LEADERSHIP FORMATION IN MINISTERIAL EDUCATION—PART 2: THE IMPACT OF GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION ON LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN THE LOCAL PASTORATE

SKIP BELL AND ROGER DUDLEY
Andrews University

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of graduate theological education, Part 1 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 noted that the Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) Church in its North American Division (NAD)[3] expects pastors to complete a Master of Divinity (M.Div.) program prior to their ordination.[4] The church

---

[1]Skip Bell and Roger Dudley, "Leadership Formation in Ministerial Education—Part 1: Assessment and Analysis of Leadership Traits in Seventh-Day Adventist Pastors in North America," *AUSS* 40 (2002): 277-299.

[2]Ibid., 290.

[3]The North American Division (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

expects graduate-level ministerial education to contribute to the preparation of a candidate for professional ministry.

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 SDA 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 examined in the next research stage, is to discover specifically what in graduate theological education contributes to that development and, subsequently, make those findings available to those involved in the process of designing seminary experience.

This current research will establish a benchmark for SDA pastors in North America, from which new educational programs and student progress can be measured. The degree of correlation between the M.Div. 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 M.Div. 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 ἐκκλησία, translated as "church," corresponds to the Hebrew *qahal*, meaning a meeting of the people summoned together. "We first read of the ἐκκλησία in Jerusalem, which is explicitly referred to as such in Acts 8:1. In Acts 7:38 the people of Israel, led through the desert by Moses, is called ἐκκλησία."[5] The NT church was commissioned to witness, to lead people to Jesus for salvation, and to make disciples. At his ascension, Jesus commissioned the disciples: "Go therefore and make disciples of all 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" (Matt 28:18-19, RSV). The church was to witness in the power of the Holy Spirit (Acts 1:8). All

---

place pastors and ordain them without a graduate degree. Some of these pastors later continue their study in a master's-level extension program offered by the Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) Theological Seminary.

[5]K. K. L. Schmidt, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. G. Kittel, G. W. Bromiley, and G. Friedrich (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 3:504.

believers are called (*klesis*) and gifted for ministry (Eph 4:1; Rom 1:1, 6; 1 Cor 12:4-5). So the Christian church is a called-out community of ministering believers in Christ.

Specific ministries within the body are also delineated. Paul described overseers (*episkopes*, 1Tim 3:1), persons chosen from the congregation for distinct ministry and who were confirmed in their ministry by the laying-on of hands (Acts 6:5). Titus was encouraged to appoint elders in every city (Titus 1:5). When the church needed to resolve issues in its life or mission, it counseled with the "apostles and elders concerning this issue" (Acts 15:2-6). The NT church was served by leaders within its community. Instructed by the biblical teaching of servant leadership, this ministry 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: "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."[6] In expanding the goal, thirteen points are developed in the *ATS Bulletin*, including: 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 is required in ministerial training. But has leadership development been provided for in seminary curriculum?

Alan E. Nelson describes the development 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. For instance, Justin Martyr founded a school in Rome in the second century, but it was 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. Following his program, the majority of priests until the time of the Reformation had no university-level theological training. In 1563, the Council of Trent decreed the establishment of seminaries where the theology of the church was to be taught. Thus, seminaries were a response to the erosion of orthodoxy.[7]

---

[6]ATS Bulletin (Pittsburgh, PA: Association of Theological Schools, June, 1992), 38.

[7]Alan E. Nelson, *Leadership Training of Ministerial Students in Evangelical Institutions of Higher Education* (Ed.D. dissertation, University of San Diego, 1994), 52-54.

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 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's institution of a similar position. Curriculum emphasis continued to be in the area of theology, while preparation for ministry was by apprenticeship. The first distinct theological seminary in North America was established 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 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."[8]

D. E. Messer notes the need for higher education enterprises committed to critical and creative theological teaching, scholarship, and research. He asserts these needs were not always self-evident to the church.[9] T. Christopher Turner finds that the development of seminaries was 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, thus, often entangled in controversy.[10]

---

[8]Ron E. M. Clouzet, *A Biblical Paradigm for Ministerial Training* (D.Min. dissertation, Fuller Theological Seminary, 1997), 206.

[9]D. E. Messer, *Calling Church and Seminary into the 21ˢᵗ Century* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1995).

[10]T. Christopher Turner, *Seminary Practice and Ministerial Realities: A Dichotomy that*

J. W. Fraser, tracking the development of theological education in America in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, suggests that the twentieth century was not creative in developing formal education for ministry. He asserts that no new patterns in theological education have emerged since the establishment of seminaries. Seminaries provide theological education, with the congregation serving as the primary setting for practical training in ministry.[11]

H. Richard Niebuhr, Daniel Day Williams, and James M. Gustafson 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."[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.[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 1955, they reported, 77 percent of ministerial faculty had pastoral experience. The authors state that while it is difficult to give reliable comparisons with similar studies of faculties in 1930, they conclude from several indicators that the percentage of pastoral experience among ministerial faculty had grown significantly. Demands on academic preparation had also increased.[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.

Niebuhr, Williams, and Gustafson also cited the problem of clarification of the church's mission and its link to theological curricula. They maintain that these are the primary problems in designing curriculum.[15] To support their thesis, they cite two exemplary theological schools that provide models, in their evaluation, of curriculum design: The Federated Theological Faculty at the University of Chicago, with a

---

Calls for Change (Ph.D. dissertation, Washington State University, 2001), 24-25.

[11]J. W. Fraser, *Schooling the Preachers: The Development of Protestant Theological Education in the U.S., 1740-1875* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1988), 61.

[12]H. Richard Niebuhr, Daniel Day Williams, and James M. Gustafson, *The Advancement of Theological Education* (New York: Harper and Row, 1957), 78.

[13]Ibid., 79.

[14]Ibid., 16-20.

[15]Ibid., 80.

traditional core curriculum organized around seven areas, none of which speaks, in their appraisal, to the practice of professional ministry; and the Perkins School of Theology at Southern Methodist University, organized around four areas of study, one being the local church. The emphasis on church administration is reflected in the seminary's handbook: "The Perkins plan allows an adjustment for the student who takes Hebrew and Greek, though he must use some of his elective time for this."[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 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 skillful 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."[17] The authors suggest the solution to this need should be addressed by new developments, but stop short of specific curriculum models or recommendations.

Francis S. Fiorenza has described three prevalent theories of how men and women are trained for ministerial service.[18] The first approach, developed by Edward Farley, asserts that the compartmentalization of theology in seminary education has fragmented the clerical paradigm. Urging 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

---

[16]Ibid., 85.

[17]Ibid., 106.

[18]F. S. Fiorenza, "Thinking Theologically About Theological Education," *Theological Education* 24 (1988), Suppl. 2: 89-119.

[19]Edward Farley, *The Fragility of Knowledge: Theological Education in the Church and University* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988).

[20]E. Farley, *Theologica: The Fragmentation and Unity of Theological Education* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), ix.

problems Niebuhr sees with the separation of theology from ministry in the local church. He reported 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, Niebuhr finds ministry education to be so compartmentalized that it contributes confusion to the identity of the pastor.[22] He notes that "our schools, like our churches and our ministers, have no clear conception of what they are doing but are carrying on traditional actions, making 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."[23] 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's third approach is represented by James Glasse, who sees seminaries as providing professional development for ministry. Turner notes that Glasse "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."[24]

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

Criticism of seminary curriculum in the discipline of leadership development is an apparent theme in literature. George Barna writes: "It is worth noting that among the relatively few pastors we interviewed who felt they 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."[25] He presses his assertion in his

[21]H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Advancement of Theological Education* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), 19.

[22]Ibid., 48-54.

[23]H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Purpose of the Church and Its Ministry* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1956), 46.

[24]Turner, 25.

[25]George Barna, *Today's Pastors* (Ventura, CA: Regal, 1993), 126.

summary: "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."[26]

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 1950s rather than the church of the 1990s. The report cites the failure to market and train for leadership and to teach relational leadership skills, strategic planning, visioning, and change process.[27]

Solutions are, of course, frequently offered. The Association of Theological Schools conducted a study of 4,995 lay and clergy people in the mid-1970s that defined eleven areas of ministry organization. The study revealed that while skills and knowledge were important, issues of character were the priority to members of the church and should guide seminary curriculum.[28]

The call for integration of apprenticeship in theological training is frequent. In 1992, J. Reed suggested church-based training for ministers similar to the apprenticeships prior to the formalizing of theological education. The Biblical Institute for Leadership Development is developing curriculum for such church-based leadership development programs.[29]

Nelson 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 described as being designed for pastoral candidates. Only six were found to support leadership development, with two or more required courses in leadership theory or practice; only three were judged, after examination by an expert panel, to offer significant emphasis on leadership

---

[26]Ibid., 137.

[27]C. Weese, *Standing on the Banks of Tomorrow!* (Granada Hills, CA: Multi-Staff Ministries, 1993), 26-33.

[28]David S. Schiller, Merton P. Strommen, and Milo Brekke, eds., *Ministry in America* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1980).

[29]J. Reed, "Church Based Theological Education: Creating a New Paradigm" (Unpublished paper presented at the North American Professors of Christian Education Conference, Dallas, Texas, 1992).

development.[30] Nelson concludes that evangelical institutions do not effectively prepare pastors to lead.[31] He 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 that his recommendations reflect the vision of the church. He advises the continuation of the traditional M.Div. 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 or more credits, 75 percent in the practice of ministry, with faculty who were actively engaged in ministry.[32]

Clouzet cites studies examining the effectiveness of preparation for 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 SDA 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 SDA M.Div. 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, in which the results on preparation for ministry still received low scores, though they were somewhat better than in the past.[33] In a 1996 assessment provided by the SDA Theological Seminary, 63.5 percent of the students indicated high satisfaction with the practical usefulness of their training. It was the first time practical preparation for SDA ministry was indicated as satisfactory by a majority of students.[34]

[30]Nelson, 71-82.

[31]Ibid, 165.

[32]Turner, 111-113.

[33]Roger Dudley, *An Evaluation of the Master of Divinity Program by Graduates of 1988 and 1993* (Berrien Springs: Institute of Church Ministry, 1995).

[34]Clouzet, 268-274.

Currently the SDA Theological Seminary at Andrews University requires one course in leadership of its M.Div. students.

However, the question remains, 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 SDA graduate education on the leadership practices of persons in pastoral ministry in the SDA 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 accomplished by selecting a number of local conferences or judicatories. The SDA Church in the United States and Canada is organized into 56 local conferences. Pastors were chosen from 27 of these.

The process of selection was not random, but was done in a manner that ensured that all of the nine NAD union conferences[35] selected pastors from three local conferences within each union's jurisdiction. In addition to geographic diversity, the selection included conferences of different sizes and four regional or Black conferences. The pool from which to draw names is thus highly representative of the SDA Church in North America.

The next step was to write to the ministerial director of each of the selected 27 conferences. The ministerial director supervises pastoral work in the local conference and thus is in a good position to know the training and qualifications of the ministers in his 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 four to ten years of ministry experience in each category. A form to collect the information was included. Twenty-six of the 27 directors provided data.

Not all of the data supplied by ministerial directors met the necessary criteria for this study, e.g., some did not provide ten names. In addition, some of the names were of associate pastors, who were not included in the study. After eliminating these names, the final list included 200 pastors. We then identified their congregations, or principal congregations in cases

---

[35]Union conferences supervise clusters of local conferences.

where a district encompassed more than one church. Lay officers, who held the positions of head elder, personal ministries director, and youth leader, for each congregation were selected. 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.[36] The LPI consists of thirty 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: Challenging the Process, Inspiring a Shared Vision, Enabling Others to Act, Modeling the Way, and Encouraging the Heart. In addition, we requested some personal information from the raters, such as gender, length of time as an SDA, ethnic background, level of formal education, and age group.

The LPI was mailed to 600 lay leaders, but 90 were returned 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 several weeks later to those who had not responded. A total of 286 surveys were returned, approximately 56 percent of those delivered. Of these, 160 evaluated pastors who possessed a graduate theological degree and 126 evaluated pastors who had only an undergraduate education.

For each rating sheet the scores for the six variables that comprised each of the five practices were summed to establish a total score for that practice. In addition, the totals of each of the five leadership practices were summed 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. Finally, the leadership scores were correlated with various demographic items.

Findings

The purpose of this second stage of research was to assess and analyze the effect of graduate theological education on the leadership practices

of persons in pastoral ministry in the SDA Church. Do seminary graduates in SDA 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 fifty 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, the five means for each group were added, arriving at a combined leadership mean.

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 discovery 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 SDA 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 four to ten 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 twentieth century. Significant curriculum adjustments made at the SDA 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 SDA Theological Seminary reflect the norm in graduate theological education. Only one required two-credit course in leadership is currently included in the M.Div. curriculum at the SDA Theological Seminary.[37]

In regard to reliability, the task assigned to the lay leaders was subjective. While the reliability of the assessment instrument has been

---

[37]Note the findings and recommendations of Alan Nelson referenced earlier in this report.

well established,[38] a number of factors could influence the respondents. Examples might be local contextual factors such as economic or demographic shifts, church conflicts, or generational differences between the pastor and congregation, any of which may impact church health and may bias the perspectives of effective leadership unfairly.

Table 1
Comparisons of Pastors Who Have Graduate Theological Education with Those Who Do Not on Five Leadership Practices

Leadership Practice	Mean of Pastors Graduate Education	Mean of Pastors No Graduate Education	Significance
Challenging the process	6.83	6.62	.39
Inspiring a shared vision	7.34	7.18	.52
Enabling others to act	7.79	7.50	.19
Modeling the way	7.48	7.47	.97
Encouraging the heart	7.35	7.06	.21
Combined leadership	36.79	35.83	.38

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

Four of the leadership practices and the combined leadership scores were correlated with age. The correlation coefficients are quite modest, but with the exception of challenging the process all are significant beyond the .05 level, with two practices and the combined total reaching the .01 level. Older members tend to rate pastors higher, which could influence the education/noneducation equation.

[38]A technical presentation of the Leadership Practices Inventory may be obtained from the authors at www.kouzesposner.com.

Still, the most obvious conclusion is that graduate theological education is not doing a superior job of developing leadership practices.

Table 2
Correlations of Perceived Leadership Practices
with Age Group Respondents

Leadership Practice	Pearson Correlation	Significance
Challenging the process	.11	.07
Inspiring a shared vision	.15	.01
Enabling others to act	.13	.03
Modeling the way	.15	.01
Encouraging the heart	.12	.04
Combined leadership	.14	.01

Since we know from Part 1 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.

Nelson found in his review of American seminaries that only three institutions demonstrated significant emphasis on leadership development.[39] We wish to continue the research question by observing graduates of those programs and examining those leadership curricula. 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.

[39]Nelson.