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In order to evaluate the effectiveness of graduate theological education, Part I of this study sought to establish frames of reference for measuring success in pastoral ministry and to evaluate the relationship between leadership practices and those criteria.\(^1\) Stated differently: Are leadership practices a predictor of success in pastoral ministry?

We concluded that; “… using superior leadership practices enables pastors to be more successful in their ministry. This study has demonstrated a strong correlation between the two. Thus, it would seem wise to devote a portion of graduate ministerial education to inculcating and developing the leadership practices described herein.”\(^2\)

Given the correlation between leadership practices and pastoral success, the formation of key leadership practices that prepare a person for success in ministry is an appropriate goal of graduate theological education. we confirmed that the Seventh-day Adventist church in the North American Division\(^3\) expects pastors to complete a Master of Divinity program prior to their ordination.\(^4\) The church expects graduate-level ministerial education to contribute to the preparation of a candidate for professional ministry.

---


\(^2\) Bell and Dudley, 290.

\(^3\) The NAD covers the territory of the United States, Canada, and Bermuda. A conference is generally a regional judicatory, corresponding to the area of a state or province.

\(^4\) The policy of the NAD requires an M.Div. degree for pastors prior to ordination to the ministry. “L 05 05 Educational Requirement—The educational requirement for entrance into the ministry (except as provided in L 05 20) shall be the completion of the seven-year ministerial training program. College ministerial graduates shall attend the Andrews University Theological Seminary to complete the nine quarter program. Upon satisfactory completion of nine quarters, the graduate is eligible for a three-quarter assignment as a ministerial intern, or for other direct appointments to the ministry” (North American Division of the General Conference Working Policy 1998-1999 [Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald, 1999], 417). In practice, local conferences often place pastors and ordain them without a graduate degree. Some of these pastors later continue their study in a masters-level extension program offered by the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary.
The purpose of this second stage of research is to assess and analyze the effect of graduate education on the leadership practices of persons in pastoral ministry in the Seventh-day Adventist church in North America. While this research will disclose the impact of graduate theological education in developing leadership effectiveness for ministerial students, the ultimate purpose, to be approached in the next research stage, is to discover specifically what in graduate theological education contributes to that development and make those findings available to the process of designing the seminary experience.

This research will establish a benchmark for Seventh-day Adventist pastors in North America from which new educational programs and student progress can be measured. The degree of correlation between the Master of Divinity program of study and growth in leadership traits will be a significant factor in forming church policy for pastoral education. The third research stage, proposed for the year 2004, will examine correlations between delivery system options, the learning environment, and course emphasis in a broad range of Master of Divinity programs beyond Andrews University in North America and will be valuable as ministerial education is refined in the future by the church.

**Leadership Development in the Church – a Brief Review**

Scripture defines the church as a body of ministering believers. The Greek word *ekklesia*, translated as “church”, is from the Hebrew *qahal*, meaning a meeting of the people summoned together. Mark, Luke, and John, do not employ the word. Acts, however, makes frequent use of the term. “We first read of the
ἐκκλησία in Jerusalem, which is explicitly referred to as such in 8:1. At 7:38 the people of Israel, led through the desert by Moses, is called ἐκκλησία.⁵ The New Testament church was commissioned to witness, to lead people to Jesus for salvation, to make disciples. “Go therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you….” (Matthew 18-19)

The church was to witness in the power of the Holy Spirit (Acts 1:8). All believers are called, klesis, and gifted for ministry (Ephesians 4:1; Romans 1:1,6, 1 Corinthians 12:4-5). So the Christian church is a called out community of ministering believers in Christ.

Specific ministries within the body are also described. Paul describes overseers, the episcopes, (1Timothy 3:1). Congregations were to choose from among themselves persons for distinct ministry and confirm their ministry by the laying on of hands (Acts 6:5). Titus is encouraged to appoint elders in every city (Titus 1:5). When the church needed to resolve issues in its life of mission, they counselled with the “apostles and elders concerning this issue” (Acts 15:2 – 6).

The New Testament church was served by leaders within its community. Instructed by the biblical teaching of servant leadership, the ministry of leadership continues in the contemporary church.

Seminary education contributes to the preparation of these leaders. The ATS Bulletin: Procedures, Standards and Criteria for Membership, describes goals for a seminary program leading to ordination in these words: “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 such ministry. In expanding the goal, thirteen points are developed in
the ATS Bulletin, including these leadership issues: serving as a change agent,
relational development of leaders, and assisting the congregation in developing
its purpose and corporate life. It is apparent that leadership development is a part
of congregational expectation, and required in ministerial training. But has
leadership development been provided for in seminary curriculum?

Alan E. Nelson, in his dissertation at the University of San Diego,
describes the evolution of formal ministerial training programs in the Christian
church. Jesus modeled the personal apprenticeship exercised by the early
church in training church leaders. The early church had no institutions of pastoral
training. Justin founded a school in Rome in the second century, though not
designed for the training of church leaders. Augustine first imposed a communal
life for the preparation of candidates for priesthood, as an enhancement of the
apprenticeship system. The majority of priests until the time of the reformation
had no university theological training. In 1563, the Council of Trent decreed the
establishment of seminaries, where the theology of the church was to be taught.
Seminaries were a response to the erosion of orthodoxy.

In the post reformation years, those preparing for pastoral ministry in the
protestant movements generally spent a few months to a year living in the home
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6 ATS Bulletin (Pittsburgh Pa: The Association of Theological Schools, June, 1992), 38.
7 Alan E. Nelson, Leadership Training of Ministerial Students in Evangelical Institutions of Higher
of one of the revivalist preachers to prepare for ministry. The practice was
continued in America when Harvard was founded, with those who prepared for
pastoral ministry in the liberal arts program spending up to three years in a
pastor’s home while completing their course of studies. Harvard developed a
separate chair of theology in 1721, followed soon after by Yale. Curriculum
emphasis continued to be in theology, while preparation for ministry was by
apprenticeship. The first distinct theological seminary was in Andover,
Massachusetts, in 1808. By the late nineteenth century the tradition of a four year
college degree plus a graduate seminary experience was established, though not
required.

**Literature Review**

The literature investigating the development of graduate theological
education in America, and especially its contribution to leadership development
among pastors, describes the limitations of graduate theological education in
responding to the needs for leadership development. Seminaries are described
as products of their educational and church traditions. Professional creativity
takes second place to doctrinal orthodoxy. The apparent theme is the challenge
the seminary faces in leadership development for the church.

Ron Clouzet, in his dissertation for the Doctor of Ministry program at Fuller
seminary, states; “…It was during the last part of the eighteenth and the first part
of the nineteenth centuries that the major institutional forms by which American
Protestant clergy were trained took shape. The basic structure of ministerial education, namely, four years of college followed by three years of seminary, did not change after that.\textsuperscript{8}

D. E. Messer states: “In frontier America, the need for higher education enterprises committed to critical and creative theological teaching, scholarship, and research was not always self-evident to the church, and the services these enterprises render to church and society were not always welcomed.”\textsuperscript{9} T. Christopher Turner, in his doctoral dissertation at Washington State University, describes the evolution of seminaries to provide graduate theological education in America, and asserts that seminaries designed to prepare professional leaders for the church are still a relatively new experience, and often entangled in controversy.\textsuperscript{10}

J. W. Fraser, writing in 1988 and tracking the development of theological education in America in the 19\textsuperscript{th} and 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries, suggests that the twentieth century was not creative in developing formal education for ministry. He asserts that no new patterns in theological education emerged since the establishment of seminaries. Seminaries provided theological education, and the congregation was the primary setting for practical training in ministry.\textsuperscript{11}

Richard Niebuhr, Daniel Day Williams, and James M. Gustafson in their 1957 book, \textit{The Advancement of Theological Education}, a second volume

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{8} Ron E. M. Clouzet, \textit{A Biblical Paradigm for Ministerial Training}, a dissertation, (Fuller Theological Seminary: August, 1997), 206.
\item\textsuperscript{9} D. E. Messer, \textit{Calling Church and Seminary Into the 21st Century} (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995).
\item\textsuperscript{11} J. W. Fraser, \textit{Schooling the Preachers: The Development of Protestant Theological Education in the U.S. 1740-1875} (Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1988) 61.
\end{itemize}
reporting the results of research initiated by the American Association of Theological Schools and financed by the Carnegie Corporation, describe the role of tradition in establishing curriculum in theological schools. “Certain studies have always formed the foundation of the course because they stem from the scripture and tradition of the Christian faith. Study of the Bible, the history of doctrine, the history of the church, are established elements in all theological education.”\textsuperscript{12}

The authors maintain that, at the time of their writing, curriculum in the content areas of practical ministry in the local church was not well defined or developed. “The disciplines related to pastoral responsibilities, Homiletics, Pastoral Care, Church Administration, and Religious Education, are somewhat less sharply defined as to content and method of teaching.”\textsuperscript{13} Their research did affirm a growing percentage of faculty in theological education prepared by pastoral or other church based professional experience when compared to a similar 1930 study. In 1957 they reported 77\% having pastoral experience. Demands on academic preparation had also increased.\textsuperscript{14} The authors do not mention leadership as a course of study in their inquiry, although they do give brief attention to administration, perhaps not clearly discerning between leadership and administration.

The same authors in their first volume, \textit{The Purpose of the Church and Its Ministry}, had cited the problem of clarification of the churches mission and its link to theological curriculum. They maintain, in their second publication, this is the

\begin{footnotes}
\item[13] Ibid., p.79.
\item[14] Ibid., 16-20.
\end{footnotes}
primary problem presented to faculties in designing curriculum.\textsuperscript{15} They cite two exemplary theological schools that provide models, in their evaluation, of curriculum design. One is The Federated Theological Faculty at the University of Chicago with a traditional core curriculum organized around seven areas, none of which speaks, in their appraisal, to the practice of professional ministry. The second, which receives more detailed investigation, is that of the Perkins School of Theology at Southern Methodist University, organized around four areas of study, one being the local church. It is in this context that mention is made of emphasis on church administration. “The Perkins plan”, the authors note, “allows an adjustment for the student who takes Hebrew and Greek, though he must use some of his elective time for this.”\textsuperscript{16}

Niebuhr, Williams, and Gustafson sought responses in their inquiry from persons in pastoral ministry regarding what they saw as lacking in their ministerial preparation. “The surveyors,” they reported, “received a remarkably consistent testimony from ministers as to the need for some imaginative new approaches to church administration. The American church depends in part upon skilful organization to maintain its effectiveness as a Christian community. Many of the conspicuous examples of ministerial failure which were reported to us had to do with ineptness in handling organizational problems.”\textsuperscript{17} The authors suggest the solution to the need should be addressed by new developments, but stop short of specific curriculum models or recommendations.

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid, 80.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., 85
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid., 106.
Francis S. Fiorenza has described three prevalent theories of how men and women are trained for ministerial service.\(^{18}\) He suggests that Edward Farley represents one approach. Farley asserts that the compartmentalization of theology in seminary education has fragmented the clerical paradigm. He urges seminaries to focus on knowing God as the object of theological education.\(^{19}\) Farley states: “Theology has long since disappeared as the unity, subject matter, and the end of clergy education and this disappearance is responsible more than anything else for the problematic character of that education as a course of study.”\(^{20}\) Farley goes on to assert that theological inquiry should be the sole focus of graduate theological education.

H. Richard Niebuhr represents a second approach in Fiorenza’s model. Niebuhr, as has been previously cited, urges that the mission of the church define the substance of theological education. Fiorenza cites the problems Niebuhr sees with the separation of theology from ministry in the local church. He reported in the 1955 study that most seminary presidents, deans, and professors in practical theology had some pastoral experience, but it was no longer a consistent expectation in areas of theology.\(^{21}\) Like Farley, Neibuhr finds ministry education to be so compartmentalized that it contributes confusion to the identity of the pastor.\(^{22}\) “Our schools, like our churches and our ministers, have no clear conception of what they are doing but are carrying on traditional actions, making

\(^{18}\) F. S. Fiorenza, “Thinking Theologically About Theological Education” Theological Education, 24.
\(^{22}\) Ibid., 48-54.
separate responses to various pressures exerted by churches and society,
contriving uneasy compromises among values, trying to improve their work by
adjusting major parts of the academic machine or by changing the specifications
of the raw materials to be treated.”

Niebuhr links the purpose of the seminary to
that of the church, and suggests that the church must clearly understand its
mission in order for the seminary to provide unity within theological education.

Fiorenza sees a third approach represented by James Glasse. Glasse
sees seminaries as providing professional development for ministry. Turner
describes this vision of Glasse: “Glasse, in his book Profession: Ministry lists five
characteristics of a profession and claims that all five can be found in formal
ministry: first, a specific area of knowledge; second, expertise in a cluster of
skills; third, service through a specific social institution; fourth, accepted
standards of competence and ethics; and fifth, specific values and purposes of
the profession for society.”

It is relevant to note that at least three approaches to developing leaders
for the church are apparent in seminary education: 1) knowing God as the object
of seminary education, 2) the substance of theological education is defined by
the mission of the church, and 3) seminaries exist to provide professional
development for ministry.

Criticism of seminary curriculum in the discipline of leadership
development is an apparent theme in current literature. George Barna writes: “It
is worth noting that among the relatively few pastors we interviewed who felt they

23 H. Richard Niebuhr, The Purpose of the Church and Its Ministry (San Francisco: Harper and Row,
1956), 46.
24 Turner, 25.
had the gift of leadership, none of them said the seminary prepared them very well for their responsibilities of leadership they have since encountered in ministry.”

He presses his assertion in the summary of his research, “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 tangible 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.”

Standing on the Banks of Tomorrow!, a report from a conference of evangelical pastors and seminary deans, is critical of seminary curriculum, describing it as preparing people for ministry in the church of the 50’s rather than the church of the 90’s. The report cites the failure to market leadership, train for leadership, teach relational leadership skills, strategic planning, visioning, and change process.

Solutions are, of course, frequently offered. The Association of Theological Schools conducted a study of 4,995 lay and clergy people in the mid 1970’s that defined eleven areas of ministry organization. The study revealed that while skills and knowledge were important, issues of character were the priority in the eyes of the church, and should guide seminary curriculum.

The call for integration of apprenticeship in theological training is frequent. In 1992 J. Reed suggested church-based training for ministers similar to the
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26 Ibid., 137.
27 C. Weese, Standing on the Banks of Tomorrow! (Granada Hills, Ca.: Multi-Staff Ministries), 26-33.
apprenticeships prior to the formalizing of theological education. The Biblical Institute for Leadership Development is developing curriculum for such church based leadership development programs, he reports.\textsuperscript{29}

Alan Nelson, in his dissertation \textit{Leadership Training of Ministerial Students in Evangelical Institutions of Higher Education} surveyed the programs of 77 undergraduate liberal arts colleges offering majors in theology and 64 graduate seminaries. All were institutions operated by or affiliated with protestant denominations in America. All the programs investigated were designated as designed for pastoral candidates. Only six were found to support leadership development with two or more required courses in leadership theory or practice, and only three were judged after examination by an expert panel to offer significant emphasis on leadership development.\textsuperscript{30} He concludes from several research methodologies that evangelical institutions do not effectively prepare pastors to lead.\textsuperscript{31} Nelson suggests a new curriculum, constructed in collaboration with leading seminary educators and church pastors, with major emphasis on leadership development.

Turner implemented several focus groups and panels for reflection in the process of his research and thus asserts his recommendations reflect the vision of the church. He recommends continuation of the traditional MDiv. as a practical necessity for persons wanting to teach or do theological research, while creating a new program for the “reflective practitioner”. The new program would have 90

\textsuperscript{30} Nelson, 71-82.
\textsuperscript{31} Ibid, 165.
or more credits, 75% in the practice of ministry, with faculty who were engaged in ministry.32

Clouzet cites studies examining the effectiveness of preparation for Seventh-day Adventist pastors at the SDA theological seminary. He describes Edward Dower’s 1980 doctoral research revealing that of fifty items ranked lowest in preparation for ministry by Adventist seminary graduates 44 were ministerial skill items, and none were scholarly skills. Two thirds of the respondents appealed for more practical preparation. In 1986 a report on student evaluations was reported to the Ministerial Training Advisory Council. Three years earlier, Clouzet reports, the MDiv. Curriculum had changed to the “first truly professional curriculum.” Still, of the nineteen factors rated, practical emphasis was rated lowest by the respondents.

A 1988 study on pastoral effectiveness by Roger Dudley and David Dennis again showed that preparation for ministry was viewed as strong in academics but weak in practical training and spiritual formation. The study also indicated that the value of seminary education was significantly increased when preceded by two years of ministerial internship. A further investigation was undertaken by Dudley in 1995 and published by the Institute of Church Ministry.33 The results on preparation for ministry still received low scores, though somewhat better than in the past. In a 1996 assessment provided by the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Clouzet reports, 63.5% of the students indicated high satisfaction with the practical usefulness of their training.

32 Turner, 111-113.
It is the first time practical preparation for ministry is indicated as satisfactory by a majority of students.\(^{34}\)

The literature invites expansion of the question of this research. The Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary at Andrews University presently requires one course in leadership of its Master of Divinity students. Do today’s seminary graduates experience an effective preparation for ministry leadership? Does theological inquiry in itself form a person who is a more effective learner, and who thus accommodates the leadership challenges of local church ministry more readily?

**Methodology**

The purpose of this second stage of research is to assess and analyze the effect of graduate education on the leadership practices of persons in pastoral ministry in the Seventh-day Adventist church. Do seminary graduates typically possess greater leadership skills than pastors who have received only undergraduate training?

In order to investigate a possible differentiation, it was necessary to identify two groups of pastors who could be contrasted. This was done by a purposive selection process. First a number of local conferences or judicatories were selected. The Seventh-day Adventist church in the United States and Canada is organized into 56 local conferences, and 27, or nearly half, were chosen from which to select the pastors for the two groups.

\(^{34}\) Clouzet, 268-274.
The selection process was not random but done in a manner that ensured that every one of the nine union conferences (organizations supervising the local conferences) incorporated three local conferences. In addition to geographic diversity, the selection included conferences of different sizes—from large to small—and four regional or Black conferences. The pool from which to draw names is thus highly representative of the Adventist church in North America.

The next step was to write to the ministerial director of each of the 27 conferences. This individual supervises pastoral work in the local conference and thus is in a good position to know the training and qualifications of the ministers in that field. The director was asked to supply the names of five pastors who possessed graduate theological education and five who did not—if the conference had as many as five in each category. We asked for pastors with from four to ten years of ministry experience in each category. A form to collect the information was included. After many telephone calls and e-mail messages, 26 of the 27 directors returned lists.

All lists did not have the full ten names, and some of the names were of associate pastors who would not fit into the rating scheme. After eliminating these names our final list included 200 pastors. We then identified their congregation or principal congregation in cases where their district encompassed more than one church. From lists of lay officers for each congregation, we selected three prominent names—the head elder, the personal ministries director, and the youth leader. It was assumed that these three officers, being vitally involved in the operation of the congregation, would be in a good position to observe the leadership skills of their pastor.
The instrument chosen to rate the leadership skills was the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) developed by James Kouzez and Barry Pozner.\textsuperscript{35} The LPI consists of 30 descriptions of behavior. The observer is asked to rate the pastor on each behavior using a ten-point scale from “almost never” to “almost always.” Answers are then aggregated into five scales of six responses each. The scales are: (1) Challenging the Process, (2) Inspiring a Shared Vision, (3) Enabling Others to Act, (4) Modeling the Way, and (5) Encouraging the Heart. In addition we requested some personal information from the raters such as gender, length of time as an Adventist, ethnic background, level of formal education, and age group.

The LPI was mailed to 600 lay leaders, but 90 came back as “addressee unknown” or party moved and left no forwarding address. We assumed then that 510 surveys were actually delivered to the intended target. A second mailing was implemented weeks later to those who had not responded. We received back 286 surveys or about 56% of those delivered. Of these 160 rated pastors who possess a graduate theological degree, and 126 rated pastors with only undergraduate education.

For each rating sheet we summed the scores for the six variables that comprised each of the five practices to establish a total score for that practice. We also summed the totals of each of the five leadership practices to develop a master leadership scale. The t-
test for the difference between independent means was employed to determine significant differences between the two groups of pastors on each of the five leadership practices as well as on the total leadership score. We also correlated the leadership scores with various demographic items.

Findings

Again, the purpose of this second stage of research is to assess and analyze the effect of graduate theological education on the leadership practices of persons in pastoral ministry in the Seventh-day Adventist church. Do seminary graduates in Adventist ministry typically possess greater leadership skills than pastors who have received only undergraduate training?

Our research, while showing a slight consistent variation, finds no significant difference in leadership skills between the two groups. These current results are consistent with earlier studies and the conclusions of researchers over the past 50 years as reported in the literature review.

The t-tests for independent means are displayed in table 1. Each of the 30 items was scored 1 to 10. The value of each scale was the mean of the items answered.

There were no extremes: all these means ranged in the sixes and sevens. Finally, we added the five means for each group and arrived at a combined leadership mean.
### TABLE 1
**COMPARISONS OF PASTORS WHO HAVE GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION WITH THOSE WHO DO NOT ON FIVE LEADERSHIP PRACTICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Practice</th>
<th>Mean of Pastors with Graduate Education</th>
<th>Mean of Pastors without Graduate Education</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHALLENGING THE PROCESS</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSPIRING A SHARED VISION</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENABLING OTHERS TO ACT</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODELING THE WAY</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENCOURAGING THE HEART</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMBINED LEADERSHIP</td>
<td>36.79</td>
<td>35.83</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows that on every practice and on the combined scores, the means are somewhat higher for those with graduate theological education than for those without it. However, it also shows that none of these differences is statistically significant.
Therefore, we must conclude that this study demonstrates no significant difference in leadership practices between the two groups.

What does the research indicate? The most evident learning is that the findings are consistent with earlier research. While we may have wished to discover improvement, no significant change in the impact of leadership formation through graduate theological education has been discovered.

It is important to recognize the time frame referenced in this research. The pastoral samples were of persons with from four to 10 years of ministerial experience. This means the research measures the formative effect of theological education delivered to a pastoral population in the final decade of the 20th century. Significant curriculum adjustments made at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary in 1999 or later would have no effect on this study.

It should be further noted that current and recent past requirements in leadership courses in the curriculum of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary reflect the norm in graduate theological education. Only one required 2 credit course in leadership is included in the MDiv curriculum at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary.36

A reader can question reliability. The task assigned to the lay leaders is, after all, a subjective one. While the reliability of the assessment instrument has been well established37, a number of factors could influence the respondents. Examples might be local contextual factors such as economy or demographic shifts, church conflicts, or
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36 Note the findings and recommendations of Alan Nelson referenced earlier in this report
37 A technical presentation of the Leadership Practices Inventory may be obtained from the authors at www.kouzesposner.com.
generational differences between the pastor and congregation, any of which may impact church health, and may bias the perspectives of effective leadership unfairly.

Another possibility is that some factor other than education is influencing the ratings. We asked lay leaders to indicate their age groups as follows: (1) under 25, (2) 25-39, (3) 40-54, (4) 55-65, and (5) over 65. We then correlated the ages with scores they gave to the pastor’s leadership practices. The results are shown in table 2.

### TABLE 2

**CORRELATIONS OF PERCEIVED LEADERSHIP PRACTICES WITH AGE GROUP OF RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Practice</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHALLENGING THE PROCESS</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSPIRING A SHARED VISION</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENABLING OTHERS TO ACT</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODELING THE WAY</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Four of the leadership practices and the combined leadership scores are correlated with age. The correlation coefficients are quite modest, but with the exception of challenging the process all are significant beyond the .05 level, and two practices and the combined total reach the .01 level. Older members tend to rate pastors higher, and this could introduce an influence into the education/non-education equation.

Still, the most obvious conclusion is that graduate theological education is not doing a superior job of developing leadership practices. Since we know from part one of this research that the use of superior leadership practices does predict pastoral success, then, certainly, leadership development should be a concern of seminary education.

Alan Nelson’s review of seminaries in America\textsuperscript{38} found that only three institutions demonstrated significant emphasis on leadership development. We wish to continue the research question by observing graduates of those programs and examining those leadership curriculums. Recent developments in learning theory and the field of leadership studies can provide a prescriptive base and inform change as the challenges of providing superior pastoral leadership for the church are met in the future.