeably.

Figure 1

A Continuum of Change Per Profession

Perhaps one way to avoid such debate is by seeing the two as first or second cousins to each other (see Figure 1). On a continuum of change, using profession titles to describe differences in terms of change, to the extreme right would be the archeologist, one who describes what happened historically. Next would come an accountant, one who merely reports what is happening. Beside this would come a manager, one who carries out prescribed functions with some supervision, who is primarily engaged in the maintenance of the organization's purpose. To the left would appear the leader, one with a heart for vision and a sense of overall responsibility, a people organizer and motivator. Finally to the extreme left would be an entrepreneur, one who brings about significant change either through an invention or starting an organization.

A given organization calls for a role corresponding to the amount of

change it needs or desires to facilitate. One possible reason for the recent outcry for more leaders is the logarithmic progression of changes of technology and life in general in the postindustrial Information Age. When drastic changes are needed, acquire the services of an entrepreneur. When less drastic but significant and ongoing changes are necessary, procure a leader. When constructive maintenance is key, seek a manager. When little more than an organizational autopsy is desired, an archeologist will do. An astute, talented individual can provide appropriate responses to a larger distance on this continuum, although not all of it. Most people tend to be more specialized with regard to their role on the change continuum. An entrepreneur can be devastating to an organization which seeks stability, and conversely, an administrator could be like a deck chair arranger on the Titanic. Therefore, each aspect is equally valuable in its time and equally dangerous when inappropriate. A continuum such as this is more useful than categorical specification for it acknowledges overlap and muddiness.

One way to help clarify the confusion and common overlap of the concepts of leadership and management is to present them together in a supervision taxonomy on one segment of a change continuum (see Figure 2). Supervision implies overall responsibility. The "one in charge" is an often heard phrase in the context of management and leadership. This may be why many use the terms in this taxonomy interchangeably, as if they mean the same thing.

Figure 2

Taxonomy of Supervision

Management refers to maintenance supervision of organizational structure such as carrying out policy and fiduciary responsibilities. Management is a sort of link between the product and people, the organizational structure and the services provided. Management is primarily concerned with the implementation of policy, a process which emphasizes incremental changes to the existing system within the existing environment. Toward the management section on the continuum, but within the leadership parameters would be the aspect of transactional leadership (Burns, 1978). This type of leadership emphasizes more of an exchange of resources and a political, judicious change process. This form of leadership differentiates from management in its proactivity and responsiveness to changing conditions in the organization and/or environment. To the left of this would be transformational leadership. This kind of leadership is primarily value changing and instills more significant and penetrating changes. Transactional leadership is more evolutionary, yet intentional, whereas transformational leadership is more creationist in style. Often, leaders with personal charisma or strong power resources catalyze transformational leadership to take place.

In summary, good management is seen as the healthy maintenance of an

organization whereby leadership implies intentional change, more emphasis on vision, and greater responsibility for the big picture. In the context of the pastorate, local church management would equate to the functions of organizational administration (i. e., budget setting, program planning, chairing the board of elders, etc.). The spiritual side of this managerial function would include ministerial behaviors such as preaching, teaching, evangelizing, discipleship, counseling and officiating religious services, in sum a spiritual/religious technician. A certain degree of ministerial and managerial skills are expected as prerequisites in pastoral leaders. For example, individuals with influence aptitudes, but who lacked professional skills of ministry would not be considered pastors. On the other hand, such ministerial roles can basically be performed without leadership skills, even though the pastor is still considered a church supervisor. Pastoral leadership involves vision casting, empowering of the laity via equipping them for ministry and delegating some of the ministry to them. It is the effective creation of teamwork and commitment. Although only certain aspects of a pastor's activities require leadership behaviors, pastors without such abilities at the times when leadership is needed would be deemed as ineffective leaders. Pastoral leadership expresses the pastor's part of congregational leadership as a whole. In simple terms, pastoral leadership facilitates leadership in the local church life.

Ministry

A final term worth posing a definition for is *ministry*. Traditionally, ministry refers to the religious/spiritual tasks that clerical professionals provide. This would include the officiating at formal and nonformal religious functions and counseling. The focus here is on spiritual nurturing and formation. Ministry in a biblical sense transcends this tradition to include lay service as well. Although the topic at hand relates to professional clergy, this empowerment of the laity must come into greater clarification as it pertains to pastoral expectations, priorities, and time issues. In this context, ministry per se refers to **fulfilling congregational needs in community**. If the pastor is considered the minister, it is likely that the congregational expectations will be for a spiritual technician and resident theologian. If the laity recognize the priesthood of believers, the expectations will primarily be for the pastor to exude leader abilities.

Research Questions

I am investigating five research questions in this study. Although there is a strong tradition in evangelicalism to include biblical and historical premises upon which to base contemporary studies, this study intentionally deviates from this tradition based on the realization that leadership studies are somewhat modern, beginning around the turn of the twentieth century (Rost, 1991). It would not seem appropriate to analyze and critique ministerial training antecedent to the awareness that leadership is a field of study and practice in and of itself. This is

not to imply that leadership is a modern phenomena. I believe it is as old as most socializing processes. However, to force a contemporary leadership paradigm upon eras which did not consider leadership a formal, intentional process would be to create unnecessary research parameters and not necessarily support the issue at hand, that being an analysis of leadership training of ministerial students. To inspect leadership training prior to times when leadership was recognized as an autonomous concept would be an unnatural and cumbersome process.

1. How does leadership pertain to a local church? The *ecclesia*, the called out ones, refers to those making up the body of Christ, commonly known as the Church. The Church consists of numerous microcosms, typically resembling congregations indigenous to specific locales. Because a local church is defined by people versus buildings or programs, the need for leadership is implied. How is leadership seen in the context of a local congregation? Is it addressed in an official governing polity, or is it implied via theological traditions or both? What is the leadership *modus operandi* of a typical local church? The role of pastor is very important to the evangelical congregation so that leadership, whether it be pastoral or other, significantly affects the position. Congregations can formally and informally assume a lot about who will lead and what will result from this leadership. If the laity exercises leadership, tension may arise when a pastor assumes his/her role as the main initiator. Conversely, if parishioners assume certain leadership qualities in a pastor, who sees his/her role as more of a

theological educator and spiritual provider versus an organizational leader, frustration will transpire from these unmet expectations.

2. What is the difference between ministry and leadership? If leadership is a relationship, in this case between laity and the pastor, how is this relationship different than ministerial relationships? A common name for a pastor or ordained clergy person is minister. Is a professional minister, namely one trained and paid to work in the church, also expected to lead? How are these terms similar and dissimilar? A pastor can minister by leading, but ministry done by a pastor is not necessarily leading. And what is the congregation's role in the ministry? A review of the dialectic discussions of leaders versus managers proves helpful in understanding some of the dynamics in this comparison as well. Some theologians have proposed a distinction between prophets and priests in a similar vein. It appears that theological institutions of higher education have done a good job in training priests, but not prophets (L. Blank, personal communication, April 10, 1992). Is it the pastor's role to be the chief minister, or is it his/her role to lead the laity to minister? Again, a fundamental theological interpretation is key here as it applies to the Levitic tradition as opposed to that of the early church, the one which serves as the model for the evangelical philosophy of ministry.

3. Do evangelical institutions of higher education effectively prepare pastors to lead? If so, how? If not, why not? Pedagogical organizations ideally reflect the priorities and philosophies of ministry that the denominations and Church as a whole represent collectively. Local and national church bodies

depend upon such institutions to train and prepare suitable candidates for spiritual leadership, most commonly that of the local church pastor. Therefore, an analysis of the Christian institutions of higher education and specifically the programming applicable to ministerial students would assist an investigation of the dissonance between local church leadership expectations and pastoral behaviors.

4. To what degree can leader skills be taught? A more appropriate question may be, how does one distinguish those with leadership aptitudes? If everyone is a leader, then no one is a leader. As in most practices and fields, individuals emerge with special inclinations. By developing a process of recognizing those with and without such inclinations, more effective counseling can take place. Upon recognizing those with a call to ministry, but who lack such aptitudes, special training could help these ministers learn their functions in the leadership process.

5. What would an ideal leadership training program for ministerial students look like? The preponderance of this study's impact lies in how it can transform future leadership training of pastoral neophytes. In essence, what arises in a critique of current training programs, and what would an ideal leadership training experience look like? This question in particular sets the theme for the methodology of the research project, based on the foundation of the conceptual facets. What attributes would an incarnate leadership program have, and what curricula and adjunct processes could be intentionally designed to prepare pastors to lead, in addition to minister?

Significance of Study

First, this study will benefit the evangelical community at large by adding to the body of information on Christian leadership. It will provide a synthesis of leadership ideas from both Christian and secular sources. Specifically, it will add to a body of literature regarding leadership and theological training which, as the literature review reveals, is drastically sparse. Although much has been written about theological education as well as pastoral ministry, and the body of literature on Christian leadership is expanding rapidly, very little has been done at the crossroads of these three fields pertaining to leadership training for pastors in institutions of higher education.

Second, this study will benefit those called into full time Christian service, especially those interested in the pastorate. The current pastor who may be interested in enhancing his/her leadership capacities would be stretched by thinking through some of the theological and philosophical implications distilled in this work and would be able to better understand the dynamics at work between the pastor and the church he/she serves. In addition, ministerial candidates could be piqued to analyze their own perceptions of ministerial training and seek out courses and even schools which reflect a leadership tenor.

Third, this study will benefit administrative and academic personnel in critiquing past and current ministerial training programs in the context of leadership preparation, as well as designing future programs better prepared to train pastors and full time Christian service workers in leadership principles. Such

a leadership theme in a Christian context could transcend theological programs by providing a curriculum for Christian leaders who want to serve God in other professional careers other than the pastorate. Very little is being done in evangelical institutions of higher education to train such leaders.

An Outline of This Study

The purpose of this study is to look at the state of leadership training of pastors in evangelical institutions of higher education in the United States, as well as develop an optimum training program. Chapter one provides the background of this study by raising issues, contextualizing terms, and providing rationale for the study. The focus is on training pastors as primary catalysts within local congregational leadership.

Chapter two is a literature review regarding five areas surrounding this project. They include (1) pastoral leadership which entails leadership studies in general and literature from a Christian context, (2) ministerial roles and pastoral expectations, both biblical and traditional, (3) leadership versus management and the context of the local church, (4) ministerial preparation with an emphasis on theological education, and (5) a brief look at leadership education. The chapter concludes with a critical look at the literature as a whole in this area as it pertains to the state of pastoral leadership training in institutions of higher education.

Chapter three is a rationale for and description of the methodology used in the two-phase research. The first phase had to do with gathering and reviewing

141 higher education catalogs of pastoral training programs. These programs were listed and categorized according to the breadth and depth of leadership curricula offered. The second phase involved gathering an expert panel who constructed an optimum training program via the Delphi method. The chapter provides a step-by-step description of the research.

Chapter four provides further description and results of the review of institutional programs. Five categories of programs are identified as (1) not supporting leadership training, (2) failing to clarify leadership from management and ministry, (3) acknowledging leadership, (4) supporting leadership training, and (5) emphasizing leadership training. A brief description of programs in the fourth category is provided along with a more detailed description and analysis of the fifth category programs.

Chapter five explains the step-by-step evolution of the expert panel's recommendation for an optimum ministerial training program according to the Delphi method. A six step process incorporated three Delphi rounds, resulting in three possible programs including an undergraduate minor, a master of arts in Pastoral Leadership and a MDiv with leadership emphasis. A final critique of the process and product is included.

Chapter six provides a brief comparison of the blue ribbon training programs and the expert panel's recommendations for an optimum training program. A summary of the dissertation is included along with personal comments and recommendations for future research in the area.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The literature review consists of a summary discourse in each of five areas. First, there is a truncated overview of pastoral leadership which includes leadership studies in general, and those from a Christian context in particular. Due to the immensity of this field, the focus will be on sampling of the latter. The goal is primarily to provide an overview of available leadership training materials for ministerial education. Secondly, the literature pertaining to ministerial roles and pastoral expectations, both biblical and traditional, is discussed. Thirdly, literature regarding the differences between leadership and management is considered. Most pastors tend toward managing whereas congregational expectations include leading. Fourthly, a consideration of the literature addressing ministerial preparation with an emphasis on theological education reforms is presented. Finally, a refined look at leadership training proves helpful in better understanding how ministerial preparation evolved into its present condition and how it might best be changed. This review provides insights for an ideal leadership training program as to whether such a program is feasible as a part of a reformed existing institution or if an adjunct training institute

should be created. A synthesis of these literature reviews serves as a thorough backdrop from which to synthesize a well grounded theory in addition to creating a unique study.

Pastoral Leadership

Leadership literature has burgeoned since the 1970s (Bass, 1990; Bennis, 1989; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Burns, 1978; Gardner, 1990; Kouzes & Posner, 1987 & 1993; Rost, 1991; Stogdill, 1974). Although it resembles one of numerous societal changes indicative of the paradigmatic revolution of industrial to informational societies, leadership studies appear to be here for awhile (Toffler, 1990). Religious/Spiritual cultures are little different than the rest of the world in this area, striving to keep up with myriad changes, proactively out of anticipation and reactively out of anxiety and losses. By nature leaders help provide a sense of direction, meaning, and organization, thus producing hope. Leadership is in greater demand when situations show need for change. The plethora of leadership books, articles, and courses on the subject reveals the anxiety of the present.

One possible theory as to why more is not being done in pastoral leadership training is that sufficient Christian texts do not exist. It is not uncommon for theological circles to be ten years or more behind societal shifts. However, this proves to be untrue in the area of leadership. Among the nearly 200 books I now have in my personal library, representing most titles published in

the last five years with very few preceding 1975, over one-third pertain to leadership in a Christian context. The church is not typically known as a pacesetter, but in this arena, it appears to be holding its own respectively with the more aggressive business realm.

By far, most of the leadership literature in the Christian realm exists in published books. It is not uncommon for leader interviews to show up in evangelical periodicals (Kachur & Neff, 1986; Mangrum, 1986). One journal, titled *Leadership*, exists specifically for pastors. A majority of the article titles deal with pastoral topics which are ministerial (such as counseling, worship, burnout, integrity, evangelism, discipleship, and other themes), versus specifically the nature of leadership. Although every pastor needs to be concerned with such topics, the journal title is a bit misleading in that leadership specifically is rarely addressed. Exceptions include an article by Peter Drucker (1989) which was managerial in context, a leadership forum on steering the church (Cunningham, Jacobsen, Rhodes, Stedman, & Ukleja, 1989), and "The Race to the Pole: Lessons for Leaders" (Burkeen, 1989). The journal title appears to reflect the common notion identified in Chapter 1, that leadership is perceived as positional and is an expectation of pastors. *Ministries Today* focuses on pastoral concerns, but few if any articles discuss leadership in particular. In corresponding with the editor in 1992, I suggested she consider offering a monthly leadership column devoted solely to leadership issues. She said she would consider it, but found little room due to the many existing columns which focus on worship, counseling, prayer, and

similar ministerial topics. A few other journals or periodicals feature articles pertaining to leadership. *Christian Education Journal* (1991) dedicated six of ten articles to leadership, but such foci tend to be rare. A handful of denominational periodicals such as *Preacher's Magazine* cater to pastors, but also tend to overlook leadership on a regular basis. *Growing Churches*, a Southern Baptist publication for pastors, does a fairly good job of including organizational change articles in a church context, although most of them have to do with peripheral behaviors versus process issues. I have published four articles on leadership concept issues in this journal and the editor appears interested in more on the same theme. Even more sparse are leadership interests within more scholarly periodicals such as *Theologia*, *Theology Today*, *Church History*, as well as various seminary publications, which generally pertain to theological issues written by faculty members.

In addition to books, and aside from periodicals, a growing literature pool exists in private ministries sensitive to the leadership training. Bobby Clinton of the School of World Missions at Fuller Seminary has authored several unpublished monographs as well as several books which he uses in leadership training (Clinton 1984, 1989, 1992a, 1992b). George Barna, Bobb Biehls, Carl George, Howard Hendricks, John Maxwell, Fred Smith, Elmer Towns, and others stand out as purveyors of live seminars, video and audio tapes, articles, and seminar transcripts on evangelical leadership issues.

Christian leadership literature in books appears to fall within three

categories: general, leader character, and church.

General Leadership

General leadership books strive to provide an overview of leadership characteristics by synthesizing both secular and biblical thoughts. Engstrom (1976) came out with one of the first of this genre, wherein he discussed biblical examples of leadership as well as tasks, styles, and measurements. Hocking (1991) and McKenna (1989) described Christian leadership as a whole. By comparing these ideas with secular leadership theories, one can glean how Christian leadership is different than leadership in general. MacArthur (1989) confined his leadership views to commentary on biblical passages describing a leader, whereas D'Souza (1985, 1986a, 1986a) incorporated a lot of secular materials into his leadership theories.

Leader traits and behaviors tend to make up most of the leadership literature (Engstrom & Larson, 1988; Gangel, 1980; Hian, 1987; Myra, 1987; Powers, 1979; Stott, 1985) while Barber & Strauss (1982), Clinton (1992a), Nauss (1989), and Siler (1986) emphasize styles. Authors tend to vary in their approach, spanning from a very thorough, verse by verse inductive study of leadership oriented passages, to straight organizational material provided for those who claim Christian values. Swindoll (1978) and White (1986) rely heavily on Nehemiah's story for leadership principles, while Marshall (1991) analyzed New Testament leadership and Ford (1991) focused more on Jesus' way of creating vision, shaping

values, and empowering change. Boehme (1989), Eims (1975), and Swindoll (1985) describe leader traits in terms of biblical character traits. Gangel (1980) described various leaders in the Bible and provided brief reviews of their leadership, whereas MacArthur (1989) and Miller (1987) basically provided Bible studies on the topic. The most thorough biblical analysis on leadership roles within the church was by Harrington (1985).

All of this literature takes a somewhat traditional approach to Christian teaching by deducing ideas and behaviors from biblical passages. The benefits are hopefully obvious to most evangelicals. The weakness of this methodology is that we are at times reading into situations what often was not recognized in the context, since the study of leadership per se is a relatively new phenomena. Biblical passages usually pertain to life in general and are often transferable to many different situations in addition to leadership, which means that we may be stretching the concept at times when we thrust scriptures into a contemporary concept of leadership.

It is important to note that much of the Christian literature on leadership frequently quotes from the secular literature, and relies heavily on general organizational information. Companies are not Christian; people are. Leadership is not Christian; people are. Developing a theology of leadership (Gangel, 1991) need not diminish one's respect for leadership ideas generated outside of evangelicalism. Although there are aspects within some forms of leadership influence which would be counter Christian in character, such as those ends and

means to the end which did not reflect the lifestyle of Jesus, for the most part leadership is in itself a generic social truth and both Christian and secular students of leadership should be able to learn from each other (Klopfenstein, 1991). There is a growing trend to recognize the generic flavor of leadership which not only comes out via Christian authors published by secular publishers (DePree 1989, 1992) but especially by traditional Christian writers and publishers to put out leadership materials which are not laced with scriptures and biblical notations (Biehl, 1989; Maxwell, 1993; Oster, 1991).

Leader Character

The second category of Christian leadership literature has to do with the character of the leader. A significant difference between the corporate leadership and Christian leadership literature is that the latter greatly emphasizes motivations and character, although there are some exceptions. Greenleaf (1977) discussed servant leadership, Covey (1991) principle-centered leadership, Kouzes and Posner (1993) credibility, and Badaracco and Ellsworth (1989) integrity. DePree (1988, 1992) melded all of these concerns, whose views reflect a less industrial and more Christian approach to leadership. Cedar (1987) and Greenslade (1984) support the same views, but with an unabashed reference to Jesus' modeling of servant leadership, as does Youssef (1986). Clinton (1988) provided significant insight as to how leaders emerge and how God processes them in character. Such a book could prove an excellent text for leadership

training. Zaleznick (1977) equated leaders with artists, although unlike an artist, a leader is aesthetically a part of the artwork, meaning "you cannot look at a leader's art without looking at the artist" (p. 72). Since pastors lead organizations whose primary focus lies around spiritual- and character-changing processes, it is only logical that a significant amount of emphasis is placed on the character and nature of pastoral leadership, where the leader is both model and mentor, teacher and preacher (Oates, 1987). Nouwen (1990) and Sanders (1967), known for their deeply spiritual writing, wrote books on the importance of spirituality in leaders. Armerding (1992), Haggai (1986), Hocking (1991), and Towns (1986) discussed leader traits such as humility, love, vision, goal setting, perseverance, and faith in terms of biblical standards. Narramore (1988) noticed that Christian leaders fall under significant leadership pressures due to a lack of character strengths.

In an advertisement for a book on leadership, the caption read "How to Serve by Taking Charge." The emphasis on servanthood in Christian leadership literature evolves from a more Christian influence on leadership than the traditional views (Hawkins, 1988). Titles such as "Strength in Servant Leadership" (Cedar, 1987), "Leadership, Greatness, and Servanthood" (Greenslade, 1984), "Leading with a Follower's Heart" (Habecker, 1990), and "Power to Follow, Grace to Lead" (McKenna, 1989) all reveal a leadership model based on a Christian paradigm, yet generally include significant quotes and references from other secular and Christian leadership literature. Lawrence (1987) noted seven distinctions of Christian leadership, including one's position as other than number

one, character requirements, the source and enablement being the Holy Spirit, the ambition and motivation are for God's glory, and that one's authority is as a servant. Although both Christian and secular concepts of leadership have much in common, Nott (1986) suggested that the Church be more active in sharing its concepts of leadership with the secular realms in that its distinctions can greatly benefit the secular world.

Church Ministry

The third category of Christian leadership literature addresses church ministry. Some authors refer to ministry leadership without specifically addressing the pastor (Adams, 1978; Means, 1989), implying that church leadership need not be pastoral. Lee (1989) specifically pointed out pastoral and lay leadership in church life. Schaller is perhaps the most prolific author with regard to church growth ideas and two of his books (1986, 1988) focused primarily on leadership behaviors necessary for effective pastoring. Three church leadership books by Gangel (1989), Richards and Hoeldtke (1980), and Shawchuck and Heuser (1993), covered a wide spectrum of theological, attitudinal, and behavioral aspects regarding church leadership, as well as some managerial and administration functions. Ellis (1982), Gibbs (1987), and Nelson (1988) took general looks at pastoring in a briefer analysis. Cueni (1991) and Jones (1988) synthesized an array of Christian and secular concepts from various authors.

Another variance of literature within this category might be deemed

managerial. Anderson (1986), Dibbert (1986) and Luecke (1990) described pastoral leadership in the context of leading and managing the local church. Kilinski and Wofford (1973) take a more administrative angle by discussing things such as staffing and budgets. More recent trends include an emphasis on vision in leadership (Barna, 1991; Brown, 1991; Malphurs, 1992) which generally preceded their secular counterparts on the topic (Nanus, 1992; Quigley, 1993; Wall, Solum & Sobol, 1993).

The purpose of this section is not so much to describe pastoral or Christian leadership as much as to show that significant resources do exist for leadership training, by providing a sampling of such literature. Most of the leadership materials have to do with content issues versus process-oriented concepts. According to Clinton (1992, personal communication, September 22), an expert in the field of evangelical leadership studies, practically nothing has been written in the Christian leadership literature which focuses primarily on process.

Ministerial Roles

"If the primary purpose of theological education is to train ministers for the church, then the prime question in theological education must always be: 'what is the nature of ministry?'" (Fraser, 1988, p. xiv). "Entering the ministry is . . . like entering the army, where one never knows where he will land or live or what specific work he will be called to perform" (Neibuhr, 1956, p. 51). Hough and Cobb (1985) carried on one of Niebuhr's (1956) basic approaches by suggesting

the theological school should be a school for professional leadership. The problem is that instead of one master image, they gave eleven images of the church because no one image is complete. For example, the church is a caring community, a place of worship, and a structure for helping the less fortunate. Most pastors would not likely diffuse eleven images, but the fact that various models exist presents a challenge to an overly simplistic description of pastoral roles. Pastors often joke about the multitudinous expectations parishioners have of them, including such roles as teacher, counselor, administrator, CEO, CFO, janitor, preacher, fundraiser, contractor, etcetera. Considering that 85% of evangelical churches in the United States average under 200 Sunday morning attenders, one can understand the breadth of these expectations in that little room exists for specialization in such an organization. The local church pastor is one of the last generalist professions existing in a specialist's world.

Another element to consider regarding the protestant church is the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. It professes belief in the central place of the church's laity and seeks to stimulate lay expression. "But in a technical society Protestantism is also aware of the urgency of sustaining a large and well-qualified corps of professional priests" (Marty, 1962, p. 1360). Power is more balanced when the elevation of lay ministry reduces the gap between pastoral positional authority and the laity. At the same time, when lay ministry is elevated, the need for the local church pastor to be a leader, one who organizes, equips, and motivates the laity versus just managing the local religious corporation

increases.

Biblical terms for those in church leadership roles consisted of elder, builder, apostle, teacher, prophet, evangelist, and shepherd. Three terms are basically used to describe the office of the minister: *elder*, used sixteen times in the Bible, *overseer* or *bishop*, used six times, and *pastor*, used three times (Jones, 1988). It was not until the third or fourth century that church leaders took the Old Testament name of priest. Early church authority originally came from nonpatriarchal giftedness, recognized by the church body, but later it came through official succession as symbolized in the ordination ritual. All the while, the image of the church leader was that of both a spiritual model and teacher. Deegan (1969) saw the priest as primarily a manager of the local parish, similar to a corporate manager who runs an office in the business realm. Although the early church saw its leadership in terms of giftedness and election, the middle-age church gave great pomp and circumstance to the ordained few. The anti-clericalism of Tertullian originated the concept of the universal priesthood of believers (Harrisville, 1987). Recent renewal of that concept has created a modern crisis of pastoral identity. Although all believers are referred to as a royal priesthood, how does a pastor position him/herself in the church picture?

The Protestant image of the church leader changed significantly with the Reformation, when the priest had a negative image. Church leaders became known as preachers, pastors, and even parsons, emphasizing a shepherding motif. An additional change was that the preacher was seen behind the altar with a

Bible (Messer, 1989). The perception of the pastor/priest has often ebbed and peaked according to religious fervor as well as individual church community. The bottom line which appears is that "pastoral office refers to a position of leadership recognized as such within the Christian community, with a degree of permanence and status" (Volz, 1990, p. 13). Therefore, whether individually gifted or trained in leadership, those who fill the pastoral position as head of a local congregation are considered to be responsible for it, and are typically expected to behave as the religious organization's leader.

Ministers and the ministry schools give evidence of the prevailing mistiness of the conception of the ministry. Niebuhr (1956) suggested that church officials tended to be like merchants offering all sorts of wares so many customers would be attracted to their ecclesiastical emporiums. However, society was starting to fill many of those niches. Niebuhr went on to state that the confusion of what to offer keeps church officials from agreeing on the most important part of ministry which, of course, causes debate on what should be the sort of training made available by institutions designed to prepare students for the ministry. Callahan (1990) noted that the essence of ministry has changed as our society has become secularized. The day of the professional minister ended a few years ago "as professional ministers experienced a gridlock of meetings, desks stacked with papers, calendars filled with appointments, and declining worship attendances in their churches" (p. 3). Gustafson (1988) suggested that the theological education literature from 1955-1985 reflected the many societal changes experienced during

that same time, threats to Christian identity, denominational distinctiveness, the flow and ebb of ecumenism, the changing and differing conceptions of the purpose of the church and ministry, the global context, preseminary education, the relation between the number of graduates of theological schools and the available positions in churches and other institutions, and the Association of Theological Schools and its activities. A critique of the church which strives to respond to the cries of the congregation runs the risk of compromising biblical standards. Fiorenza (1988) noted the danger of training ministers to fulfill what the church and parishes feel they needed versus educating the ministers to tell the church or parishes what they should do. "A ministry professionalized to satisfying parochial expectations can become a ministry trained to be non-prophetic" (p. 114).

There is no clear cut job definition for a pastor from a biblical perspective. In fact, few pastors receive written job descriptions when hired. Much of the position has been based on sketchy scriptural descriptions of various aspects of early church life and tradition. When the early church grew so quickly, the apostles found themselves delegating managerial tasks such as caring for the widows, so that they could be about teaching and preaching of the word. Pastoral ministry has generally been associated with the responsibility of a local body. Thus, the definition of a leader used in this study is sufficient to call a pastor a leader. When leadership becomes a need of the congregation, the pastor needs to act as a catalyst for such, and thus would be ministering by being a leader. However, there are numerous pastoral activities which would not be considered

leading, and would come under the label of ministry.

There appear to be three categories of pastoral behaviors and expectations. The first is the spiritual provision, including religious activities such as serving the sacraments, teaching, counseling, prayer, making hospital calls, marrying and burying. The second category might be called management, which includes organizational maintenance like board meetings, daily administration, finances, and program assistance. The final category, perhaps the briefest in that it is episodic, is leadership. By far, theological education focuses on the first category, while a contemporary movement called practical theology seeks to apply the first and train in the second. Practically nonexistent is leadership training. There is a vast array of literature available on spiritual provision spanning from theology to biblical studies, from counseling to homiletic books and articles. What is not so clear is the church management literature in its distinctions from leadership. *Leadership* is a popular quarterly publication which tends to emphasize church management and ministry. It provides little in terms of specific leadership articles. It might be helpful at this point to distinguish ministry from leadership, noting the latter as a subset of the former. It may be helpful at this point to look at the management versus leadership literature and draw some ministerial correlations.

Leadership Versus Management

Kouzes and Posner (1987) suggested that effective leadership is a step

beyond managing, including challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act, modeling the way, and encouraging the heart (pp. 9-10). Bennis (1989) simplified the difference by suggesting managers do things right and leaders do the right thing, including the management of attention, meaning, trust, and self (p. 45). In an interview, Russell Palmer dissected the difference as number-crunching professionals versus leader-managers, who lead people versus just reacting to numbers (Quickel, 1989, p. 69). Levitt (1976) defined management as the rational assessment of a situation and the systematic selection of goals and purposes; the systematic development of strategies to achieve these goals; the marshalling of the required resources; the rational design, organization, direction, and control of the activities required to attend the selected purposes (p. 72). Zaleznik (1977, p. 126) used Levitt's (1976) description of management to point out that leaders and managers have basic different world views, overlapping into conceptions of work, the desire for balance and limited options versus change and increased options, and in relating to people. The malaise in American business is that managers, not leaders, have ascended the corporate hierarchy (Zaleznik, 1989). Kotter (1990a) suggested that management is a relatively new concept appearing in the last century, and has to do with planning and budgeting, organizing and staffing, and controlling and problem solving versus leadership which establishes direction, aligns people, and motivates and inspires. The manager is generally a people person who often lacks intuition and sees people as actors in a sequence of events whereas a leader attends to what the events and

decisions mean to participants and work out of vision and intuition.

Leadership is not necessarily better than management or a replacement for it (Kotter, 1990a, p. 103). Management bashing only muddies the waters by intimidating those who participate in the process and who therefore are reluctant to be identified with a title such as manager. When we depreciate the value of a manager, everyone wants to be called a leader, regardless of whether they catalyze leadership or not. The name game becomes our primary goal versus exercising real leadership. Rost (1991) suggested that not only are the terms *leadership* and *management* treated synonymously in much of the literature and popular communication, but in much of leadership literature management is demoted in value (p. 143). He noted that there is a place for good management and effective leadership, that serious students in the fields need to learn to distinguish between and appreciate the two. "My knowledge of organizational behavior has led me to the conclusion that effective organizations can be managed and supervised and not led, while some ineffective organizations can be lead into their difficulties without the benefit of management and supervision. Leadership is a rare phenomenon, not a common one in organizational behavior" (Dubin, 1979, pp. 225-226).

Managers tend to fear change and seek maintenance, whereas leaders do not fear change (Main, 1987, p. 92). Engstrom (1976) saw the leader "as one who guides and develops the activities of others. This includes the president, administrator, executive, pastor, director, superintendent, supervisor, department

head, and so on. It is a broader term than the popular term manager, which traditionally is associated more with industry or commerce" (p. 15). Leadership is a quality providing vision, and detail with concepts, exercising faith, seeking effectiveness, and providing direction while thriving on opportunity, whereas management is a science and an art, which supplies realistic perspectives, relates to functions and has to do with facts while seeking efficiency, and is concerned about control and accomplishment (Engstrom, 1976, p. 23). Tramel and Reynolds (1981) differentiated leaders from managers by self-identity versus organizational identity, the questioning of established procedures versus maintaining existing policies, personal versus positional power, and the enjoyment of innovating versus conforming to organizational structure (pp. 33-35). Management involves an authority relationship between managers and subordinates for the outcome of product and the selling of goods and services, whereas leadership is an influence relationship between leaders and followers for the purpose of intended changes emerging out of mutual purposes.

Callahan (1990, pp. 3-12) suggested that professional ministers need to be replaced with missionary pastors, those who have a mentality of using the resources of an organization to reach the community and not just maintain the fort. Leadership is different than both management and ministry (Marshall, 1991, pp. 6-7). Maxwell suggested that ministers are shepherds of the congregation who seek to add to the flock, respond to the atmosphere, find tasks fulfilling, and seek stability for short-term church health. Leaders adopt a rancher method seeking to

multiply the congregation and strive to create the atmosphere and motivate by vision. They are change oriented and strive to train people for longterm service by making one's self dispensable (1991, pp. 55-58).

What keeps so many professional pastors from taking on a leader mentality is the belief that they are the only ones who can do ministry tasks well. Smith (1986) said, "A leader is not a person who can do the work better than the followers; a leader is a person who can get followers to do the work better than he or she can, who can bring out the best in people" (p. 126). Maxwell agreed, "the pastor can't do it all" (1991, p. 55). Although endless seminars and course descriptions claim to teach leadership, there is a continual mindset developed in many of them of spiritual nurturing versus leading a local religious organization. Jones (1988) wrote a book on ministerial leadership, but compared these leaders with business managers. Brown (1991) wrote a critique on bringing leadership training into Christian education, and he proceeded to advocate teaching biblical content, taking spiritual life seriously, evangelizing, and other similar spiritual tasks seriously (pp. 109-113).

It seems difficult to convey the idea that leading needs to be distinguished from other ministerial functions. Professional ministers seem to match their business counterparts for the most part in that they serve as church managers and spiritual technicians, versus pastoral leaders. Blank (personal communication, October 10, 1992) suggested clarification by using the word *prophet* in terms of a leader, and *priest* in terms of a manager. Our ministerial schools train people to

be priests, not prophets. The only drawback of this biblical analogy is that prophets tended to be loners, whereas leaders work with people. Perhaps the goal would be to develop a mind of a priest and the soul of a prophet.

Lawrence (1992) questioned whether leadership skills can be developed in academic structures. "Limits in academic ministry leadership training are not news to anyone who knows the field. In and outside theological education, thoughtful people noted that the churches did not have effective people at their head. At least part of the reason was that the seminaries did not educate people to take charge" (p. 12). Shelley (1992) noted that the early seminaries did not think of seminaries as schools for professional and para-professional ministers as do contemporary educators. All of this appears to suggest that the traditional theological education system is designed to prepare professional ministers who upon graduation are obsolete in terms of leading the current church. The professional minister parallels a spiritual manager, but spirit-led leaders are expected by a majority of evangelical congregations. Zaleznik (1977) employed William James' (1958) description of two personality types, "once-born" and "twice born," suggesting that leaders are those twice-born persons who look at life in less than an orderly structure (p. 132). Since evangelicals consider themselves born again, might we suggest that an evangelical leader be thrice-born? The concept itself seems to fit the Hinduistic concept of reincarnation versus the Judeo-Christian paradigm.

One important distinction most common among church versus other

organizational leaders is that pastors are thought of as servants and stewards more than their secular counterparts. Biblical models suggest that pastors are church builders, but God gives the increase. This gets lost in much of the popular pastoral literature, but the idea that God is the granter of organizational success is strongly biblical. Change is primarily an outcome of the Holy Spirit versus the result of a shrewd leader with exceptional gifts and abilities. This is not to suggest that scriptures are anti-gifts, rather that the gifts, experiences, and human capabilities an individual brings into the picture are always subservient to power of God. In essence, leaders typically get the credit when leadership results in significant change. Biblically speaking, significant growth within a local body should reflect the movement of God, even though the practical result is that many individuals receive credit for the action. Personal success and progeny are not necessarily the fruitfulness which scripture deems important. A church leader tends to be more of a conduit for change versus the main change agent. This at once reduces the responsibility of any given leader by recognizing that God is ultimately in control, and yet adds the responsibility of staying spiritually strong, taking one's tasks seriously as a steward, and also maintaining a humble attitude of dependence on God's Spirit. Institutional power and spiritual authority are not the same (Jacobsen, 1992; Robinson, 1992; Segler, 1987).

Thus, the role of the pastor need greater clarification if proper theological education is to take place, especially as we learn to differentiate ministerial and managerial functions from leading aspects of pastoring. These roles may also

depend upon church size, denominational and local church polity and structure, and even theological and cultural variances.

Ministerial Preparation

It is only after one has defined ministry in the context of the pastorate and addressed role expectations of the congregation, that one can elaborate on what the pastoral training should look like. Having reviewed the literature on pastoral roles, it is now appropriate to discuss what the less optimistic commentators refer to as the dilemma in pastoral preparation. A brief history of ministerial training, and the literature addressing current evaluations and potential reforms within evangelical institutions of higher education are also discussed. The emphasis here is on theological education in the context of leadership training and institutional reform, as my hypothesis is that little has been done in the area of leadership training while churches were expected such training. Very little exists in the literature regarding leadership training and ministerial higher education. Cross referencing the two fields provided very few entries in the literature. Wood (1990) appeared to have isolate the issue with his article titled "Theological Education and Education for Church Leadership," but the focus of it was on theological training for church leaders who in turn teach theology to others, giving little attention to the specific training in leadership concepts. One might conjecture that the pleas for leadership are more recent, otherwise they would have showed up in current literature and actual church reforms if leadership had

been a long term felt need. This dearth may also help explain the growing number of adjunct agencies providing postseminary leadership training such as *Leadership Network* which hosts popular leadership conferences. *Christianity Today* listed "The Church in the 21st Century" conference as "One of the hottest new annual conferences," unique in its presentation of entrepreneurial leadership and management skills successful in large businesses (Chandler, 1993, p. 46).

To better understand the present situation, it might be helpful to briefly analyze the evolution of theological education (Marshall & Rossman, 1989). While recognizing Old Testament models, such as Samuel's mentoring in the temple and Elijah's School of the Prophets, Christian tradition of ministerial preparation focuses on Jesus and his inner circle of twelve and the outer circle of uncounted others. This personal style continued, such as with Paul's training of Timothy. There is no formal history of the seminary for us to refer to as such. In 250 AD, Rome had only forty-six priests who had mostly liturgical and pastoral duties. The early church had no specific institution for training pastors. In the second century, Justin founded his school in Rome, although not intended as a training center for priests. Augustine was the first to impose a communal life for aspirants to the priesthood in Hippo. This was an improvement on the apprentice system. Only a small fraction of the medieval clergy could attend a university, so the majority of the priests spawned for 1,000 years were not exposed to any systematic theological education (Poole, 1965).

At the time of the Reformation, the condition of the papacy and clergy was

at a low level, provoking the Council of Trent to decree the establishment of seminaries in 1563. Historically speaking, ministerial training had taken place with small cloisters of students gathering around a priest or parson, who basically taught them as apprentices. During post-Reformation years, seminarians typically spent a few months to a year or more in the home of one of the revival preachers. During the first days of Harvard, a student would spend up to three years in the home of a pastor prior to his master's examinations. In the early colonies and in England and Scotland, divinity training was not separated from the arts and sciences. All students went through a required liberal arts course of studies. There was no special vocational training for the priesthood (Fraser, 1988, p. 43). As professions began specializing, theological education evolved into its own field. The first steps toward a specialized focus on theology emerged as Harvard and Yale developed separate chairs of divinity in 1721 and 1755 respectively. The Great Awakenings of the 1730s and 1740s brought significant reform to ministerial schooling. Most of the current institutional structure was formulated between 1740 and 1875. The first theological seminary did not exist in the United States until 1808, when one began in Andover, MA.

The Wesleyan movement was not anti-intellectual, but it went to the people via the circuit riding system developed by Francis Asbury. Few latter-day scholars have examined this apprenticeship model as a method of theological education. "It assured [ministerial students] the practical, personal oversight of senior preachers in the actual work of the ministry; the stimulus and profit of

contact with superior minds; the advantages of living models; and the blessed contagion of mature character" (Wyant, 1906, p. 195). Bellah and team (1991) noted that "until late in the nineteenth century formal education beyond basic literacy was not essential to prepare for an occupation. Even among the clergy, for whom formal preparation was traditionally most expected, seminary training was not required in the fastest-growing Protestant denominations, the Baptists and the Methodists" (p. 147). By 1875, the tradition of a four year college degree plus three years of seminary was in place. During the next century, the number of seminaries and students increased, but no new patterns in theological education emerged. For those who distrusted formal preparation for the ministry, the primary agency of education was often the local congregation (Fraser, 1988, p. 61). Those who achieved leader positions and became assistants in the parent church often used their training as ministers of new churches. Most seminaries, both Catholic and Protestant, have seen reduced numbers of students in recent years. A part of this reduction is due to the high demands, the nebulous definition of ministry, and a lost sense of accomplishment amidst a busy society (Steele, 1986, p. 36).

Recognizing that the present system is not necessarily biblical in its modeling, and noting that it has remained somewhat unchanged in structure for the last one hundred plus years, one can understand the growing criticisms in light of societal changes. The critiques on theological training are plentiful. Webber (1973) referred to an increasing frequency of funded and ably staffed critical

studies, most of which end with no consensus on the critical points (p. 156). A decade later, Hunter (1982) concurred with Webber, reiterating the idea that "theological education today is not related as it might be to the realities, expectations, and needs of ministry in the church and society" (p. 93). Marion (1989) pointed out that what is taught tends to be taught out of tradition, based on a powerful assumption that since well-educated people teach it, it must be worth learning. "What students are asked to relate to in school is increasingly artificial, cut off from the human experiences subject matter is supposed to reflect," (p. 1). Theological institutions appear to lapse into this same predicament. What is needed is a criteria for selecting what should be taught in the relatively brief instructional time available, given the acceleration of knowledge. Dystra (1991) suggested a major cause for the lack of innovation malaise is that theological schools are organized into departments staffed by academic specialists whose reasons for being are intimately connected to the justifications for those departments held in place by the structure of studies and its presuppositions. "It is not easy for the explorer of theological education to strike a pose of indifference on the matter of whether or not the explorer's own scholarly endeavor should continue to exist!" (pp. 13-14). Such a socio-economic reality transcends pedagogical arrangements, affirmed by Maslow's hierarchy of needs. Staff resist structural changes in lieu of adding or deleting individual courses, much to the same effect as tinkering with the spark plugs of a car which needs an overhaul. Dykstra (1991) went on to suggest that this need for

restructuring was fundamental to addressing the criticisms of theological aridity of most practical studies, the lack of integration of the disciplines, and the failure of the scholarly aspect of theological education to have much effect in ministry (p. 49).

Evaluation can be an expensive and exhaustive process, which may be why many seminaries refrain from extensive evaluation due to limited budgets. Nelson (1975) suggested increasing the evaluation of ministry programs in order to make better changes toward transformation. Reformers often talk about innovation, but innovation results tend to be untested and therefore less certain. Innovation may create large change, but such inventions tend to be out of an unclear understanding of how to change and therefore involve more risk. By more clearly understanding how to change via a quality evaluation, an organization can bring about transformation which is less risky and more likely to succeed. Thus, better evaluative techniques should be implemented when considering institutional reform. Gustafson (1988) pointed out that a lot of the literature had to do with the shortcomings of theological education (Layman, 1986; Long, 1991; Thiemann, 1987). Brushaber's (1991) editorial titled "Good Theologians Are Not Enough" suggests that "seminary students are likely to find theological education in a state of ferment. Seminaries, whatever their theological persuasion, have been among the most change-resistant educational institutions. There is a growing awareness that the way the church selects and equips its leaders should be undergoing a fundamental revolution" (p. 19). "Some of the literature is in such strong

language that one could call it indictment literature, holding faculty, schools, and others virtually guilty for the dereliction of duty" (Brushaber, 1991, p. 28).

Charges include the discontinuities between the ways in which clergy are trained and the actual practice of ministry, lack of clarity about the purpose of theological education or even wrong purposes reigning, education is not student centered and lacks spiritual formation, programs are burdened with traditionalism, and an absence of disciplined evaluation of programs and their effectiveness. Perhaps such harsh self-analysis is due to the melancholy temperament common among many educators, resulting in a mound of such literature, much like the economists who have predicted ten of the last three recessions. No doubt this study would fall into this genre of literature, although hopefully a more positive and gracious outcome will result. Anyone concerned about analyzing and suggesting reform within institutions of higher education must consider accreditation associations. The Association of Theological Schools, formerly the American Association of Theological School, oversees the accreditation for Protestant and Catholic graduate programs in theology. Ziegler (1984) reviewed the Association of Theological Schools from 1960-1980, suggesting that numbers of innovations had been spawned in theological training due to the presence of ATS. He failed to define his concept of innovation. However, none of these innovations mentioned specifically referred to leadership training.

According to the *ATS Bulletin: Procedures, Standards and Criteria for Membership* (1992), in the section pertaining to programs primarily related to

ordination, program goals include the following: "Since the educational procedures for this degree are designed primarily to prepare men and women for effective ministries of church and synagogue, goals and objectives should be stated in terms of knowledge and ability required for beginning in such ministry" (p. 38). If leadership is therefore considered to be a part of pastoral expectations, there is not only room for leadership training in the system, but necessitates it. Thirteen minor points illustrate this larger goal. Three of them pertain to skills oriented toward leadership. "F. Ability to perceive people and situations accurately and sympathetically" (p. 38). While this appears to refer to counseling situations, it could also be used to justify relational training for leadership situations. The word *leadership* is used in one of the points, but the context is of planing and conducting corporate worship, which is the context of a spiritual technician. "J. Ability to function as a change agent -- to use and mediate the range of social process (including conflict) in a way that contributes to the common good" (p. 39). The term *change agent* is right out of leadership literature and a strong concept for leadership training. "K. Ability to assist the congregation in the definition and accomplishment of its purposes and effectively to administer its corporate life" (p. 39). Purpose, vision, mission, and definition are all elements of leadership, thereby supporting further the need for leadership training under the ATS guidelines. The most obvious declaration of preparing the pastor to lead is found under the section on "Personal and Spiritual Formation." "There is careful reflection on the role of minister as leader, guide, and servant of the community,"

(p. 40). The question arises, why is leadership not a more obvious part of pastoral training?

A preliminary meeting took place at the Glen Eyrie Conference Center in Colorado Springs, drawing together a group of senior pastors from large evangelical churches, and presidents, deans, and board members of seminaries, to discuss the large church and how the church in America is changing, and the type of leadership it takes to lead such a complex organization. They discussed what curriculum the seminary is offering, the methods by which the classes are taught, and whether the seminary graduate is adequately prepared to face the church of tomorrow. This study is a bit skewed as a representation of evangelicalism, in that most churches in America remain small, although the number of larger churches of 1,000 members plus is increasing significantly. The results of this meeting were published in a report by Multi-Staff Ministries titled *Standing on the Banks of Tomorrow!* (Weese, 1993). I was told by a participant in this study that a limited number of individuals had access to the report which involved an analysis requested by seven evangelical seminaries to see how the seminary in America impacted and related to the emerging church of the twenty-first century. The report title refers to the biblical account of Joshua standing on the banks of the Jordan river, preparing to take the People of Israel into Canaan. "The primary question to ask then, is the seminary standing with their feet in the water ready to move across with the cross-over people, or is it standing on the banks with dying churches, safe and dry, not willing to risk transition or change?"

(Weese, 1993, p. 3). The study emerged out of sense that the decade of the 90's should be labeled as the decade of transition.

One of the emergent trends noted by the seminaries is that the quality of the people entering the seminary has changed dramatically in the last twenty years, and therefore, the quality of the finished graduate leaving the seminary has changed just as dramatically. The average age of the entering student is approximately 33 years old and an increasing number of women have enrolled. Most seminarians see the ministry as a second or third career choice, having become dissatisfied with their first or second choice. "The best and brightest college graduates are looking toward other careers, because the role of clergy is not the well respected career it once was" (Weese, 1993, p. 11). A summary of this extensive report suggested that "the seminaries are training people today for positions in churches that are living in the 50's more than the 90's. The seminaries must recognize how dramatically our culture and needs have changed, and begin to prepare their students to conduct a ministry that is relevant to the needs of today, without compromising the orthodoxy of the gospel" (Weese, 1993, p. 26). Listed among the things seminaries are not doing well were marketing leadership, training leadership, teaching relational skills, strategic planning, vision, and training to be insightful leaders and to act as change-agents with people. The most common word occurring on the two page list of shortcomings was leadership (Weese, 1993, p. 31-33).

The problem here seems to be in quality evaluation. Formal evaluation is

a relatively recent phenomenon subsequent to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Nelson, 1975; Tucker, 1985). Yet, educational reform goes back to Martin Luther's concern for competent leadership (Tucker, 1985, p. 61). Aleshire noted the need for more formative evaluation in that an ongoing evolution helps avoid significant summative changes (1985, p. 83). Either the schools are not effectively using the evaluation information they have been gathering which suggests that there is and has been a lack of leadership training, or there is a need for evaluation which would review ministerial programs regarding leadership preparation. Patton noted that in making effective qualitative analysis, disciplined training and rigorous preparation are necessary (1990). One might deduce that those in the evaluation mode are not sufficiently prepared to suggest that leadership training is a necessary part of ministry education. These criticisms are expanded and more broadly supported in Chapter 5 in the description of an optimum leadership training program. The emergent criticisms of seminaries by the large church pastors in the study discussed above show that leadership preparation is lacking. Perhaps leadership awareness is a blindspot of many in academics who may be intelligent and gifted teachers, but who are not experienced and/or trained in leadership and who are not in touch with expectations of local congregations. Thiemann (1987) noted the extraordinary diversity of the disciplines taught in ministry programs. The rise of pluralism makes evaluation more difficult as a whole (Leonard, 1985). What appears to be missing is a standard with which to compare current ministry

programs.

Much of the discrepancy might be rooted in the role of the pastor and what the expectations are. Stating educational program objectives is important (Wheeler, 1985). If educational program objectives included a definition of pastoral ministry which includes leadership expectations, ministry programs should support it. Recent dialogues with church leaders appear to raise the same disillusionment with regard to higher education in terms of ministerial preparation. Evaluation needs this sort of triangulation if it is going to be reliable (Madaus, Scriven, & Stufflebeam, 1983; Marshall & Rossman, 1989; Patton, 1990). In defense of the seminaries, Fletcher (1984), who was involved in a Lilly Endowment funded study titled "The Seminary Futures Project," commented that he had great confidence in the leadership qualities of the many persons with whom he consulted in the four year study (p. 71). The study pointed out the potential dangers of turning out an increasing number of untested, future clergypersons, partially due to the students' tendencies to commute while attending college and be involved in other activities that compete for focused study time and quality field supervision ("Can Seminaries Adapt . . .," 1986, pp. 35-40). The bottom line is that "seminary faculties have the controlling role in determining the quality and adequacy of contemporary theological education" (Layman, 1986, p. 115).

Leadership Education

Much of this discussion on educational reform and leadership training hinges on the issue of whether leadership can be taught at all. It is a topic worth noting, even if briefly, as a school of thought exists which suggests that leaders are born and will naturally rise to leader roles. Zaleznik (1977) declared "there are no known ways to train great leaders" (p. 68). Lawrence (1992) affirmed that conclusion. Colleagues insisted that Wharton School's dean, Russell Palmer, was trying to do what was unteachable when he began the first class on leadership (Main, 1987, p. 94). The majority of people in the leadership studies field believe leadership can be taught. The questions are primarily twofold. Can it be taught to everyone, namely those without aptitudes for leading? Secondly, what is the best way to teach leadership? Perhaps the disillusionment about leadership training has more to do with past and current methodologies than whether or not the concept can be taught. Many believe that although anyone can learn at least some leadership behavioral skills, leadership tends to be an aptitude of a select group of people. Whether through spiritual gift, natural inclination, or learned abilities, certain individuals emerge from the rest as leaders. This view has significant biblical support throughout the Old Testament, as well as in the discussion of the spiritual gifts in the New Testament.

The second question is whether or not the first one is true. Classical Hebraic education began with what was known, and then progressed to the unknown. Socratic methodologies begin with naturalistic observations and then

analysis, versus starting with a theoretical base and striving to prove or disprove the theory by applying it to various contexts. The Westernized paradigm of classroom education inhibits leadership training, according to several authors (Clinton, 1984; Harrison, 1982; Reed, 1992; Webber, 1973). Webber (1973) noted that the dean of the Harvard Law School explained that the case method was used starting the fifth week in the first semester of law school, because no one can learn the body of law since it is too vast. The intent of the school is to teach men and women to think legally, that is, to take a problem which arises in the practice of law and in the light of tradition, seek to come up with the contemporary and appropriate solution. "In a very direct way he seemed to be saying to the theological seminary faculty that we are quite wrong in trying to take our three or four years to teach men Old Testament, New Testament, Church History, Systematic Theology and Philosophy of Religion, and then expect that when they graduate they will begin to apply this in their practice of ministry" (p. 99). Although this observation was made over two decades ago, the same situation holds true for both Harvard and most seminaries. If there is no room remaining in existing programs for leadership training, perhaps new programs could be designed and developed around the idea of trying to produce men and women who think like pastors so that they will be able to be lifetime learners as well as functioning ministers. A part of this educational core could address the need for leadership training. Professional education is often put down for the sake of the academic model, even though law and medical schools in the country are moving

toward faculties made up of persons who are practicing professionals. Reed (1992) suggested a return to church-based training as was done in the early church before ministry training became structured, where education is very close to life situations. The Biblical Institute for Leadership Development (BILD) is investing nearly \$250,000 to create 10,000 pages of curriculum by over 400 authors, for church-based leadership training programs (Reed, 1992). Seminaries are now meeting with megachurch pastors for ideas on seminary reformation by coming up with more creative strategies for education.

Harrison (1982) suggested there are two overarching philosophical perspectives to training, the traditional schooling model, and the developmental model. The traditional model is based on students in a passive learning process, acquiring a predetermined body of knowledge, typically in a classroom under formal lectures by trainers viewed as authorities, creating a teaching emphasis in the teaching/learning couplet. The emphasis is that knowing is more important than doing, and even that ideas are more important than people. Information accumulation is emphasized. The developmental model is characterized by a holistic approach to knowledge, seeing education as growth and application. Education can take place anywhere. Trainers are seen as facilitators of learning where the trainer is considered a fellow learner. The emphasis is on learning in the teacher/learner couplet (Clinton, 1984). Most of these ideas, if implemented, would bring significant reformation to evangelical ministerial preparation.

Summary

Although this brief literature review is in places a sampling of what is available, it reflects a summary of the literature and thus provides a foundation on which to base this research. A significant amount of Christian leadership literature exists, although by far, most of it deals with traits, skills, and character principles versus leadership theory and process concepts. If a breakdown of the literature is a reflection of evangelical thinking, it shows that the church esteems and is concerned about leaders and leadership, but perhaps its investigation of the subject has not gone deep enough. Few leadership scholars exist in the evangelical realm. Therefore, if one is to see leadership courses become a part of ministerial training programs, educational and church leaders will need to either become knowledgeable in the field, or recognize those who are. Practitioners are often unable to effectively analyze and teach what they do, whereas understanding leadership in no way guarantees a person will be able to lead. The optimum situation would mean harnessing effective leaders who in turn understood the concepts and implementation of leadership. A more practical approach may be to team leadership theory experts with effective practitioners.

Bible colleges and professional programs emphasizing practical skills have often been discriminated against and looked down upon by academics such as accreditation committees. At the same time leadership scholars are needed in evangelicalism, there is a need to intelligently develop a more practical approach to training pastors to lead. This overcompensation for the academic is not solely

a theological situation. For example, the field of psychology has evolved into a respected discipline where positivistic research revolves around psychometric instruments measuring the domains of thoughts, feelings, and sensory. Out of the desire to make early psychology respected in the scientific arena, the field has at times transcended common sense with regard to human nature. In a similar vein, the study of God and human's relationship with God has at times grasped for acceptance by Western academic circles, such that pastoral training has evolved into a predominate left-brain classroom experience. There appears to be a gap in the literature linking conceptual leadership processes with hands-on leadership learning experiences.

The plethora of theological education literature reveals ample intelligence and motivation among evangelical scholars and educators. The missing link appears to be in understanding the role of the pastor as church leader. The leader is consistently defined as one who conducts religious services, who manages the church, and who performs ministerial functions such as preaching, sacerdotal activities, and counseling. It would behoove all to differentiate the acts of leading and of catalyzing leadership from ministerial and managerial tasks at hand, even though the latter two are perhaps the most time consuming in the life of a local church pastor, and prerequisite to a person becoming ordained. The apparent inability to clearly define leadership from management and ministry may be at the heart of the issue, such that educators and pastoral students are not able to distinguish between various church demands. Although life is not so cut and

dried, the muddy overlapping of these concepts blurs the pastor's decision-making ability to respond appropriately. Because leadership is episodic, the pastor must recognize when management, when ministry, and when leadership are necessary, and when to merge or separate them. Very little literature could be found which succinctly addressed this issue, and the overall tendency to either avoid leadership topics or refer to them as something else gave one the sense that the majority of the authors were not able to distinguish leadership from other church functions. A bulk of the leadership literature was written by practitioners. Since the educational system does not heavily rely on practitioners for early pastoral preparation, there would be the tendency to overlook this genre of literature in the training programs.

The complexities in resolving the situation regarding leadership training and higher education reform emerged with each layer of new literature. The lack of written thought and research regarding leadership training in this context also shows that little has been tried in this area. This study by its own recognition is a Quixote-like daunting of the windmills. Hopefully, this study, along with a growing number of others like it (Ford, 1990; Palmer, 1978; Shaw, 1989; Tan, 1991) from doctoral programs in leadership and seminaries with leadership emphases will provide a significant ground swell resulting in some lasting changes. The intention of this study is to not only add to the leadership studies literature, but also to serve as a leadership catalyst, to bring about real intended change in pastoral leadership training.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Framework for Methodology

The hypothesis of this study, based on the explanations in Chapter One and the literature review, is that improved leadership training is necessary for pastoral preparation to fulfill expectations, since little leadership training of ministerial students is taking place in evangelical institutions of higher education. Because leadership is a socially constructed reality, it tends to be an inexact science. Add to this the complexities of theological, spiritual, cultural and educational influences which this study requires, then research flexibility becomes imperative. Due to the multiple human idiosyncracies and influences germane to the contexts involved, a positivistic, quantitative methodology would not provide the sort of breadth and philosophical sensitivity which such a study demands. Therefore, a qualitative method inquiry based on a naturalistic paradigm would be more appropriate (Guba and Lincoln, 1985).

This section will explain design issues, as well as details such as participant selection, and data gathering and analysis techniques. The research methodology consisted of two phases. Phase one involved a review of current ministerial training programs in graduate and four year liberal art accredited evangelical

institutions in the United States. Phase two developed an optimum leadership training program as recommended by a panel of experts. The justification and detail of these phases follow. These explanations along with a subsequent section on limitations and assumptions should serve as a rational foundation for the selected and utilized research methodologies.

Phase One: Catalog Review

Patton (1990) noted that qualitative methods consist of three kinds of data collection: open-ended interviews, direct observation, and written documents. Phase one utilized the first and third of these methods, primarily the latter.

In order to ascertain whether there was indeed a lack of leadership training available for ministerial students within institutions of higher education in the United States, it was important to review current programs. The first phase involved an analysis of programs and curricula of evangelical institutions in the United States, as they pertain to leadership training of ministerial students. According to Dale (1985), "seminaries are updating old church administration courses and are developing practical theology courses on leadership, pastoral management, congregational health, and organizational development" (p. 21). Through initial investigations and interviews, I did not find this statement to be verifiable other than in limited niches, especially regarding leadership courses. Others agree with me (J. R. Clinton, personal communication, September 28, 1992). In order to substantiate a recommendation to expand leadership training

opportunities, it was important to survey a significant cross section of such institutions, and show that a limited training emphasis on leadership existed if indeed this was true.

Phase one consisted of three steps: reviewing current programs for leadership content, classifying programs according to the extent of their apparent leadership training, and investigating programs which appeared to contain significant leadership classes. The goal was to clarify the extent leadership was emphasized and therefore to ascertain which programs might be labeled as blue ribbon programs. An analysis of these findings and step three as a whole are described in chapter four.

Phase One, Step One: Investigating Current Programs

The first step involved analyzing institutional documentation commonly referred to as the college catalog. Institutional catalogs serve as informational and marketing resources of educational organizations. They are made available to the public and usually include course titles and descriptions, as well as pertinent emphases within a major, so that students can learn what a specific program requires and offers. The rationale for using these documents is that if leadership training was a priority of an institution, it should manifest itself through courses on the nature of and issues concerning leadership, as well as peripheral program facets such as internships, mentoring relationships, and other leadership training strategies.

The survey consisted of a review of 134 institutional catalogs describing ministerial training programs in accredited evangelical institutions in the United States. This included two schools of theology which provided master of divinity (MDiv) degrees, associated with undergraduate institutions. This number did not include seven nonMDiv graduate programs associated with undergraduate institutions. Therefore, the total programs considered in this analysis was 141. Naturally, any study less than 100% runs the risk of overlooking potential leadership programs. This study represented a majority of such institutions and included nearly all of those considered to be major influences within domestic evangelicalism in the United States. Institutions outside of those studied would be considered fringe and less influential among evangelicals, whether by size or prominence. Limiting the study geographically to the United States confined the parameters to insure a consistency in accreditation standards, as well as increased cultural homogeneity. These institutions were primarily selected from among those listed in the *1992-93 National Evangelical Directory* (National Association of Evangelicals, 1992). The NAE is an interchurch body of 43,000 local churches from seventy-four Protestant denominations. These churches represent a broad range of theological traditions, but all subscribe to the NAE seven-point Statement of Faith, a statement that addresses the basic tenets of historic Christianity (see Appendix A).

The study included 77 undergraduate liberal arts programs, and 64 graduate programs, the latter consisting of 14 graduate programs, schools of

theology and divinity schools, and 50 seminaries. The primary graduate degree preparatory for ordination is the MDiv. Several other graduate programs were reviewed along with the undergraduate programs, but the only ones counted in this study were those implying some sort of supervisory course and suggesting the programs were designed for pastoral candidates. All others were passed over since most students pursuing ordination via a masters degree enroll in the MDiv degree and the intent of most governing bodies is for this to occur. If nonMDiv graduate programs with no supervisory classes were considered, this would have made the research even more extensive and significantly skewed the data toward the belief that little is done in leadership training. Graduate institutions typically associated with a liberal arts institution, but which offer the traditional ordination degree of MDiv are generally referred to as schools of theology and occasionally as schools of divinity. Seminaries are graduate institutions existing for the primary purpose of preparing people for professional Christian service.

Most of the undergraduate programs surveyed were from institutions which were members of the Christian College Coalition. This association of over 80, four-year, accredited liberal arts schools adheres to an evangelical theology, as well as maintaining a faculty and administration of professional excellence. The schools of theology and seminaries are ATS accredited. Bible colleges were avoided in that they do not tend to be the main path toward ordination. These also more often offer associate degrees, are less likely to be accredited, and serve a student body which is older, and tend to tap the populist and dissenting

character of evangelicalism (Shelley, 1992). Although this is not true of all Bible colleges, I believed that their lack of prominence and consistency in accreditation would not avail to this study. This is not intended to sound critical of Bible colleges, only that they would be harder to compare qualitatively, and they tend to be less than the ideal representation of what denominations expect in pastoral preparation. Correspondence programs and this genre of extension programs were not considered since these programs generally are poorly monitored and at the time of this study were still considered nontraditional. Doctor of ministry programs were also avoided in this research because they are designed for in-service pastors with experience as a postgraduate continuing education. The intention of this research is to consider how institutions can better prepare ministerial students prior to significant ministry experience. To put it into the vernacular, the intent was to analyze programs where evangelicalism gives pastoral preparation its best shot.

Most of the catalogs were received subsequent to a written request but a few were obtained from telephone calls. This is common behavior among potential students considering a school and was an inoffensive approach to gathering data. Obviously, a weak point in the methodology was that catalog review only considers one or two years of curriculum at any given time. These catalogs reflected contemporary documents generally procured from July 1992 through July 1993. Like anything which is fluid, evaluation must take periodic samplings to determine at any given time the state of and needed changes in

curriculum. A study of documents five years past, and another such study in five years or so would provide greater clarity as to the metamorphosis of leadership training within pastoral preparation programs.

The following criteria served in the analysis of the documents. The undergraduate and graduate programs designed for pastoral preparation were housed in majors that usually existed in departments named religion, biblical literature, or theology. Within the departments, specific majors and programs nearly always denoted whether the program was applicable to those preparing for pastoral duties. Majors such as Christian education, religious education, youth ministry, and missions were considered only to the extent that they might provide elective courses supporting leadership training outside the required classes for ministerial majors. These majors are designed to prepare people for ministerial roles other than the senior or sole pastorate. The department and major offering the class and whether or not a course was elective for pastoral students were deemed important information. If a leadership class was available as an elective, but not required for one going into the pastorate, it was listed but not considered as an important emphasis in leadership. Programs which seriously considered the importance of leadership training for pastors would include such classes in the required core of the major.

Most evangelical institutions have one or at most two programs designed for pastoral preparation. Upon discovering the designated program(s), analysis consisted of reading the program description to observe statements affirming

directly or indirectly that leadership was a priority. Secondly, and most importantly, courses were surveyed to note any which pertained to either the nature of leadership or peripheral topics such as leadership skills, organization structure and change, church management, supervision, planning, and goal setting. Because many people do not differentiate between leadership and management, courses described as management were noted and then analyzed as to their management versus leadership content. The brief catalog descriptions prevented indepth analysis. However, programs where leadership was specifically emphasized should be able to communicate this succinctly via abbreviated course descriptions. Ministerial classes in the context of the pastorate included the mention of behaviors such as preaching, teaching, worship and sacramental service performance. Managerial classes in the context of the pastorate included terms such as budgets, denominational structure, office management, Roberts Rules of Order, and administration. *Administration* tends to be a word referring to managerial supervision versus transformational leadership, but such courses were considered for course description and potential further investigation. A master list of the programs was developed with an inclusion of course titles in or approaching leadership along with key words and phrases, including the program major, number of units, and whether or not this was elective or mandated. Most of the time, this information was available.

A natural methodology for this genre of research would be a content analysis of the course descriptions. It was determined that this would not be a

recommended method for two reasons. The first reason is because this only involved part of the total research methodology, and not the main emphasis, namely the Delphi expert panel's synthesis of an optimum training program. More importantly, content analysis was not recommended because of the nebulous ways in which the terms *leader* and *leadership* were utilized throughout the catalogs. Because sufficient detail was not given for the definitions, it would be ineffective to lump divergent terms together, thus creating a significant amount of unreliable data. Rost (1991) pointed out the common lack of definitions of the terms *leader* and *leadership* among leadership writers and scholars, as well as the mixed use of terms. A quantitative content analysis would be invalid when at least 134 different institutions across the nation were involved in their own use of the terms *leader* and *leadership*.

Phase One, Step Two: Classification

The second step of phase one involved the classification of programs into various domains of leadership training, based on the contents of the master list of courses. Two taxonomies quickly emerged, those which did and those which did not appear to address leadership studies. Upon the review of all the programs and the courses along with their catalog descriptions, five separate categories emerged. The first category was simply those which did not recognize leadership. In essence, they did not list a class which mentioned or appeared to approximate leadership content. Whether or not the program authors considered ministerial

leadership as theological knowledge was not hypothesized. These programs received a numerical value of 0.

The second category involved programs which acknowledged supervision, but which were unclear in leadership. These programs consisted of courses which may have even used the word *leader*, or *leadership*, but which went on to describe managerial and ministerial information such as budgets, board meetings, denomination structure, counseling, discipleship, small groups, lay ministry and the like. All of these are important pastoral issues but peripheral to leadership. This category also included programs with a possible leadership class or two but which did not require it, such as electives in Christian Education majors, the rationale being that if the program did not see leadership as important enough to require it for pastors, it was not worthy of recognition. Institutions which have a clear understanding of leadership should be able to reflect this by clearly describing the elements. Programs in this category received a value of 1.

The third category was those which recognized leadership. This category pertained to programs which had one or two courses appearing to specifically discuss the nature and behaviors of leading. Signs indicative of this classification were the mention of topics such as change agent, conflict management, interpersonal relationships, vision, leadership styles, competency in planning, organizational structure and change, conflict resolution in the context of stimulating change, and supportive definitions. Programs in this category tended to recognize the subject of leadership, but took little more than a sampling

approach or at best a singular overview approach. Programs in this category received a value of 2.

The fourth category supported leadership training. This category was for those programs which had three or four classes which dealt with leadership in terms of pastoral preparation. These courses were generally required for those in the MDiv or ministerial major and included a more detailed look at leadership issues than just an overview course as in the previous category. These programs gave sufficient evidence of some clarification of leadership versus managerial pastoring, and that special attention to the subject was expected among students. These programs received a numerical value of 3.

The fifth category included the premier programs in that they emphasized leadership training. These programs promoted leadership by offering multiple classes and even a major or minor in the field. Organizational structure and change, leadership styles, leadership emergence, leadership and character, leadership ethics, and other classes give a clear indication that leadership was a serious field of study. These programs were rated 4. Given the theme, an appropriate metaphor with regard to the last three categories is baptism. In the 2 rated programs, one gets a sprinkling of leadership. In the 3 rated programs, students are poured upon. And in the 4 rated programs, students are immersed in leadership studies.

Denzin (1978) identified four basic types of triangulation, including investigator triangulation, which was implemented here and in subsequent steps in

phase two. In order to avoid significant researcher bias, I reviewed the course descriptions twice, and had two trained associates do the same, marking each program with 0 to 4 points, representative of the five categories. Training involved describing the five categories verbally and in written form as mentioned above, and providing further explanation on the difference between ministerial management and leadership. There was consensus on a majority of the four reviews. When discrepancies arose, an average of the values provided the final category of the program. On two occasions when there was more than one point difference in the scores, a rationale was given and a word for word analysis of the class description provided justification for a revised program score, resulting in consensus. In general, borderline cases were given the benefit of the doubt. The specific outcomes of this step are discussed in Chapter Four.

Since nearly everyone who has taken college classes has experienced the reality that class content does not always reflect catalog descriptions, there is an inherent weakness in this methodology. While a class which actually taught process and peripheral leadership issues would rarely be described some other way, but the counter situation was more likely as leadership becomes a more popular term. This type of summary research relied heavily upon the department chair or professor to adequately and succinctly describe the course. Since our culture relies heavily on information bits, the responsibility to portray classes as leadership or not rested heavily upon the authors of course definitions. Naturally, these can be misleading. Generally, if a course or program appeared to lie on the

border between categories, benefit was given to the program and it was placed in the next higher category. Exceptions involved the final two categories where leadership appeared to be emphasized and more detailed analysis was in order.

A listing of the 141 programs reviewed and their numerical ratings are displayed in Appendix B.

Phase One, Step Three: Investigating the Leadership-Oriented Programs

Step three of phase one involved the further investigation of category four and five programs, to determine if indeed the catalog descriptions were valid. Because only six out of the 134 programs considered emerged into categories four and five, their number lent themselves to more detailed review. All of these schools were personally contacted by the researcher, and where possible, course syllabi were requested. Interview questions were naturalistic and developed around the themes of the following questions:

1. What is the history of the leadership courses in this program?
2. Who taught the courses and what training did these persons have in terms of practical ministry experience and leadership studies?
3. Are the classes required of majors in the pastoral preparation program?
4. What texts were generally used and were syllabi available?
5. How were the classes developed in light of pastoral leadership training as a whole?
6. Were there any other leadership training procedures implemented which

were not reflected in the catalog?

Interviews allowed for deeper probing into the programs which appeared to provide for some type of leadership emphasis. More detailed description of this research phase along with an analysis of the findings plus descriptions of the blue ribbon programs occur in Chapter Four of this study.

Phase Two: Expert Panel

The second phase of the methodology utilized an expert panel whose objective was to establish an optimum leadership training program for ministerial candidates via the Delphi method. "Delphi may be characterized as a method for structuring a group communication process so that the process is effective in allowing a group of individuals, as a whole, to deal with a complex problem" (Linstone & Turoff, 1975, p. 3). This methodology, which was designed by the Rand Corporation in the 1950s for forecasting in complex situations, has become utilized in a variety studies, including the planning of curriculum development and model structuring. Although there are various modifications and adaptations of the Delphi method per situational applications, the basic premise is the synthesis and prioritization of ideas gained from a pool of experts, refined through rounds of conceptual distillation. Thomas (1980) suggested that debating is what committees really do, not thinking. Delphi tends to be a quiet, thoughtful conversation, in which everyone gets a chance to listen. The background noise of small talk and the recurrent sonic booms of vanity are eliminated at the outset,

and there is time to think. Three cycles are usually enough to obtain a synergistic product. By that time as much of a consensus has been reached as can be reached, and the final answers are said to be substantially more reliable and often more interesting, than the first time around. "Anonymity makes it unlikely that consensus will be forced since no respondent knows how others, particularly those of ascribed authority, have voted" (Hartman, 1981, p. 491).

Phase two involved six design steps.

Phase Two, Step One: Panel Selection

Step one involved the selection of panel members, including stakeholders, experts, and facilitators (Scheele, 1975). I, along with an assistant who has military leadership, middle corporate management, and church lay leadership experiences, and a female ordained minister with large and small church staff experiences, served as project facilitators. Panel members consisted of those who were stakeholders as well as experts. Panel members needed to have an interest in the project in order to participate, and they had to provide motivation for quality input. Palumbo (1987) emphasized the need to go beyond the obvious interested parties when considering goal setting. One of the inherent weaknesses of accrediting associations is that it is peers critiquing peers versus a viable representation of all major stakeholders. Stakeholder groups of ministerial leadership training include: theological educators and administrators who actually teach and set curriculum policy; pastors concerned about facilitating quality

pastoral leadership; administrators such as denominational officials who oversee local churches and who are responsible for recruiting pastoral candidates as well as church consultants; and lay leaders who are concerned about seeing and participating in quality church leadership. Traditional educational discussions tend to use one or two of these resource groups, but all four represent those concerned about pastoral leadership. A variety of interest perspectives provided a more balanced outcome as well as one with reliability. At the same time, the diversity of the four groups made for a more difficult synthesizing process.

Criteria distinguishing the panel members as experts included an overall collection of experiences, proven effectiveness in applicable areas, as well as personal leadership aptitudes. In essence, it was important to select panel members who understood leadership issues of the church conceptually and empirically. These dynamics varied from group to group, and some members had experience in more than one of the four categories. The latter issue allowed for increased effectiveness created by those sensitive to various aspects of pastoral leadership preparation.

Typical Delphi groups average from ten to fifty participants. Due to the outlay of time for the procedures described, a group of twenty seemed sufficient, consisting of five members per category. The researcher and assistants approved of the potential panelist list. An alternate was contacted after one of the candidates became seriously ill. All of the candidates were contacted initially by letter, and then by telephone to explain the research project and include the

expectations. Panelist candidates were told the tenor of the study, and that the work consisted of a half hour interview, plus two subsequent mail surveys, with a total commitment time of approximately two hours. Each panelist received, signed, and returned a consent form noting their willing participation and explaining the confidentiality involved in the research (see Appendix C). All of the panelist candidates accepted the arrangements and agreed to participate. They represented people across the nation, eight of whom had authored books on Christian leadership and pastoral ministry, and several who are noted leaders in evangelicalism, including one seminary president, a dean of a graduate school of theology, and two religion department chairs. All of the candidates had significant experience in their domains and were considered experts relative to their level of involvement.

Biographies or resumes were requested of panel members. Brief biographies were created for each member without names. These, in turn, were given to four people making up a team for triangulation, each a representative of the four interest groups. The people were informed of the nature of the study, and were requested to critique the qualifications of the members. No members were disqualified by the triangulation team.

The members tended to consist of those past the midlife transition, thus potentially overlooking younger views of leadership. This was true of all but three of the members who were pastors. The qualification for panelist experience created this potential oversight. No females were listed in the panel membership,

but this was not out of line since very few evangelical pastors are females and the church is still very male oriented in its hierarchy, although future trends are slowly recognizing the role of women in leadership and seminary membership includes a growing number of females. Due to the acceptance of the members to the study and the approval of the review committee, the panel was adopted without revision.

Phase Two, Step Two: Construct Interview Questions

The second design step required the construction of initial questions to which the panel members could respond during an interview. Although the interview allowed for panel members to initiate ideas and to prioritize materials, the majority of the members preferred to respond to preliminary questions due to their heavy time and talent demands. These questions included three or four general questions for all members, and three or four questions germane to members of the individual categories. The facilitators initiated sample questions. These were then critiqued by five potential panel candidates, each representing the four interest groups, and two from the academic group. The result of this input served as the basis for interview questions (see Appendix D).

Phase Two, Step Three: Panelist Interviews

The third design step incorporated a recorded interview of each panelist. Due to time and location barriers, most interviews were conducted over the

telephone, taped, and processed into transcripts. All panelists were informed that the interview was taped. Two interviews were done in person. The interviews were approximately thirty minutes each, ranging from twenty-five to forty-five minutes, and focused on the general and applicable specific questions. Although time consuming and laborious, the purpose of the interviews was to allow for a more detailed investigation of the issues pertaining to the subject, which a more passive medium such as a survey would not allow. Interviews helped ascertain whether the initial questions and concerns were indeed those prioritized by the panel members, versus projecting assumptions onto the panel. In addition, contextual idiosyncracies and new perspectives for establishing other survey questions emerged from the live dialogue. All panel members fulfilled this step.

The transcripts were then reviewed by the facilitators and the main ideas were written in the margins of the transcripts so that taxonomies could be established. The challenge was to reliably take the many pages of transcripts and synthesize them into a survey pertaining to an optimum leadership training program (see Appendix E). Step three was considered the first Delphi round.

Phase Two, Step Four: First Panel Survey

The fourth design step involved a response to a written survey, based on the findings from the interviews. These were mailed with a self-addressed, stamped envelope to each panelist for his response. The survey allowed for open-ended responses, but primarily involved the prioritization of topics and an

expansion of emergent ideas from the interviews. Step four represented the second Delphi round.

Phase Two, Step Five: Second Panel Survey

The fifth design step was the third Delphi round similar to the second round, and incorporated a mailed survey based on the edited results of the previous one. All but one of the panelists completed the survey. One member, a pastor, excused himself, suggesting that with the current time pressures of pastoring and finishing a national book tour for his most recent release, he did not feel he could provide much more than he did during the interview. The lack of response from this single member would not skew the responses much from the nineteen others, especially since I, the researcher, am a pastor.

The goal was to further clarify priorities so as to establish an optimum leadership training program for ministerial students. The end product of this round consisted of a draft of an optimum leadership training program. The difficulty the facilitators had in synthesizing this round was striving to maintain data integrity while bringing together divergent ideas into a workable program draft. Attempts were made to build conceptual shelves for the new boxes of information brought into the picture, without the facilitators themselves imposing their own ideas into the process (see Appendix F). Generally, subsequent rounds result in diminishing returns in Delphi, such that this round seemed all that was necessary. Various feedback from the panelists also seemed to indicate that they

felt the outcome sufficiently reflected their ideas, and that they had no more to give to the process.

Phase Two, Step Six: Final Programs Recommended

The final design step required the facilitators to synthesize the third Delphi round responses into a coherent format, representative of the expert panel's opinions. The member who backed out of the first survey did so in the second. The reason given was that he did not comprehend the requirements up front in light of his current schedule as well as the angle of the study as it emerged. A lengthy phone conversation suggested that his incompletion would not adversely affect the research and notes were taken from the telephone conversation. A second pastoral panelist also did not fulfill the final survey. Of all the panelists, I was most familiar with the leadership beliefs of this member, as he served as a mentor for a time and his views are quite well known from his writing and speaking. Recognizing that two of these members were pastors, I did not think this would deter from a balanced outcome, given my own experience in this area. I thought the responses of the panelists generated a significant amount of data and I appreciated the attention this project received from the high majority of these distinguished panelists. The survey results from this round provided another round of data for the researcher and facilitators. This finished product would be available for others to review, as well as to do a comparison with the case studies from phase two. The optimum leadership training program is described and

analyzed in Chapter Five of this dissertation.

Limitations and Assumptions

Phase one limitations include a less than 100% institutional inclusion so the possibility remains that a leadership program exists outside of the sample population. Although this would not be a significantly influential school, the possibility remains. Another limitation is the short time frame of the catalogs, providing a snapshot of a year or two at most of the ever evolving curriculum process. There was also an inexactness and variety of ways that the words *leadership* and *leader* were defined. A third limitation was the lack of investigation of what is actually taught in the courses. Argyris (1982) discussed the difference between espoused theories from theories-in-use. To discover the theory-in-use, students and graduates would have to be interviewed, versus the survey of institutional documentation and interviewing professors. One example was a course with the word *leadership* in the title which was explained to me by a former student as an excellent course, but was about practical ministry such as hospital calls and funerals, and not leadership per se. The assumption of this research is that there was not a major difference between course descriptions and syllabi content. Because the objective of the phase one research was to provide an overview of evangelical pastoral training, these noted limitations were accepted and considered worth the risk.

Phase two limitations tended to be indigenous to the Delphi methodology.

The demographic homogeneity of the expert panel members, being white males, aged 38-64, is somewhat typical of experienced pastoral and scholastic populations in the United States at this time. The anonymity of the phase two expert panel members may have had a limiting effect on the final outcome. Being incognito helped avoid the political power effect which takes place in social settings, whereby one or more people receive extra influence due to their perceived power resources or where they take it upon themselves to sway others to their beliefs. It likely helped in the ideally pure process of pursuing truth. On the other hand, truth has context. By removing the course recommendations from one of the important aspects of Aristotelian argumentation, namely *ethos* (credibility), it may have skewed the selection outcome. For example, if it was known that a lay leader suggested the addition of several leadership courses to a training program, it might have cast a different weight than if an academician recommended the same. The latter panelist might be perceived to know that it would be a more realistic choice for actual implementation. In essence, information detached from context loses some of its meaning. By detaching the opinions from the sources, they lost some of their meaning. One thing which counteracted this weakness was that in the final rounds of the survey, prioritizing necessitated that all members commit to their preferences, while letting go of lesser held opinions. It was assumed that all the members would complete all three expectations of them upon signing the consent forms. This expectation was not realized as two members dropped out of the second and third rounds.

Most research is skewed by the biases of participants and researchers, and such is the nature of leadership as well. This study was no different in that respect. There was the possibility of facilitator manipulation during the survey editing as well as the final result of phase two. The use of facilitator's assistants should have reduced this factor. In addition, there was an inherent bias in the expert panel. The fact that they were selected to this panel revealed that they were more than likely to prefer strong pastoral leadership and see a need for greater preparatory resources. This view is not the case across the board. Since the premise of the study is on leadership design, the bias of the research is noted up front. One other foreseeable limitation is that three fourths of the panelists were not academicians. The weakness here is in providing an optimum leadership training program that is also realistic to the parameters of an academic setting. This study did not consider necessary courses in the preparation of pastors such as theology, biblical literature, church history, and associated studies, a limitation mentioned by one of the academics. One goal of this study is to provide a model program and realistic guidance for programmatic enhancements within existing institutions. Hopefully, the academics' input and the sensitivity of the other panelists allowed for such an outcome. Their comments in the final Delphi round did not appear to negate the viability of the optimum program. If the prescribed program would not fit under current criteria for accreditation including that of the ATS, perhaps such a program would need to exist as an adjunct training center, or require a new paradigm for ministerial education (Lawrence, 1992; Reed, 1992).

Ethical Concerns

The established procedures of the University of San Diego's Committee on Protection of Human Subjects were followed in advance of undertaking the study. The nature of this study was ethically safe. The procedures included the development of a consent form which was approved by the committee (see Appendix C). Each panelist signed and returned a consent form. Panelists' identities were confidential. The interviewer informed the people contacted during the program investigations about the nature of the call and that confidentiality would be maintained. Because the institutional catalogs were for public release, permission was not sought prior to the description and critique of listed programs.

CHAPTER 4

DESCRIPTIONS AND ANALYSIS OF PASTORAL TRAINING PROGRAMS

Introduction

More evangelical institutions are marketing their educational wares as the number of potential students decreases and as increasing costs cause potential students to be more discerning in their educational commitments. The cover of Eastern Mennonite Seminary's 1993-1995 catalog read, ". . . preparing servant-leaders for ministry." The caption of an advertisement for Reformed Theological Seminary (RTS) stated, "How you learn will determine how you lead," followed by "Effective leaders aren't born, they're nurtured," implying that RTS is about the nurturing of leaders. The Graduate Program at Southern California College advertised, "Do you feel the need to develop as a leader with character, authority and compassion?" Regent University used the phrase "Leadership to Change the World" as the title of a two page advertisement and used the words *leader* or *leadership* five more times throughout the text. After listing the schools including the School of Divinity, it read: "Each of the colleges is training leaders." A Seattle Pacific University graduate studies advertisement said, "More than ever, a hurting world is in need of educated Christian leadership at both the professional and lay levels. Foundations for this leadership are built on proper understanding

and interpretation of the Bible." This premise may be true, to be Christian one must properly understand and interpret the Bible, but a house needs more than a foundation to be complete. Too often, the advertising appears to offer more than is delivered, or the intended outcome overlooks the need to specifically address the field of leadership studies in order to develop leaders.

A deeper issue is how programs designed to produce church leaders go about instilling leadership virtues. Grier (1993) noted that there are three primary goals for programs which lead to ordination. One goal is to help students acquire appropriate theological knowledge and skills. Another is to help students develop competencies for a Christian witness. The third is to help students form Christian character for the practice of ministry by spiritual disciplines (pp. 7-8). Nowhere was leadership mentioned in this description of goals. The MDiv program is the standard degree program for ordination to the ministry and includes biblical languages, exegetical theology, systematic theology, philosophical theology and ministry theology. The implication is that to become a church leader, a student primarily needs an array of theological and biblical classes. On the other hand, programs not specifically designed for pastoral ordination, such as other master's degrees, are designed to prepare people "for competent leadership" in specialized ministries like religious education, music, or missions (Grier, 1993, p. 9). The gist of the first phase of this study involved looking into the evangelical institutions of higher education to see whether leadership training specifically was provided, and if so, how and to what extent.

Catalog Review

The review of institutional catalogs included a brief perusal of purpose statements, departmental objectives, and organizational objectives. On several occasions I discovered that written intentions to turn out leaders were not supported by leadership courses. For example, the description of Anderson University's Christian Ministries major stated, "This major is designed to prepare persons to serve as Christian leaders in the world." No leadership classes were found in the program. Asbury Seminary listed "Goals of Theological Education" which included "Leadership: Students will exhibit basic skills to lead, characterized by flexibility, facilitation, creative uses of conflict, and competency in planning, organizing and completing administrative tasks effectively and redemptively." Only one course titled "The Servant as Leader" existed. This same institution recently received a significant endowment for a center to include pastoral leadership, but it appears to be in the form of a doctorate of ministry which is designed for postgraduate continuing education studies. The content of this pastoral leadership is yet to be defined. Azusa Pacific University's school of theology states program goals which include, "be able to provide leadership in the administration of the local church; be able to provide leadership in addressing the church social/cultural mandate." This program appeared to better support this statement by providing two or three leadership-oriented classes. Eastern College's Biblical Studies major suggested "this program is recommended for those who plan to become leaders in the life of the church." No leadership courses existed.

Indiana Wesleyan University's Christian Ministries major is partially defined as "the degree which contains the fullest set of courses designed to prepare young persons for the ministry of the Church." The program contains no leadership courses at the undergraduate or graduate level, and a single course on church management. Trinity College's admission requirement sections stated that "Trinity's purpose is to prepare Christian young people for leadership" No leadership courses are offered. Trinity Western University's Department of Religious Studies' introduction included, "Students will also be well prepared to assume leadership roles in biblical scholarship, professional ministry, lay vocations and community service." No leadership courses were offered. Educational objectives need to be expressed at the start so that departmental and program goals can be determined and expressed via courses (Ford, 1991).

Too often, mission statements mention leadership and then offer nothing. Institutions need to list leadership as an objective and then support this by developing appropriate courses. Very few of the institutions mentioned leadership among the department or major objectives. The point to emerge from this section was not so much whether program goals were being met. The primary observation was that leadership and leader training were not primary values of most evangelical pastoral training programs.

The results of the educational program scoring methodology resulted in categorizing 56 programs as not acknowledging leadership, 56 which acknowledged but did not clarify leadership, and 23 which recognized leadership

(see Table 1). The three programs which supported leadership were Moody Graduate School in Chicago, IL, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC, and Western Evangelical Seminary in Portland, OR. The three programs which emphasized leadership training programs included the Fuller Seminary School of World Missions in Pasadena, CA, the graduate program of Southern California College in Costa Mesa, CA, and the Center for Christian Leadership at Dallas Seminary, TX.

The cumulative average of all programs considered on the stated value system was 0.87, which helps explain the concern for leadership training in evangelical institutions of higher education in the United States. Undergraduate programs averaged 0.56. All graduate programs averaged 1.25 while seminaries alone averaged 0.88. Graduate programs other than seminaries skewed the average upward since the only programs included in the study were those which implied some sort of supervisory courses. Just over 73% of the no leadership programs were undergraduate, 27% were graduate. Nearly 52% of the programs that did not clarify leadership were undergraduate, versus 48% graduate. Just over 30% of the programs that recognized leadership were undergraduate, while 70% were graduate. All of the programs that supported and emphasized leadership were graduate, two thirds of the latter being seminaries. The strength of leadership training in graduate over undergraduate programs makes sense considering that graduate programs are designed for specialization, whereas most undergraduate programs emphasize general knowledge and foundational learning

preparatory for advanced skills and conceptual development.

Table 1

Results of Pastoral Training Programs Reviewed

Rating	Undergrad	Graduate	Total
No leadership (0)	41	15	56
Unclear leadership (1)	29	27	56
Recognized leadership (2)	7	16	23
Supported leadership (3)	0	3	3
Emphasized leadership (4)	0	3	3

The first and largest category of training programs reviewed contained no signs of leadership training. These programs seemed to be serious about theological and biblical training but overlooked the need for specific teaching along the lines of leadership studies. By far, most institutional catalogues do not include the terms *leader* or *leadership* in their program objectives. This is perhaps a better reflection of why leadership studies are not taken seriously as a part of ministerial training programs. Although a few of the total number of institutions listed leadership in some way, most of these did not support them with leadership classes. This suggests that either the intentions were not implemented, or that ministerial leadership was defined as theological information and ministerial skills. The latter seems to be the assumption according to course descriptions.

Category 2: Unclear Leadership

The second category of ministerial training programs included those programs which were unclear in their leadership concept. The majority appeared to confuse leadership with management. Several of the seminaries had programs clearly titled "church management," which pertained to budgeting, board meetings, program structure, and denominational hierarchy. Most of the programs in this classification were not investigated beyond the review catalog description, but it was difficult at times to discern class content without consistent definition of terms. For example, Bethel Theological Seminary, like many, listed a course on church management and administration, which referred to management by objectives, budgeting, staff relations, denominational structure, and use of volunteers. Several schools seemed to confuse the two concepts by mixing up management and leadership concepts within a single class, or calling a subject leadership when indeed it better explained management. Asbury College had a class titled "Organizational Strategies of Ministry," which included words such as "administrative structures" and "evaluating the administrative framework of various types of ministries." Assemblies of God Theological Seminary had a peripheral class on the pastor and staff which discussed staff relationships with a "consideration of the personality aspects of leadership and motivation of personnel." It went on to clarify this in terms of job descriptions, outlines, and organizational flow charts, a management giveaway. Faith Seminary's course titled "Principles of Christian Leadership" offered an introduction to various

aspects of church leadership including tax law, insurance liability, budget development, staff meetings, and working with a board.

In addition to organizational management versus leadership, ministry skills were commonly confused with leadership concepts. Columbia Biblical Seminary offered a course titled "Leadership Training for Spiritual Development." The terms *leadership skills* and *vision* were used in the context of disciple making. Mentoring, a concept with potential leadership applications, is different than discipleship which is primarily concerned with spiritual formation. Eastern Mennonite College offered a course called "Congregational Leadership," defined as basic public leadership skills for the life of the congregation. This included the preparation of sermons and planning the worship services for various occasions. Grand Canyon University described the emphasis of its Christian Studies major as "to equip [students] for leadership in various church-related activities." It offered courses such as "Church Administration," including instruction on worship, church music, evangelism, counseling, and missionary outreach. "Pastoral Ministry" described the pastor's call, his/her leadership role in the church, and leadership in worship, but went on to talk about pastoral care, preaching, and administration of church affairs. North American Baptist Seminary's course on "Church Leadership and Administration" was described as introducing "the student to principles of leadership and administration, church organization, mobilizing laity and staff, church membership classes, guiding financial procedures, and planning for advancement." Again, the combining of possible leader skills with ministerial

functions appeared common in several program course descriptions. *Leadership* and *church leader* are terms often used in a context of ministry initiation and overseeing with or without regard to the actual leadership process. The typical context is of a spiritual or religious technician as well as a church manager.

One area of strength appeared to be the number of leadership-oriented courses being offered in institutions of higher education, but which were designed for non-pastoral students. One example is Fuller Seminary's new Master of Arts in Christian Leadership. The degree is designed specifically for professionals with previous experience in their major field of study, with emphases in lay ministry and adolescent ministry. "The curriculum is designed specifically to meet the educational needs of lay leaders who want to be informed theologically, practically and administratively." Although the program only has a couple courses specifically on leadership as a concept, one descriptive line stated that the degree was suitable for those whose denominations do not require an MDiv degree in pastoring. Eastern Mennonite Seminary offered a Master of Arts in Church Leadership, designed for persons contemplating specialized leadership roles in congregational or church agency settings. The title reveals a traditional church view of leadership as nearly all of the courses emphasize Bible and theology and one elective is titled "Leadership and Administration," most likely a managerial course.

Several leadership-oriented courses were found in Christian and religious education majors. Students with these majors typically go serve on the staff at a

church in charge of Christian education or go on to serve in educational institutions versus the pastorate. Biola University's "Foundations of Leadership" class discussed the "basics of leadership for a Christian education ministry. Emphasis upon development of personal leadership qualities including Bible study, worship, prayer and interpersonal development." Bryan College included a "Research Seminar on Christian Leadership" under the Christian Education major. Central Baptist Seminary provided a course on "Leadership Development" regarding volunteers and small groups in its religious education major. Columbia Biblical Seminary included a class on small group leadership and leadership training in church planting in its Christian education department. Evangelical School of Theology's course in Christian Education included a look at leadership models. Grand Rapids Baptist College included courses on adult leadership dynamics, principles of leadership and administration, and church administration in its Christian education division. Houghton College's course titled "Leadership in Ministry" came under the Christian Education minor. Lee College titled a Christian education course "Principles of Leadership," discussing basic concepts of leadership with an emphasis on volunteer leadership. Many of the Christian education classes emphasize lay leadership and developing lay leaders because students learn to oversee education ministries where a large number of lay staff are needed for programs such as Sunday school. Liberty Baptist Theological Seminary required Masters of Religious Education students to take a class titled "Christian Leadership" which included a study of theories, types, techniques, and

hazards of leadership. Mid-American Baptist Theological Seminary included a class on "Leadership in Christian Ministry" in the Religious Education major. MidAmerica Nazarene College included a course on "Leadership and Supervision" which claimed to recognize leadership as a vital factor in a successful program and included theories, types, and principles of church leadership. This was required in the Christian Education major but not for ministerial students. Montreat-Anderson College described a Christian education course titled "Organizational Leadership and Management," apparently mixing leadership and management concepts. Northwestern College described its Christian Education major as helping "a student examine . . . and discover and develop his/her abilities in Christian leadership." Wheaton College heavily emphasized leadership in its Christian Education major, including courses such as "Dynamics of Leadership and Organization," "Leadership Development," and "Leadership in Christian Education." The major included a Church Leadership Track which was designed for "students interested in preparing for church or para-church opportunities in youth work, Christian education, curriculum development, writing, or camping." Wheaton College was given a 2 rating because of this emphasis, even though none of these courses appeared to be required for pastoral majors. Although these courses could theoretically be taken by ministerial students as electives, the existence of such courses outside pastoral core classes, and the lack of any requirement to study such topics by ministerial students revealed a definite lack of leadership training courses in pastoral preparation. It was not that

leadership classes simply do not exist.

According to Marion (1989), the conclusion is inescapable. Our best minds tell us that knowledge is related, yet our curriculum is fragmented and the fragments are moving farther apart. If all knowledge is related, then any curriculum in which the major elements are not related is not a good curriculum. "Until students can move smoothly and logically from concept to concept and component to component, every compendium of course descriptions, every college catalog will testify to a major failure of the educational establishment--our inability to devise an educational program which reflects one of the most fundamental attributes of knowledge" (p. 9). In essence, if the role of a pastor requires leading, then there should be some sense of leadership continuity flowing from course to course.

Category 3: Recognized Leadership

Approximately 17% of the reviewed programs were classified as recognizing leadership. This category was for those programs which had one or two courses which appeared to specifically discuss the nature and behaviors of leading. Signs were topics such as change agent, conflict management, relationships, vision, leadership styles, etc. This category reflects a bit of a token look at the subject, but at least a stab at the concept. Naturally, some of the listed terms may also appear in non-leadership contexts, but benefit of the doubt was given out of limited time and personnel resources to follow up each course

with a syllabi critique. A prerequisite was that the course or courses be required of ministerial students as opposed to being electives. Besides providing the classes, the programs required for pastoral majors to take them and/or were listed in pastoral tracks. The exception of Wheaton's strong Christian Education major was noted earlier.

Terms signifying a recognition of leadership as opposed to administration, management, and ministry skills included leadership styles; leadership training models; leader identification, selection, and training; the biblical view of a servant leader; Christian leadership, giving attention to its biblical basis, principles, meaning, purpose and successful implementation; a study of the vital role of the leader in pastoral ministry with consideration of long-range planning, the selection and development of leaders and group dynamics; training key leaders of local churches for the development of vision and formulating plans; conflict resolution; time management; the minister's role as a leader and organizer; identifying and analyzing one's leadership skills; mobilizing and motivating laity and staff; change and conflict management; dealing with difficult persons and their power; organizational leadership skills; followership; dynamics of group interaction; examination of the nature of leadership; assessment of leadership styles and behavior; biblical, historical, and contemporary leadership will be evaluated on the basis of biblical teaching; leadership development and ministerial ethics; help the student practitioner develop positive skills in personal leadership; secular as well as contemporary readings, case studies and simulation exercises, personal

inventories and assessment tools; and development of mentoring skills for the equipping of emerging leadership. The purpose for this collage of excerpted phrases is to depict the genre of subjects identifying potential leadership courses.

Asbury Seminary's single class on "The Servant as Leader" highlighted a number of leader-oriented terms such as *change* and *mission, research-based theories of leadership* and *serving as agents of leadership*. Azusa Pacific University's MDiv program included "Church Leadership and Administration" as well as "Pastoral Servant Leadership." The down side of the latter class is that it was described as relating to responsibilities, family, church, and community. These are not necessarily about leadership. The undergraduate program at Azusa included a "Leadership Practicum" and a "Leadership Seminar," but both could be taken for as little as one credit each, so this did not qualify as recognizing leadership training. The latter class was recently moved to an entirely different school within the institution.

Most of the issues dealt with in these courses have to do with peripheral leadership issues focusing on behaviors and traits versus concepts. Consistently, definitions, concepts, and leadership as a process appeared to be overlooked. Such a study would be more indicative of programs which wanted to do more than a token or overview look at the subject. Therefore, it was not surprising to see so many skill-oriented classes in this category. Again, it was encouraging to see the number of program transcending purely ministerial and managerial functions, but at the same time, actual class content cannot be critiqued on the limited course

descriptions and without clarifying definitions. A leadership paradigm could look at the same terms differently than a managerial or ministerial paradigm.

Category 4: Supported Leadership

There were three programs identified as supportive of leadership training. These programs contained at least three leadership-oriented classes within a pastoral major. Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary in Wake Forest, North Carolina offered the minimum number to qualify for this category. A brief phone interview provided further insight into the program beyond the catalog descriptions. A course titled "Leadership Style for Ministry" was described as "an exploration of leader and follower styles, situational factors in leadership, theological foundations for leadership, (doctrine of humanity), consultative skills for minister, and the stewardship of power and authority in the ministry." This course was required in the MDiv degree and approximately 60% of the students enrolled were headed for the pastorate. The professor who has taught the course the last two years is a New Testament and Greek professor, and did not have a leadership background. Texts included Christian books with some secular articles added. Two other electives included "Christian Leadership," taught by an adjunct professor, and "Conflict Management, and Christian leadership and Change Management." These are generally offered every other year and have a lower enrollment than the required course. After talking to the professor who taught the main course on leadership, I did not get a strong sense that leadership was a

major emphasis in the program, and that it tended to be staffed by more traditional seminary professors versus those knowledgeable in leadership studies.

Moody Graduate School is a graduate program of a Bible college, the latter not being considered in this study. The school began a Master of Ministry degree in 1985, consisting of 36 hours of 10 classes plus a six hour project. Prerequisite to the program, students must have a minimum of 20 hours of Bible credits and 10 credit hours of theology, in that the program is not heavily oriented to Bible and theology but is based on such a foundation. Students are required to be involved in ministry during the degree, which is set up in one week modules plus preparatory and post-training work. The degree is primary designed for continuing education for those in ministry, versus a straight from college to graduate school track of many seminaries and traditional graduate schools. This cast a different light onto the curriculum, similar to the practical orientation of doctor of ministry programs. Four classes qualified for the leadership training, including "Training of Leaders," wherein "biblical and cultural requirements determining how church leaders reproduce leaders qualified for ministry;" "Excellence in Leadership," a course "focusing on personal performance and productivity improvement;" "Change, Power, and Conflict Management," a course on how change is introduced into the ministry; and "Leadership and Motivation of People," which is "an advanced course in behavioral management stressing the skills and techniques relative to working with individuals, committees and staffs." Each module is team taught by an academician and practitioner in order to

provide a balanced approach. None of the leadership courses are required, although the first course is in a single set of seventeen classes from which one must be selected. The latter three are in a group of several classes, from which one is required. One of the classes is taught by an adjunct professor. The other three were taught by two Moody staff professors.

The third program in this category is from Reformed Theological Seminary (RTS) in Jackson, MS. Leadership was a required course in the MDiv degree, but had not been offered for a couple of years as of the time of the interview. "The historical development and biblical principles of management theory and leadership style are studied in this course." The course description also included strategic planning, setting goals, budgeting, direction programs, and evaluating results. Although leadership oriented, it appeared to intermix management principles. The second course had similar management and leadership sounds. "Decision-Making in Church Courts and Committees" was described as "to help future ministers improve their ability to function effectively in church courts and committees on the local and denominational levels." This appeared to be political leadership and perhaps what Burns (1978) referred to as transactional leadership, or what Rost (1991) called management. This was an elective course. The third class was titled "Leadership for Church Planting and Growth," an elective not offered at the Jackson, MS campus, but only at the Orlando, FL extension. It was predominately for those involved in church planting and included an evaluation of leadership style, defining and raising up a ministry team, and improving leadership

training. Because of the mix of management terms, and the electives and divided campus, RTS, like the other two programs in this category, did not seem to be a strong leadership training program for ministerial students serious about learning the art of leading as opposed to church management, theology, and ministry techniques.

Blue Ribbon Programs

Three programs emerged significantly above the other 138, and received the highest rating of 4, referred to as blue ribbon programs.

Southern California College's Master of Arts in Church Leadership Studies

Roger Heuser chairs the graduate studies at Southern California College (SCC) in Costa Mesa, California. Heuser (1993) co-authored a textbook on church leadership in the context of character development and is currently working on a sequel. SCC is a liberal arts college of the Assemblies of God denomination. A graduate division titled Church Leadership Studies contains the eight leadership courses within the Master of Arts in Church Leadership. The leadership program has been the focus of full page ads in various Christian publications promoting the school. All courses listed are four units unless noted otherwise.

The "Introduction to Church Leadership Studies" is a course studying "selected models and principles by which to understand the interior life of the

leader as well as skills needed to facilitate the church's spiritual life and mission within cultural and social environments."

"The Seminar in Church Leadership Studies" provides "a mutual investigation of one topic in practices of particular relevance to graduate students in church leadership studies."

"Church Leadership and Management" was defined as "a conceptual overview which examines church leadership, the interior life of the leader, development of vision, and translating that vision into program ministries of the church. Awareness of one's own leadership, interpersonal skills, decision-making processes, and motivation will be explored within the context of a local congregation and/or religious organization." Apparently the program uses the terms *management* and *leadership* in close proximity.

"Change in Church Organizations" is a "systematic examination of change within congregations and religious organizations with a view to understanding the relationship between the organization structures and its environment. Long range planning, problem solving, and program evaluation will be explored in light of intentional mission and ministry."

"Conflict Management" is "an examination of the nature of conflict and how it develops within the church or religious organization, ways to manage conflict, and how to be effective in intervention strategies using the best models in social sciences and the Christian tradition." Although conflict management may be a managerial process, it is an important skill for leaders in that organizational

change almost always results in some form of conflict.

"Issues in Pastoral Leadership" involves "a study of the leadership role of the pastor in developing evangelistic strategies, lay leadership, and group and individual interaction in the church. Also included will be issues of the minister's ongoing personal growth, skill development and mental health with assessment of the 'life passages' of the pastor. Strategies of resolving role conflicts will be evaluated, including role definition and conflict in multiple staff relations." This course appears to merge more than one theme, but the thrust appears to be primarily on the leader's personal role with regard to mobilizing outreach, the laity, and staff.

"Leadership Development in Cultural Context" appears to be a missions-oriented course described as "the role of church leadership in relationship to social/organizational structures with an emphasis on leadership development that occurs among developing nations or people groups." Another course titled "Seminar in Church Leadership Studies" allowed for mutual investigation of a topic in cross-cultural ministry relevant to church leadership.

Supplemental courses made room for independent study in church leadership, allowing for one to four units of credit, as well as a one to four unit "Special Topics" course on church leadership, and apparently an opening for special topics and seminars which arise.

It is apparent that SCC has done more than just applied the word *leadership* to its courses, as some programs have been tempted to do. The

breadth of courses allows for a more detailed look at leadership concerns within a church context. The program began in 1982 and has been in its basic condition for the last decade. A recent ten year survey of alumni offered high marks for the program, although the number of returned surveys was too small to be significant. Course teachers are either those with leadership experience and/or those who have interest in leadership studies. There is an increasing interest in cross-cultural leadership theories. A mix of secular and Christian leadership texts are utilized. The major changes in the courses over the ten years have occurred with the changing literature. Early courses used more managerial materials like Drucker and Hersey and Blanchard, but more recent classes have used Bennis and Nanus. Heuser suggested that the primary difficulty in establishing the program was with the accrediting committee, who raised questions about the title of the program, suggesting that it must be more professional than academic.

A majority of the students enrolled in the major are ministry oriented and headed for the pastorate. The Assembly of God denomination, with which SCC is associated, has a strong pentecostal tradition where higher education is at times considered suspect or at least not necessary for the pastorate. Therefore, the traditional MDiv degree is not as esteemed as in other denominations. This makes SCC's program more acceptable as a pastoral preparation program than other master's programs.

Center for Christian Leadership at Dallas Seminary (CCL)

Dallas Seminary provides a Master of Theology (ThM) degree which is the most inclined to incorporate those going into the pastorate. Approximately 50% of those in the ThM program are headed for the pastorate. Each student in the Master of Theology program must select one of seven ministry tracks, one of which is Pastoral Leadership. This track is "designed to equip students for ministry as senior or associate pastors in local churches, combines courses in expository preaching with courses in leadership skills and counseling." The focus of this track appears to emphasize skills of a pastoral leader versus leadership skills. Two of the seven courses in this track are titled "Leading through Expository Preaching," one is called "Leading the Church in Worship" and another is titled "Leading and Managing the Church," most likely a managerial course. Although the track has bought into the theme of leading, it apparently supports the view that to lead means to manage the church and minister. Only a single course, "Leading the Church to Growth" is oriented toward leadership.

Although the above degree appeared to be a somewhat traditional program which has the appearance of a leadership focus, what set Dallas apart from other seminaries analyzed in this study was the Center for Christian Leadership, chaired by Howard Hendricks, and assisted by William Lawrence and Peter Deison. The Center serves as an entity within the larger institution of Dallas Seminary, a well known bastion of conservative biblical training among evangelicalism. It is given a sense of self-identity as it has its own stationery and provides a number of

training resources outside of the seminary. At the same time, the director answers to one of the vice-presidents of the seminary. "The Center for Christian Leadership seeks to build godly servant leaders with the character, vision, and skill to build other leaders. The three target audiences of the Center's activities are (1) students on the Dallas Seminary campus, (2) pastors and vocational Christian workers, and (3) business leaders in the workplace, lay leaders in local churches, and other believers interested in impacting their communities for Christ." By its own purpose statement, it is evident that this center transcends traditional academic training for seminary students.

The seed work of CCL began in 1986 and the center began in 1987. The seminary was going through a time of transition, striving to prepare for the turn of the century. A planning group came up with the concept called Vision 2000. Andy Wildmon had the idea for such a center and a subsequent team of people met for a retreat to discuss changing the purpose statement and to help develop leaders. The seminary's previous purpose statement emphasized expository preaching, for which Dallas is known, but a growing number of majors did not emphasize this. In addition, graduates tended to be failing in their ministries, not in the area of preaching or biblical knowledge, but in the areas of relational impact. Since most strategic leadership takes place in a small group, they believed that is where the impact needed to be made. Wildmon realized the seminary said it was developing leaders, but could not find where it was doing this. The intent of the center is to provide an array of resources available for

students and non-students.

The primary thrust of CCL is for character development of leaders. It is responsible for the four hour Spiritual Formation program at the Seminary which all ThM majors must take. Students become a part of a spiritual formation group which seek discipleship and accountability. The goal is "the all and the few."

Staff try to get as many as possible into the spiritual formation groups, and then a few are recruited to be part of the leadership training. All students are given an invitation to such an orientation, explaining the thrust of the leadership courses, and some are specifically invited. The orientation produces 75% of the trainers who commit to leading the small groups, which not only benefits the members, but specifically trains the leaders in leadership skills. Approximately 25% of the trainers are seminary faculty, who must also agree to investing three hours per week to the group and also participate in a peer group as well as go through the leader training.

Although the spiritual formation classes are the only required courses from the center, many students are recruited to be a part of other leadership courses, especially those who indicate strengths in this area. No specific assessment is given. The elective courses offered by CCL could be taken in the master's level program subject to the requirements for electives. All of the leadership courses offered were therefore elective. A student showing influence aptitudes would be encouraged to enroll in 8 hours of leadership courses available and another 4 hours of leadership training classes, thus totally 12 hours beyond the spiritual

formation core. It is doubtful that other leadership courses will be added to the required ThM load, as a significant struggle took place just to get the spiritual formation classes added to the core group according to Lawrence (personal communication, November, 1993).

"Leadership Development and Character Development for Small Groups" is "a course in training students to lead small groups, how to develop leaders of small groups, and how to devise small group programs to meet the needs of a particular church or organization." This elective is 2 credit hours. It is uncertain whether this is truly a leadership course or a small group ministry course.

"Advanced Leadership Development" is a single unit credit, small group course dealing with "group leadership modeling, problem solving, assessment-vision, teaching skill, and character modeling skill." Again, it is uncertain whether this is leadership, small group ministry or both.

"Independent Study in Leadership" allows for independent research on a subject in the area of leadership not treated in other courses. The number of credit units was not stated.

"Dynamics of Leadership" is a 3 unit course on "an analysis of the qualities and practices of the effective Christian leadership based on principles in Scripture and related literature, with attention to devising a personal philosophy of spiritual leadership."

"Personal Assessment and Ministry Vision" is a 2 credit course "designed to assess and define a person's ministry strengths and weaknesses and to develop

leadership and interpersonal skills for more effective ministry, for the purpose of building confidence in future ministry decisions and developing vision."

Enrollment requires consent of the professor.

"Leadership Seminar" is a 2 credit course requiring a prerequisite of "Dynamics of Leadership." It is described as "a small-group seminar on current issues in Christian leadership, with emphasis on research and problems."

CCL also provides ongoing programs for continuing education as well as seminars and conferences on Christian leadership and related topics. Although these were not a matter of analysis in this study, they are to be noted in that CCL provides a mindset supportive of leadership training for the seminary students, as well as available programs for students interested in advanced leadership training. Students serious about leadership training have the opportunity to get involved in extracurricular leadership studies beyond what other institutions can offer. The thrust of CCL appears to be one of a holistic approach, taking into account a strong biblical-theological foundation, along with spiritual formation, and thirdly, leadership training. The leadership training facet, although not as broad or focused as SCC's program, nevertheless went beyond all the other seminary programs reviewed.

CCL is currently in a development stage, striving to raise \$1,500,000 in the next two years to expand, including the hiring of six staff people. In addition to the student population, there is interest in developing resources for the vocational market, pastors and full-time Christian workers, and the market place segment,

made up of business people and non-clerical workers.

Fuller Theological Seminary School of World Missions

Fuller Seminary is made up of three schools, the School of Theology, the School of World Missions, and the School of Psychology. The premiere leadership training, evangelical institution in the United States appears to be Fuller Seminary. The Master of Arts in Christian Leadership was noted earlier in this study, offering three leadership courses, two of which are required.

"Leadership and Character Development, . . . takes a general look at leadership theory and practice from the light of spirituality and character formation.

Additionally, the course looks at the practice of leadership with a focus on self-insight, giftedness, personality and styles of leadership." "Leadership in Diversity: Gender, Multicultural, and Ethnicity" discusses the dynamics of leadership in this context and challenges students to consider their own blocks to effective leadership in diverse settings. "Leadership Theory" is a required course taken from the School of World Missions, discussed later. This program appears to be a good example of a balanced graduate program as an alternative to a traditional MDiv program, although the leadership training is not emphasized over other aspects. Patrick Lattore chairs this program.

The Doctor of Ministry program at Fuller offers some leadership focus for the continuing education of experienced pastors, as do other Doctor of Ministry programs. Fuller is recognized for its church growth emphasis, an aspect of strong

church leadership.

The reason this study is skewed, and the reason Fuller Seminary is noted as the leader in leadership training, is because the School of World Missions has the most extensive leadership program, but it falls outside the track of most pastoral students. Edgar Elliston (personal communication, October 21, 1993) noted that few students from the School of Theology, and more notably, the MDiv program, enroll in the leadership courses in the School of World Missions. The School of Theology offers the traditional MDiv program which has little in the way of leadership studies. MDiv students who would want to pursue specific training in leadership would need to take electives from the School of World Missions. Except for Wheaton's Christian Education program, I declined rating nonpastoral programs even if they included leadership courses, noting that few pastors would likely take such courses other than possible electives. However, due to the breadth and depth of leadership training available in the School of World Missions, an exception was made in considering it a blue ribbon program. The rationale for deviating from the original methodology follows via a description of the program.

The first leadership course in the School of World Missions was offered in 1967 when Ralph Winter taught a course on multicultural leadership. Leadership studies became a focus in the School of World Missions because a major task of missionaries is to locate and train national leaders who, in turn, takeover indigenous ministries. Therefore, an understanding of the process of leadership

and leader development have evolved over the last two decades. The emphasis is primarily on multicultural and crosscultural leadership, which includes leadership paradigms which are quite different than the Western approach common in most leadership writing. Elliston (personal communication, October 21, 1993) noted that other cultures view the leader and leadership process differently.

A 1993 full page magazine advertisement for Fuller Theological Seminary showed two professors smiling, chatting with a group of students around a table. The text reads: "Great leaders aren't simply born--they're shaped. And, at Fuller Theological Seminary, we specialize in developing leaders for specialized positions within the kingdom of God. At Fuller, we offer a unique emphasis in leadership within our internationally recognized School of World Missions." The advertisement goes on to suggest that "people today are hungry for men and women who are able to effectively model servant leadership in the name of Jesus Christ." The professors are noted as J. Robert Clinton and Edgar Elliston, "recognized pioneers in the emerging discipline of Leadership." Unlike many other promotionals, this advertisement seems to be supported by an array of courses.

The Leadership Training core includes the following courses specifically addressing leadership-oriented themes.

"Basic Leadership Emergence Patterns: a study of leadership selection processes, including development phases, process items, spheres of influence, spiritual authority, and leadership principles. Focuses on a biblical case study and

missionary case study to illustrate theory." This course is taught by Clinton and was put in book form titled The Making of A Leader (1988).

"Foundations of Leadership: a survey of leadership theory, including the history of leadership and contributions from various disciplines (including sociology, anthropology, and management theory). Explores biblical perspectives on leadership, including such topics as styles, spiritual gifts, modeling, emergence patterns, and church structures."

"Developing Leadership Gifts: an in-depth study of the doctrine of spiritual gifts, with an emphasis on leadership gifts (both directive and supportive). Points out responsibility for identifying, developing and releasing gifted people. Uses Holland's profile to suggest creation of structures through which gifts can operate. Suggests convergence as a major goal for level 4 and 5 leaders."

"Mentoring: Conducts an in-depth study of relational empowerment and the nine basic mentor types; mentor discipler, spiritual guide, coach, counselor, teacher, sponsor, contemporary model, historical model and divine contact."

"Life-Long Development: Gives a biblical basis for the study of leadership selection processes. Identifies patterns such as time lines, development phases, process items, idealized time line, convergence, gift mix, spheres of influence, spiritual authority, and leadership principles, all in the context of study of actual biblical, historical and present day leaders." I took this course in a special cluster group with four other pastors, and the relevance and unique models of Clinton (1992) provided a higher order look at practical experiences.

"Leadership Training Models: An overview of leadership training which first focuses on the evaluation of training, using two major evaluation models as standards for evaluation. The course next categorizes 30-40 training models under three headings; formal, non-formal, and informal. Finally, various field training cases are analyzed using the perspectives that were introduced in the course." An additional course on generic training models is offered with an emphasis on a particular announced leadership training model.

"Change Dynamics: A course for executive and middle-level leadership of Christian organizations which explores change agent roles, organizational dynamics, and decision making processes. Introduces several change models as heuristic models for analyzing current change situations."

Additional leadership support courses are offered such as the "Topics of Leadership Selection and Training" which is offered periodically to cover additional subjects as they arise, plus a class for independent study. "Tutorial in Leadership" is for supervised investigation of topics by Ph. D. candidates, is "Methods in Leadership Training."

The extent of this program makes it the leader among leadership training programs in evangelicalism. Clinton and Elliston have developed several models and teaching themes out of their own research and by synthesizing both secular and Christian literature. Their pioneer work has set a pace for others who seek to do the same or similar works. Although course descriptions vary from other leadership programs such as Harvard and the University of San Diego in that they

reflect an evangelical church context, there are some similarities such as overviews of leadership studies and organizational change. Clinton (1992) suggested that the vacuum within Christian literature on leadership is a conceptual analysis of the leadership process. Most literature and courses reflect a skill, attribute approach. The Fuller curriculum represents a mixture of skill and theory classes as well as hybrids of the two.

The School of World Missions also offers a doctorate in missiology and a Ph.D., styled after the British doctoral studies, which emphasizes an individual contract made up of individual research components. The emphasis in leadership provides an opportunity for specific further study into research topics, typically in a missions context. An MDiv degree or equivalent is required, along with a minimum of forty-eight hours of missions studies prior to the program. Elliston (personal communication, October 21, 1993) believed that other schools were beginning to take a look at leadership studies, although he did not think that traditional pastoral programs would provide much in the way of leadership training given the large amount of theological courses required for ministerial preparation.

When the professors from each of the three blue ribbon programs were notified that their program was recognized as one of the top three leadership training programs in the United States according to this study, they all appeared genuinely appreciative, and also surprised. During the interviews, the professors noted that their focus on their own programs did not allow for them to learn what

others were doing in similar fields, and that their programs had emerged as pioneers in this field. This revealed that there is a general lack of organized effort to advance leadership studies in a broad field, and that only scattered pockets exist, generally around certain personalities.

Almost all of the Fuller School of World Missions courses are taught by either Clinton or Elliston. Heuser was at the foundation and has been significantly involved with the development of SCC's leadership program, currently serving as chair. Hendricks and Lawrence are major promoters of CCL at Dallas. The concept of CCL was initiated by Wildmon during a brainstorming time. All of these programs have in common educational leaders who carry a burden for leadership training in the church. Just as leaders catalyze leadership for the sake of organizational change, these educators have facilitated leadership in an entrepreneurial fashion by raising up programs specifically focusing on leadership training in the ministry.

A brief comparison of the three blue ribbon programs with the optimum leadership program defined in the next chapter will be discussed in Chapter Six.

Summary

Although this was an abridged study of evangelical institutions of higher education, and as noted, intentionally overlooked Bible colleges and nonevangelical programs, the number of schools reviewed provides a fairly thorough overview of evangelicalism with regard to pastoral leadership training.

The results displayed in Appendix B give reason for concern if indeed leadership training is a concern for pastors. Pastoral education appears to consist of an emphasis on somewhat traditional theology and biblical fundamentals, sprinkled with practical courses such as counseling, preaching, and administration. Recent literature and curriculum changes tend to be responding to the cries for more practical courses versus more leadership courses.

A majority of schools either do nothing for leadership training or clearly fail to clarify leadership from administration and priestly functions such as religious rituals and officiating services. The lack of literature pertaining to leadership training in higher education corresponds to the limited number of solid leadership courses, let alone programs.

On a more positive note, there appear to be a handful of programs available which could serve as models for more concerted leadership training programs. It might behoove all for these more focused programs to network together to sharpen each other as well as to promote leadership training among other evangelical institutions. At the same time, there appeared to be little cross-pollination among evangelical, nonevangelical, and secular institutions. Since leadership is not necessarily evangelical in and of itself, many of the concepts from programs such as the University of San Diego, Harvard's Kennedy School, and the Center for Creative Leadership could be translated into Protestant pastoral contexts.

CHAPTER 5

OPTIMUM LEADERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAMS

Project Introduction

The goal of this project consisted of determining optimum leadership training programs for ministerial students at the graduate and undergraduate level. Due to developmental differences between the two levels, and out of concern that traditional MDiv programs would not allow for a leadership emphasis, three programs were recommended, one for undergraduate, one as an MDiv renovation, and one as a separate graduate degree. This chapter will explain the six steps of phase two, along with descriptions of the final outcomes.

The panelists involved in the Delphi method included expert members from four targeted stakeholder groups: pastors, academics, administrators, and lay leaders. The inclusion of all four groups was an intentional design choice to avoid bias of a select group and hopefully to avoid blindspots. Because each group represented different aspects of the process and outcome, attention needed to be given to provide a synthesis in the diversity. At the same time, most of the participants had at least a nominal awareness of the current system, so that the emerging program could have a better chance of fitting into a somewhat traditional framework. Panel members were not required to be experts in the

current pastoral preparation model as this was not the focus of the research.

The diversity of the group presented some challenges in terms of synthesizing various priorities and suggestions. The greatest differences appeared to exist between the academic group versus the practitioner pastors and lay leaders. This seemed to be a healthy situation for an optimum program development as most curriculum development is a matter of academic initiation. The final outcomes seemed to satisfy nearly all of the panel members, so that the methodology appeared effective.

The first step of phase two had to do with the selection of panel members, explained in Chapter 3 of this study. The second step of phase two involved the development of interview questions for the first Delphi round of interviews. This also is explained in Chapter 3.

First Round Results

Step three, the first round of the Delphi, provided a multitude of issues. The questions posed during the 30 minute interviews were intended to initiate direct responses as well as originate new ideas which may have been overlooked by the researcher. All of the interviews went well. The most difficult aspect of this round was setting up appointments to talk to 20 busy people over the telephone. Some of the men had international travel schedules, two were on book tours, and others were busy with their ongoing work. Only one interview was done in person. All of the participants were informed that their comments

would be taped and were confidential. Two of the lay leaders appeared to lack confidence in the area being researched, as was noted in a few disclaimers of being unsure about how much they could add to the study and that they had never been pastors or professors. The triangulation group found all of the original panelists appropriate for their roles. It is not uncommon to find a certain intimidation factor in laity regarding ministry-related domains. Apprehensions were allayed and the responses to questions were generally determined to be equivalent to the other three lay members.

The average interview lasted for 27 minutes. The interviews ranged in duration from 17 to 50 minutes. After the interviews were transcribed and subjects listed in the transcript margins, the research team began categorizing the concerns and ideas. The result of this process provided a sense of structure from which to develop the next Delphi round in the form of a survey. Three taxonomies emerged from the numerous topics discussed and clarified during the interviews. They were (1) diagnostic practices, (2) core courses, and (3) practicum.

Diagnostic Practices

The title *diagnostic practices* pertains to methods of analyzing a student's call to the ministry, and more specifically, one's leadership aptitudes. The panel suggested that those with higher leadership aptitudes ought to be recruited to take more leadership courses as well as get involved in experience gaining activities.

Since the area of giftedness is a biblical concept and generally accepted among evangelicals, recognition of natural, spiritual, and learned areas of strength require proper stewardship. Three domains emerged in this taxonomy. The first includes tools which help reveal leadership aptitudes. Various psychometric instruments and dispositional questionnaires were suggested and listed. The second domain has to do with recommendations from people who have seen the student in past and present activities. The idea that leadership gifts emerge early in life prevailed, suggesting that reports from coaches, teachers, pastors, bosses, and co-workers could aid in determining leadership strengths. A third domain relates to faculty and adjunct counseling ideas, suggesting interviewing techniques and professorial feedback. This would provide more personalized guidance and even the establishment of growth objectives during the program.

Core Courses

The second taxonomy dealt with core leadership courses which would be offered in the program. The research team distinguished these courses from church management and ministerial skills as was done during the Phase One catalog surveys. Classes which were suggested out of a managerial or ministerial mindset were not included, although very few were mentioned during the interview process. A distinction was made between giving leaders training in pastoral behaviors such as preaching and counseling and leadership training specifically. Potential courses emerged upon the grouping of certain words,

phrases, and concepts recommended during the interviews. Two of the courses listed were introduced by the research team from topics introduced indirectly by the panel members, such as adult development, the title taken from the leadership program at the University of San Diego, and leadership case studies, which originated from Harvard's Kennedy School leadership program. The courses are described as follows.

Organizational Theory: How organizations function, including strengths and weaknesses of various models and case studies.

Organizational Change: The leader acting as change agent, conflict management, side effects of change pressures, and dynamics which catalyze change.

Leadership Theory I: A brief history and overview of leadership studies; leadership differentiated from management; interpersonal relationships emphasized.

Leadership Theory II: Case study analysis of various leadership situations along with guest practitioners; discussions to focus on practical as well as complex process issues at hand in actual leadership scenarios.

Time Management: The issues of priority setting; mission and purpose statements; delegation and the 80/20 principle.

Group Psychology: Social dynamics among people; organizing groups for planning and tasks; identifying potential leaders and problem people; team building and meeting leading skills.

Adult Development: Understanding the various phases of adult development so one can better identify priorities, values, and interests of those with whom one leads.

Mentoring: Identifying potential leadership and principles for reproducing oneself in others; ideas for raising up more and better new leaders.

Decision Making/Planning: Structural principles on getting a group away from status quo; goal setting; how dreams can become realities by organizational structuring and carrying out ideas.

Leadership Case Studies: A Socratic course designed to look at actual organizational situations for the purpose of discussion and better understanding real life scenarios. Guest practitioners would be invited in as well to discuss leadership issues.

A miscellaneous question was posed concerning the selection of suitable teachers for such courses, as several panelists brought up the concern about teachers having experience in church leadership prior to teaching leadership courses.

Practicum

The third taxonomy had to do with practical experience issues. Most of the panelists discussed the importance of this as leaders learn best from watching and doing versus classroom discussions. The optimum learning sequence involved (1) classroom lectures on the theories, (2) practitioner interview and discussion, (3)

practical experience, and (4) classroom debriefing. This sequence is obviously somewhat ideal. The emerging concerns seemed to center around the availability of appropriate people and situations to provide for adequate practicum experiences. Several open-ended questions were posed which addressed this area.

1. What length of time would be realistic for an internship? Any minimum time?

2. What requirements are expected from this practicum? For example, should this be part time or full time employment? Should it be mere observation during staff or board meetings? Should it involve direct contact with the leader or not?

3. What could be done to best match students with mentors?

4. What could be done to target good examples of leaders, and motivate them to participate in such a program?

5. What feedback should be required from the on campus mentor and practicum mentor?

6. Are there any other ideas, pitfalls, challenges in providing a practicum for leadership training?

Finally, panelists were asked to address any issues they deemed worthy which did not occur in previous interactions.

Second Round Results

The feedback from the second round questionnaire provided a significant

amount of information in terms of firming up possible programs. The section dealing with assessment processes resulted in a basic listing of test instruments along with a synthesis of the reference and counseling aspects. The section pertaining to possible courses was processed according to a majority vote and minor modifications and amendments were added. The third section on a practicum provided less specific directions, even though the panel felt it was perhaps the single most important aspect of the program in terms of applying what was learned. The time duration of the internship was a simple mathematical averaging of time recommended by the panel members. A consistent need for locating and training qualified intern hosts was noted as well.

Much of the feedback from the academics was that between accreditation requirements and the need for significant Bible and theology knowledge, there was no room in MDiv degrees for significant leadership courses. The pastors and lay leaders did not see it the same way, and suggested more leadership courses should be offered in MDiv programs. To make room for these courses, the practitioner panel members believed that those courses which lacked practicality should be deleted. Because of this significant discrepancy among panelists, the research committee constructed two graduate programs, one which is a modified MDiv degree, and another which is a pastoral-oriented Master of Arts degree in Christian Leadership. Several comments suggested that certain courses would not be appropriate for undergrad students as they lack the experience and maturity necessary to understand certain concepts. Although older students with more

experience could grasp the ideas, a program could not count on having older students. Because of these life process issues, a tertiary program was developed which addressed the unique abilities of undergraduate students to synthesize leadership studies. The three programs were then developed from the tabulated feedback of the round two responses by the research team.

The results of round two were placed into a draft program format so that final ideas and thoughts could be gleaned from the panel. The questionnaire was divided into three segments, dealing with the diagnostic analysis, leadership core courses, and leadership practicum. The introduction oriented the members to these segments, as well as the rationale behind the three programs. The members were instructed to review the draft programs and critique them in terms of their viability within current institutions and make detailed changes or overall observations about their implementation.

Diagnostic Analysis

Diagnostic analysis is concerned with the identification of those with leadership aptitudes. The purpose is to help students discover their gifts and also to serve the faculty in counseling students and in program development. All of the ministerial students would fulfill the three substeps, including a diagnostic instrument, reference feedback, and an interview with one or more qualified professors and/or practitioners. Several instruments were recommended. They were listed in order of popularity: Myers Briggs, Performax, 16 Personality Factors

(16PF), and Minnesota Multi-Personality Inventory (MMPI). Tools mentioned only once were: Personality Profile, Role Preference Inventory, Personality Development Profile, Taylor Johnson Temperament Analysis, and Strong-Campbell. The emphasis here is on looking specifically for leadership strengths as opposed to a generic personality test. The suggestion is that two instruments be administered and evaluated by a certified technician.

References would be solicited from people in a student's life who would have experience seeing the student in potential leadership roles prior to attending the institution. Forms would be designed to ask questions pertaining to leadership situations. Several of the members emphasized the idea that leadership aptitudes tend to show up early in a person's life.

Interviews subsequent to the first two diagnostic procedures would complete this segment. These would be conducted preferably by a committee of both practitioners, most likely alumni, and professors. More than one panel member noted that the ability of educators and practitioners to recognize pastoral students with potential influence gifts is limited. Few can perceive potential leaders. Information would specifically seek to uncover past leadership experience as well as goals, ministry expectations, and calling. The purpose of the interviewing would be to better counsel the student in terms of course work and to focus on maximizing strengths and minimizing weaknesses.

Leadership Core Courses

The panel strongly communicated that leadership courses should only be taught by faculty members who had proven leadership interest, research, and who had practical experience, the latter of which was preferably within the last five to seven years. If such faculty members were not available on campus, then qualified adjunct professors consisting of local or visiting guest practitioners would be necessary to round out a credible teaching team. An overseeing committee consisting of both institutional people and practitioners could provide accountability and support for a balanced teaching staff. According to several panelists, academics appear to overestimate their ability to do it all, and practitioners tend to underestimate the academics' ability to teach leadership well.

Undergraduate Program

An undergraduate program would best be provided via a minor in leadership. The minor would consist of 24 semester units, made up of 16 concentrated units of 4 core courses, 4 units of a leadership project, and 4 units of practicum. These numbers were based on the general amount of courses recommended in the second round survey. Although this would be for religion majors, or those in whatever ministerial track is provided by the institution, such a minor could easily be open to all majors, with practica done in areas of the student's interest. The total number of units would reflect what was required by each institution.

The core courses would be taken during two years in a normal four year program. Year one, semester one would involve leadership theory: an overview of leadership studies, the nature of leadership, seeing leadership primarily as a process and a relationship, servant leadership, ethics, transformational leadership, and defining leadership.

Year one, semester two would involve organizational theory and change: systems thinking, introducing various organizational models in the context of the church, and introducing change theories in the church context.

Year two courses would involve more skills for carrying out leader behaviors. Semester one includes modules on time management, mission and purpose statements, vision, and decision making.

Year two, semester two focuses on other modules such as mentoring, empowerment, team building concepts, and the utilization of some case studies.

The leadership project would involve some approved leadership activity along with a faculty or qualified sponsor. Situations could include local church or parachurch leadership roles, student government, or an entrepreneurial endeavor involving leadership. This would include some self-study in the area of activity. More than a paper or research, this would serve as an immersion into a situation requiring leadership implementation. The project would be more self-motivated and reflect the student's world more so than a practicum might. Regular updates and a final paper or practical demonstration of learned skills would be included. The project would be designed to get the student out of the classroom and into

some leadership activity during formal education.

The practicum for the undergraduate program did not emerge much differently than from other level programs. A couple of panel members commented that the practicum was an important aspect, but perhaps not as important at the undergraduate level due to the general inexperience and possible immaturity of the student.

MDiv Program

The recommended MDiv program would be approximately one third leadership, displacing one third of the electives and/or other course work. This would be an optimum program for students with undergraduate degrees in Bible or religion, so that theological training would not necessarily be sacrificed for the leadership core. Approximately 30 leadership learning units would include 24 units of course work and 6 units of practicum.

Core courses would include: leadership theory, organization theory, change strategies, leadership skills, mission and purpose, mentoring, incarnational leadership (spiritual formation), and an elective in either group psychology, or a self-study into a special aspect of leadership.

MA in Christian Leadership

The Master of Arts in Christian Leadership would involve 24 units of core courses, 12-21 units of pastoring electives, and 6 units of practicum, for a total

program of 42-51 units. This program would be recommended for those with undergraduate degrees in religion or biblical literature, again, so that theological fundamentals are established. This major would be available where an MDiv degree was not required by a governing body, or where a traditional MDiv program was already in place and change within the MDiv program was not desired. The program would include the courses listed in the revised MDiv leadership core, and would add another 12-21 units in pastoral skills, church management, theology, church history, biblical literature, homiletics, hermeneutics, or as recommended.

Practica

The undergraduate minor in leadership would include work in a supervised leadership situation, involving full-time work one summer or part-time (20 hours/week) during a semester. This situation would be negotiated between a campus sponsor in the leadership area, and an effective practitioner. The student would have responsibilities requiring some leadership skills but would also shadow the leader during leader-type situations as well as spend time weekly in one-on-one situations as well as spend time weekly in one-on-one interaction and feedback sessions. Weekly reports/journals would be turned in and reviewed by the campus coordinator. A final debriefing between the mentor, campus sponsor and student would culminate the experience. This would be 4 units of credit.

The graduate level practicum would involve an internship under the

supervision of a recognized leader who would be trained as a supervisor. This could take place via two years of part-time mentoring, or one year of full-time mentoring. Ideally this would be a paid working relationship. A triangular relationship between campus representative, mentor, and student would be vital to the program. Regular reports and feedback and debriefing would play important parts in the process.

A five page, single-spaced survey with these course descriptions made up the third round survey which was sent to panelists for their critique. Instructions called for final recommendations and implementation instructions for the programs.

Rationale for Round Three

The results from the first survey, representing the second Delphi round, tended to be more refining than transformational in nature. There were three primary reasons why a subsequent round was implemented other than that the original methodology called for it.

First of all, the research team believed that changing the optimum program into three programs represented a significant change from the first survey. The provision for an undergraduate and two graduate programs potentially provided a number of refinements per program. These refinements could enhance the likelihood for such a program to serve as an optimum leadership training program. The first survey only suggested a single program.

Secondly, the instructions given with survey one emphasized content issues with regard to diagnostic tools, core courses, and practicum. The second survey emphasized potential implementation concerns. By presenting the programs as examples of final institutional drafts, it was believed that this emphasis might present a different angle to the study, as an optimum program would need to be implementational in the real world if indeed it lived up to its title.

Thirdly, it was felt to be an important issue that a sense of diminishing returns had been established. In much research, the point of diminishing returns allows researchers to draw the line and rest more confidently with the final results. The limited number of change issues generated from round three substantiated this hope. Because panelists were informed that there would be three rounds, the team decided it would behoove the project to use this option and better hone more minute points in the programs. If the results had turned the other way and a fourth round was needed, it would have made the process much more difficult.

Third Round Results

Approximately half of the third round second surveys came back with very few recommendations for changes. I noted in Chapter 3 that two of the panel members did not complete this survey. The majority of the remaining panelists provided a few more suggested changes and a single member had some significant negative feedback regarding the programs as a whole. As in all negotiated

agreements, consensus does not necessarily mean total individual satisfaction.

Most of the edits had to do with suggestions regarding implementation and various minor points in the program. The member who provided the negative feedback was from the academic group. He was concerned that the program was elitist and tended to focus on the superleader. The problem, he noted, is that there are few superleaders and never enough to go around. A larger number of pastoral students need to learn leadership. He was also concerned that the programs, in part, emphasized leadership at the sake of theological fundamentals so that some of the foundational skills necessary for the pastorate might be undermined. A single subsequent correspondence to this person provided clarification of these concerns.

Other than this single commentary, only minor changes were suggested between the two surveys. Descriptions of the final programs with explanations are given below. They are put into terms similar to an elaborated program description, including some instructions on implementation for academics interested in utilizing such a program.

Researcher liberties were taken in terms of filling out the course descriptions and at times, using terms which were only inferred and not literally mentioned by the expert panel members. The rationale for this decision was to fulfill the research objective which was to provide a leadership program description which might be included in a detailed brochure or college catalog, along with some inclusive operational instructions and descriptions. Most of these

terms and descriptions come out of my own leadership studies and were neither intended to change the panel's intentions, nor to add to the information so that it would corrupt the context of the suggestions. The research team approved this editing, and believed it best represented a synthesis of the panel's intentions.

Undergraduate Minor In Leadership

The minor in leadership is designed for students in various liberal arts degrees who desire to learn leadership theories and applications in hopes of becoming Christian leaders in organizations. This emphasis is for upperclass status, or for older students with faculty permission.

Diagnostic Evaluation

In order to better understand a student's leadership aptitudes, a diagnostic evaluation will serve as the entrance requirement into the program. This is not so much for the purpose of setting minimum standards as it is to better counsel the student and augment strengths and weaknesses of the student during the program.

Diagnostic Instrument: Two instruments will be administered and evaluated by certified technicians, who will look for both emergent leadership aptitudes as well as any other personality strengths or weaknesses which could increase or decrease an individual's effectiveness as a leader. One of the following group would be included: Performax or Role Preference Inventory. These tend to reveal leadership aptitudes with regard to role preferences and comforts. The second

instrument would be selected from the following group: Myers Briggs, 16PF, MMPI, Strong-Campbell, Personality Development Profile. These tend to be more general personality profiles which reveal potential strengths, weaknesses, and interpersonal relationship styles.

References: Generally, leadership strengths emerge early in life, such that a person can detect such aptitudes by reviewing past group and organizational experiences. Three to four reference questionnaires are to be given to and returned by people in the student's life who have seen the student in group activities. These may include Sunday school teachers, coaches, employers, work subordinates, or the like.

Questionnaires should reflect a focus on leader behaviors, identifying an array of leadership behaviors such as are reflected in some of the following example questions.

1. How long have you known this person?
2. In what group setting have you seen this person interact with others?
3. What effect did this person seem to have on the group interaction and/or task at hand?
4. Would you consider this person a leader? Why or why not?
5. Would other group members consider this person a leader? Why or why not?
6. List some potential strengths and weaknesses of this person in working with others.

7. This person is enrolling in a leadership minor. How might you advise us in helping develop this individual's leadership ability?

A questionnaire with open-ended questions would be preferred over a quantifiable format.

Interview: An interview team made up of at least two people will interview each student prior to admission into the program and subsequent to receiving the results of the diagnostic instruments and the references. This will allow for a more cogent look into the student in terms of leadership aptitudes and potential areas for growth. The team should be made up of a faculty member from the leadership training staff, along with a qualified practitioner, preferably in a field related to the student's major. Practitioners need to be designated as those willing to participate in such a process, and who have shown leadership gifts in his/her areas of expertise, whether church, business, education, or other. The interview would take place preferably with both interview team members together. A part of this interview process would include an overview of the other diagnostic measurements along with some recommendations for personal emphasis during the study.

This information can be kept on file for future updating and reference, and might prove especially helpful during the practicum.

Although these diagnostic evaluations should not be seen as a screening process for an elitist program, the attraction for such a program as this would be the reputation developed for admitting and graduating quality students. Students

recognized on campus as leaders and those with leader aptitudes should be recruited to participate in such a program. At the same time, standards should not be lowered to the point that anyone is able to pass such core courses without a significant amount of work and application. Thus, the end goal is that whatever leader aptitudes a person has coming into the program might be discovered and developed as best possible.

Core Leadership Studies

The key to success in this area is that these courses need to be taught by those who have proven leadership interest, research, and practical experience. If the latter is not available on campus, then adjunct professors consisting of local or visiting guest practitioners would be necessary to round out a credible teaching team. The term *practitioner* implies more than just a professional, but rather one who has demonstrated leader abilities. When a practitioner is used, the best available faculty candidate could oversee the course development in terms of its academic integrity and theoretical veracity if the adjunct professor did not have suitable credentials.

A minor in leadership would involve 21-24 semester units consisting of four core courses of 3 units each, four semesters of spiritual formation classes consisting of 1 unit each, 3 units of a leadership project, and 3-6 units of a practicum. Programs where strong courses consist of 4 semester units would increase appropriately. These courses would be taken during the junior and

senior years of a typical four year liberal arts degree. These courses would tend to be sequential as they build on each other. The first course especially would be prerequisite for the others.

Spiritual Formation (Character Development): The purpose of this series is to incarnate spiritual growth for the net result of developing Christian character. Since leader abilities and a leadership understanding are not sufficient to produce effective Christian leadership, this is seen as a necessary undergirding for helping prepare men and women to become Christian leaders in whatever fields the students chose to participate. Every student in the leadership minor will take a 1 unit spiritual formation class during each semester a core course is taken. This class will consist of a seminar/retreat experience at the first of the semester, and include a weekly small group meeting with a qualified faculty or spiritual leader, and include an array of experiential topics such as character, prayer, ethics, spiritual disciplines, and the like. The intent of this emphasis is to contextualize the leadership materials into a man or woman with strong character.

Year one: Theory/Concepts

Year one, semester one: Leadership Theory. This course provides an overview of leadership studies, the nature of leadership as opposed to management, and seeing leadership primarily as a process and a relationship. A major emphasis will be placed on defining leadership, and themes such as ethics, servant leadership, and transformational leadership in the context of Christian leadership will be discussed.

Year one, semester two: Organizational Systems and Change. This is a look at systems thinking, seeing the big picture of a group or organization. An introduction of various organizational models will be introduced, illustrated with case studies. A course project will be a leadership analysis of a case study in one's field of interest.

Year two: Leadership Content/Skills.

Year two, semester one: The emphasis of this course is to build on the theoretical base provided during the previous two courses. Behavioral skills affecting a leader such as time management, mission and purpose statements, vision, and decision making will be discussed with an emphasis on practical application.

Year two, semester two: More content and skills issues will be discussed such as mentoring, empowerment, and team building concepts will be investigated. Cases studies will be involved to look at various aspects of leader and leadership issues. Local practitioners will be invited to discuss real issues.

Leadership Project: The emphasis of this project is a practical experience in a leadership situation, preferably among one's peers. The hope is that the campus and student body will be able to benefit from leadership students and their gain of knowledge. Students learn to participate in leadership processes among peers, an important part of leading. In addition, faculty sponsorship will be able to provide more direct feedback and observation, without having to go off-campus. A project proposal will be prepared and approved beforehand. This

project can take place after the first semester in the minor. Examples could include student government, a special task force such as homecoming, a social concern on campus, or the coordination of a significant event or entrepreneurial endeavor. The key element is that the emphasis must include some direct leadership application. Weekly updates for evaluation and supervision would go on during the semester. The project would end with a group report, debriefing, and evaluation of what was learned, what went well, and what did not go well and why.

Practicum

The practicum, as opposed to the leadership project, tends take the student from a campus setting as a peer leader into an off-campus situation where the student can watch, observe, and participate in an ongoing organizational environment. The supervision staff would include a campus faculty and an organizational supervisor. Supervisor qualifications should include experience in leadership, preferably a strong Christian faith and lifestyle, and an awareness of the leadership minor program including meeting with a faculty supervisor to understand the practicum objectives.

The goal of the educational institution would be to develop a network of qualified, willing off-campus supervisors who would regularly participate in such internships. Alumni would be natural participants with whom to begin such a program. The benefit of the off-campus supervisor is both altruistic as well as

being able to recognize potential employees. Also, a remuneration and recognition system could be established with the institution.

This practicum would take place after the first year of leadership studies, and would include a summer of full-time employment, or a semester of part-time employment, equivalent to 20 hours per week. This could be a paid or volunteer position, so long as it did not deter from the basic objective of learning leadership principles in an ongoing organization. A minimum once a week meeting with the off-campus supervisor would be appropriate. The off-campus and on-campus supervisor would meet mid-semester to evaluate the student's progress and focus on learning opportunities. The student would be required to keep a weekly journal, for the purpose of analyzing organizational situations and strive to do some critical thinking in terms of leadership principles. The practicum would end with a meeting between the student and his/her supervisors.

Master of Divinity with Leadership Emphasis

The MDiv with an emphasis in leadership is designed as a modified traditional program for those desiring to fulfill ordination requirements and who plan on some type of role as a leader in ministry. Approximately one-third of the regular MDiv course work has been reduced so that a concentrated study of leadership principles can take place. Since traditional MDiv degrees require a set number of theology and biblical literature courses, an undergraduate degree in religion or biblical literature is recommended as a prerequisite to acceptance in

the MDiv with a leadership emphasis. The student's transcripts will be reviewed prior to beginning the program to be sure there will be a balanced foundation of theology, church history, biblical literature, and professional skill courses (i. e., counseling, church administration, evangelism, homiletics). The other difference in this revised program is a more involved internship for the sake of mentoring and application of leadership skills.

Diagnostic Evaluation

The same basic evaluation process will be used as for the undergraduate minor in leadership. Variations germane to the revised MDiv program would include a greater emphasis on more recent ministerial and leadership experiences, plus greater clarification of calling and life goals. The latter should be better honed given the advanced age and maturity of most graduate students as opposed to undergraduates.

Leadership Core

Because MDiv programs vary, each institution would need to analyze its own program according to its own objectives and revise as necessary. The leadership core would consist of basically the same structure as follows.

Leadership Theory: This is an overview of the history of leadership studies, the nature and definition of leadership, including a spectrum of main themes and theories. Leadership is seen as a relationship between a leader and followers.

Clarification will be made between leadership and church management and ministry.

Systems Thinking: This will include a focus on organizational structures along with various ways of looking at organizations. The result of this will be analyzing these models in the context of a local church and church-related organizations.

Church Change: Organizational change theories and models will be discussed, including elements such as policy making, program evaluation, conflict management, and risk assessment. Case studies and guest lecturers will provide living examples for the students to discuss these concepts.

Leadership Skills: This course takes a look at leader skills such as situational leadership, agenda setting, small group functioning, relational skills, and a review of trait theories, set in a local church context.

Mission and Purpose: This is a skill-oriented course which includes theoretical looks at vision casting, decision making, and time management. Case studies will be included to contextualize the themes.

Mentoring: A part of a leader's responsibility is to reproduce him/herself in others. Focus will go beyond discipleship and consider team empowerment and look at the mentoring process. The class will include a semester long mentoring relationship.

Incarnational Leadership: This concentrated course looks at character development of the pastor as leader. Aspects of servant leadership, character

development, spiritual disciplines, and leadership emergent theory will also be discussed.

If a spiritual formation focus is not provided by the institution, then an ongoing small group spiritual formation structure would come under this focus. This course would then act as a prerequisite in the leadership program.

Leadership Research Project: This course would be supervised by a faculty sponsor or qualified local practitioner. The project could involve one of three emphases. The student could research a specific leadership element within pastoral ministry. The second option is direct involvement in an on-campus or off-campus leadership situation. The latter aspect is not a practicum, as it is a special opportunity to both experience and analyze one's leading skills. A third possibility is to do a detailed case study of a leadership situation, including analysis and application of leadership theories. This course will result in a project report.

Internship

An internship under the supervision of a recognized leader will serve as a cornerstone to this major and to the total learning experience of the pastoral student. Theory without application is of limited value. This situation would be negotiated between a campus sponsor in the leadership area and an effective practitioner. The student would have responsibilities requiring the application of some leadership skills. This person would also strive to shadow the leader during

leader-oriented situations as well as spend time weekly in one-on-one interaction and feedback sessions. Unique situations such as actually pastoring a congregation or overseeing a ministry could suffice for this internship so long as the requirements of a qualified mentor and weekly feedback were accomplished.

Two internship options exist, a two year part-time or a one year full-time mentoring. Designated church and parachurch ministries with trained, willing leaders should provide a significant experience in the lives of ministerial students in the leadership training programs as a whole.

This internship would ideally take place sometime during the formal education process, so that class work takes on the flavor of practical discussion versus idealistic theory. A triangular relationship between campus representative, mentor, and student would be vital to the program. Regular reports and feedback debriefings will also play important roles in the process.

Intern sponsors would consist of sympathetic and alumni-led ministries where pastoral staff saw the importance of investing in future ministers. These positions could be on a paid basis where possible. Bi-vocational situations could exist otherwise. The ministry sponsor would have preferential selection or right of decline with regard to selecting an intern. Sensitivity toward matching the student with a compatible supervisor would be the responsibility of the leadership faculty, including the ministry supervisors. The qualification is that the supervisor be actively involved in the mentoring of the student versus providing the church with inexpensive labor.

Master of Arts in Christian Leadership

The Master of Arts in Christian Leadership is a graduate degree designed specifically for those who sense a calling in their lives into full-time Christian service, and who believe that one aspect of this service will be in a leader role, whether in a pastorate, on a large church staff, or in a parachurch organization. The program is also available to those who desire to investigate theoretical and practical aspects of leadership in a Christian context. This degree is designed to be an alternative graduate program for the MDiv degree, providing the student has acquired a bachelor's degree or equivalent in religion or biblical literature, and providing the student's denomination allows for such a degree as a prerequisite to ordination. Students planning to go into the pastorate who have some other liberal arts degree other than religion, biblical literature, or an equivalent, would be encouraged to seek a traditional MDiv degree for the purpose of developing a strong theological foundation. This program would tend to emerge in institutions where the change of a traditional MDiv program was not desired, or a Christian liberal arts school which sought to directly prepare men and women for a pastoral position. The intent is to produce men and women who are grounded spiritually and theologically, skilled in both leadership theory and skills, and who have a degree of practical experience via a mentoring relationship with a proven leader. Various learning models and topics are utilized to provide a program which is somewhat personalized according to a student's calling and individual gifts.

The Master of Arts in Christian Leadership consists of 42-51 total units. There are 24 units of core courses, 6 units of internship, plus 12-21 units (4-7 courses) of pastoral electives. The pastoral electives will be designed to supplement the undergraduate program in terms of a balanced preparation for church ministry. Students enrolling from other schools might therefore be required to make up classes in areas where insufficiencies exist. The department will determine what these electives should include, such as theology, evangelism, church management, polity, homiletics, biblical literature, pastoral practices, etcetera. Program advisors will counsel the student to augment areas where he/she is deficient.

The culmination of the classroom work will result in a thesis based on the integration of research and theory with a practical leadership situation, preferably in a church-related context.

Diagnostic Evaluation

The diagnostic evaluation would be the same as the MDiv degree with a leadership emphasis.

Leadership Core

The leadership courses would basically consist of those described in the revised MDiv program.

These classes might benefit from a module format which would allow more

students who are currently active in some type of ministry to take them, and would also allow for qualified adjunct professors to come and teach in one to two week periods. Because the program itself is nontraditional, such a format would be in sync with the concept as a whole. A concentrated module format would require sufficient preclass and postclass activities as to round out the individual course experience and accreditation requirements. Teaching teams made up of an academic member and a qualified practitioner would hopefully provide the best of both strengths.

Internship

The practicum for the Master of Arts in Christian Leadership would be the same as described in the MDiv degree with a leadership emphasis.

Program Evaluation

Although the panel did not provide details for program evaluation, it did agree that such a task was necessary, and too often lacking among current programs. The evaluation should include summative and formative feedback in order to enhance individual courses, faculty, advisement, and internship processes. Quantitative and qualitative instruments could be developed to give a short term and long term view of strengths and weaknesses inherent in the program. Program alumni could be surveyed periodically (i. e., 5-10 year periods) to uncover the external validity of the training.

Another evaluation methodology would be to compare graduates of leadership training programs with traditional theological education to determine if there was significant difference in ministry effectiveness due to a leadership emphasis.

Optimum Programs Summary and Implementation

The research team took liberties to fill in some of the course descriptions within the context of suggestions and themes recommended by the expert panel. However, there still exists significant latitude for course design. Specific issues such as text recommendations were not made, and would not be fitting at this level of discussion. The end product appeared to be a somewhat thorough outline for a school which desired to pursue such a training emphasis.

The weakness of these programs is that there still remains a number of unanswered questions. Concerns about faculty selection, internship supervision qualifications and recruitment, and accreditation challenges were raised but remained somewhat open. Perhaps these concerns should not be an issue at this point in the planning phase and considering the breadth of panel members.

The methodology did not allow for the inclusion of all suggestions and recommendations. Unless a specific point was profoundly made and supported by good rationale, it may have been eliminated if it did not fit with the flow of the overall theme. These idiosyncratic ideas are the type which would make each individual program somewhat unique, according to those who are responsible for

its creation. The intention was not so much to create a program which would be franchised among schools, but rather one which provided a quality overview of leadership training according to congregational needs, while creating enough room for creativity and institutional influence. The editing process was at times messy in that twenty panelists from four stakeholder groups were represented, a few of whom appeared to be in dialectic opposition at times. The potential for sabotage is real unless a similar sort of group was involved in the actual creation and implementation of such a program in an institution. A sense of ownership would be an essential point for developing a leadership training program.

What appears to be needed are leaders from within the academic realm who have a personal vision for leadership training programs such as this, and/or the partnership of church and parachurch ministries with educational institutions. Most institutions do not seem to be ready for such entrepreneurial endeavors, so that academic leaders desiring to start such programs are limited by hierarchical bureaucracy and tradition. The most likely approach would be to encourage experimental programs to develop alongside traditional ones versus the trauma of renovating existing programs. Adjunct agencies like Dallas Seminary's Center for Christian Leadership may be the best strategy, in that the sponsoring institution's reputation remains intact and the more progressive agency is allowed room to innovate and modify. Two-fold problems remain, such as funding the new agency as well as gaining accreditation among traditional accreditation groups. Private funding via philanthropic supporters and supplemental seminars, retreats, and

courses could supply start-up capital for the program, until it received regional and/or national recognition as a leader in leadership training. Accreditation by-laws usually allow for latitudes recommended in the optimum programs, as long as they were couched in acceptable language and structure. The bottom line is that there is a need for leaders for pastoral leadership training to take place in evangelical institutions of higher education.

CHAPTER 6

LEADERSHIP TRAINING OF MINISTERS: A SUMMARY

Research Overview

There are only a limited number of domestic evangelical programs in which a pastoral student could enroll in order to receive formal training in leadership studies. The scarcity of evangelical leadership courses available matches the brevity of literature regarding higher theological education and leadership. The amount of leadership literature in a Christian context in general is quite sizable, but this literature is predominately designed for those already in full-time Christian service. Like its secular counterpart, Christian leadership literature is a mixed bag of themes, including a leadership/church management hybrid, shepherding traits, spiritual techniques, and biblical instruction on character development. Even fewer books and articles focusing on leadership theory and process exist in evangelicalism than in nonreligious fields.

The research showed that a multistakeholder panel could develop a training program for ministerial candidates which would theoretically address the priorities of academics, pastors, administrators, and lay leaders. Since most traditional ministerial training programs are designed by academics, such a model appears to provide a more satisfactory product. Although actual implementation

of the optimum program has yet to be attempted, the blue ribbon institutions existing in the United States demonstrate that such an experimental program is feasible.

At the beginning of this study, five research questions were introduced. Following are the questions with synoptic responses.

1. How does leadership pertain to a local church? The role of the pastor has a plethora of definitions corresponding with myriad church expectations, which is one of the major problems in designing a program that effectively provides ministerial training. Traditionally, the pastor has been a spiritual mentor, a theological teacher, and a church manager. Although church leadership is perhaps as old as the church, the role of pastors has tended toward the priestly aspect as a spiritual technician until recent cultural changes. Due to the recent rise of larger church ministries as well as the rapid social changes, the market for more and better leaders has created a perceived leadership dilemma. Most local congregations now perceive the pastor to act as the main influencer in the leadership relationship, primarily due to the office of the pastorate. The holder of this title is the one whose chief responsibility is to catalyze congregational care, spiritual formation, and organizational health. However, traditional theological education as well as many church structures do not promote this view and therefore fail to provide for adequate leadership training.

2. What is the difference between ministry and leadership? Consistently in the literature and among the institution catalogs, there is significant overlap of

these concepts. It is presumed that pastoral ministry and leadership are synonymous. The changing perception of the role of the pastor and thus the pertinence of leadership in the local congregation is bringing about greater clarification between ministry and leadership. Leadership in the pragmatic use of the word means responsibility for the health and welfare of a local congregation. This idea may actually result in little leading and leadership, in that good management and appropriate ministerial skills may suffice. The rise of spiritual gift teaching and lay ministry enhance the separation of ministry and leadership, such that leadership is the relationship of those effectively overseeing the ministries of the church with those performing the ministry (Nelson, 1993). Ministry involves preaching, teaching, discipling, counseling, care giving, and training of the local congregation. Leadership seeks to coordinate these ministries and provide vision, recruitment, and expansion of such church functions.

3. Do evangelical institutions of higher education effectively prepare pastors to lead? The unequivocal answer from this research is that most institutions do not effectively prepare pastors to lead. A majority of the institutions had either no leadership courses or a token course of leadership/management mixed. A few others had a singular course on leadership, while only six of the 141 programs reviewed provided two or more leadership courses, most of which were electives rather than required courses. There appears to be some confusion among academics in these programs as to what the local church expectations are, and the difference between leadership and ministry.

Most academics have limited recent pastoral experience and very few have been involved in leadership studies. Until those responsible for overseeing ministerial training view pastors as congregational leaders as opposed to ministerial technicians, it is doubtful the programs will change toward leadership training.

4. To what degree can leader skills be taught? This question has yet to be answered definitively. Some propose that leadership can be learned or "caught," but not taught. This view suggests that leader skills are learned via following a mentor and during internships versus classroom settings. Thus, the responsibility lies primarily on the student to learn versus the teacher to teach. The responsibility of the educational institution is to provide sufficient affective experiences for leadership learning. One finding from the expert panel is the belief that leadership aptitudes emerge early in life, and therefore reflect latent potential which primarily needs to be developed and honed versus taught from scratch.

A secondary issue is that those with limited gifts and aptitudes should be counseled to pursue ministry roles where leading is not as important as in support ministry positions, local churches which do not expect the pastor to lead, and other nonleader ministerial roles outside the local church.

A tertiary issue is that superleaders are too few for the multitude of leader roles needed, therefore leadership should be taught to all going into church work so that they can expand what potential they have as well as train others in the leadership process. (This process is clarified in the definition section in Chapter 1

of this study.)

5. What would an ideal leadership training program for ministerial students look like? The word *ideal* proved to be too strong for the outcome of the Delphi method. An ideal program which lacked realistic implementation potential would benefit few. The term *optimum* emerged as a stronger possibility. The result of the interviews of expert panel members and their input, analysis, and critique resulted in a leadership training program which sought to discern aptitudes and giftedness early on for pre- and post-program advisement. A covey of core courses emerged which emphasized leadership aspects in the context of a local church organization. A capstone experience involved first hand leadership demonstration via an internship in a selected environment under the tutelage of a trained leader.

Comparison of Blue Ribbon and Optimum Programs

Similarities

Some similarities exist between the blue ribbon programs as well as the optimum programs. None of the blue ribbon degrees wholly parallel the latter. As far as overall balance, the closest comparison would be Southern California Christian (SCC) College's Master of Christian Leadership and Fuller's Master of Arts in Christian Leadership to the proposed MA in Christian Leadership in that a balance of Bible, church history, theology, ministerial skills, and leadership are provided. This would be a good alternative to the traditional MDiv degree.

The expansive nature of leadership courses recommended in the optimum programs best parallel the Fuller School of World Missions' depth and breadth in terms of sheer number of courses offered, along with leadership theory. The Center for Christian Leadership (CCL) at Dallas Seminary and SCC's graduate program also provided a good number of leadership training classes, but with less leadership theory and perhaps as well, less diversity of leadership particulars. The similarity of all of these programs, as opposed to the other programs reviewed across the country, lies in the number of leadership facets analyzed in the various courses.

Differences

Several differences are noted in comparing the programs. Naturally, every institution and program will be somewhat idiosyncratic, based on different faculty expertise as well as evolutionary influences within the programs.

The main difference between the panel's optimum and the blue ribbon programs is the core requirements for pastoral students. Few pastoral students enroll in Fuller's School of World Missions' classes, and although CCL actively recruits students into its leadership classes, none are required except the spiritual formation core. SCC's program is developed more directly around leadership, although there is still a certain degree of room for electives. This program best reflects the requirement of a certain minimum of leadership courses to be taken to complete the program. The element of required core courses is the chief

difference between the optimum programs and nearly all of the programs reviewed during phase one of this research.

The expert panel's program recommends more of a theological and ministry foundation than does SCC's, thus increasing the total amount of hours. Although this study looked at leadership courses versus other ministerial classes, concern was raised by panel members for a thorough educational experience in the other areas as well.

The main difference between the proposed program and Fuller's is that there is a larger required leadership core in the optimum program and this degree is specifically designed for pastors and church professionals versus missionaries. The latter comment is not to infer that missionaries do not need to understand leadership, but the purpose of this study is to focus on pastors who work in the United States.

None of the undergraduate programs surveyed received ratings of 3 or 4 so that comparison with the optimum training program at the undergraduate level is difficult. An ideal situation might be to open up a minor in leadership to an array of majors in a liberal arts school, such that the minor's faculty could openly invite and recruit many students from varied backgrounds and majors. This would enhance future church leadership from both the lay and pastoral fields. Because leadership principles tend to be somewhat generic, this sort of program could be cross-marketed. Because most undergraduate students have not had significant ministry experience, a specific church leadership core would not necessarily be as

effective as it would with graduate and experienced students.

Dallas Seminary's ThM degree is not representative of the MDiv programs of most seminaries, even though most pastoral students at Dallas go through this track. Therefore, none of the blue ribbon programs would closely match the revised MDiv of the optimum program. Dallas' program would most likely be the closest to it in that a large amount of the course work is on the Bible, theology, and ministerial skills.

None of the blue ribbon programs appear to have as thorough a diagnosis of leadership aptitude. Most of the programs relied upon basic admissions application policies and subsequent recruiting took place on a personal basis by professors. Other admissions resulted from student interest. By determining those students with stronger leader gifts and experiences, one would hope to better counsel and direct students through personal growth resources, whether that meant recommending more or less leadership training.

Although most of the seminary programs reviewed in phase one had some type of internship experience optional or required, it was difficult to ascertain how effective these programs were. One of the challenges noted by the expert panel was in finding quality mentoring situations with both trained and motivated practitioners. Other than the optimum program's emphasis on recruiting and training of internship hosts, there is not enough detail provided in the optimum or the blue ribbon internship programs for adequate comparison.

Recommendations

Although abridged, this research provides insights into the arena of higher theological education in terms of leadership training of pastors. At the same time, the importance of an effective study lies beyond what is discovered, and includes clearer foci of yet uncharted territories. Following are both recommendations for what needs to take place to fulfill the need for more and better church leaders, and also a critique of this research along with areas for more and expanded studies.

Objectives and Curriculum

"Alice [in Wonderland] asked the Cheshire Cat, 'Would you tell me, please, which way I ought to go from here?'

'That depends a good deal on where you want to get to,' said the Cat.

'I don't much care where,' said Alice.

'Then it doesn't matter which way you go,' said the Cat" (Carroll, 1946, pp. 71-72).

The Latin origin of the term *curriculum* means a running race chariot, or a light, two-wheeled, open carriage drawn by two horses abreast. The word suggests a set course and a prescribed structure. Tyler (Madaus et al, 1983, p. 74) noted four basic questions that should be answered in developing curriculum and a plan of instruction. (1) What educational objectives are the students to be helped to attain? (2) What learning experiences can be provided that will enable the

students to attain the objectives? (3) How will the learning experiences be organized to maximize their cumulative effect (i. e., sequence, integration)? (4) How will effectiveness of the program be evaluated?

The most common concern by those interviewed from educational institutions, both on and off the panel, had to do with the provision of enough space within a pastoral preparation program. There are so many topics to cover, such as theology, biblical literature and languages, plus peripheral issues. The issue, as always, becomes one of priority. Just as there are more places to spend one's money than there is money, and more things to do than time allows, the bottom line is always priority. What seems to be said is that learning to lead is not as important as learning to preach, or to exegete Greek, or to systematize theology. The problem with promoting a significant versus token look at leadership is that other topics are already consuming curriculum space. All core ministerial training classes are important. To suggest that fewer hours of one or more subjects should be taken to make space for leadership studies is to imply that theology or Bible or homiletics are not important. This implication would be deadly to any effort to transform the curriculum of pastoral preparation programs by including more leadership studies in them. What needs to be asked is, what are we teaching now that is dead wood? In essence, which courses are not preparing for real issues pastors encounter in the local church pastorate? These questions cannot be answered by academics who have been away from practical ministry for a number of years. A part of this answer may be found in the

growing number of DMin programs which include leadership courses, thus suggesting that pastors are experiencing a lack of preparation in this area. "Leadership development and administration are as crucial as church history or three years of Greek when it comes to leading a complex church. The token offerings in leadership development and administration are not enough. Balance is the key word in curriculum," (Weese, 1993, p. 46).

Unless the people in a department or program know where it is headed, they will find it difficult to determine how to arrive at that destination. Leaders help provide direction, purpose, and meaning within a leadership context. Unless the responsible people set appropriate objectives within pastoral leadership training programs, and unless those objectives are supported with proper curriculum, staffing, and resources, leadership training is not likely to occur. The bottom line is that pastoral training responsibilities fall on those who set program priorities. In the given definition of leadership, this does not rule out the influence of stakeholders outside the direct line of command, such as large church pastors, denominational officials, consultants, and significant lay leaders. At the basis of this issue is the purpose of institutional pastoral education.

Mere dispersement of information is not enough. The justification for a university is that it preserves the connection between knowledge and the zest of life, by uniting the young and the old in the imaginative consideration of learning. Imagination is not to be divorced from the facts; it is a way of illuminating the facts. The tragedy of the world is that those who are imaginative have but slight

experience, and those who are experienced have feeble imaginations. Fools act on imagination without knowledge; pedants act on knowledge without imagination. The task of a university is to weld together imagination and experience. (Whitehead, 1929, p. 93)

Although this quote was written for all educational institutions, it could not be truer than for evangelical institutions of higher education and specifically the departments of pastoral preparation. Pastors who are not inspired to work from the heart are not apt to stay in the ministry long, considering the high stress, modest pay, and vague terms of accomplishment. Developing leadership course work within a new or existing pastoral training program must emphasize this objective for both content and affective relevance. An effective leadership training program must look at the faculty, curriculum, and support resources such as internship and spiritual formation.

Implementation Through Innovation

The challenge for anyone hoping to gain from phase two of this study would be implementation. Instead of reworking a standard pastoral program, it would most likely be effective to begin a new major as did SCC, or to bring in a leadership emphasis via an adjunct institute like CCL. It is often easier to build a house from the ground up, than to renovate an old shell. Retrofits often lag due to unwilling stakeholders, gatekeepers, and old image problems. CCL is an example of an attached center given a degree of autonomy, which provides

educational services beyond the local campus population. The Fuller School of Theology has not adopted the leadership training burden of the School of World Mission, so that pastors inclined to do leadership studies must go outside the pastoral track to the School of World Missions. Heuser's comment (personal communication, October 26, 1993) that the accreditation body looks at SCC's Christian Leadership degree with some suspicion supports the concern that peer accountability may not be the best road to innovation in this area. All of these cases seem to suggest that if leadership training is to be taken seriously, something must significantly happen in the presiding bodies to make such a transformation possible.

The primary reason given by academics for a lack of space within traditional MDiv programs for more leadership training is that no units remained beyond those required by accrediting bodies. I did find specific parameters stated in the *ATS Bulletin*. "The school shall have a sufficient degree of autonomy to determine and carry out its basic purposes. Such autonomy does not preclude the advantages which may accrue from inter-institutional sharing of resources" (1992, p. 4). This criterion would appear to provide sufficient space within a qualified MDiv program to warrant the infusion of significant leadership studies.

"Why do we keep our heads covered and always wear a little prayer shawl? Why does the master have the final word at home? Why are the brides chosen for sons, and daughters taught to mend and tend?" In *Fiddler on the Roof*, Tevya questions why the people of his little village follow certain customs. He then

explains it by "tradition." What is done is done because that is the way it has always been done. The average institution of theological education is a bastion of tradition, inherently established to carry on millenniums of scriptural interpretations and theology. The problem is when this attitude carries over into adjunct subjects such as leadership. As noted earlier in this study, our current model of theological education is really only about 120 years old. If change is going to occur within evangelical institutions of higher education with regard to leadership training, it is going to require leaders who are willing to move beyond recent tradition. Individuals with a vision for change and a mindset of what needs to happen will be necessary to catalyze leadership in motivated administrations.

Educational Leaders

Ironically, the lack of leadership training is probably reflective of the lack of leaders in such institutions. Zaleznik summarized the situation when he wrote, "the actors become engrossed in the bigger problem of how to make decisions, not what decisions to make" (1977, p. 74). The red tape procedures within many institutions along with the accrediting process, may force leadership training of ministerial students outside of traditional degrees.

Reformers will need to transform both curriculum and teacher credibility. Gustafson (1988) noted that in most literature on theological education, much attention is given to curriculum reform and so little to the quality of teachers and of teaching in theological schools. Perhaps it has to do with the fox guarding the

henhouse. It is one thing to critique curriculum which tends to be inanimate, but analysis of one's peers and oneself can be convictional and potentially politically incorrect. Obviously, this comment is a biased commentary from one outside the theological system, but it is one which finds significant support among the active clergy.

Webber (1973) defined innovation as a more fundamental change than simply the curriculum revision process. "Innovation implies substantive changes in the basic structure and style of theological education, beyond even the experiments that traditional seminaries frequently undertake alongside their regular curricula. This definition grows out of a fairly severe disenchantment" (p. 95). Using the words *leader* and *leadership* in institutional advertisements and catalog course descriptions is not enough. Adding another church management/leadership course will not suffice for quality leadership training. "The best that can be said for those people who promise neatly packaged management solutions to leadership problems is that they are simply cosmeticians. As the Avon lady said, all of that stuff washes off" (Enoch, 1981, p. 178). It would appear that plastic surgery is necessary in many cases, or else new birth. Since being born again is a major premise within evangelical theology, perhaps the latter would be acceptable when applied to institutional reform.

If significant changes are not feasible within existing, traditional institutions, then new models of pastoral training may mold the future. One potential emerging model is the church-based model. As society induces

downsizing from a university structure, a natural move is toward a church-based model. If the seminary is to be relevant to the church in the twenty-first century, cutting edge techniques and concepts must take place and quicker changes must occur within pastoral training. A church-based model would allow for lower overhead, inhouse and/or nearby mentoring and apprenticeships, as well as reducing full-time faculty for part-time and practitioner/pastors who would carry part of the teaching load. Such a model would appear to be a hybrid between the historical apprentice model and the classroom system common since 1875 in America (Shelley, 1992).

Learning Via Practice and Mentoring

A significant change needs to occur in practical training. Many people in and out of the church are suggesting that an enhanced model for internship be devised (Weese, 1993). The chancellor of one university said, "I want to train young leaders for the church. However, I realize that leadership is more than acquiring knowledge or gaining academic tools. Leaders are formed in the crucible of service, not simply by sitting in a classroom" (Towns, 1986, p. 4). Towns referred to mentoring as the "hot poker" principle. As the poker becomes hot when placed into the coals, so people become leaders by their exposure to the influence of great leaders (p. 4). Such a training emphasis would require quality supervision.

More mentoring can be done on campus as the Center for Christian

Leadership's spiritual formation core illustrates, if faculty would be involved in personal interaction with students. Lyman Beecher, while president of Lane Seminary, said,

I think it highly important that the theological instructor should if possible, sustain pastoral relations, and the students worship with him in a popular assembly--that while in the acquisition of doctrine they might witness its application, and feel its power, and observe its effect. (Wyatt-Brown, 1969, pp. 128-129)

The burden for most of this mentoring in the context of internships rests on local ministries. "The church needs to recognize today, that in mentoring and developing interns, they are investing in the church of tomorrow. The seminary can't be expected to do everything" (Weese, 1993, p. 50).

Webber (1973) noted that a gap lies between the classroom and a supervised internship. He pointed out that perhaps the most telling problem in relationship to pedagogy is the viability of learning significant substance without being engaged in practice at the same time. It is unrealistic for seminaries to recommend a student engage in field work twelve or fifteen hours a week in another person's church and without the pressures of full responsibility. Do we know what we do not do? We are dysfunctional if the style and patterns of the seminary do not correlate to the congregation.

Evaluation

Another area needing change is evaluation. A few of the Delphi panel members brought up the issue of measuring pastoral effectiveness subsequent to graduation, so that the program can be evaluated and change can be suggested and implemented. How do the seminary professors know if they are turning out a good product if they do not check the fruit of their labor? At best, alumni offices provide newsletters on graduate accomplishments, but this hardly suffices for legitimate evaluation. During this research, I found no programs which stated that they evaluated their post-degree effectiveness. Every three to five years a study should be conducted to find out where the graduates are, if they are in ministry, how they are doing, and if there is something the seminary should have done to better prepare them for what they are presently doing. More than likely, a decadel survey could provide a sufficient amount of statistical data to warrant further changes in a program.

The dilemma appears to be a conflict in basic values as opposed to merely evaluating inefficient programs or policymaking technicalism. That perhaps is the essence of this issue. Educators who are not on the cutting edge of ministry, and who have no professional or personal interest in leadership issues, are often the ones influencing and critiquing. Effective curriculum evaluation would need to be a hybrid of stakeholders in effective pastoral leadership, namely lay leaders, denominational managers, students, professors, and institutional administrators. Blindspots are created by a lack of outside perspective, much as the inside members of Plato's Cave allegory. The evaluation process often becomes a re-

arranging of the chairs on the deck of the Titanic.

A model depicting all the attributes necessary to address the current malaise in pastoral leadership training as well as that would fit into current institutional structure has yet to be discovered. Most likely this program is mythical. The optimum training program synthesized by the expert panel is a realistic endeavor to address the current needs in pastoral leadership training.

Personal Epilogue

Although laborious at times, this research project served its purpose well in providing an overview of historical and present ministerial training systems, as well as analyzing current programs and recommending changes. The goal has been to avoid merely adding to the criticism of current theological training by addressing both a need for change and a viable solution from which to work.

The word *seminary* means a seed-bed. For centuries it has been used as the name for an institution whose primary function is to train ministers. The seminary was to be the priestly nursery of the church, where spiritual leaders sprouted and developed into saplings, to be transplanted wherever needed. Having grown up in an agrarian culture, I realize that there are seeds in varying hybrids for differing soil types. The challenge becomes one of determining what sort of seed should be produced, for that in turn will determine the many aspects of cultivation.

During the late 1930s, a poster appeared in Great Britain at a time when

that country was trying to marshall all of its manpower for the war emergency. The poster read, "All persons in the above age groups are required to register for the national service except lunatics, the blind, and ministers of religion" (Jenkins, 1958, p. 7). Although comical at times, the image of the minister has often been stereotyped, but the job description has just as often been unclear. Part of the challenge for more effective pastoral training is coming to terms with what is expected of a pastor, which may vary from church to church.

One of the problems of developing a better pastoral training program is that there are so many expectations of a pastor, one is not sure what sort of seed he or she is cultivating.

To fill the job description of today's pastor sounds like a job for Superman. A pastor is expected to make house calls as willingly as yesterday's country doctor, to shake hands and smile like a politician on the campaign trail, to entertain like a stand-up comedian, to teach the Scriptures like a theology professor, and to counsel like a psychologist with the wisdom of Solomon. He should run the church like a top-level business executive, handle finances like a career accountant, and deal with the public like an expert diplomat at the United Nations. No wonder so many pastors are confused about just what is expected of them and how they will ever manage to live up to all those expectations. (Meier, Minirth, Congo, Newman, Meier, & Doran, 1993, pp. 165-166)

This quote from a group of therapists depicts what many are seeing in terms of pastoral preparation, that no single program can ready a local church pastor for the congregational expectations he or she is going to encounter. A pastor needs a variety of skills including theological and biblical fundamentals. It would seem that a pastor skilled in understanding leadership is best suited to fulfill congregational needs as he/she strives to stimulate a strong and effective leadership process within the church so that effective ministry can take place. Although we can strive to become all things to all people as the Apostle Paul suggested, anyone who has tried to do this has at times felt more like a prostitute than a priest. Leading is not an excuse for diminishing nonleadership duties, but it is more than likely the best avenue to supply ministerial resources where it is needed.

It is also helpful to realize that many local congregations really are not looking for a pastor with leadership inclinations. For them, a resident counselor, theologian, and spiritual technician is sufficient.

During the course of this research and the evolution of my own thoughts on leadership and leader training for the ministry, at least three changes in my thinking have emerged.

First Change

First and foremost is that in the midst of focusing so sharply on the need for leadership training of pastors, I recognize a softening of my views on the subject. I am not so sure that all pastors need to be leaders, as in the specific

meaning I have given the term in this study. I think it would enhance their ministries considerably to understand the leadership process. But ministry is more an issue of heart and spiritual formation. Many congregations are not looking for leaders as much as they are looking for a spiritual guide, a model, a theologian, a teacher, and one who will love them. Leadership is not necessary for people to love, teach, and pray. At times, it works against the process, for leadership infers change which in turn must confront, and hold accountable, and ruffle feathers.

Leadership is influence, but not all influence is leadership. A man or woman who loves, models purity, and exemplifies Christlike characteristics can influence others without being a leader. Although more and more religious organizations need leaders versus ministers, there is a definite place for the one called solely to be the latter. Everything does not rise and fall on leadership.

Second Change

A second change in my thinking to occur from this research is that leadership ought to be a subject for many, not just the few gifted. Originally, I thought it would be most beneficial if the most gifted could be recognized and then nurtured in a ministerial Top Gun program, an elite sort of program. Although attention ought to be given to those with most potential, the principle of the many and the few makes more sense, where many are invited, and a few are recruited to seek further studies and practical experience. This seems to parallel Jesus' teaching that many are called, but few respond. As one seminary president said, there are only a few super leaders, but there is a plethora of situations

requiring leaders. There will never be enough leaders to fill the needs. If Barna (1993) was right in his research which suggested that only 6% of pastors are gifted in leadership, many others need to be informed and trained in the field. An elitist mentality is not within the budget of evangelicalism.

An issue related to this is that leadership training ought to take place with nonpastoral majors, including staff workers. Good staff workers are often needed to act as leaders, and most staff ministers eventually find themselves in pastoral positions as they mature.

Third Change

A third issue where I experienced a shift in my thinking is in terms of who is going to help make this transformation in evangelicalism. A rise of leadership training is not going to magically appear. Like the study recommends, if things are going to change, it will take people like myself who catalyze the leadership process. Although a few pockets of leadership studies exist, I was taken back by how little these groups were aware of their uniqueness in the whole of higher education and how limited was the networking process. I emerged from this study more confident and motivated to act as a catalyst in this area and serve as a networker among like-minded groups. Peter Drucker said, "A major industry will rarely put its best brains to work on basic changes. It will rather tend to fritter away its energies on desperate efforts to keep yesterday going a little longer. But in such a situation imaginative and knowledgeable people outside the industry

often see the opportunity and go to work. Should they produce results, they are likely to have major impact fast" (1985, pp. 95-96).

Future Research

A number of related research projects could evolve around the theme of leadership education of pastoral students. Diagnostic evaluation could be investigated in greater detail. An evaluation model for pastors could be designed as well, and used to analyze graduates of leadership programs in comparison with traditional graduates.

Most leadership literature is from a Westernized mentality. An interesting study would be to compare and contrast leadership theories and behaviors among cultures. Programs such as Fuller's School of World Missions could generate such research.

The possibilities continue to increase as the frustration level increases in local churches and as the call for more and better leaders intensifies. Interest in leadership studies continues to rise in evangelicalism, making such research justified and to a degree, popular.

Closing Comments

After Halcolm had completed explaining to a scholarly assembly the many different perspectives one could use in looking at the world, he was hungry. While he answered questions and

continued the discussion, he sent a listener to inquire if the midday meal was ready.

The messenger did not return, so Halcolm sent a second messenger. The second messenger did not return. So Halcolm went himself.

He found the two messengers, the chef, and three visiting scholars engaged in heated debate. Ignoring the debate, Halcolm asked "Is the midday meal ready?"

The first and eldest visiting scholar responded, "I have been explaining to these young men that the state of the food is not the only issue in determining readiness. A meal is not just food. The meal must include those who would partake of the food, so the meal is not ready until everything is in order and those who would eat are assembled."

The second visiting scholar said, "I dare to taste the meal. From the perspective of a gourmet chef, this meal will never be ready. It is hopeless, let us return to the city."

The third visiting scholar said, "Readiness is a state of mind, not a physical state. Since the food has no mind, the food cannot be ready. Only people can be ready."

The chef added, "The midday meal is at midday every day. At midday the meal is ready. Why ask if the meal is ready? It is

midday. This is the meal. Therefore the midday meal is ready."

With that, they all began talking at once making ever finer points, drawing ever narrower distinctions.

Halcolm, meanwhile, sat down and ate his midday meal.

A student asked why he had not joined the debate to clarify these important issues. Halcolm took another bite and replied, "The apple of your eye won't satisfy the emptiness in your stomach.

There is a time to talk about the nature of eating--and there is a time to eat." (Patton, 1990, pp. 90-91)

The formality of this research in dissertation form was due to the fulfillment of a doctoral requirement. The purpose and motivation behind the topic, and the spirit of the researcher emerged from a burden to see a greater emphasis placed on leadership training for pastors, for the sake of both pastors and congregations. Obviously, more discussion, research, and negotiations are needed to develop many new and revised training programs. But the time is ripe for action, not just sophistry. The answer is not found in debating whether or not one can train pastors (dogs are trained), as critiqued recently by an academic. The average parishioner is not so interested in the lofty discussions germane to dissertations and theological educators, often removed from the essence of everyday struggles in marriage, work, spiritual welfare, and church health. To put it in terms of Patton's parable, there are too many empty congregational stomachs to justify spending much more time deliberating in the kitchen.

The bottom line is that more and better leaders are required in most organizations in times of drastic change, and the church is no different. Like many research projects, this one ends with a question versus a solution, but the question points toward the answer. How are more and better leaders to be raised, unless we consciously, painstakingly, provide quality leadership training resources for ministerial students?

REFERENCES

- Adams, A. M. (1978). *Effective leadership for today's church*. Philadelphia: Westminster.
- Aleshire, D. O. (1985). The evaluation of people in theological schools. *Theological Education*, 22(1), 71-92.
- Anderson, R. S. (1986). *Minding God's business*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans.
- Argyris, C. (1982). *Reasoning, learning and action: Individual and organizational*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Armerding, H. T. (1992). *The heart of godly leadership*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway.
- ATS bulletin: Procedures, standards, and criteria for membership*. (1992, June) Pittsburgh, PA: The Association of Theological Schools.
- Badaracco, J. L., & Ellsworth, R. R. (1989). *Leadership and the quest for integrity*. Boston: Harvard Business School.
- Barber, C. J., & Strauss, G. H. (1982). *Leadership: The dynamics of success*. Greenwood, SC: The Attic.
- Barna, G. (1991). *Without a vision, the people perish*. Glendale, CA: Barna Research Group.
- Barna, G. (1993). *Today's pastor*. Ventura, CA: Regal.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership*. (3rd Ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. M. (1991). *The good society*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Bennis, W. G. (1989). *On becoming a leader*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

- Bennis, W. G., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Biehl, B. (1989). *Increasing your leadership confidence*. Sisters, OR: Questar.
- Boehme, R. (1989). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. Seattle, WA: Frontline Communications.
- Brown, B. E. (1991). Practices of leadership in the context of church education. *Christian Education Journal*, 12(1), 107-114.
- Brown, J. T. (Ed). (1991). *Visionary leadership for church growth*. Nashville, TN: Convention.
- Brushaber, G. K. (1991, September 16). Good theologians are not enough. *Christianity Today*, p. 19.
- Burkeen, C. (1989). The race to the pole: Lessons for leaders. *Leadership*, 10(4), 104-113.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Callahan, K. L. (1990). *Effective church leadership: Building on the twelve keys*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Campbell, T. C. (1981). *The gift of administration*. Philadelphia: Westminster.
- "Can seminaries adapt the to student of the '80's?" (1986, February 7). *Christianity Today*, pp. 35-40.
- Carroll, L. (1946). *Alice in wonderland*. pp. 71-72.
- Cedar, P. A. (1987). *Strength in servant leadership*. Waco, TX: Word.
- Chandler, R. (1993, August 16). The 21st-century church. *Christianity Today*, pp. 46.
- Clinton, J. R. (1984). *Leadership training models: A self-study manual for evaluating training*. Altadena, CA: Barnabas.
- Clinton, J. R. (1988). *The making of a leader*. Colorado Springs, CO: NavPress.
- Clinton, J. R. (1989). *Leadership emergence theory*. Altadena, CA: Barnabas.

- Clinton, J. R. (1992a). *Conclusions on leadership style*. Altadena, CA: Barnabas.
- Clinton, J. R. (1992b). *Bridging strategies: Leadership perspectives for introducing change*. Altadena, CA: Barnabas.
- Covey, S. R. (1991). *Principle-centered leadership*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Cueni, R. R. (1991). *The vital church leader*. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Cunningham, M., Jacobsen, W., Rhodes, J., Stedman, R., & Ukleja, M. (1989). How do you steer a church? *Leadership*, 10(2), 126-133.
- Dale, R. D. (1985). *Pastoral leadership*. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Deegan, A. X. (1969). *The priest as manager*. New York: Bruce.
- Denzin, N. K. (1978). The logic of naturalistic inquiry. In Denzin N. K. (Ed.), *Sociological methods: A sourcebook*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- DePree, M. (1989). *Leadership is an art*. New York: Bantam.
- DePree, M. (1992). *Leadership jazz*. New York: Bantam.
- Dibbert, M. T. (1989). *Spiritual leadership, responsible management*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Drucker, P. (1985). *Age of discontinuity*. New York: Harper-Collins.
- Drucker, P. (1989). Managing to minister. *Leadership*, 10(4), 14-25.
- D'Souza, A. (1985). *Being a leader*. Atlanta: Haggai Institute.
- D'Souza, A. (1986a). *Leading effectively*. Atlanta: Haggai Institute.
- D'Souza, A. (1986b). *Leading others*. Atlanta: Haggai Institute.
- Dubin, R. (1979). Metaphors of leadership: An overview. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Crosscurrents in leadership*, (pp. 225-238). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dykstra, C., (1991). *Reconceiving practice in shifting boundaries: Contextual approaches to the structure of theological education*. Louisville, KY: John Knox.

- Eims, L. (1975). *Be the leader you were meant to be: What the Bible says about leadership*. Wheaton, IL: Victor.
- Ellis, J. S. (1982). *The church on purpose: Keys to effective church leadership*. Cincinnati, OH: Standard.
- Engstrom, T. W. (1976). *The making of a Christian leader*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Engstrom, T. W. & Larson, R. C. (1988). *Seizing the torch*. Ventura, CA: Regal.
- Enoch, J. C. (1981, November). Up from management. *Phi Delta Kappa*, 63, 175-178.
- Fiorenza, F. S. (1988). Thinking theologically about theological education. *Theological Education*, (Suppl. 2), 89-119.
- Fletcher, J. C. (1984). Theological seminaries in the future. *Theological Education*, 21(1), 71-86.
- Ford, J. H. (1990). *Education for Christian leadership*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of San Diego, CA.
- Ford, L. (1991). *A curriculum design manual for theological education*. Nashville: Broadman.
- Ford, L. (1991). *Transforming leadership: Jesus' way of creating vision, shaping values, and empowering change*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity.
- Fraser, J. W. (1988). *Schooling the preachers: The development of Protestant theological education in the U.S. 1740-1875*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Gangel, K. O. (1980). *Lessons in leadership from the Bible*. Wino Lake, IN: BMH Books.
- Gangel, K. O. (1989). *Feeding and leading: A practical handbook on administration in churches and Christian organizations*. Wheaton, IL: Victor.
- Gangel, K. O. (1989). *So you want to be a leader!*. Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications.
- Gangel, K. O. (1991). Biblical theology of leadership. *The Christian Journal*, 12(1), 13-32.

- Gardner, J. W. (1990). *On leadership*. New York: Free Press.
- Gibbs, E. (1987). *Followed or pushed?*. London: MARC Europe.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist.
- Greenslade, P. (1984). *Leadership, greatness and servanthood*. Minneapolis: Bethany House.
- Grier, J. (1993). Programs leading to ordination. *The 1993 Seminary and Graduate School Handbook*. Evanston, IL: Berry.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1985). *Effective evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gustafson, J. M. (1988). Reflections on the literature on theological education published between 1955 and 1985. *Theological Education*, (Suppl. 2), 9-82.
- Habecker, E. B. (1987). *The other side of leadership*. Wheaton, IL: Victor.
- Habecker, E. B. (1990). *Leading with a follower's heart*. Wheaton, IL: Victor.
- Habecker, E. B. (1991). Introduction. *Christian Education Jernal*, 12(1), 9-12.
- Habecker, E. B. (1991). Educational leadership: An inside-out, upside-down perspective. *Christian Education Journal*, 12(1), 61-68.
- Haggai, J. E. (1986). *Lead on!*. Waco, TX: Word.
- Harper, M. (1978, April). Duplicating the new testament church. *Eternity*, p. 25.
- Harrington, A. (1985). *What the Bible says about leadership*. Joplin, MO: College Press.
- Harrisville, R. A. (1987). *Ministry in crisis: Changing perspective on ordination and the priesthood of all believers*. Minneapolis: Augsburg.
- Harrison, P. (1982, April) T.E.E. rural experiment in Australia. *The International Review of Mission*, 71(282), 185-192.
- Hartman, A. (1981, March). Reaching consensus using the Delphi technique. *Educational Leadership*, pp. 92-97.
- Hawkins, R. E. (1988, January) A servant's heart. *Fundamentalist*, pp. 15-17.

- Hian, C. W. (1987). *The making of a leader*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity.
- Hickman, C. R. (1990). *Mind of a manager; soul of a leader*. New York: Wiley.
- Hocking, D. L. (1991). *The seven laws of Christian leadership*. Ventura, CA: Regal.
- Hough, J. & Cobb, J. (1985). *Christian identity and theological education*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.
- Hunter, G. I. (1982). *Supervision and education-formation for ministry*. Cambridge, MA: Episcopal Divinity School.
- Jacobsen, W. (1992). A case of mistaken ministerial identity. *Leadership*, 13(1), 92-95.
- James, W. (1958). *Varieties of religious experience*. New York: Mentor.
- Jenkins, D. T. (1958). *The Protestant minister*. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday.
- Jones, B. W. (1988). *Ministerial leadership in a managerial world*. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale.
- Kachur, R. M., & Neff, D. (1986, April 18). Surviving leadership in fast forward. *Christianity Today*, pp. 22-26.
- Kallgren, R. C. (1991, September 16). The invisible colleges. *Christianity Today*, pp. 27-28.
- Kilinski, K. K., & Wofford, J. C. (1973). *Organization and leadership in the local church*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Klopfenstein, D. E. (1991). A selected bibliography on Christian leading. *The Christian Journal*, 12(1), 33-54.
- Kotter, J. P. (1990a, May-June). What leaders really do. *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 103-111.
- Kotter, J. P. (1990b). *A force for change*. New York: Free Press.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1987). *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1993). *Credibility*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Krass, A. (1989, July-August). On getting the job done. *The Other Side*, p. 85.
- Lawrence, W. D. (1987). Distinctives of Christian leadership. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 144(575), 317-329.
- Lawrence, W. D. (1992). *A vision for personal and leadership development*. Paper presented at the National Association of Professors of Christian Education Conference, Dallas.
- Layman, F. D. (1986). Contemporary issues in theological education. *The Asbury Theological Journal*, 41(1), 91-115.
- Lee, H. W. (1989). *Effective church leadership*. Minneapolis: Augsburg.
- Leonard, B. J. (1985). A theological evaluation of evaluations: The evangelicals. *Theological Education*, 22(1), (pp. 7-25).
- Levitt, T. (1976, Summer). Management and the post industrial society. *The Public Interest*, pp. 39-46.
- Linstone, H. A., & Turoff M. (Eds.). (1975). *The Delphi method: Techniques and applications*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Long, T. G. (1991). Liturgical storm clouds. *Theology Today*, 48(1), 1-5.
- Luecke, D. S. (1990). *New designs for church leadership*. St. Louis: Concordia.
- MacArthur, J. F. (1989). *Church leadership*. Chicago: Moody.
- Madaus, G. F., Scriven, M. S., & Stufflebeam, D. L. (Eds.). (1983). *Evaluation models*. Norwell, MA: Kluwer-Nijhoff.
- Main, J. (1987, September 2). Wanted: leaders who can make a difference. *Fortune*, pp. 92-102.
- Malphurs, A. (1992). *Developing a vision for ministry in the twenty-first century*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker.
- Mangrum, B. (1986, January-February). Christian leadership: An interview with Gordon McDonald. *Talbot Seminary Fellowship Bulletin*.
- Marion, B. (1989). *What's worth teaching?*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1989). *Designing qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Marshall, T. (1991). *Understanding leadership: Fresh perspectives on the essentials of New Testament leadership*. Lynnwood, WA: Emerald.
- Marty, M. (1962, November 7). Seminary enrollments 1962. *The Christian Century*, pp. 66-69.
- Maxwell, J. C. (1991). Practices of leadership in the context of pastoral leadership. *Christian Education Journal*, 12(1), 55-60.
- Maxwell, J. C. (1993). *Developing the leader within you*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson.
- McCarty, D. (1978). *Supervising ministry students*. Atlanta, GA: Home Mission Board.
- McKenna, D. L., (1989). *Power to follow grace to lead*. Dallas: Word.
- Means, J. E., (1989). *Leadership in Christian ministry*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker.
- Meier, P., Minirth, F., Congo, D., Newman., Meier, R., & Doran, A. (1993). *What they didn't teach you in seminary*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.
- Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Messer, D. E. (1989). *Contemporary images of Christian ministry*. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Miller, C. (1987). *Leadership*. Colorado Springs: NavPress.
- Muck, T. (1987, November 20). So where's the crisis? *Christianity Today*, p. 17.
- Myra, H. (Ed.). (1987). *Leaders*. Waco, TX: Word.
- Nanus, B. (1992). *Visionary leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Narramore, C. M. (1988). *Why a Christian leader may fall*. Westchester, IL: Crossway.
- National Association of Evangelicals. (1992). *1992-93 National evangelical directory*. Carol Stream, IL: Author.

- Nauss, A. (1989). Leadership styles of effective ministry. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*. 17(1), 59-67.
- Nelson, A. E. (1993). *Five minute ministry*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- Nelson, C. E. (1975). *Using evaluation in theological education*. Nashville, TN: Discipleship Resources.
- Nelson, W. R. (1988). *Ministry formation for effective leadership*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon.
- Niebuhr, H. R. (1956). *The purpose of the church and its ministry: Reflections on the aims of theological education*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Nott, P. (1986). Towards a theology of leadership. *The Expository Times*, 97(5), 138-142.
- Nouwen, H. J. (1990). *In the name of Jesus: Reflection on Christian leadership*. New York: Crossroad.
- Oates, W. E. (1987). The marks of a Christian leader. *Southwestern Journal of Theology*, 29(2), 19-24.
- Oster, M. J. (1991). *Vision-driven leadership*. San Bernardino, CA: Here's Life.
- Palmer, R. P. (1978). *Basic considerations relative to a more effective ministerial training at Covenant Theological Seminary*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA.
- Palumbo, D. J. (Ed.). (1987). *The politics of program evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Poole, S. (1965). *Seminary in crisis*. New York: Herder and Herder.
- Powers, B. P. (1979). *Christian leadership*. Nashville: Broadman.
- Quickel, W. (1989, January). "Forget managers: What we need are leaders." *Business Month*, p.69-70.
- Quigley, J. V. (1993). *Vision: How leaders develop it, share it, and sustain it*. New York: McGraw Hill.

- Ramsey, R. R. (Ed.). (1991). *Christian Education Journal*, 12(1), 7.
- Reed, J. (1992). *Church-based theological education: Creating a new paradigm*. Paper presented at the North American Professors of Christian Education Conference, Dallas.
- Richards, L. O., & Hoeldtke, C. (1980). *Church leadership*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Robinson, A. B. (1992, May 20-27). Authority and leadership in ministry. *The Christian Century*, pp. 550-552.
- Rost, J. C. (1988, July). *The nature of leadership in the postindustrial era*. Paper presented at a meeting of Educational Leadership Researchers at the Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, NC.
- Rost, J. C. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. New York: Praeger.
- Sanders, J. O. (1967). *Spiritual leadership*. Chicago: Moody.
- Scheele, D. S. (1975). Reality construction as a product of Delphi interaction. In Linstone, H. A., & Turoff M. (Eds.). *The Delphi method: Techniques and applications*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Schaller, L. E. (1986). *Getting things done*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon.
- Schaller, L. E. (1988). *The senior minister*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon.
- Segler, F. M. (1987). Theological foundations for ministry. *Southwestern Journal of Theology*. 29(2), 5-17.
- Shaw, C. N. (1989). *A philosophy of education for leadership development through theological studies*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. School of World Missions at Fuller Seminary, Pasadena, CA.
- Shawchuck, N., & Heuser, R. (1993). *Leading the congregation: Caring for yourself while serving others*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon.
- Shelley, B. L. (1992). *Evangelical seminaries and the large churches*. Paper delivered at the North American Professors of Christian Education Conference, Dallas.
- Siler, M. (1986). Leaves from a pastoral notebook. *Review and Expositor*, 83(4), 529-530.

- Smith, F. (1986). *Learning to lead*. Waco, TX: Word.
- Steele, D. A. (1986). *Images of leadership and authority for the church*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Stevens, R. P., & Schoberg, G. (1990). *Servant leadership*. Wheaton, IL: Harold Shaw.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook on leadership*. New York: Macmillan Free Press.
- Stott, J. R. (1985, August 8). What makes leadership. *Christianity Today*, pp. 24-27.
- Swindoll, C. R. (1978). *Hand me another brick*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.
- Swindoll, C. R. (1985). *Leadership: Influence that inspires*. Waco, TX: Word.
- Tan, H. H. (1991). *Leadership development at a training center in the Philippines*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of San Diego, CA.
- Tenney, M. C. (Ed.). (1975). Education. *Pictorial encyclopedia of the Bible* (Vol. 2). Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Thiemann, R. F., (1987). The scholarly vocation: Its future challenges and threat. *Theological Educator*, 24(1), 123-129.
- Thomas, L. (1980). *The medusa and the snail*. New York: Bantam.
- Toffler, A. (1990). *Powershift*. New York: Bantam.
- Towns, E. L. (1986). *Becoming a leader*. Lynchburg, VA: Church Leadership Institute.
- Tramel, M. E., & Reynolds, H. (1981). *Executive leadership*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice.
- Tucker, G. L. (1985). A theological analysis of evaluation within protestantism. *Theological Education*, 22(1), 49-70.
- Volz, C. A. (1990). *Pastoral life and practice in the early church*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg.
- Wagner, C. P. (1979). *Understanding your spiritual gifts*. Ventura, CA: Regal.

- Wall, B., Solum, R. S., & Sobol, M. R. (1992). *The visionary leader*. Rocklin, CA: Prima.
- Webber, G. W. (1973). *Learning in context: The search for innovative patterns in theological education*. Kent, England: The Theological Education Fund.
- Weese, C. (1993). *Standing on the banks of tomorrow!* Granada Hills, CA: Multi-Staff Ministries.
- Wheeler, B. G. (1985). Program Evaluation: Some practical guidelines. *Theological Education*, 22(1), 93-118.
- White, J. (1986). *Excellence in leadership*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity.
- Whitehead, A. N. (1929). *The aims of education and other essays*. New York: The Free Press.
- Wood, C. M. (1990). Theological education and education for church leadership. *Quarterly Review*, 10(2), 65-81.
- Wyant, R.M. (1906). Without the seminary. *Semi-Centennial Celebration: Garrett Biblical Institute*. Evanston, IL: Garrett Biblical Institute.
- Wyatt-Brown, B. (1969). *Lewis Tappan and the evangelical war against slavery*. Cleveland, OH.
- Young, D. S. (1988). Leadership. *Brethren Life and Thought*, 33(2), 131-135.
- Yousseff, M. (1986). *The leadership style of Jesus*. Wheaton, IL: Victor.
- Zaleznik, A. (1977, May-June). Managers and leaders: Are they different? *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 67-78.
- Zaleznik, A. (1989). *The managerial mystique: Restoring leadership in business*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Ziegler, J. (1984). *ATS through two decades: Reflections on theological education 1960-1980*. Worcester, MA: Hefferman.

APPENDIX A

National Association of Evangelicals Statement of Faith

NAE seven-point Statement of Faith, a statement that addresses the basic tenets of historic Christianity.

1. We believe the Bible to be the inspired, the only infallible, authoritative Word of God.

2. We believe that there is one God, eternally existent in three persons: Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

3. We believe in the deity of our Lord Jesus Christ, in His virgin birth, in His sinless life, in His miracles, in His vicarious and atoning death through His shed blood, in His bodily resurrection, in His ascension to the right hand of the Father, and in His personal return in power and glory.

4. We believe that for the salvation of lost and sinful man, regeneration by the Holy Spirit is absolutely essential.

5. We believe in the present ministry of the Holy Spirit by whose indwelling the Christian is enabled to live a godly life.

6. We believe in the resurrection of both the saved and the lost; they that are saved unto the resurrection of life and they that are lost unto the resurrection of damnation.

7. We believe in the spiritual unity of believers in our Lord Jesus Christ.

APPENDIX B

Pastoral Training Programs Reviewed For Leadership Training

Key: U (undergraduate), G (graduate), S (seminary)

Rating:

- 0-no leadership courses offered
- 1-leadership not clarified from management, other
- 2-acknowledges leadership
- 3-supports leadership
- 4-emphasizes leadership

1. American Baptist Seminary, Berkeley, CA: S/0
2. Anderson University, Anderson, IN: U/1
3. Asbury College, Wilmore, KY: U/2
4. Asbury Seminary, Wilmore, KY: S/2
5. Assemblies of God Theological Seminary, Springfield, MO: S/1
6. Associated Mennonite Biblical Seminaries, Elkhart, IN: S/1
7. Azusa Pacific University, Azusa, CA: G/2
8. Asusa Pacific University, Azusa, CA: U/0
9. Baptist Missionary Association Theological Seminary, Jacksonville, TX: S/0
10. Bartlesville Wesleyan College, Bartlesville, OK: L/0
11. Beevson Divinity School, Birmingham, AL: G/1
12. Belhaaven College, Jackson, MS: U/0
13. Bethel College, St. Paul, MN: U/0
14. Bethel Theological Seminary, St. Paul, MN: S/1
15. Bethel College, North Newton, KS: U/O
16. Bethel College, Mishawaka, IN: U/1
17. Biblical Theological Seminary, Hatfield, PA: S/0
18. Biola University, La Mirada, CA: U/1
19. Talbot School of Theology, La Mirada, CA: G/2
20. Bluffton College, Bluffton, OH: U/0
21. Bryan College, Dayton, TN: U/0
22. California Baptist College, Riverside, CA: U/1
23. Calvary Theological Seminary, Kansas City, MO: S/0
24. Calvin College, Grand Rapids, MI: U/0
25. Calvin Theological Seminary, Grand Rapids, MI: S/0
26. Campbellsville College, Campbellsville, KY: U/0
27. Capital Bible Seminary, Lanham, MD: S/1
28. Cedarville College, Cedarvill, OH: U/0
29. Central Baptist Theological Seminary, Kansas City, KS: S/1
30. Chesapeake Theological Seminary, Linthicum, MD: S/0
31. Cincinnati Bible College, Cincinnati, OH: U/0
32. Colorado Christian University, Lakewood, CO: U/2

33. Columbia Biblical Seminary, Columbia, SC: S/1
34. Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, MO: S/0
35. Concordia Theological Seminary, Fort Wayne, IN: S/0
36. Covenant College, Lookout Mountain, GA: U/0
37. Covenant Theological Seminary, St. Louis, MO: S/1
38. Church of God School of Theology, Cleveland, TN: S/2
39. Dallas Baptist University, Dallas, TX: U/0
40. Dallas Theological Seminary, Dallas, TX: S/4*
41. Denver Seminary, Denver, CO: S/2
42. Eastern College, St. Davids, PA: U/0
43. Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, PA: S/0
44. Eastern Mennonite College, Harrisonburg, VA: U/1
45. Eastern Mennonite Seminary, Harrisonburg, VA: S/1
46. Eastern Nazarene College, Quincy, MA: U/1
47. Erskine College, Due West, SC: U/0
48. Evangel College, Springfield, MO: U/1
49. Evangelical School of Theology, Myerstown, PA: U/1
50. Faith Seminary, Tacoma, WA: S/1
51. Fresno Pacific College, Fresno, CA: U/1
52. Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA: S/4*
53. Geneva College, Beaver Falls, PA: U/0
54. George Fox College, Newberg, OR: U/1
55. Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary, Mill Valley, CA: S/1
56. Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, South Hamilton, MA: S/0
57. Goshen College, Goshen, IN: U/0
58. Grace College, Winona Lake, IN: U/0
59. Grace Theological Seminary, Winona Lake, IN: S/1
60. Grand Canyon University: U/1
61. Grand Rapids Baptist College, Grand Rapids, MI: U/0
62. Grand Rapids Baptist Seminary, Grand Rapids, MI: S/1
63. Greenville College, Greenville, IL: U/0
64. Houghton College, Houghton, NY: U/1
65. Huntington College, Huntington, IN: U/0
66. Huntington College, Huntington, IN: G/1
67. Indiana Wesleyan University, Marion, IN: U/0
68. Indiana Wesleyan University, Marion, IN: G/0
69. John Brown University, Siloam Springs, AR: U/0
70. Judson College, Elgin, IL: U/0
71. King College, Bristol, TN: U/0
72. Knox Theological Seminary, Fort Lauderdale, FL: S/1
73. Lee College, Cleveland, TN: U/1
74. Te Tourneau University, Longview, TX: U/0
75. Liberty Baptist Theological Seminary, Lynchburg, VA: S/1
76. Lincoln Christian Seminary, Lincoln, IL: S/0

77. Luther Rice Seminary, Lithonia, GA: S/2
78. Mennonite Brethren Biblical Seminary, Fresno, CA: S/1
79. Messia College, Grantham, PA: U/1
80. Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary, Memphis, TN: S/1
81. MidAmerica Nazarene College, Olathe, KS: U/0
82. Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Kansas City, MO: S/1
83. Milligan College, TN: U/1
84. Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, IL: G/3
85. Montreat-Anderson College, Montreat, NC: U/1
86. Mount Vernon Nazarene College, Mt. Vernon, OH: U/2
87. Multnomah Graduate School, Portland, OR: G/2
88. Nazarene Theological Seminary, Kansas City, MO: S/0
89. Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Lombard, IL: S/1
90. North Park College, Chicago, IL: U/0
91. North Park Theological Seminary, Chicago, IL: S/1
92. Northwest Christian College, Eugene, OR: G/2
93. Northwest College, Kirkland, WA: U/1
94. Northwestern College, Orange, IA: U/0
95. Northwestern College, St. Paul, MN: U/1
96. Northwest Nazarene College, Nampa, ID: U/0
97. Northwest Nazarene College, Nampa, ID: G/2
98. North American Baptist Seminary, Sioux Falls, SD: S/2
99. Nyack College, Nyack, NY: U/1
100. Olivet Nazarene University, Kankakee, IL: U/1
101. Point Loma Nazarene College, San Diego, CA: U/0
102. Point Loma Nazarene College, San Diego, CA: G/1
103. Reformed Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, PA: S/1
104. Reformed Theological Seminary, Charlotte, NC: S/3
105. Regents University, Virginia Beach, VA: G/1
106. Roberts Wesleyan College, Rochester, NY: U/0
107. Seattle Pacific University, Seattle, WA: U/1
108. Seminary of the East, Dresher, PA: S/1
109. Simpson College, Redding, CA: U/0
110. Sioux Falls College, Sioux Falls, SD: U/0
111. Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, NC: S/3
112. Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY: S/0
113. Southern California College, Costa Mesa, CA: U/1
114. Southern California College, Costa Mesa, CA: G/4
115. Southern Nazarene University, Bethany, OK: U/2
116. Southern Nazarene University, Bethany, OK: G/2
117. Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Forth Worth, TX: S/2
118. Spring Arbor College, Spring Arbor, MI: U/1
119. Sterling College, Sterling, KS: U/1
120. Tabor College, Hillsboro, KS: U/0

121. Taylor University, Upland, IN: U/1
122. The King's College, Briarcliff, NY: U/2
123. The Master's College, Santa Clarita, CA: U/1
124. The Master's Seminary, Sun Valley, CA: S/2
125. Trevecca Nazarene College, Nashville, TN: U/1
126. Trinity Christian College, Palos Heights, IL: U/0
127. Trinity College, Deerfield, IL: U/0
128. Trinity Western University, Blaine, WA: U/0
129. Tyndale, Fort Worth, TX: U/0
130. Warner Pacific College: U/0
131. Warner Pacific College: G/1
132. Warner Southern College, Lake Wales, FL: U/2
133. Wesley Biblical Seminary, Jackson, MS: S/1
134. Western Baptist College, OR: U/1
135. Western Evangelical Seminary, Portland, OR: S/2
136. Western Evangelical Seminar, Holland, MI: S/2
137. Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, PA: S/2
138. Westminster Theological Seminary, CA: S/0
139. Westmont College, Santa Barbara, CA: U/0
140. Wheaton College, Wheaton, IL: U/2
141. Winebrenner Theological Seminary, Findlay, OH: S/0

*special notation explained in text

APPENDIX C

Expert Panel Member Consent Form

Pastoral Leadership Training Survey- Panelist Consent Agreement

I understand that Alan Nelson (researcher) is asking that I and other ministry experts share our knowledge and experiences as anonymous participants on a Delphi technique survey panel and that a consensus of the panel's opinions will serve as part of the researcher's doctoral dissertation and that:

1. The panelists who participate in the survey will have access to the data base and the analysis and conclusions arising from it.
2. The purposes of this study are to develop suggestions for an optimum leadership ministerial training program, provide this information to academic and denominational administrators, and focus the need for further research in the field of evangelical ministerial higher education.
3. The identity of each panel member and his/her individual opinions will be kept anonymous by the researcher. Participation on this panel is completely voluntary and may be withdrawn at any time.
4. There is no apparent risk to any individual participant because only panel consensus data are pertinent to the conclusions arising from this research methodology. Any other input will be used only with individual permission.

The time commitment estimate is 2 hours (30 minutes recorded interview, 30-45 minutes to respond to 2nd round summary, 30-45 minutes to respond to 3rd round summary). Research will run from March- June, 1993.

I have read and understood the above and have also had, prior to my decision to participate, the opportunity to ask the researcher clarifying questions regarding the study. There is no agreement, written or verbal, beyond that expressed in this consent agreement. Therefore, on the basis of the above, I give my consent to voluntarily participate in this research.

Pastoral leadership training expert panelist Date:

Witness Date:

Researcher Date:

Alan Nelson, 27521 Nivelada, Mission Viejo, CA 92692 (714) 458-0764 office

APPENDIX D

Questions for Expert Panel Interviews Regarding Training Pastoral Students in Leadership

General Questions:

1. Is it the senior pastor's role to be the leader of a church? If so, why? If not, why not?
2. What is leadership? Is leadership the same as management?
3. To what extent is leadership training the college's/seminary's responsibility?
4. How do you expect that a pastor should exert leadership?
5. How do you distinguish those with leadership gifts/aptitudes?
6. What experiences should ministerial students have regarding leadership development during their education in institutions of higher education (undergraduate and graduate)?

Specific Group Questions:

Administrators

1. How do you go about finding pastoral candidates who have effectively demonstrated leadership?
2. What are congregations looking for in a pastor?
3. Do you see any trends regarding leadership aptitudes in ministerial candidates the last several years?

Lay Leaders

1. What are laity looking for in a pastor and in his/her ministerial education?
2. How can a congregation better discern who is likely to demonstrate effective leadership?
3. What is the role of the laity regarding church leadership?

Academicians

1. Do you see any trends in ministerial students in the last several years regarding leadership aptitude?
2. How would your leadership training vary from undergraduate to graduate programs?
3. What accreditation and/or institutional policies do you see that potentially hinder implementing leadership training in ministerial programs?

Pastors

1. What are the congregational expectations regarding the pastor?
2. Can leadership be learned? If so, how?
3. How would you improve ministerial training in the college/seminary?

APPENDIX E
SECOND ROUND DELPHI SURVEY

Interview Results Summarized *(Please respond to the following items as best as you feel able. Feel free to use the back.)*

I. Diagnostic Practices: *It was believed that a more proficient method of determining leadership aptitudes should exist, so that ministerial students with high aptitudes could be better trained, and those lacking such aptitudes could be counseled toward areas of ministry demanding less leadership.*

A. Tools/Instruments: What instruments or tools would you recommend for this purpose? (The more specific, the better)

B. Recommendations (Past/Present): It was generally believed that leadership aptitudes emerge early in life via social settings. What sort of situations would you look at, or what people would you reference, to determine if and what leadership aptitudes a student possess?

C. Counsel: What type of counsel would you recommend take place, once initial aptitude diagnosis is made? How might a student, perceived gifted in leadership, be directed and mentored during the educational process as opposed to those with lesser aptitudes?

II. Core Courses: *Many schools offer theology and skills necessary for church leadership (i.e., homiletics, counseling, church administration, etc.), but there is a difference between "training a leader" and "leadership training." Distinctions should be made between church management (maintenance and carrying out of ongoing ministry), and leadership (vision casting, significant change and growth). Little is being done with the latter in mind. These courses directly or indirectly were referred to out of the interviews for the purpose of leadership training. Which of these would you add or delete?*

Organizational Theory (How do organizations function? What are strengths and weaknesses of various models and case studies?)

Organizational Change (Acting as a change agent, conflict management, dynamics which catalyze change, side effects of change pressures)

Leadership Theory I (A brief history and overview of leadership studies. Leadership as a process versus a person. The difference between leadership and management in the ministry. The difference between a leader and leadership. Focus on the process of leadership relationships versus content of specific situations.)

Leadership Theory II (Case study analysis of various leadership situations along with guest practitioners. Discussions to focus on practical as well as complex process issues at hand in real life leadership scenarios. Various aspects of different theories such as trait, situational/style, power resources, etc.)

Time Management (The issues of priority setting. Mission and purpose statements. Delegation and the 80/20 principle.)

Group Psychology (Social dynamics among people. Organizing groups for planning and tasks. Identifying potential leaders and problem people. Team building and general people skills and interpersonal relations.)

Adult Development (Understanding the various phases of adult development, so that you can better identify priorities, values, and interests of those with whom you lead.)

Mentoring (Identifying potential leaders and principles for reproducing yourself in others. Ideas for raising up more and better new leaders.)

Decision Making/Planning (Structural principles on getting a group away from status quo. Goal setting. How dreams can become realities by organizational structuring and carrying out ideas.

Leadership Case Studies (A socratic course designed to look at actual organizational situations for the purpose of discussion and better understanding real life scenarios. Guest practitioners would be invited in as well to discuss leadership issues.)

Misc: Any ideas on how one might select suitable teachers for such courses? Should these be practitioner driven, relying heavily on outside speakers?

***III. Practicum:** One overwhelming theme to emerge is the importance of having first hand experience. Although many seminaries and graduate schools have practicums in their programs, few undergrad programs do, and many have suggested that the current practicums are either limited in scope and/or leadership training.*

What length of duration do you think would be realistic for an internship? Any minimum time?

What sort of requirements would you expect from this practicum? For example, should this be part time or full time employment? Should it be mere observation during meetings (staff/board)? Should it involve direct contact with the leader or not?

What could be done to best match students with mentors?

What could be done to target good examples of leadership, and motivate them to participate in such a program?

What sort of feedback should be required from the on campus mentor and practicum mentor?

Any other ideas, pitfalls, challenges, to providing a practicum for leadership training?

Anything important left out of this survey that you believe should be added?

APPENDIX F

THIRD ROUND DELPHI SURVEY

Instructions: Thanks so much for your participation in the first survey on the Optimum Leadership Training program. You will find a synthesis of these results as follows. Please consider these draft programs, and your task is to edit and critique the programs as they are listed, in terms of balance, thoroughness, and implementation. Please make generous marks in the margins, on the back, or on a separate sheet of paper. Your prompt response in the stamped, self-addressed envelope enclosed is greatly appreciated!

INTRO:

There are three segments to the leadership program: *1. Diagnostic Analysis (determining latent and/or proven leadership aptitudes), 2. Leadership Core Courses, and 3. Leadership Practicum.* Because there was some concern about the ability of an undergraduate student to assimilate the same material as a graduate student, it appeared prudent to develop programs for two distinct groups. At the same time, some concern was expressed about tinkering much with the MDiv (masters of divinity) flagship degree. If it would be ivory tower thinking to suggest that a seminary would allow such a significant change to occur in their main ministerial degree, an alternate graduate degree in ministerial leadership would be recommended. Therefore, you have three suggested programs to critique. The three programs are the same in the Diagnostic Analysis segment, and vary some in the latter two segments. They are based on data given by you and your peers in this study. Please review them and make detailed changes or overall observations about their implementation.

(Please make legible comments and editorial notes in the margins or on the back as you review the programs. Thank you!)

SEGMENT ONE: DIAGNOSTIC ANALYSIS

Similar for 1. Undergraduate Leadership Minor 2. MDiv (Masters of Divinity) with leadership emphasis 3. Masters in Christian Leadership

The purpose of this step is to identify those with leadership aptitudes. This is seen as a proactive step in helping students early in the process, to discover their gifts, and also to serve the faculty in counseling and program development for individuals. Naturally, there is the possibility of missing those whose leadership potential emerges later, but the intent is to develop those most inclined to become leaders.

This does not deny ministerial aptitudes of others, rather it recognizes those with natural leadership abilities, much like those in other fields such as athletics, the arts, and academics. All ministerial students would complete the following three processes and those with emergent leadership strengths would be advised to be a part of the leadership track for special emphasis.

A. Diagnostic Instrument: Two instruments would be administered and evaluated by certified technicians, who will look for emergent leadership strengths. Preferred instruments included: Myers Briggs, DISC, 16PF, TJTA, & MMPI. Other possible instruments mentioned were: DISC, Performax, SIMA, Personality Profile, PDP, and Strong-Campbell. The emphasis here is on looking specifically for leadership strengths, as opposed to a generic personality test.

B. References: It is agreed that generally, leadership qualities emerge early in life experiences, and/or that those with leadership aptitudes seek out leadership situations. Most schools seek some sort of references prior to enrollment. Either forms could be modified to include questions pertaining to observed leadership experience, or special forms could be developed which primarily emphasize this quality. Ministerial students would submit these to pastors, youth ministers, teachers, boy scout leaders, coaches, etc.

C. Interviews: One or more qualified professors or leadership experienced practitioners would interview each ministerial student, to best ascertain not only the individual's call and motivations behind seeking the ministry, but also to discern potential leadership strengths. Questions specifically seeking past leadership experiences and information about goals and ministry expectations should provide a personal sense of a student's inclinations.

A committee of those directly involved in the leadership program would initiate the review process of these three aspects, so that only those diagnosed as possessing latent or perceived leadership strengths be allowed as well as encouraged to participate in the program. The intent is not to develop an elitist attitude, but rather to recognize those with leadership aptitudes for the purpose of further developing these abilities. Others who recognize a valid call of God to the ministry could develop as usual in the regular program, and intentionally counseled toward ministry areas not requiring strong leadership gifts (i.e. church staff, or churches with lay led structure).

By establishing entrance requirements such as this, it is hoped to better equip and nurture those with leadership aptitudes. At the same time, it should build a reputation for the program, so that graduates with a leadership minor become recognized as strong potential church leaders, versus allowing anyone with academic ability to enroll in the program.

SEGMENT TWO: LEADERSHIP CORE COURSES

All of these courses would need to be taught by those who have proven leadership interest, research, and the inclusion of those who have practical experience. If the latter were not available on campus, as most academics are gifted in teaching versus leadership skills, then adjunct professors consisting of local or visiting guest practitioners would be necessary to round out a credible

teaching team. An overseeing committee consisting of both institutional people and practitioners could provide accountability and support for a balanced teaching staff. (According to several panelists, academics appear to overestimate their ability to do it all, and practitioners tend to underestimate the academics' ability to teach leadership well.)

Undergraduate Leadership Minor (24 semester units consisting of 16 concentrated units of 4 core courses, 4 units of a leadership project, 4 units practicum)

(This could be potentially available to all students in a Christian college displaying leadership aptitudes, but here it is specifically designated for ministerial students.)

Requirement: Majoring in a typical religion/ theology/ biblical literature program tracking toward ordination and formal ministry preparation. The minor would involve core courses taken primarily during two years (sophomore or upper division) and equivalent to semester hours or those amounting to requirements for a minor at the institution.

Year 1: Theory/Concepts

Year 1 Semester 1: Leadership Theory: an overview of leadership studies, the nature of leadership, seeing leadership primarily as a process and a relationship, servant leadership, ethics, transformational leadership, defining leadership.

Year 1 Semester 2: Organizational Theory and Change: systems thinking, introducing various organizational models in the context of the church, introducing change theories in the church context

Year 2: Content/skills

Year 2 Semester 1: modules focusing on time management, mission and purpose statements, vision, decision making

Year 2 Semester 2: mentoring, empowerment, and team building concepts are investigated, and some case studies utilized

Leadership Project: Subsequent to year one, the student would select an approved leadership activity, along with a faculty/ qualified sponsor. Situations could include local church or parachurch leadership roles, student government, or entrepreneurial endeavor involving leadership. The role would include some additional self-study in the area of activity. This is not a paper or research project but an immersion into a real situation requiring leadership implementation. This would be different than the practicum, allowing greater latitude, less supervision, and more student interest driven. Regular updates and a paper discussing the various leadership aspects of the project would be included. (Designed to get undergraduate students involved in leadership)

Master of Divinity (1/3 of program designated toward leadership development, displacing 1/3 of the electives and other traditional courses, approximating 30 learning units total, including 24 units of coursework, and 6 units of practicum). Recommended for those with undergraduate degrees in religion or biblical literature, so that the displaced courses do not significantly weaken the academic foundation.

Core Courses:

***Leadership Theory:** an overview of the history of leadership studies, the nature and definition of leadership, a smorgasbord of main themes and theories, leadership vs. management & ministry

***Organization Theory:** systems thinking, an overview of various models with a church context, organizational metaphors

***Organization Change:** policy making, program evaluation, risks and motivations for change, change models, include case studies

***Leadership Skills:** situational leadership, trait theories highlighted, relational skills, agenda setting

***Mission & Purpose:** time management, vision, utilize case studies, decision making

***Mentoring:** reproducing yourself, empowering a team, developing other leaders around you, include a short term mentoring relationship

***Incarnational Leadership:** a leader's private life, credibility, servant leadership, character development and spirituality

***Elective:** adult development, group psychology, administration, self-study into a special aspect of leadership

Master of Arts in Christian Leadership (24 units core courses, 6-12 units pastoring electives, 6 units practicum: 36-42 total units)

This program would be based for those with pre-seminary, ordination track undergraduate degrees in biblical literature or religion. It might be implemented where a traditional MDiv program was not preferred and/or where an institution did not want to modify the traditional MDiv format. The only addition to the leadership courses listed above in the MDiv emphasis would be another 6-12 units worth of courses in areas which needed ministerial preparation support, depending on denominational requirements for ordination and how well the undergraduate degree prepared the student, i.e. practical pastoring skills, homiletics, administration, staff development, Christian education, theology, counseling, preaching, biblical literature, etc.

SEGMENT THREE: PRACTICUM**Undergraduate Minor In Leadership**

This would be a supervised leadership situation, involving fulltime work one summer, or parttime (20 hours/week) during a semester. This situation would be negotiated between a campus sponsor in the leadership area, and an effective practitioner. The student would have responsibilities requiring some leadership skills, but would also shadow the leader during leader-type situations as well as spend time weekly in one on one interaction and feedback sessions. Weekly reports/journaling would be turned in and reviewed by the campus coordinator. A final debriefing between the mentor, campus sponsor and student would culminate the experience. (4 units of credit)

MDiv program with leadership emphasis & MA in Christian Leadership program:

An internship under the supervision of a recognized leader would be a key part of these programs. This could take place via two years of parttime mentoring, or one year of fulltime mentoring. Ideally, this would be a paid working relationship. Designated churches/ministries with trained, willing leaders, could provide a significant experience in the lives of ministerial students and the leadership training programs as a whole.

These internships would ideally take place sometime during the formal education process, so that class work takes on the flavor of practical discussion, versus ivory tower theory. Thus, case studies could take a greater part in the training, so long as the students had some practical experience from which to base their analyses.

A triangular relationship between campus representative, mentor, and student would be vital to the program. Regular reports and feedback/debriefings would also play important roles in the process. A diploma or certification of leadership emphasis as a result ought to have credibility, which would require a student be involved in more than just classroom learning.