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The objective of the study was to determine whether pastors of high growth churches in the Lake Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists were more effective leaders than those pastors who served in low growth churches. The answer to this query was recognized as having implications for the pre-service and in-service training of pastors and in the periodic evaluation of their performance. The Lake Union Conference is an administrative body that oversees the work of the Church in five local conference units, namely, Illinois, Indiana, Lake Region, Michigan, and Wisconsin.

In the literature on effective leadership, there is consistent support for the view that the effective leader makes a difference in the situation (Bass, 1981; Bennis & Nanus, 1985). A previous study on church growth in the Lake Union Conference (Oosterwal, 1976) however, showed that in the churches surveyed, the pastors were directly responsible for little of the membership growth occurring in their churches. This finding seemed to be conflicting and led to a recommendation for this study.
Fifty pastors and their fifty first elders were sampled in this study. The sample was equally divided to represent high growth and low growth churches. Growth was defined as the percentage membership increase (baptisms and profession of faith) over a two-year period. The leader behaviors of the pastors were recorded by the pastors and their first elders using a standardized instrument, the Leader Behavior Questionnaire. The overall response rate was 86 percent for the pastors and 74 percent for the elders.

Ten null hypotheses were tested in this study. The data were analyzed using one-way ANOVAs and Pearson r's. The results showed that there was no significant difference in the behaviors of pastors of high growth and low growth churches in the Lake Union Conference. A positive relationship was recorded between the visionary ability of the leader and his follower-centered leader style. Pastors from the Lake Region Conference scored significantly higher than pastors from all the other local conferences except Michigan. No significant differences were noted in the matched scores of the pastors and their first elders. Based on these findings, several recommendations were made for further study.
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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Background to the Problem

The Seventh-day Adventist Church (SDA) was founded with a mission to persuade as many people as possible to adopt its religious world-view and its life-style (Minis­
terial Association, 1977). The organization has grown in size and complexity since its early beginnings in 1863. From 3,500 adherents then, the church in December 1984 had a world membership of over 4.5 million in 184 countries (Thompson, 1985).

According to the United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census (1983), the United States general popula­tion increased approximately 11.4 percent during the latest 10-year population study (1970-1980). Maloney and Phillips (1984) indicated that between 1973 and 1983 the membership in Protestant churches in the United States increased about 40 percent. The level of growth in the Seventh-day Advent­ist (SDA) church could be seen from the fact that for the same period as the Maloney and Phillips study (1973-1983), the SDA church membership grew approximately 34 percent in the United States, according to the Seventh-day Adventist church's 121st Annual Statistical Report--1983 (Seventh-day
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Adventists, 1984). In Table 1, data on membership growth by world divisions for the period 1979 to 1983 are provided. The North American Division includes the United States and Canada.

In harmony with the global mission of the church and its commitment to growth, the local Seventh-day Adventist church functions as a reproductive cell in a community with the goal of encouraging as many people as possible to enter and remain within its fold. Tippett (1970) described this goal as representing a concern for "quantitative and qualitative growth" (p. 25). But in his speech to the Caribbean Club at Andrews University, Thompson, the executive secretary of the world church compressed the goal even further to represent primarily a concern for qualitative growth, but he added: "We want quality in the quantity" (1986). The frequent global emphasis in the Church on the "1,000 days of Reaping," "Harvest 90," and so forth give additional support to this quantitative focus for church growth within the organization.

Since the growth of the denomination as a whole is so inexorably linked to the growth activities of the local church, the optimum functioning of the local unit will be expected to be a priority item within the organization. The central role of the leader in this process cannot be underestimated.

The SDA church pastor is an ordained or licensed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa-Indian Ocean</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>362,873</td>
<td>391,000</td>
<td>437,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australasian</td>
<td>137,215</td>
<td>142,010</td>
<td>147,522</td>
<td>154,026</td>
<td>161,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Africa&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>217,252</td>
<td>225,542</td>
<td>239,941</td>
<td>263,569</td>
<td>284,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euro-Africa</td>
<td>249,148</td>
<td>258,167</td>
<td>229,137</td>
<td>238,125</td>
<td>250,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far Eastern</td>
<td>402,087</td>
<td>430,313</td>
<td>454,170</td>
<td>483,361</td>
<td>505,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-America</td>
<td>606,567</td>
<td>646,969</td>
<td>685,832</td>
<td>737,791</td>
<td>774,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern European&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>123,644</td>
<td>138,582</td>
<td>42,014</td>
<td>42,570</td>
<td>43,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>465,054</td>
<td>496,954</td>
<td>534,561</td>
<td>564,944</td>
<td>608,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Asia</td>
<td>101,657</td>
<td>106,929</td>
<td>117,418</td>
<td>128,326</td>
<td>139,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans-Africa</td>
<td>352,349</td>
<td>369,454</td>
<td>179,886</td>
<td>197,379</td>
<td>220,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East Union</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2,888</td>
<td>2,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>21,168</td>
<td>21,168</td>
<td>21,168</td>
<td>21,168</td>
<td>21,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDA Church in USSR</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>30,604</td>
<td>30,344</td>
<td>30,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,308,191</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,480,518</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,668,087</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,897,814</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,140,206</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Afro-Mideast Division became the Eastern Africa Division, January 1, 1982, except for the Middle East Union which is attached to the General Conference. Became the Northern European Division, January 1, 1981. China—1951 figures. USSR—Accurate figures begin in 1981.
minister assigned to a church or district by the local conference committee and paid by that conference (General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1976). He is the leader of the church and assists the lay officers in carrying out the mission of the church. The Manual for Ministers (Ministerial Association, 1977) stated that the pastor is responsible for "overseeing and fostering all branches of the work" (p. 43).

To carry out his functions, the pastor is expected to rely on the use of personal influence rather than the power invested in his position (General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1976). The Manual (Ministerial Association, 1977) indicated that the "church pastor should work in close cooperation with the local elder(s) and the church board, seeking counsel, planning and moving forward together" (p. 44). This Manual continued to state that the pastor who exercises independent judgment, making the decisions or announcing the future plans without such consultation and mingling of ideas, will find it difficult to secure the hearty cooperation of the church body (pp. 44-45).

Several agencies and instruments are employed by the church in attracting new believers into the fold. These include Sabbath school, church service, Bible study, association with SDA friends, Review and Herald and other SDA publications, mission activities, prayer and mediation, and, of course, the SDA minister (Oosterwal, 1976).
Oosterwal contended however, that while the prospective member is fortunate to have all these agencies to facilitate his conversion, the Church as an organization does not make enough use of this variety of agencies and instruments of church growth. (p. 64)

Oosterwal (1976) also found that the centralized programs of the organization failed to give adequate consideration to the great diversity that exists among local congregations and communities. He therefore saw as one of the consequences of his findings that the Church would stimulate local congregations to become more creative in developing programs that appeal to a much larger number of believers and prospective believers and that are much more geared towards particular local needs, resources, and challenges. (p. 65)

From a practical standpoint, Oosterwal's suggestion was consonant with the thinking in the larger society as posited by Naisbitt (1982). Two of Naisbitt's "megatrends" in society which have particular relevance here include the shift from centralization to decentralization and from institutional help to self-help. Naisbitt asserted that the prevailing attitudes indicated a greater interest in local affairs as opposed to national affairs. There was a greater concern for local needs, challenges, and opportunities. Oosterwal's thinking was therefore at the forefront of the views advanced by Naisbitt.
But this kind of shift only further highlighted the need for effective leadership of today's SDA church.

Engstrom (1976) asserted that:

the local church is the most complicated and sophisticated organism in the world. It is one thing to lead a group of people who depend upon the organization for livelihood. It is quite another to motivate a group when 99% are volunteers! (p. 14)

From his study of SDA church growth in the Lake Union Conference, Oosterwal (1976) noted:

a second general finding, and a rather shocking one at that, is that Adventist church growth in North America is so utterly dependent upon the minister (pastor) and the way he fulfills his role.... This finding really may force the church to take a hard and bold look at the role of the minister in the church. (p. 66)

From a review of the church's literature, several studies have been found which have looked in some way at the role of the local church pastor but none has yet addressed the issue of his leader behaviors and their role in the quantitative growth of the church. Two widely-circulated works on the pastor were Rhodes (1955, 1965) and Berg (1966). Both of these were focused on an administrative role for the pastor, seeing him more as the bureaucratic coordinator of procedures, services, and activities (Sashkin, 1986b), rather than the creative, visionary leader of a distinct organization. The emphasis was therefore at the operational rather than the organizational level to use Katz and Kahn's (1978) terminology.
Pierson (1966, 1978) were both more general on the theme of church leadership at all levels but the concepts presented there evolved from one man's value premises rather than from empirical research. Related studies by Brown (1977) and McBride (1984) underscored the role conflicts the SDA church pastor experiences in his role, much of these related to this whole issue of his leader role.

Wiggins (1979), in his study of the minister's locus of control and his evangelistic (quantitative growth) success, found that those who were more successful in evangelism were more responsive to the environment and could adopt more successfully to that environment. These ministers also saw themselves as being personally competent (p. 58).

Dudley and Cummings (1982) did a study of 172 pastors in North America to determine factors related to pastoral morale in the Seventh-day Adventist Church. They concluded that

pastoral morale is likely to be higher in congregations in which the lay members take an active part in the mission of the church. Where the church is united in its purposes, where the members set personal soul-winning goals, where members are actually responsible for bringing in new converts, and where the congregation has a self-image as a soul-winning church, there is a high probability of finding a happy and fulfilled pastor. (p. 137)

The studies cited above may be regarded as being representative of the church's thinking and they reflect the
importance of the role of the church pastor in church growth. The leader behaviors that will support the optimum achievement of this growth objective therefore needs to be studied.

The church growth literature in North America emphasizes the vital role played by church pastors in facilitating growth. Peter Wagner (1976) rated strong pastoral leadership as the first of the vital signs of a healthy, growing church. He wrote: "Vital Signs Number One of a healthy, growing church is a pastor who is a possibility thinker and whose dynamic leadership has been used to catalyse the entire church into action for growth" (p. 57).

Similarly, Gibbs (1981) noted that

his [the pastor's] sheer ability, love and dedication have earned him a place of authority in his church. This is not an authority of status invested by the ecclesiastical hierarchy, but generated from below, built up through living relationships with people. (p. 357)

The Southern Baptists tested out Wagner's seven vital signs in a study of 277 of their fastest growing churches in the United States and found that the pastors of the fifteen fastest growing churches were the undisputed leaders of their congregations. Seventy-eight percent of the lay persons interviewed from these top fifteen growth-oriented churches considered their pastor to be a strong leader.

More generally, however, Worley (quoted in Lindgren,
1977) of Chicago's McCormick Theological Seminary found that "it is strongly characteristic of Protestantism that the prophet-preaching and the sacramental roles have been emphasized while the kingly (organizational) governance of wise-rule (management) activity has been largely neglected" (p. 17). Lindgren (1977) himself commented that there is grave concern about the welfare of Christian organizations "because many church leaders carry out their organizational responsibilities more or less intuitively" (20).

In the wider field of leadership, Bennis and Nanus (1985) believed that

leadership is the pivotal force behind successful organizations and that to create vital and viable organizations, leadership is necessary to help organizations develop a new vision of what they can be, then mobilize the organization change toward the new vision. (pp. 2-3)

Oosterwal's (1976) study showed that the minister was directly responsible for 21 percent of the non-SDA's joining the church. The literature does suggest, however, and the members did state, as Oosterwal's study pointed out, that quantitative church growth could be improved if the pastor were to manifest the behaviors which foster the effective accomplishment of this goal. This is a summit goal for this organization and thus the behavioral role of the church pastor in the achievement of this major objective needs to be addressed.
The need was therefore seen for a study on the behavioral role of the local pastor in the SDA church. There was a need to bridge this gap in knowledge in the SDA church and this study was intended to fulfill that function. Specifically, this study looked at the relationships between the leader behaviors of SDA church pastors and the quantitative growth of their churches in the Lake Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. The behaviors were recorded by the pastors and their first elders utilizing a standardized instrument, the Leader Behavior Questionnaire (LBQ).

Quantitative church growth was measured by the percentage of baptisms and profession of faith over a two-year period (January 1, 1984 to December 31, 1985). Five pastors from the churches with the highest growth from every one of the five conferences of the Lake Union Conference formed the sample for this study.

Definition of Terms

An explanation of the following terms which have been used in this study may be helpful to the reader:

**Seventh-day Adventist (SDA):** An evangelical Protestant church with world headquarters in Takoma Park, Maryland. This church uses a representative form of government which espouses the democratic process in every facet of its operations (Seventh-day Adventists, 1981). There are five
steps leading from the individual believer to the worldwide organization of the work of the church.

1. The local church, a united organized body of individual believers. A pastor is appointed by the next level (the local conference or field) to serve each local church congregation.

2. The local conference or local field, a united organized body of churches in a state, province, or territory.

3. The union conference or union field, a united body of conferences, or fields within a large territory.

4. The division, a section of the General Conference, embracing local or union conferences or fields in larger areas of the world field.

5. The General Conference, the largest unit or organization, embracing all divisions and churches in all parts of the world (Seventh-day Adventists, 1981, p. 54).

Baptism: In the Seventh-day Adventist church baptism is by immersion only and is entered into only by a person that can cognitively understand the meaning of the rite. It is usually performed only after a person has the ability to make the decision for him/herself. The age of 12 is usually considered a typical age for baptism. It is primarily through baptism that a person becomes a church member.

Church membership: Membership in the Seventh-day Adventist Church is by the rite of baptism or profession of
faith. The latter is used only when a person is incapable of being baptized because of some physical condition, or when a person has previously been baptized into a Christian Protestant communion and wishes to express that commitment as espoused in the Adventist fellowship.

**Leadership:** Leadership is understood in this study to refer to an interaction process in which an individual influences the behavior of others toward a particular end. Such an individual is regarded as the leader for that particular objective.

**Leader effectiveness:** Effective leaders are identifiable by sustained high performance from their subordinates (individually and as an aggregate) as well as by sustained high performance in an organization sense (profits, return on investments, growth, etc.). They are, furthermore, personally successful in the sense of advancement, salary, and other extrinsic rewards, as well as in the intrinsic sense of having a positive self concept and seeing themselves as "self-actualizing" (or achieving their ideals) (Sashkin & Fulmer, 1985).

**Statement of the Problem**

The problem in this study was to establish the relationship between the leader behaviors of pastors and the quantitative growth of their churches in the Lake Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. Specifically, this
study sought an answer to the research question: Do pastors of high growth churches in the Lake Union Conference differ significantly in their leader behaviors from pastors of low growth churches?

Basic Assumptions

In order to achieve the purposes of this study, certain assumptions were made:

1. There were existing leader behaviors which could be identified, analyzed, described, and categorized.
2. There were leader behaviors that were common to all SDA church pastors in the Lake Union Conference.
3. The pastors were qualified to rate the extent of specific behaviors which they manifested.
4. First elders observed the behaviors of their pastors and were qualified to rate the extent of the occurrence of these behaviors.
5. The procedures utilized in this study were adequate for yielding data regarding the leader behaviors of SDA church pastors in the Lake Union Conference.

Research Design

The problem in this study was to establish the relationship between the leader behaviors of pastors and their church growth in the Lake Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. The variable leader behaviors was recorded by
the pastors and their first elders and was measured by the Leader Behavior Questionnaire instruments. Church growth had two levels, namely, high growth and low growth, and was measured by the percentage of baptisms and professions of faith in the church for a two-year period, January 1, 1984 to December 31, 1985.

The population of interest for this study was the church pastors within the Lake Union Conference. From this group, the sample of 50 church pastors, comprising 25 from the high growth churches in the five local conferences, and 25 from the low growth churches in the same five conferences, was drawn. The 50 first elders (local lay leaders) who served as the chief associates of these pastors were also invited to record their perceptions of the leader behaviors of their pastors.

The Lake Union Conference is an administrative body that coordinates the SDA work in four states: Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin. Permission to conduct this study was secured from the Lake Union Conference on March 11, 1986.

Limitation of the Study

Incorporating the research and the literature on leader behaviors into thinking about the role of the pastor is a pioneering field of inquiry for the Seventh-day Adventist Church, and even for the wider field of church leadership.
It is important to note that none of the traditional ways of looking at the church deals with its nature as an organization. Very few take note of organizational arrangements at all. Most do not even suggest, except indirectly, that the church is an organization. The traditional interest of Christians in the church has simply been of another kind. Their theological emphasis has been on the transcendent source of the church and its relationship with God through Christ, rather than on the organized ways in which Christians have gone about the church's business. (p. 23)

The study was therefore limited from the absence of precedence to serve as a guide. Further inquiry will doubtless build on the area of inquiry. The development of certain standards which may serve as a guide for the training of ministers and for a review of their subsequent performance could emanate from this field of research.

Another limitation is related to the nature of the study itself. The instrument used for the measurement of the leader behaviors of pastors surveyed a sample of specific leader behaviors in order to make an assessment of the leader's effectiveness. The totality of behaviors were not covered—a fact which is valid for any instrument that seeks to measure behaviors and attitudes. It is therefore possible for error to be present in the findings simply because the behaviors that made a significant difference were not included for measurement in the instrument.
Delimitations of the Study

This study did not address the role of the spiritual resources such as a divine call, prayer, Bible study, and the Holy Spirit in the leadership of the local church and in the attainment of its quantitative growth goals. The perspective here was that of a behavioral scientist, not a theologian. Support for this perspective came from Ellen White (1913), a well-respected church authority. She wrote that "the secret of success is the union of divine power with human effort" (p. 509). It was to enhance the quality of this human effort for the pastor and consequently for his membership that this study was undertaken.

Another delimitation related to the focusing in on the local church as an organization. The hierarchical structure of the church was considered to be tangential in this analysis. Also, while this researcher recognized the invaluable contributions lay leaders have made to the continuing leadership and growth of the church, they were not the primary focus of this study. The emphasis here was on the leader behaviors of the pastor. The implication, of course, is that a more effective church pastor will result in higher levels of performance from these lay leaders, and indeed from the entire congregation.
Significance of the Study

This study was initiated out of a recognition of the importance of the work of the local pastor. His role is critical to the overall growth of the organization for the only way one can unite with the world church is through the local church body, and the pastor is the head of that local unit. His optimum effectiveness will therefore be ultimately reflected in the growth patterns of the world body. Oosterwal (1976) confirmed that this has been a neglected area of concern in the church and this study was an attempt to bridge the gap.

From this exploratory study, it is hoped that further work in this area will be pursued, and that consequently, standards in the area of leader behaviors may be developed for the pre-service and in-service training of pastors and in the periodic evaluation of their performance.

Organization of the Study

In Chapter I of the study, a background to the problem, the definition of terms, the statement of the problem, the basic assumptions and a brief description of methodology are presented. There is also a discussion of the limitation, delimitations, and significance of the study.

An introduction to the instruments used for the measurement of leadership and a presentation of a new
model--The Visionary Leader framework--are discussed in Chapter II. A summary of the literature and research on effective leader behaviors and how these could be integrated into this new framework are then presented. The research hypotheses for this study are also presented at the end of this chapter.

The research design is described in Chapter III. This will include descriptions of the population and sample, the data collection procedures, the instrumentation, the data analysis techniques, and the null hypotheses.

In Chapter IV, the data generated from the study are analyzed.

Chapter V of the study contains a presentation of the summary, conclusions, and recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The research question under consideration in this study was: Do pastors of high growth churches in the Lake Union Conference differ significantly in their leader behaviors from pastors in low growth churches? To address this question, attention was focused on the literature on church growth and, specifically, the role of the pastor in such growth. The new framework for understanding the leadership phenomenon in organizations was then addressed. Finally, a summary of the literature on effective leader behaviors was presented. This chapter is thus divided according to these three major sections. First of all, however, some comments on the measurement of leader behaviors were deemed necessary.

The Measurement of Leader Behaviors

Kavanagh (1978) argued that the effective measurement of leader behavior has many practical implications. Citing its role in diagnosis, he maintained that such a scale could provide an assessment of current leader practices, and thus, in relation to other diagnostic information
provide guidelines for organizational changes and training needs.

A large amount of literature has been generated on the topic of leadership but some of the most influential research conducted in this century have been the Ohio State Leadership Studies (Stogdill & Coons, 1957). Five widely used measures of leader behavior and attitudes toward leaders have resulted from the Ohio State studies:

1. Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ).
2. Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form 12 (LBDQ-12).
3. Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire (SBDQ).
4. Ideal Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (ILBDQ).
5. The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ).

Dipboye (1978) contended that the LBDQ-12 appeared to be the best of the Ohio State Leadership Scales in that it provided a multi-faceted measure of leader behaviors and traits and provided measures of initiating structure and consideration that are unconfounded with punitive leadership items, which was a negative feature of earlier instruments.

For the purposes of this study, however, the instruments referred to above all seemed to be inadequate. The focus of these instruments seemed to be on supervisory
behavior and limited the number of variables (Sashkin & Fulmer, 1985). An instrument was needed that measured executive as well as managerial leadership. This need was stimulated by Bennis and Nanus (1985) whose studies on American leaders in a variety of settings showed up several dimensions of leadership which were not considered in earlier theories.

Based on the Ohio studies (Stogdill & Coons, 1957), the work of Bennis and Nanus (1985), and the work at the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research (Bowers & Seashore, 1966), Sashkin and Fulmer (1985) have advanced a new framework for understanding the leadership phenomenon and Sashkin (1985) has developed the Leader Behavior Questionnaire (LBQ) instrument for its measurement.

Church Growth and the Role of the Pastor

From a review of the literature on church growth, growth is accepted as the undisputed mission for a local Christian congregation. Chaney and Lewis (1977) listed four grounds for church growth. These were:

1. Growth is the work and will of God.
2. Growth is an innate quality of the church of Jesus Christ.
3. Growth is the nature of the gospel.
4. Growth is characteristic of the churches in the
There has been a continuing debate about the nature of church growth. Some have argued primarily for numerical (quantitative) growth while others have opted for emphasizing internal (qualitative) growth in grace of the members. These two kinds of growth, however, are not mutually exclusive, nor should one be emphasized to the neglect of the other. Indeed, as will be demonstrated from the literature, qualitative growth is a necessary precursor to quantitative growth, but when quantitative growth ceases, that church ceases to be in pursuit of its divine mission.

The SDA church conceives its mission as one of quantitative and qualitative growth. As Thompson (1986) pointed out, the summit goal for the organization, in consonance with its divine mission, is that of numerical growth. McGavran (1970) indicated that numerical growth is considered the ultimate goal of the church's mission and a reliable indication of its qualities. White (1971) an influential SDA writer, stated that "the church is God's appointed agency for the salvation of men. It was organized for service, and its mission is to carry the Gospel to the world" (p. 9). Of course, this perspective needs to be undergirded by an orientation which places emphasis on the making of disciples, and not merely the gaining of decisions. For White (1900) also indicated that God estimates the church "according to the growth of the members in the knowledge of
Christ, according to their progress in spiritual experience" (p. 298).

Three basic classes of numerical growth may be identified—biological, transfer, and conversion. Biological growth is that which produces Christians of the second and successive generations. Transfer growth in a church occurs when believers from another sister congregation elect to unite with that particular church body. Conversion growth takes place when a person places their faith intelligently in Christ, and as a consequence of such a conversion, formally unites with a church congregation. Of these three classes of growth, transfer growth was eliminated from consideration in this study since, unlike biological and conversion growth, transfer growth does not affect the overall membership of the denomination.

Five major variables have been identified from the literature which impact on church growth. These variables are: (1) the congregation; (2) the mission; (3) social factors; (4) spiritual factors, and (5) the leader.

Yamamari (1981) stated that a church likely to grow is made up of numerous dynamic witnessing members in actual and frequent contact with non-Christians in the community. Wagner (1982) referred to such a church as one that is motivated and willing to pay the price for growth. A church of this kind has generally developed an effective method of constantly enlisting and training workers whose primary
efforts are directed outward to non-Christians in the community. The pastor exerts his influence to ensure that a proportionately large number of laymen are recruited, trained, and sent into the community. By contrast, a non-growing church mobilizes its laymen primarily for the maintenance of the church as an institution—serving on various committees and making sure that all the needs are met for the smooth operation of the church.

Secondly, churches grow when they accept their mission seriously. McGavran (1982) suggested that churches grow when they believe that God wants them to grow. They thus determine to grow. For such congregations, church growth is not a spasmodic activity; rather it is a way of life for the church. It is a way of thinking, planning, and doing. Dudley and Cummings (1981) concluded that church growth is a result of concentrated effort and planning. In such a church, "every other program and ministry is evaluated by the extent to which it contributes toward attaining the goal" (p. 130). The pastor in this setting also places prime emphasis on the winning of souls.

A third variable in church growth relate to the social factors involved. The church is both a spiritual and social organism, and church growth takes place within the societies in which men live. A growing church therefore notes these social realities (McGavran, 1982). Research has shown that people most likely to join a particular church are those
within the community who most approximate its membership (Yamamari, 1982). This is referred to in the literature as growth within homogenous units. Church growth also tends to be more pronounced in urban settings than in rural settings where life is more stable and unchanging. (Belew, 1971)

High growth congregations also become that way because they place a high premium on the role of spiritual factors in church growth. They see themselves in a divine operation with the Holy Spirit being the chief empowering force. Such churches pray for growth. They also pray regularly that Christians may become skillful finders of lost sheep (McGavran, 1982). By contrast, non-growing churches tended to pray more for the sick, for the building program, and for the spread of peace (McGavran, 1982).

In all four variables thus listed, the pastor remained a key individual. Through the use of his influence, he assists the church to focus on the social and spiritual realities of its mission. Wagner (1976) sees the pastor who is a possibility thinker as the first vital sign of a growing church. Wagner candidly stated that many churches are not growing because their pastor does not want them to grow (Wagner, 1982). He went on to explain that growth demands a price from the pastor and many pastors are unwilling to pay that price. He noted that growing churches are characterized by hard working pastors who are willing to
share leadership and to have church members who they cannot personally pastor because of the size of the congregation. Weld and McGavran (1971) also pointed out that growing churches generally have a leader with a plan and a program; he organizes for growth.

Emery (1979) stated that all growing churches have purposeful, goal-directed, achievement-oriented leadership. While lay leaders play a vital role in such leadership, much of it must also be found in the church pastor.

Dudley and Cummings (1981) recommended that "the pastor must give a major share of his time to training, assigning, and supervising members in soulwinning work" (p. 135). They further recommended that "much more consideration must be given to the roles of the pastor" (p. 135). They saw that the pastor's schedule should be planned to "maximize his effectiveness in leading the church in its mission" (p. 135).

The Visionary Leader Framework

This new framework attempts to describe the leadership phenomenon in organizations, integrating both managerial and "executive" leadership. This dissertation study is an exploratory test of this new framework. The pilots of this new framework, Sashkin and Fulmer (1985), explained that this visionary leader framework takes into account specific key leader personality variables, identifies a set of
specific situational factors, shows how these interact to
determine appropriate leader behavior, explains why ques­tionnaire measures of leader behavior have been confusing,
and integrates executive and managerial leadership in
terms of common underlying themes.

The framework is predicted on the basic Lewinian
notion that behavior is a function of the interaction be­
tween person and situation or environment (Lewin, 1951):

\[ B = f (P, S) \]

The framework draws on the guidelines found in the
theories developed by Fiedler (1967) and by Hersey and
Blanchard (1982), and incorporates the path-goal concept
initially put forth by House (1971). This framework diff­
ers from any of the other approaches in the breadth of the
leadership situations covered and by encompassing a focus
on situational task structure. Hersey and Blanchard (1982)
deal only with interpersonal superior-subordinate inter­
action and on subordinates' capabilities. Fiedler (1967)
deals only with the leader's control over situational task
structure factors and on the specific task and relationship-
centered behaviors that leaders engage in to deal with these
issues.

The work that led to the development of this framework
began with an attempt to develop a questionnaire that would
tap the leader behaviors, not traits, that create charisma,
that cause the set of affective responses on the part of
followers commonly called "charisma." In the continuing work on this LBQ, it was found that what is termed as "executive leadership" poses two additional requirements. The first relates to leaders' personalities; the second addresses the factors in the organizational situation on which leaders focus their attention. The three factors—personality, situations, and behavior—apply not just to executive leadership but to leadership at all levels of an organization.

In this framework, the single most important problem with, and limit on, earlier theories of leadership has been the focus on but one or two of these three variable sets namely, personality, situation, and behavior. Early researchers looked only at personality factors (Stogdill, 1948). The Ohio State Studies (Stogdill & Coons, 1957) examined only perceptions of behavior. Fiedler (1967) incorporated personality and situation factors in his *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*, but ignored behavior, while House (1971) included behavior and situation while neglecting personality factors. In his theory of charismatic leadership, House (1977) did include (although not in a formal framework) examples of all three factors. This approach did not, however, extend to the general issues of leadership. An adequate theory of leadership must incorporate all three variables.
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The premise that an adequate theory of leadership must incorporate all three variables noted above is, of course, based on the end-result issue, leader effectiveness. As stated earlier, effective leaders are identifiable by sustained high performance from their subordinates (individually and as an aggregate) as well as by sustained high performance in an organization sense.

The definition of an effective leader does not, however, ignore the varied criteria available for measuring leader performance. Three broad areas of measurement were identified by Culbert and McDonough (1980). These were (a) inputs, (b) outputs, and (c) impact. The definition above stands with any of these three measurement criteria. Drucker (1967) correctly maintained, however, that the executive could only be effectively measured by the impact his presence makes on the organization, and this could be understood from the definition of an executive. For him, an executive is any worker who "is responsible for actions and decisions which are meant to contribute to the performance capacity of his organization" (p. 9).

The visionary leader framework also supports the view that the level of effectiveness of a leader is determined by the situation appropriateness of his leader action. Leader actions which are situation-appropriate require
(a) conceptual diagnostic ability (to understand the situation and what action needs to be taken) and a certain action orientation (these are the personality variables), and (b) specific behavioral skills on the part of leaders.

Managerial and Executive Leaders

The visionary leader framework takes into account and integratively resolves the long-standing, quasi-philosophical issues of whether managers are leaders. It is suggested that there are two basic types of leaders, managerial and executive. Effectiveness for a group, unit, department, division, or organization is hypothesized as requiring leadership. Such leadership, at whatever level, derives from the same basic sorts of variables in terms of personality, situation, and behavior. While there are some important differences at lower versus top organization levels (Katz & Kahn, 1978), these differences are matters of degree or scale, not difference of kind.

There are two specific personality factors, which apply to both managerial and executive leaders. The first is the need to have an impact on the organization through the use of power and influence: to "empower" others to achieve organizational goals. Personality research is consistent in identifying a higher than average need for power, "dominance," or aggressiveness on the part of leaders (House, 1977); Stogdill, 1948). Where managerial and
executive leaders differ is in cognitive ability, the second personality variable.

In a global sense, "cognitive ability" may be understood to mean the leader's breadth of vision. At the lowest managerial levels, a time span of a year or so is quite adequate, while middle-managers must typically be able to think and plan over three to five year spans. At the top of the executive leadership levels, CEO's must be able to think, in meaningful concrete detail, over spans of ten or even twenty years.

Both managerial and executive leaders must use their cognitive abilities to analyze three key aspects of situation. These three situational factors are (1) the need for active adaptation imposed by the situation, (2) the need to attain task goals, and (3) the need to coordinate employees' activities. These functions are well expressed in Parsons' (1957) four basic organizational functions (see Figure 1).

Managerial leaders respond to the adaptation issue by using their authority to delegate action responsibilities to subordinates. Executive leaders, on the other hand, are concerned with creating organizational cultures that facilitate successful adaptation and, therefore, promote organizational survival. Such cultures are characterized by organization members' willingness to take action, even risks, rather than waiting for direction and approval while
doing nothing. Thus, the managerial leader is concerned with authority (or its lack), while the executive leader is concerned with creating cultural values that enhance decision-making. Both are dealing with the situation factor of adaptation. Similarly, both respond to the task-goal attainment factor, the managerial leader by concern with task structure, the executive leader by creating the cultural value of over-riding concern for customer/client goals (follower-centered leadership).

The third underlying situational factor is internal organizational coordination of organization members' activities. This is dealt with by managerial leaders.
through a focus on the task capabilities of subordinates (in terms of competence and cooperation). Executive leaders are concerned with the broader organizational issue of coordination and approach this issue by creating a cultural value that places great import on people and their involvement and participation in the organization. Complex organizations are coordinated through patterns of mutual adjustment, not merely by rules or plans. Most organizations require intensive interactions, and coordination of such interactions is greatly facilitated by the active involvement of employees.

Finally, the interaction of personality and situation results in behavior. The managerial leader identifies task- and/or relationship-centered action appropriate to a specific situation and can carry out specific behaviors skillfully; managerial leaders are thus versatile behaviorally. Interestingly, this versatility leads their subordinates to see them as both highly task-centered and highly relationship-oriented (the 9:9 posture in Blake and Mouton's (1964) Managerial Grid).

This perception is no misconception because, in terms of the meaning of their behaviors, managerial leaders are, indeed, highly task and relationship focused, even though their physical behavior at a given point in time may be viewed objectively as highly directive and not particularly relational, highly relationship-focused and not very
structuring, highly directive and highly supportive, or not very much oriented toward either task structure or relationship emphasis (the four variables in the quadrant theories; see, for example, Blake & Mouton, 1964; Hersey & Blanchard, 1982; Reddin, 1970). Physical behavior means something only when it is perceived by others, but it would be wrong to label this a simple attributional or image presentation issue. The visionary leader framework is in support of the view that the specific behaviors required for effective leadership do vary, and vary in consistent situationally determined ways.

The LBQ Instrument

The instrument used to gather data for this research measures task- and relationship-centered behaviors in terms of the four factors of support, goal-emphasis, task facilitation, and interaction facilitation (Bowers & Seashore, 1966). Because the concern is with measuring the meaning of behavior and not the physical activity, high scores are desirable. Thus, while the "high-high leader behavior myth is indeed a myth in terms of actual leader behavior, it has considerable truth as an interpretation and expression of the meaning of behavior.

The executive leader is also concerned with task- and relationship-centered behaviors, because that is how the executive leader creates an organizational culture—through
leader behavior. The LBQ measures five such specific behaviors. Three are specialized relationship-focused actions, two are task-oriented. The three relationship-oriented behaviors all aim at instilling the value of the importance of people and their involvement in the organization. These are skilled communication (active listening, feedback, etc.); development of trust through consistency and reliability; and expression of respect and regard both for self and other. One task behavior, focused attention, centers on task-goal attainment. The other, risk-taking and risk-involvement, relates to adaptation action.

In the next chapter on research design, descriptions of both the ten indices of the LBQ and the initial data and test of this new framework are presented.

Effective Leader Behaviors

Attention will now be given to providing a review of the literature on effective leader behaviors. The ten indices of the LBQ are used as an organizer for the presentation of this summary review of the literature.

1. Focused Leadership

Bennis and Nanus (1985) found a common pattern of focusing behaviors when individuals took charge of their organizations:
They paid attention to what was going on, they determined what part of the events at hand would be important for the future of the organization, they set a new direction, and they concentrated the attention of everyone in the organization on it. (p. 88)

This concept of focusing behaviors is closely akin to the idea of vision. Bennis and Nanus (1985) defined vision as a desired future state. Burns (1978) referred to these preferred end-states as values which serve as "both calls to action and guides to behavior" (p. 375).

Boles and Davenport (1983) used the term "preferred outcome" to describe this same concept of focus leadership. They cited as examples of preferred outcomes Kennedy's desire to have Russian missiles removed from Cuba and Margaret Thatcher's desire to retake the Falkland Islands from Argentina. "Institutional embodiment of purpose" (Selznick, 1957) takes place when the preferred outcomes of the leader becomes the desired end-states of the organization.

But how leadership behavior affects the group depends to some extent on characteristics of the group. O'Reilly and Roberts (1978) reported that low supervisor influence and low subordinate mobility aspirations reduced the impact of leader behavior on satisfaction and performance.

Peters and Waterman (1982) found in their study of excellent companies that each had a chief executive officer who had articulated a goal that used only a few words to
summarize what was unique and special about the company, what all employees could focus on and use as a guideline, and what the company stood for. IBM's "customer service," Sears's "value at a decent price," and GE's "progress is our most important product" are all examples of the focusing behaviors of leaders.

2. Communication Leadership

Leaders lead by communicating. Boles and Davenport (1983) asserted that there is no way that influence, authority, or power can be utilized without some form of communication. Horne and Lupton (1965) indicated that by far the most time-consuming activity of all managers is that of giving and gaining information. Indeed the research on the subject (Stewart, 1967) consistently showed that managers spend between 70 and 80 percent of their time talking in various kinds of meetings with subordinates, superiors, colleagues, and representatives external to that organization.

Infusing a belief in a common purpose is an essential executive function (Barnard, 1938). Selznick (1957) pointed out that upper-level executives have a responsibility to communicate the system perspective which is the overview of the organization from his high position.

Bennis and Nanus (1985) used the term "social architect" to describe this communication skill of the leader.
and they affirmed that the design and management of social architecture is one of the four pivotal responsibilities of a leader. They described social architecture as the norms and values that shape behavior in any organized setting. It implies "change and tractability and that leaders can do something about it" (p. 112).

According to Bennis and Nanus' position, three processes need to occur for a successful transformation of the social architecture to be achieved: (1) create a new and compelling vision capable of bringing the work force to a new place; (2) develop commitment for the new vision, and (3) institutionalize the new vision. All three steps are enhanced by the use of effective communication skills. Two other factors in effective communication are trustworthiness and expertness (Adams, 1978; Bennis, 1984).

French (1956) found that group members could influence each other more readily if they were in open communication with each other while Sayles (1964) showed that the transfer and processing of information from subordinates and elsewhere has become a dominant facet of management. Philips (1954) observed that among twenty-four groups of five third-graders playing a modified version of "Twenty Questions," task efficiency correlated positively with the amount of task-oriented communication and interest in discussing the question. A survey of 500 work groups suggested
that communication ease resulted in increased efficiency (Bass, 1954).

3. Trust Leadership

A leadership based on trust is also supported as an effective leader behavior. Friedlander and Marguiles (1969) found that the task motivation and involvement of research personnel are maximized by high management trust. Further, Wilxoc and Burke (1969) concluded that openness between workers and supervisors resulted in greater job satisfaction for both. In his survey of opinion leadership in Bemidji, Moorhead and St. Cloud (all in Minnesota), Devine (1977) found that opinion leaders showed more willingness than opinion isolates in trusting others. Gean (1984) supported a similar view from his study in church leadership.

The concept of a leadership of trust is particularly valid in a Christian church setting where the pastor is regarded as a leader after the divine model, Jesus Christ. The Christian story of redemption is nothing but a story of a God who trusts and accepts even those who are unloving and unaccepting of others (White, 1913). Such people are encouraged to join the church, the caring community, where they are accepted not for who they are but for who they can become through the grace of God.

Church leaders have a responsibility for modeling
trust. As they care about people and trust them to be creative, they will be catalysts in the growth and development of the church (Adams, 1978). Trust includes giving others the same credit for good intentions assumed of one's self. Further, it includes taking seriously the hard work of task forces and not demanding that committee work be redone by the larger body.

4. Self Leadership

Sydney Harris (Quoted in Boles & Davenport, 1983), made the following observation on an individual's authenticity and his interpersonal relations:

A person is either himself or not himself; is either rooted in his existence, or is a fabrication; has either found his humanness or is still playing with masks and roles and status symbols. And nobody is more aware of this difference (although unconsciously) than a child. Only an authentic person can evoke a good response in the core of the other person; only person is resonant to person. (p. 265)

This has implications for the leader's self-perception and his level of effectiveness. There is also theoretical support for this outlook. According to the psychotherapist Bugenthal (1965), each of us is like a person who pays blackmail to keep a feared reality from becoming manifest. He argued that while no one is ever fully authentic, the less blackmail one pays, the more authentic that person is.

Bugenthal (1965) stated that being authentic consisted of being as fully aware as one can be, choosing alternatives
(values) to which to commit effort, devotion, and allegiance; taking responsibility for each choice, knowing that it probably is not the optimum; and all the while recognizing the imperfection of one's awareness and the inherent risk, unmitigated by good intentions. High perception of reality therefore seems to be a function of authenticity and is seen as a precursor to the effective leadership of others (Boles & Davenport, 1983).

Boles and Davenport (1983) captured the concept well in their summary of the implications of authenticity in leaders:

Leaders and would-be leaders must have a sense of identity that does not depend on status, they must have values which are so integral to their natures that they cannot be denied, they must know their cultural prejudices and the limitations that those prejudices impose, and they must know how far they can go in trying to be like others without compromising their own standards. (p. 268)

5. Risk Leadership

Attempts to lead and success in leading others are greater among those willing to take greater risks. Wallach, Kogan, and Bem (1962) found that high risk takers were more influential in discussion than low risk takers. Marquis (1962) and Collins and Guetzkow (1964) observed that high risk rakers are more persuasive than more cautious members of a group. Clausen (1965) and Burnstein (1969) accounted for these results by suggesting that high risk takers
tended to score high in self confidence which in turn led them to attempt and to succeed in influencing the group to follow their lead.

There is no guarantee, however, that taking action under uncertainty will be effective and/or satisfying to the group. For instance, Bass, Burger, Doktor and Barrett (1979) failed to find any association between the rate of advancement of 1,044 managers in an international sample and their self-rated actual and preferred risk taking under uncertainty.

Any aspiring leader must understand that risk "comes with the territory" (Boles and Davenport, 1983). If a group can go only one way or if members have no ego involvements, no leader is needed. It is only when choices are possible or egos are involved that risk is possible and thus a leader is required to assume responsibility for decision-making. In supporting this concept of risk leadership, Ginzberg (1966) said:

For the top executive, the sharing of responsibility is impossible. He must make his decisions, change them if necessary, but he must live with them. If his calculations go awry he cannot place the blame on others. Nor has he anything to gain by passing the buck, for failure leaves him vulnerable. If a general loses a campaign, or a high command loses a war, they have lost it and must suffer the consequences no matter who else has failed. (p. 115)

How much risk leaders can afford is related both to their power base (Byrd, 1971) and their "idiosyncrasy credit"
with the group (Hollander, 1964). Byrd has provided a
ten-item checklist by means of which a leader could assess
the strength of his power base. Idiosyncrasy credit is
essentially a fund of good will which the leader engenders
from the group because of his perceived contributions to
the group's primary tasks (competence) and loyalty to the
group's norms (conformity). The higher the perceived con-
petence and conformity of the leader, the greater the
possibility of his maintaining the support of his followers
when taking risks.

6. Follower-Centered Leadership

Management literature repeatedly calls for the optimum
use of persons within the organization. Iacocca (1984)
recorded the sentiments thus:

In the end, all business operations can be
reduced to three words: people, product, and
profits. People come first. Unless you have
got a good team, you cannot do much with the
other two. (p. 167)

Putting it another way, Schutz (1961) stated that the old
adage is true: "the good king is one whose subjects pros-
per" (p. 62).

In studies on the effects of participation on group
decision quality and manager's rate of advancement, high
positive correlations were reported (Hall & Donnell, 1979;
Lorge, Fox, Davitz & Brenner, 1958). Bass (1960), however,
showed that the group decision may not be as good as that
of the best member in the group, but then there could be no guarantee that the leader is the best member of the group.

With respect to the effects of participation and direction on productivity, about every possible alternative emerges (Bass, 1981). However, Lawrence and Smith (1955) suggested that when participatory leadership has a focus, it positively affects productivity. In their study of checkers and mail openers over a five-week period, only the goal-setting, participative groups showed increased productivity. Likert (1959) also noted that if participation is greater than expected, dissatisfaction would result, while Ivancevich (1979) found that performance suffered when participation was above or below optimum.

More generally on the role of followers, it is believed that it was Moser (1957) who coined the term "transactional" to describe the leader behavior in which there is the recognition that while the goals of the social system must be carried out, success therein demands that consideration be given to the personalities and need dispositions of the followers. Getzels and Guba (1957) referring to these as the nomothetic and idiographic dimensions respectively, advocated that the leader have a thorough awareness of the limits and resources of both individuals and institutions within which administrative action may occur, with intelligent application of the two as a specific problem may demand.
In a similar vein, Hollander and Julian (1969) stated that the process of leadership involves a social exchange between the leader and followers. For them, effective leaders give something and get something in return. Burns (1978) referred to this as transactional leadership where the emphasis is on the trading of benefits. He went on to posit the view of the "transformational" leader who he described as one capable of riveting followers' attention on a "better" picture of social reality. However, Hollander (1978) pointed out that Burns' transformational leadership may be seen as a special kind of transaction in which the leader provides a strong dose of social reality linked to goal-setting.

The leader should also pay close attention to feedback (Hicks, 1972). Hicks claimed that the leader must be alert to psychological mechanisms such as increased effort, identification, sublimation, suppression, aggression, and so forth. According to him, such feedback cues should be carefully analysed.

Bass and Rytterband (1979) summarized the differences between the participatory approaches as espoused by behaviorists such as Likert (1961, 1967), Mayo (1933) and McGregor (1960), the classical management approaches as evidenced in Taylor (1911) and others. They indicated that the extreme classical position called for subordinates to receive clear, written job specifications and role
assignments on how they must complete their tasks. On the other hand, the extreme behavioral position required that goals be clear and subordinates be allowed, commensurate with their training and experience, to decide how to reach the goals.

The classical approach depended on external constraints to yield compliance and commitment of followers. In contrast, the participatory mode was expected to gain even more commitment and compliance through individual awareness and insight into effective interpersonal relations and trust.

After examining studies in communist, socialist, and capitalist societies, Tannebaum and Cooke (1978), reported that there is widespread approval of participative decision-making. In an extensive investigation of 3,641 managers in 14 countries, Haire, Ghiselli, and Porter (1966) found that in all cultures there was a tendency to regard democratic methods as the best methods of leadership.

Follower-centered leadership is, of course, related to the issue of power. Power is an exchange relation in which one member has either behavioral control or fate control over the behavior of another (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). For Dahl (1957), "A has power over B to the extent that A can get B to do something that B would not otherwise do" (p. 203). Five kinds of power have been identified by French and Raven (1959): reward power, coercive power, legitimate
power, expert power, and referrent power.

Student (1968) however, regarded referrent power and expert power as sources of "incremental influence" that characterize the individual, whereas reward power, legitimate power, and coercive power are organizationally derived. He found that supervisory scores on incremental influence, referrent power, and expert power were positively and significantly related to quality of group performance and to costs. But average earnings declined with reward power of the supervisor, and maintenance costs of the group rose with coercion.

Bass (1961) found that attempts to lead were more successful among able and esteemed leaders, especially when the congruence between the leader's esteem from others and self esteem was great. Similarly, Levinger (1959) found that perceived relative power of a member in a group correlated .55 with number of influence attempts, .51 with range of assertiveness, and .48 with degree of assertiveness of the member. Change in influence attempts tended to change along with change in perceived power as the group continued with the problem.

To use power based on incremental influence rather than that which is organizationally derived has support from a number of studies. Rosenberg and Pearlin (1962) studied the attitudes of 1,138 hospital nurses toward power. Among these, 54 percent, stated that they would use
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persuasion; 38 percent, benevolent manipulation; 5 percent, legitimate authority; 1 percent, contractual power; and 2 percent, coercive power.

Ivancevich (1970) reported that life insurance agents' satisfaction correlated .35 with use of referrent power, expert power, and reward power by the agency manager. But satisfaction correlated -.23 with use of coercive power and .14 with use of legitimate power by the manager. Bachman (1968) found that college faculty members are better satisfied under deans with high power (control over college affairs) whose influence was based on expert and referrent power rating than under deans who rely on reward, legitimate, or coercive power. Ivancevich and Donelly (1970) found that only expert and referrent powers were positively related to productivity; coercive and legitimate powers had no effect.

7. Supportive Management

Leaders differ in their concern about the group members in the extent to which they pursue a human relations approach and try to maintain friendly, supportive relations with followers. Those with such strong concerns are identified as relations-oriented (Katz, Maccoby & Morse, 1950), emphasizing employees (Fleishman, 1957), concerned for group maintenance (Cartwright & Zander, 1960; Wofford, 1970), concerned for people (Blake & Mouton, 1964) people-
centered (Anderson, 1974), interaction-facilitative and supportive (Bowers & Seashore, 1966), and in need of affiliation (McClelland, 1961).

Usually associated with a relations-orientation is a sense of trust in subordinates, less felt need to control them, and more general rather than close supervision (McGregor, 1960). The whole human relations trust in organizational leadership can be thought of as an attempt to promote referent power in addition to, and to some extent instead of, power based on rewards, punishments, and the acceptance of organizational law. Likert's (1961) new patterns, McGregor's (1960) theory Y, and Argyris' (1962) interpersonal competence have this emphasis in common.

While a review of Schriesheim, Mowday, and Stogdill (1979) indicated that evidence that leadership affects group drive is sparse, yet they affirmed that, in studies by Lewin (1939), Likert (1961b, 1967), and Lippit (1940), democratic, participative, and relations-oriented leader behavior was found to contribute to group cohesiveness. Effective supervisors were found to excel in ability to interact effectively and in interest in people (Shartle, 1934). Similarly, Katzell, Barret Vann, and Hogan (1968) found that executives whose roles emphasized administrative rather than technical performance received higher performance ratings from their superiors.

Highly promotable supervisors were described by their...
employees as being good at handling people, approachable, willing to "go to bat" for employees, letting them know where they stand, pulling for both company and workers rather than either alone, and using general rather than close supervision (Mann & Dent, 1954). Similarly, in an extensive analysis of twenty-seven organizations of seven types involving more than 1,300 supervisors and 3,700 employees, Stogdill (1965) found that supervisory consideration was related to employee satisfaction with the company and to measure of group and organization cohesiveness.

8. Goal-Oriented Management

One of the key components in reaching excellence is the establishment of an overarching goal for the unit, which serves to give coherence, excitement, and meaning to the unit's work (Bradford & Cohen, 1984). Bradford and Cohen claimed that an effective overarching goal has four essential characteristics:

1. The goal reflects the core purpose of the department.

2. The goal is feasible.

3. The goal is challenging.

4. The goal has larger significance.

Maintaining a similar goal orientation, House (1971) in his Path-Goal Theory advocated that the role of the
leader is to clarify the goals for the organization and to remove the obstacles in the way of goal accomplishment. Blake and Mouton (1964) confirmed a similar concern for production in their 9:9 position of the managerial grid.

Mitchell (1979) called for the leader to provide subordinates with coaching, guidance, and the rewards necessary for satisfaction and effective performance. Reviews of the empirical literature by House and Mitchell (1974) and Schriesheim and Kerr (1974) both supported this theory. Valued rewards should be contingent on effective performance (Spector & Suttell, 1956).

Mixed results on the path-goal theory, however, have come from Szilagyi and Sims (1974). Their findings supported path-goal propositions concerning the relationship between the leader's initiating structure and subordinate satisfaction, they failed to do so for the relationship between the leader's initiating structure and performance.

Similarly, Stinson and Johnson (1975) tested hypotheses derived from the path-goal theory of leadership that the relationships between the leader's initiating structure and satisfaction variables and role clarity variables are more positive under conditions of low task structure, low task repetitiveness, and high task autonomy than under high task structure, high task repetitiveness, and low task autonomy. Leader consideration, subordinate satisfaction, and role clarity were expected to be more positively related
under structure, repetitive, dependent conditions than under unstructured, unrepétitive, autonomous conditions. The results were consistent with path-goal theory in respect to consideration but tended to counter the theory regarding initiating structure.

But Schriesheim and Von Glinow (1977) argued that mixed results here could accrue from the type of instrumentation employed. Their findings showed that if a coercion-loaded scale such as the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire (SBDQ) scale of initiation of structure was used, reverse results were obtained for the path-goal predictions for job satisfaction. But when coercive-free scales such as the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire and the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire XII (LBDQ, LBDQ XII) were used, path-goal predictions were confirmed if task structure and role clarity were used to moderate relations between leader consideration, initiation of structure, and job satisfaction.

Schriesheim and Von Glinow (1977) continued that a second source of contradictory findings could result from the fact that leaders tend to be more directive when it is easier for them to do so much as when roles are clear, conditions are structured, and jobs are routine (Bass, Valenzi, Farrow, and Solomon, 1975). But such direction is unnecessary for productivity when conditions are already structured.

Schriesheim and Von Glinow (1977) further maintained
that subordinate personality also needed to be considered as a factor for mixed results. Griffin (1979) called for achievement oriented, consultative leadership for self-actualizing subordinates with "big" jobs. But for self-actualizers on routine jobs of little scope, supportive leadership (consideration without consultation) was required. For "big" jobs performed by occupants uninterested in self-actualization, directive leadership (structuring without threat) was seen as most needed. For routine jobs, with job occupants without self-actualization needs, delegation by the leader (a fifth style introduced by Griffin as "maintenance leader behavior") was suggested.

9. Task-Centered Management

Schutz (1961) advocated the concept of the leader as completer. He summarized the role of the leader thus:

1. To know what functions a group needs;
2. to have the sensitivity and flexibility to sense what functions the group is not fulfilling;
3. to have the ability to get the things needed by his group accomplished; and
4. to have the willingness to do what is necessary to satisfy these needs, even thought it may be personally displeasing. (p. 62)

The concept of the leader as completer is consonant with the dimension of task-centered management. For fourteen navy airplane maintenance groups, Likert (1977) reported strong associations with the extent to which supervisors facilitated the work by helping with advanced
scheduling and offering new ideas to solve job problems and the extent to which airplanes serviced by the groups avoided accidents and disasters due to operational failures.

Task-centered leader behaviors include those behaviors in which the leader organizes and defines group activities and his relation to the group. Thus, he defines the role he expects each member to assume, assigns tasks, plans ahead, establishes ways of getting things done and pushes for production. This dimension emphasizes overt attempts to achieve organizational goals (Fleishman & Harris, 1962).

Stogdill, Shartle, Scott, Coons, and Jaynes (1956) reported that there is a systematic change in what happens when a leader is transferred in terms of their patterns of work behavior. There was a tendency for patterns of interpersonal behavior to be transferred from one situation to another, but patterns of work performance were changed in response to the task requirements of the new situation. In a similar way, Carter, Haythorn, Shriver, and Lanzetta (1951) found that the behavior of leaders differed from one situation to another depending upon requirements of the group task.

Job-oriented supervisors are regarded by higher management as more effective than person-oriented supervisors (Rubenowitz, 1962). Kelly (1964) found that the technical features of executive behavior out-weighed the effects of
personal style.

Dunteman (1966) noted that task orientation as measured by the Orientation Inventory correlated with promotability ratings based on three days of assessment of ninety-six supervisors. For both sixty-six first-line and twenty-seven second-line supervisors, task orientation significantly contributed to their high on-the-job performance ratings by their own supervisors (Dunteman & Bass, 1963).

Mann, Indik, and Vroon (1963) showed that worker production was associated with the supervisor's task orientation. Cooper (1966) also demonstrated that first-line supervisors judged by their own bosses to be higher in "task relevance" tended to have more productive and more task-motivated subordinates.

Absence of a leader to clarify task requirements and group goals result in much time being spent by groups in concern for such clarity and orderliness. Members of unorganized groups (French, 1941) and members of groups under a laissez-faire type of leader (Lippit, 1940) frequently expressed a desire to get things organized, to buckle down to work, and to stick to the job that was supposed to be done.

Bass (1981) supported the view that "the general trend of the research reviewed supports the hypothesis that groups tend to accept as leaders those members who exhibit
characteristics and abilities that will facilitate the accomplishment of the group's specific task" (p. 436).

Valenzi et al. (1972) reviewed previous research on the impact of leader behavior on task requirements and concluded that degree of task structure, routineness, complexity, interdependency, and intellectual rather than manipulative requirements systematically alter the amount and kind of leadership that will be most effective.

Based on the Valenzi et al. (1972) review, Bass, Valenzi, Farrow, and Solomon (1975) found that for the seventy-eight managers in their study, clear objectives promoted more direction and consultation. Routine tasks were associated with less participative leadership; more complex tasks, with negotiative leadership and more frequent delegation. Other dimensions isolated were autonomy or discretionary opportunities. If subordinates engaged in planning, coordination, and other managerial activities, again delegation was reported more frequently among their leaders.

10. Team Management

The team management strategies adopted by a leader are influenced by several factors. These include the maturity level of the followers (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982); the position power, leader-member relations and the task structure of the group (Fiedler, 1967); the hierarchical position
of the leader (Katz & Kahn, 1978); and the leader's idiosyncrasy credit (Hollander, 1964). Both organizing behavior (structure) and membership behavior (consideration) were found to be significantly related to group cohesiveness (Christner & Hemphill, 1955; Hemphill, Siegel & Westie, 1951).

Cooperation rather than competition within groups is emphasized in effective team management. Groups with cooperative members, as compared with groups with competitive members, were more likely to develop leaders, evaluate fellow members more favorably, show less hostility, and solve their problems as a group more rapidly (Raven & Eachus, 1963).

The leader's expectations for the group also play an important role in effective team management. Livingstone (1969) summarized the major findings as follows:

(a) What a manager expects of his subordinates and the way he treats them largely determines their performance and career progress.
(b) A unique characteristic of superior managers is their ability to create high performance expectations that subordinates fulfill.
(c) Less effective managers fail to develop similar expectations and as a consequence the productivity of their subordinates suffers.
(d) Subordinates more often than not appear to do what they believe they are expected to do. (p. 82)

In a study on how the size of League of Women Voters chapters influenced the chapter presidents, J. Likert (1958) found that members were more active when the president was
interested in their ideas (as in smaller chapters) and when the officers of the chapter felt that members should have relatively high degrees of influence in policies and activities. Conversely, members were less active in chapters where they felt pressure from the president, but participated more actively under pressure from peers and project discussion leaders.

Greene and Schriesheim (1977) examined leader behavior, group drive, and cohesiveness, using a longitudinal design with 123 work groups. With cross-lagged correlational and corrected dynamic correlational analyses, both task-oriented and relations-oriented leader behaviors were both found casually antecedent to group drive.

Summary

This survey of effective leader behaviors showed that the theoretical formulations of the visionary leader framework are in harmony with the previous studies and the literature on leadership. The framework is thus not a new theory as much as it is a refinement of that which has become established in the field of leadership research. One of its major value lies in its integrating the two-factor model of consideration and structure into a broader framework for understanding the leadership phenomenon at all levels of an organization.
Research Hypotheses

From a review of the literature on the visionary leader framework and effective leader behavior, the following research hypotheses were proposed for this study:

1. Pastors of high growth churches in the Lake Union Conference are more effective in manifesting situation-appropriate leader behaviors than are pastors of low growth churches.

2. Pastors of high growth churches in the Lake Union Conference are more effective as visionary leaders than are pastors of low growth churches.

3. Pastors of high growth churches in the Lake Union Conference are more effective as managerial leaders than are the pastors of low growth churches.

4. Pastors from high growth churches will score significantly higher on follower-centered leader behaviors than would pastors from low growth churches.

5. There is a tendency for high scores on visionary leadership to be associated with high scores on follower-centered leadership for pastors in the Lake Union Conference.

6. Both pastors and their local elders in the Lake Union Conference agree on the extent of the follower-centered leader behaviors of the pastors.

7. The local conference in which a pastor works has no bearing on his leader behaviors and the growth level of
his church.

8. Both the self-reported leader behaviors of pastors and those reported by their first elders are similar.

9. Both the self-reported visionary leader behaviors of pastors and those reported by their first elders are similar.

10. Both the self-reported managerial leader behaviors of pastors and those reported by their first elders are similar.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

The selection and characteristics of the population and sample studied, the data collection procedures, the instrumentation, and the statistical methods used are now described.

Population and Sample

All SDA church pastors in the Lake Union Conference were the population of interest for this study. A sample was chosen from this group for the purpose of this study. The sample was generated from those pastors who had been with the same churches during the period January 1, 1934 and December 31, 1985. Directories listing these pastors were available from the executive secretaries of the local conference within the Lake Union Conference.

The Lake Union Conference oversees the work of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in the four states of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Wisconsin. Because of the close fellowship and organizational bonds among Seventh-day Adventists, the interchange of workers, and the common national and denominational structures, the conferences within the Lake Union Conference were regarded as being demographically similar.
Pastors serve in five local conferences which make up the Lake Union Conference. These local conferences and their number of church pastors in employ during the period of this study are shown in Table 2.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Conference</th>
<th>No. of Church Pastors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Conference</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Conference</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Conference</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin Conference</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Region Conference</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Union Conference Total</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following sampling procedure was followed. Pastors were given a ranking based on the percentage of baptisms and professions of faith recorded by their congregations for the two-year period, January 1, 1984 to December 31, 1985. Only congregations with thirty or more members were considered for this analysis to minimize error arising from high percentages but little meaningful growth.

The ranking of the pastors was done on a local conference basis for each conference within the Lake Union
Conference. The top five pastors from each conference comprised group one, high growth pastors. The bottom five pastors from each conference were assigned to group two, low growth pastors. Thus, there were twenty-five high growth pastors and twenty-five low growth pastors who were invited to participate in this study. The first elders of the pastors thus selected were automatically chosen to form part of this study to provide a check score on the leader behaviors of their pastors.

Data Collection Procedures

Permission to conduct this study was sought from the officers of the Lake Union Conference through a letter to the president on February 10, 1986. Approval was granted on March 11.

Copies of the Leader Behavior Questionnaire (Self) were sent via first class mail to the sample of church pastors selected for this study. First elders were sent the LBQ (Other). The home addresses of pastors and the first elders, as listed in the local conference directories, were used. Each mailing contained a cover letter which explained the relevance and the importance of the study and solicited the participation of the individual. A stamped self-addressed envelope for the return of the instrument was also included. The address of the office of education of the Lake Union Conference was used for the return of the
instruments.

The instruments in this study were coded so that follow-up contacts were made only with those not yet responding. Follow-up letters were sent to those not responding from the first mailing. Subsequently, telephone calls were made on three separate occasions to the listed directory numbers for all non-respondents. The local conference directories were used for this purpose. Five business days were allowed between calls to allow for the return of the instrument. After seven weeks of data collection a response rate of 86 percent for pastors and 74 percent for first elders was achieved. At this point it was determined that non-respondents were either unwilling and/or unable to participate in the study and the data collection was therefore deemed complete.

Instrumentation

The instrument used in this study was the Leader Behavior Questionnaire (Self and Other). This instrument was initially developed and piloted by Marshall Sashkin (1985).

The instrument has been used in several settings to study: (a) mid-level managers in a rural electric utility; (b) "fast-track" plant managers in an international manufacturing corporation (consumer and industrial products); (c) executive program MBA students in a large urban university in the southeastern United States; and (d) and
evening MBA students in a large metropolitan area, mid-Atlantic United States (Sashkin & Fulmer, 1985). From these, norms have been established (see Table 3). Reliability coefficients (Standardized Item Alpha) have also been determined (Table 4).

This instrument is now commercially available and is being used in both research and management training. Some demographic details were added to this instrument for the purpose of this study.

The instrument is based in part on a recent study of the dimensions of effective leadership by Bennis (1984). Bennis and Nanus (1985) conducted a large number of in-depth interviews with chief executive officers of major American corporations. Their analysis of these interviews led them to identify five basic behavior patterns characteristic of leaders who are successful and who "inspire" followers in a "visionary" manner. Bennis and Nanus (1985) also identified a specific set of emotional responses reported by subordinates and followers of these leaders.

The LBQ measures each of the five basic behavior patterns, as well as the set of emotional responses, by using five-question indices that yield scores ranging from five to twenty-five. Each question is stated as a measure of the extent to which the leader engages in the behaviors--or generates the feelings--using a five-point Likert scale.

The LBQ also includes measures of the four factors of
Table 3
Leader Behavior Questionnaire Norms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I: Self</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II: Self</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Self</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Self</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Self</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: 1. Focus  3. Trust  5. Risk  7. Support  

I: Mid-level managers in a rural electric utility; II: "Fast track" plant managers in an international manufacturing corporation (consumer and industrial products); 
III: Executive program MBA students, large urban university, southeast U.S.; IV: MBA students, evening/part-time program, large metropolitan area, mid-Atlantic U.S.
### Table 4

**LBQ Scale Reliability Coefficients**  
*(Standardized Item Alpha)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Focus</td>
<td>.1810(^a)</td>
<td>.2143(^d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Communication</td>
<td>.5926</td>
<td>.7863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Trust</td>
<td>.4416</td>
<td>.6419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Respect</td>
<td>.5668</td>
<td>.7741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Risk</td>
<td>.1787(^b)</td>
<td>.4716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Charismatic Affect</td>
<td>.6216</td>
<td>.5804(^e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Support</td>
<td>.6120</td>
<td>.6480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Goal Emphasis</td>
<td>.3561</td>
<td>.4215(^f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Work Facilitation</td>
<td>.3868(^c)</td>
<td>.5857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Team Facilitation</td>
<td>.7541</td>
<td>.7724</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Increases to .3963 when item 11 is dropped.  
\(^b\)Increases to .3338 when item 25 is dropped.  
\(^c\)Increases to .4797 when item 9 is dropped.  
\(^d\)Increases to .6049 when item 11 is dropped.  
\(^e\)Increases to .7900 when item 36 is dropped.  
\(^f\)Increases to .6123 when item 18 is dropped.

**Note:** The items noted above were revised in instruments used for this study.
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managerial leadership identified by Likert and others (Likert, 1947, 1961b, 1967), as part of the on-going research program at the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research. These four factors represent a refinement of the dimensions identified by the earlier Ohio State University leadership studies (Stogdill & Coons, 1957). The Michigan studies break down the two broad categories of leader behavior ("initiating structure" and "consideration") into four more specific types of leader behavior (Bowers & Seashore, 1966).

Sashkin (1985) indicated that the five indices that measure visionary leadership can help to identify those managers who can be or are becoming an organization's key executives. He also saw it as helping individuals to analyze their own styles to see what changes might be required for them to become visionary leaders. He further pointed out that very few people will score exceptionally high on these indices since there are not many visionary leaders. It is felt however, that to be effective, "all leaders must behave to some degree in the way identified here" (p. 1). Very low scores should be seen as indicators of a need for development in the specific areas in which the person scores low.

The four managerial leadership factors refer to the normal leader behaviors required of any effective manager. Burns (1978) called this "transactional" leadership, because
the leader is acting as a supervisor and engaging in transactions with employees as part of the unwritten "employment contract." LBQ scores on these four indices can be used to assess leadership training needs and to provide individual counseling for managers concerning professional development needs.

Sashkin (1985) provided the following description of the ten indices measured by the LBQ:

Index 1: Focused Leadership (Items 1, 11, 21, 31, 41)

Bennis found that effective visionary executives paid especially close attention to people with whom they were communicating. They "focused in" on the key issues under discussion and helped others to see these issues clearly. Finally, they had clear ideas about the relative importance or priorities of different issues under discussion. Overall, this factor comes together as the ability to manage one's attention and to direct the attention of others.

Index 2: Communication Leadership (Items 2, 12, 22, 32, 42)

This is a very tightly related set of items that centers on the leader's communication skills; specifically the ability to get the meaning of a message across, even if this means devising some innovative approach. Also included is attention to and appreciation for feelings; both one's own and the other person's, as those feelings are an important part of the message being communicated.

Index 3: Trust Leadership (Items 3, 13, 23, 33, 43)

The key factor here is the leader's perceived trustworthiness, as shown by willingness
to take clear positions; avoid "flip-flop" shifts in position; follow through on commitments. This factor refers to the leader's ability to show steadiness or reliability in matters of trust.

Index 4: Self-Leadership (Items 4, 14, 24, 34, 44)

This index concerns the leader's general attitudes toward self and others. That is, the leader's over-all concern for others and their feelings, as well as "taking care of" feelings about self in a positive sense (e.g., self-regard). Perhaps most basic in this index is the leader's sense of how he or she fits into the organization, now and in the future, in terms of the leader's own role.

Index 5: Risk Leadership (Items 5, 15, 25, 35, 45)

Effective visionary leaders are deeply involved in what they do. They do not spend excessive amounts of time and energy on plans to protect themselves against failure. These leaders are willing to take risks, not on a hit-or-miss basis, but after careful estimation of the odds of success or failure. Their energy is then invested in action, and this is obvious from the way they enjoy what they are doing.

Index 6: Follower-Centered Leadership (Items 6, 16, 26, 36, 46)

Bennis found that the behaviors of visionary leaders, as measured by the first five indices, seem to generate consistently a set of feelings in followers. Followers feel that their work becomes more meaningful and that they are the "masters" of their own behavior. That is, they feel competent. They feel a sense of community with their colleagues and co-workers. Finally, they report that they enjoy working for this person, the effective visionary leader. All of this come together in the leader's concern for followers.
Index 7: Supportive Management (Items 7, 17, 27, 37, 47)

Support refers to the leader's personal concern for employees and for the relationship between leader and employees. This implies a sensitivity to the feelings of employees, as well as the behavioral effort of paying attention to and thus showing a real concern for their expressed problems and feelings on a one-to-one basis.

Index 8: Goal-Oriented Management (Items 8, 18, 28, 38, 48)

This dimension concerns task-related leadership behaviors, with a focus on working with employees to develop specific, high performance goals. Through his or her own achievements and by rewarding the achievements of employees, the leader behaviorally demonstrates a commitment to high performance. Employees are quite clear as to what level of performance is expected of them by the leader.

Index 9: Task-Centered Management (Items 9, 19, 29, 39, 49)

In other leadership approaches, this dimension gets folded in with Goal-Centered Management. Although equally focused on the task, Goal-Centered Management is quite different. Task-Centered Management behavior includes: attending to supplies, coordination, the working environment; and the typical administrative, task-relevant duties of the manager. It also involves task-related coaching activities; helping employees deal with and resolve work problems, improve their skills and so on.

Index 10: Team Management (Items 10, 20, 30, 40, 50)

This index measures how well the leader encourages teamwork among employees and actively uses the team approach to management that Likert and his associates found to be
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strongly related to effectiveness. This means, for example, holding team meetings and encouraging workers to meet with and help one another whenever they have task problems that involve others. This kind of team building is essential for the full development of the potential productive interaction among employees. (pp. 2-4)

Tests of the New Framework

As shown in Table 3, LBQ data from four independent samples have so far been obtained and analyzed. Sample I consisted of eighteen male mid-level managers in a relatively large electric utility organization in the midwest. The "other" data were generated by two subordinates of each manager. Sample II included twenty-one managers (twenty males) at or close to the plant manager level in a very large international manufacturing company. These individuals were specially selected to participate in a five-week training program. They were seen as future corporate level managers. Except for the non-North American manager, "other" data were obtained from two subordinates of each manager. For foreign managers outside North America one "other" was one of the other trainees, and the second other was a member of the training staff. Sample III was a convenience sample of twenty-four upper mid-level managers (including three families) from various organizations, in an "executive MBA" training program at a large urban university. Sample IV was another convenience sample of thirty lower-mid-level managers in a part-time evening
weekend MBA program. Again most were male, with only five women in the course. In this case each manager asked one subordinate to complete an "other" LBQ.

The results of analyses of variance on each index for the various samples were highly consistent in showing Sample III highest, IV next, and I lowest for "self" data, across seven of the ten indices, with I always lowest. Several of these differences were significant. Similarly, for "other" data IV is consistently highest (on seven indices) and I is always lowest, and these differences were generally significant. In no cases were significant effects detected, self or other data, on indices within samples.

For the two samples for which full data were available from self and others, analyses were conducted to determine if there were any differences between self and other reports. In Sample I, significant differences were found for "focus" (index 1) and "risk" (index 5), with others reporting higher levels of behavior. For Sample IV, significant differences were found in "focus" again, as well as "communication" (index 2) and "self" (index 4), again with others reporting higher scores. In no case did any significant differences appear on the four managerial leadership scales. Whether the differences might have been introduced by "self" respondents selecting "others" who respond to them in a generally favorable manner is an open question.
The fact that so few differences appeared and did so only for the experimental charismatic behavior scales (and not for the "four factor leadership" scales, which have been studied extensively), suggests that the differences may be due to a combination of scale item problems (a revised instrument was used for this study) and a general tendency toward under-estimation by self respondents. The important point to be noted is the general consistency observed between self and other reports.

While Sashkin and Fulmer (1985) agreed that, from these previous studies, the LBQ was in need of refinement and further testing, the data then obtained provided some support for the new framework as regards leader behavior. That support is moderately strong with respect to the hypothesis test which indicates that higher levels of what has been defined as charismatic behavior on the leader's part are associated with charismatic affect, as reported by subordinates. Generally, these results indicated that further studies were warranted. That is, the framework had enough support to be judged worth testing further. This present study, therefore provides another test for this framework.

Data Analysis Techniques

After the data were returned, they were handed over to the Center for Research and Statistical Services, Western
Michigan University for data entry and analysis utilizing the university computer services. An initial frequency run of the data was done. For hypothesis testing, the level of significance was set at .05. The following null hypotheses were tested:

1. There is no significant difference in the frequency of specific leader behaviors of pastors of high growth and low growth churches in the Lake Union Conference.

2. There is no significant difference in the visionary leader behaviors of pastors of high growth and low growth churches in the Lake Union Conference.

3. There is no significant differences in the managerial leader behaviors of pastors of high growth and low growth churches in the Lake Union Conference.

4. There is no significant difference in the follower-centered leader behaviors of pastors who come from high growth and low growth churches in the Lake Union Conference.

5. There is no relationship between the visionary leader behaviors of pastors and their follower-centered leadership.

6. There is no significant difference between the perceptions of pastors and first elders on the extent of the follower-centered leader behaviors of the pastors in the Lake Union Conference.

7. There is no significant difference in the frequency
of specific leader behaviors of the pastors from the five local conferences in the Lake Union Conference.

8. There is no significant difference between the total self-reported leader behaviors of pastors and those behaviors as reported by their first elders.

9. There is no significant difference between the visionary leader behaviors of pastors and those behaviors as reported by their first elder.

10. There is no significant difference between the managerial leader behaviors of pastors and those behaviors as reported by their first elders.

The results and overall findings of the study are now presented in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Introduction

This study was conducted in order to answer the research question: Do pastors of high growth churches in the Lake Union Conference differ significantly in their leader behaviors from pastors of low growth churches? In this chapter a description of the characteristics of the sample, data on the reliability of the instrument used in the study, and results of the testing of the hypotheses are presented. The chapter is divided according to these three categories.

Description of the Sample

On May 2, 1986, questionnaires were sent by first-class mail to twenty-five pastors and their twenty-five first elders from high growth churches and twenty-five pastors and their twenty-five first elders from low growth churches across the Lake Union Conference. The sample was derived from an analysis of the church growth records (baptisms and professions of faith) for local conferences within the Lake Union Conference. The initial letter along with a follow-up correspondence and three separate sets of telephone
calls—all over a period of seven weeks—produced responses from 84 of the 100 in the original sample.

Of the 84 respondents in this study, 80 completed all or a portion of the questionnaire. This was broken down into 43 pastors (86 percent) and 37 first elders (74 percent) and this represented an over-all response rate of 80 percent. The researcher did not find any trend in the characteristics of the non-responding pastors and first elders.

In Tables 5-7, the responses are broken down according to growth level (Table 5), local conference (Table 5), and number of matched pairs from the local conferences (Table 6).

Table 5

Number of Respondents by Growth Level

| Growth Level | Pastors |  | First Elders |  |
|--------------|---------|----------------|---------------|
|               | N       | %             | N             | %             |
| High Growth   | 23      | 92            | 18            | 72            |
| Low Growth    | 20      | 80            | 19            | 76            |
| Total         | 43      | 86            | 37            | 74            |
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Table 6
Number of Respondents by Local Conference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pastors</th>
<th></th>
<th>First Elders</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Sent</td>
<td>No. Returned</td>
<td>No. Sent</td>
<td>No. Returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Region</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7
Number of Respondents by Matched Pairs and Local Conferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Growth</th>
<th>Low Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Region</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographic Profiles of Pastors

The pastors in this study ranged in age from 29 to 70 years with a mean of 44.67. Their mean average years as a pastor was 11. With respect to size of church membership, 15 pastors had churches with 30-100 members; 18 had 100-250 members; 7 had 250-500 members; and 1 had over 500 members. There were 2 missing responses for this item. The city size in which these churches were located were quite varied, ranging from 1,000 to 3 million people. The median city population was 42,000.

Half of the pastors were baptized members of the church before their fourteenth birthday (median = 13.75). Their mean age for baptisms, however, was 16.30. From 36 responses to the item, undergraduate major, 29 stated theology. There were no social science majors in the sample. Forty percent of the pastors indicated that they had no training in leadership apart from their seminary preparation. With reference to pastoral roles (Tables 8 & 9), 29 percent (the highest percentage) favored preaching while 27.5 percent were least comfortable with long-range planning and church administration.

Reactions of Non-Respondents

Telephone contacts with non-respondents provided the researcher with a variety of responses. One low growth
Table 8
Most Comfortable Pastoral Roles by Absolute and Percentage Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Witnessing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading in Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preaching</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral Visitation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Range Planning</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9
Least Comfortable Pastoral Roles by Absolute and Percentage Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Witnessing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading in Services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral Visitation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Range Planning</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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pastor indicated that he had been in the ministry a long
time and he just wanted to "take it easy now." Two of the
elders questioned the motives for the study and feared to
become part of a study which might hurt their pastors.
Clarifications from the researcher as to the purpose of
the study failed to convince them otherwise.

Reliability Analyses

Tests of reliability establish whether the instrument
used consistently measures what it was designed to measure
(Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 1985). The statistical procedures addressed here were: (a) the mean score for the
pastors and their first elders for each index by growth
level, (b) the inter-index correlation coefficients for the
ten indices, and (c) the reliability coefficients (standardized alpha) for each index to the total scale.

Mean Scores

Tables 10 and 11 list the mean scores for the pastors
and the first elders for the ten sub-scales on the instru-
ment. This information is provided to give a quick picture
of the relative strengths of the pastors across indices for
high and low growth churches and to note the differences in
scoring between pastors and first elders for the two levels.
From exploratory tests of the hypotheses undergirding the
visionary leader framework, it has been suggested that
there would be no significant differences between the two sets of scores.

Table 10
High Growth Mean Scores by Indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Pastors</th>
<th></th>
<th>Elders</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Focus</td>
<td>20.09</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Communication</td>
<td>19.83</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Trust</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>18.28</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self</td>
<td>21.65</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>22.28</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Risk</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>18.17</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Follower-centered</td>
<td>19.44</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>19.83</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Supportive</td>
<td>21.26</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Goal-oriented</td>
<td>16.04</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>16.06</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Task-centered</td>
<td>16.57</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>16.56</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Team Management</td>
<td>21.09</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>20.72</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = Pastors, 23
Elders, 18
SD = Standard deviation
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Table 11
Low Growth Mean Scores by Indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Pastors Mean</th>
<th>Pastors SD</th>
<th>Elders Mean</th>
<th>Elders SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Focus</td>
<td>18.90</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>18.95</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Communication</td>
<td>19.25</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>19.90</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Trust</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>17.47</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Self</td>
<td>21.20</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>21.32</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Risk</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>18.53</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Follower-centered</td>
<td>19.25</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>19.53</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Supportive</td>
<td>21.15</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>19.58</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Goal-oriented</td>
<td>15.45</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>15.84</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Task-centered</td>
<td>16.35</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Team Management</td>
<td>19.15</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = Pastors, 20
Elders, 19
SD = Standard deviation

As may be expected from a church organization, the pastors scored higher in the consideration sub-scales (2, 4, 6, 7, and 10) than in the structuring (1, 5, 8, and 9). The one exception is index 3, trust leadership. An investigation of the pastor's mean scores for the items in this index revealed that scores were all above 3.0 except for item 43 which had a mean of 1.77. This item—am someone in whom people can put absolute faith—is understandably rated...
low by Christian pastors. This group believes that people should place absolute faith only in God.

In terms of relative differences, on every index pastors from high growth churches scored higher than their counterparts from low growth churches. A similar picture emerged from the elders' scores except for one (Risk leadership). Furthermore, the scores from pastors matched closely (difference of under 1.0) the comparative scores from the elders in all but two instances, both of which (Supportive and Task-centered) were for low growth settings. It should also be pointed out that the elders tended to demonstrate greater variability in recording on the consideration scales than on the structuring (see especially communication, trust, supportive, and team management).

**Inter-Index Correlative Matrix**

An inter-index correlation matrix was developed to determine how well the indices held together. Hinkle, Wiersma and Jurs (1979) provided a rule of thumb for interpreting the size of the correlation coefficient (Table 12).

Based on this rule of thumb, there was generally at least a low positive correlation for all pairs of indices as shown in Table 13. The one major exception was trust leadership (Index 3). This index had little, if any correlation with all the other indices, and interestingly, had a low negative correlation (-0.24) with index 6 (follower leadership).
Table 12

Rule of Thumb for Interpreting the Size of a Correlation Coefficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Coefficient (Range)</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.90 to 1.00 (-.90 to -1.00)</td>
<td>Very high positive (negative) correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.70 to .90 (-.70 to -.90)</td>
<td>High positive (negative) correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50 to .70 (-.50 to -.70)</td>
<td>Moderate positive (negative) correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30 to .50 (-.30 to -.50)</td>
<td>Low positive (negative) correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00 to .30 (.00 to -.30)</td>
<td>Little if any correlation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


centered leadership). This suggests that there is a tendency for an inverse relationship to exist between the pastor's trust leadership (perceived trustworthiness) and his follower-centered leadership.

Reliability Coefficients

The degree of reliability needed in a measure depends to a great extent on the use that is to be made of the results. Ary, Jacobs, and Razavieh (1985) pointed out that if the results are to be used as a basis for making decisions about individuals, especially important or irreversible decisions, only instruments with the highest reliability...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INDXP1</th>
<th>INDXP2</th>
<th>INDXP3</th>
<th>INDXP4</th>
<th>INDXP5</th>
<th>INDXP6</th>
<th>INDXP7</th>
<th>INDXP8</th>
<th>INDXP9</th>
<th>INDXP10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDXP1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDXP2</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDXP3</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDXP4</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDXP5</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDXP6</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDXP7</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDXP8</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDXP9</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDXP10</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: INDPI-10 = Correlations of Pastors' scores (P) on indices (IND) 1-10
are acceptable. They stated, however, that if the measurement results are to be used for making a decision about a group (as is the case here) or for research purposes, a lower reliability coefficient (in the range of .30 to .50) might be acceptable. Based on these guidelines, the coefficients reported in Table 14 are acceptable.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Scale Mean if Index Deleted</th>
<th>Scale Variance if Index Deleted</th>
<th>Alpha* if Index Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>170.33</td>
<td>159.99</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>170.30</td>
<td>154.17</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>172.42</td>
<td>185.53</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>168.42</td>
<td>156.68</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>170.95</td>
<td>165.76</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>170.51</td>
<td>168.78</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>168.65</td>
<td>153.14</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>174.09</td>
<td>175.13</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>173.40</td>
<td>166.34</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>169.67</td>
<td>160.22</td>
<td>8.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Mean = 189.86  
Variance = 199.17  
SD = 14.11  
Alpha = 0.819  
Standardized item alpha = 0.824  
*denotes standardized alpha
Tests of the Hypotheses

There were ten research hypotheses considered in this study. From these, ten null hypotheses were developed. The first three of these hypotheses related to the leader behaviors of pastors and the growth level of their churches. The second triad analyzed the follower-centered leadership of the pastors. Hypothesis seven looked at the differences in behaviors according to the local conference of employment. Finally, the last three hypotheses addressed the self versus other differences in the scores between the pastors and their first elders.

Behaviors and Growth

Hypothesis 1

The first null hypothesis stated that there was no significant difference in the effectiveness of the leader behaviors of pastors of high growth and low growth churches in the Lake Union Conference. The research hypothesis suggested that pastors of high growth churches in the Lake Union Conference were more effective in manifesting situation-appropriate leader behaviors than were pastors of low growth churches.

A one-way analysis of variance was used to test this hypothesis. The total mean LBQ score for the pastors was the independent variable. Similarly, a comparison test
was done utilizing the mean total LBQ score for the first elders as the dependent variable and again, level of church growth as the independent variable. The $F$ test was the test statistics employed and the probability of committing a Type 1 error was set at .05.

As Table 15 demonstrates, the first test using the scores from the pastors showed up no significant difference in the level of the leader behaviors of pastors from high growth and low growth churches. An $F$ ratio of 1.463 was obtained, but from calculations using Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (1979), 4.075 is the critical value for this statistic for 1 and 41 degrees of freedom (df). Thus this research hypothesis stands unsupported at the .05 level. The null hypothesis was therefore retained.

The comparison test which was performed on the scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary ANOVA Table for Pastors' Total LBQ and Growth Level of Church</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$F_{cv}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>474.006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>474.006</td>
<td>2.463</td>
<td>4.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>7991.156</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>192.467</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8365.163</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $N = 43$

$MS = $ Mean Square

$F_{cv} = $ Critical value of $F$
from the first elders also failed to produce any significance while the critical value for 1 and 35 df was 4.125.

**Hypothesis 2**

The second null hypothesis posited that there was no significant difference in the visionary leader behaviors of pastors of high growth and low growth churches in the Lake Union Conference. The research hypothesis suggested that pastors of high growth churches were more effective as visionary or executive leaders than were pastors of low growth churches.

As for the first hypothesis test, a one-way analysis of variance was conducted with the mean score from the pastors on the first five indices as the dependent variable and the level of church growth as the independent variable. These five indices were focused leadership, communication leadership, trust leadership, self leadership, and risk leadership. A comparison test was also done for the first elders using their mean scores from the same indices.

An F ratio of 2.263 was obtained for the pastors and, with a critical value (cv) for this statistic of 4.075 for 1 and 41 df, the null hypothesis was retained. For the elders, the observed F value was 1.281 while the cv was 4.125.
Hypothesis 3

For hypothesis three, the null form was that there was no significant difference in the managerial leader behaviors of pastors of high growth and low growth churches in the Lake Union Conference. The research hypothesis was also directional here and suggested that high growth church pastors were more effective as managerial leaders than were pastors of low growth churches.

As for the first two hypotheses, a one-way analysis of variance was conducted using the mean scores of the pastors on the last four indices. These indices were supportive management, goal-oriented management, task-centered management, and team management.

For this test, an $F$ value of 2.184 was observed. This proved non-significant at the .05 level for 1 and 41 df, ($F_{cv}$ of 4.075). Again, the null hypothesis was retained. Similar to the pastors, the analysis of variance of the mean score from the elders was not significant at the .05 level. An observed $F$ value of 2.194 ($F_{cv}$ of 4.125) was recorded.

Summary of Findings for First Three Hypotheses

The first three hypotheses all addressed the issue of whether the self-scored perceived level of frequency of specific leader behaviors of pastors in this sample were
associated with the level of growth in their churches. Summary data was used to answer this research question.

The findings from analyses of variance for the mean total, mean visionary, and the mean managerial scores all supported the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. The comparative scores from the first elders yielded similar results. From this study, it is therefore concluded that the level of frequency of specific leader behaviors of pastors in the Lake Union Conference—visionary, managerial, or total—are not associated with the growth pattern of their churches. Concerns and possible interpretations relative to these findings are discussed in Chapter V.

**Follower-Centered Leadership**

**Hypothesis 4**

The fourth null hypothesis stated that there was no significant difference in the follower-centered leadership of pastors of high and low growth churches. The research hypothesis had suggested that high growth pastors would score significantly higher than low growth pastors on this index.

To test this hypothesis, a t test was used with high growth pastors comprising group one and low growth pastors forming group two. Group one had an N of 23 and group two, an N of 20 (see Table 16).
Table 16
Summary Data for Pastors on Follower-Centered Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-Tail Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.44</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.25</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1. Group 1 = High growth pastors
2. Group 2 = Low growth pastors
2. Not significant at the .05 level

A glance at the table reveals that a mere .19 separated the means for the two groups. The cv for this statistic for 41 df (one-tailed test at .05 level of significance) was approximately 1.683. There is no evidence here, therefore, to support the research hypothesis. The null hypothesis of no difference in the follower-centered leadership of pastors according to growth level was thus retained.

**Hypothesis 5**

Hypothesis five dealt with the relationship between the visionary leader behaviors (first five indices) of pastors and their follower-centered leadership. The research hypothesis was directional in nature and suggested that there was a tendency for high scores on visionary leadership to be associated with high scores on follower-centered leadership.
This hypothesis was tested by determining the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. The Pearson $r$ is an index of the linear relationship between two variables (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 1979). From 43 valid cases, a Pearson $r$ coefficient of .284 was obtained. This resulted in a significance level (F value) of .032. This was significant at the .05 level. The conclusion therefore was that there is a low but positive correlation between the visionary leader behaviors of pastors and their follower-centered leadership. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected.

**Hypothesis 6**

Hypothesis six sought to test for any significant difference between the perceptions of pastors and first elders on the extent of the follower-centered leader behaviors of the pastors in the sample.

For this hypothesis, the null and the research forms were similar. It was hypothesized that there would be congruence in the perceptions of pastors and their first elders on the follower-centeredness of the pastors. The paired scores of the pastors and their first elders were used for this analysis. There were 34 such pairs of scores (Table 17).
Table 17
Comparison of Summary Data for Pastors and Elders on Follower-Centered Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-Tail Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pastors</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18.88</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>-2.12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.042*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elders</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19.85</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*denotes significance

A t test for difference of mean was utilized to test this hypothesis. This is supported from Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (1979) who pointed out that when testing the difference between means, the T distribution is the appropriate underlying distribution (p. 207). A T value of -2.12 was obtained. This was significant at the .05 level for a two-tailed test with 33 df (cv of approximately ± 2.031).

The null hypothesis was therefore rejected here. The finding seemed to suggest that pastors tended to rate their own follower-centered leadership significantly lower than did their elders.

Summary of Findings for Hypotheses 4, 5, and 6

Hypotheses 4, 5, and 6 were all addressing the follower-centered leadership of the pastors in this sample. The fourth hypothesis looked at the differences between high and low growth pastors on this index. The fifth
hypothesis deals with the relationship between the pastor's visionary ability and his follower-centeredness. Finally, the sixth hypothesis addressed the differences in perceptions between the pastors and their elders on this index.

The results showed that pastors did not differ significantly on this index according to the growth level of their churches. A low but positive relationship between the visionary ability of the pastors and their follower-centered leadership was noted. Pastors also tended to score themselves significantly lower than their elders on this index. In Chapter V, possible interpretations of, and implications from, these findings are discussed.

Differences by Local Conference

Hypothesis 7

In Hypothesis 7, the differences in the leader behaviors of the pastors according to their five local conferences were considered for analysis.

In this instance, the null hypothesis was in essence the research hypothesis. It was suggested that the local conference in which the pastor worked had no bearing on the frequency of the specific leader behaviors that he seemed to demonstrate.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to test
this hypothesis. Conference of employment was the independent variable and the dependent variable was the mean total LBQ scores of the pastors. A similar comparison check was done using the total mean LBQ scores from the first elders.

For the pastors, an observed $F$ value of 4.661 was noted (Table 18). This was significant for the $cv$ for 4 and 38 df at the .05 level of significance was approximately 2.63 according to calculations from the $F$ distribution table in Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (1979). The null hypothesis was therefore rejected. The conference in which the pastor worked thus tended to have an influence on his leader behaviors.

Table 18
Summary ANOVA Table for Pastors' Total LBQ Scores by Employing Conference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$X$ Square</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$F_{cv}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2753.5166</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>688.3791</td>
<td>4.661</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>5611.6397</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>147.6747</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8365.1563</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$F$-probability = 0.0037. This is significant at .05.

Post hoc multiple comparisons were also conducted on this data to determine the sources of significance. The
Least Significant Difference (LSD) method was employed for this purpose. This test showed up significance for the following pairs of conferences: Michigan and Illinois; Lake Region and Illinois; Lake Region and Wisconsin; and Lake Region and Indiana. (See Table 19.)

Interestingly, a comparison ANOVA on the scores from the elders showed up no significance (F probability of 0.23). The elders therefore demonstrated no significant difference across conferences in their ratings of their pastors.

Table 19
Post-Hoc Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Conf.</th>
<th>Ill.</th>
<th>Wis.</th>
<th>Ind.</th>
<th>Mich.</th>
<th>Lake R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>179.29</td>
<td>Ill.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183.00</td>
<td>Wis.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189.89</td>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192.44</td>
<td>Mich.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.75</td>
<td>Lake R.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level. NS denotes not significant.

Pastor Versus Elder Differences

Hypothesis 8

Hypothesis 8 considered the differences between the pastors and their first elders in the mean total LBQ scores.
Both the research and null forms of this hypothesis were similar with both indicating no significant difference in scores. A t test was used to test this hypothesis at the .05 level of significance (see Table 20). There were 31 pairs of responses analyzed. The data showed a mean of 189.58 for the pastors' LBQ and 191.10 for the elders. The test produced a T value of -0.39 which was not significant at 0.5. The null hypothesis was therefore retained and the research hypothesis was supported.

Table 20
Pastor Versus Elder Differences on Total LBQ Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-Tail Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pastors</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>189.58</td>
<td>15.28</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elders</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>191.10</td>
<td>16.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tcv = + 2.04 Not significant at 0.5

Hypothesis 9

Hypothesis 9 continued from the previous hypothesis and looked for differences on the mean visionary scores of pastors and their first elders. Again, both the research and the null forms indicated that there would be no significant differences between these two sets of scores.

As Table 21 shows, the pastors had a mean score of
97.03 and the elders, 98.42. The results showed a T value of -0.69 which was not significant at the 0.5 level. The null was therefore retained and the research hypothesis stood supported.

Table 21
Pastor Versus Elder Differences on Visionary Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-Tail Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pastors</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>97.03</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elders</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>98.42</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tcv = + 2.04 Not significant at .05

Hypothesis 10

Finally, in this triad of hypotheses, the tenth hypothesis looked at differences in mean scores between pastors and elders on the managerial scale (last four indices). Again, both the null and the research forces were similar.

From Table 22, it is noted that the pastors gained a mean score of 73.65 and the elders, 72.94. A T value of 0.37 was recorded and this was not significant at .05. Again, the null was retained and the research hypothesis was supported.
Table 22
Pastor Versus Elder Differences on Managerial Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-Tail Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pastors</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>73.65</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elders</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>72.94</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tcv = ± 2.04 Not significant at .05

Summary of findings for Hypothesis 8 Through 10

Hypotheses 8, 9, and 10 all looked at the self versus other differences between the mean scores from pastors and their first elders. Hypothesis 8 dealt with the mean total score; Hypothesis 9 with the mean visionary score; and Hypothesis 10 with the mean managerial score.

The hypotheses suggested no differences between mean scores for the three hypotheses. The t tests were conducted to analyze these differences. The results showed that, based on summary data, pastors and elders tended to score the leader behaviors of pastors similarly. Elders tended to report slightly higher scores for the total LBQ and the visionary scales, while the pastors reported slightly higher for the managerial scale.
Summary

This chapter presented the findings from the study conducted on pastors and first elders in the Lake Union Conference. There was an overall response rate of 80 percent for this study which was divided into 86 percent for pastors and 74 percent for first elders.

The reliability analyses demonstrated that the instrument's reliability coefficient was acceptable for this study and that there were generally acceptable correlations among the indices. Index 3, trust leadership, however, did pose some concerns. The nature of the sample (Christian leaders who generally advocate the placing of absolute trust only in God) was provided as a possible explanation.

The results from the tests of the ten hypotheses were then presented. The first triad of hypotheses dealt with the behaviors of pastors and church growth. No significant difference was found in the behaviors of high and low growth pastors. The second triad looked at the follower-centered leadership of pastors. Again, pastors did not differ significantly on this index. A low but positive relationship between the visionary leadership of pastors and their follower-centered ability was noted. Pastors also tended to score themselves significantly lower than their elders on this index.

Hypothesis 7 showed that the local conference a pastor
belonged to made a difference in his score. In the self versus other differences (Hypotheses 8 through 10), the results showed that pastors and elders tended to score the leader behaviors of pastors similarly.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

In this chapter, a summary of the study is first presented. This includes a re-statement of the problem, a brief overview of the relevant literature, the research design and the null hypotheses. The conclusions which may be drawn from this research study and the recommendations for further research are then presented.

Summary

The Problem

This dissertation study was conducted in order to answer the research question: Do pastors of high growth churches in the Lake Union Conference differ significantly in their leader behaviors from pastors who function in low growth churches? This project was recognized as having implications for possibly modifying current practices for the pre-service and in-service training of church pastors of the Lake Union Conference and for the periodic evaluation of their performance.
The Review of the Literature

From a review of the related literature on leader behaviors in the Seventh-day Adventist Church, particularly the Oosterwal (1976) study, a need was demonstrated for this study. Oosterwal indicated that there was need for the Church to take "a hard and bold look at the role of the minister (pastor) in the church" (p. 66).

In the field of church leadership, studies by Gibbs (1981), Lindgren and Shawchuck (1977), and Wagner (1976), have all underscored the vital role the pastor plays in the over-all mission and growth of the church. Worley (quoted in Lindgren, 1977) however, noted that the pastor's organizational role has been traditionally under-rated in favor of his prophet-preaching and sacramental roles.

In the wider field of leadership, there is consistent support for the view that the leader makes a difference in a situation. Bennis and Nanus (1985) found that the difference is related to certain specific leader behaviors manifested by these leaders. From their study of ninety American leaders in a variety of settings, they found that effective leaders distinguished themselves by inculcating a vision in the organization, by paying attention to communication, by empowering others, and by a willingness to take risks.

Sashkin and Fulmer (1985) integrated the findings of
Bennis and Nanus with those of Bowers and Seashore (1962), Parsons (1960) and Stogdill and Coons (1957) in developing a new framework for understanding the leadership phenomenon in organizations and Sashkin developed and piloted an instrument for its measurement. In this study, this instrument and the theoretical base undergirding it was used as an exploratory test of this framework in a church setting.

All levels of leadership (both supervisory and executive) are considered in this model. It expanded the two-factor dimension of initiating structure and consideration into four more specific factors (Supportive, Goal-oriented, Task-centered, and Team Management). Five leadership factors were derived for a description of executive leadership. These were Vision, Communication, Trust, Self, and Risk. The model also included an index (Follower-centered) which measured the perceived emotional response of followers to the behaviors of the leader.

From a review of the literature on effective leader behaviors (see Bass, 1981 for a thorough review), it was seen that the visionary leader framework is really an integration of earlier findings and that the ten factors all have sound empirical and theoretical support from studies and the literature in a variety of settings.
Research Design

To answer the research question posed in this study, fifty pastors and their first elders from churches across the Lake Union Conference were surveyed. Of these fifty pastors, twenty-five were from churches which were high growth, and twenty-five were from low growth churches. Growth was operationally defined as the percentage of baptisms and professions of faith over a two-year period, January 1, 1984 to December 31, 1985. Based on this criterion, the top five and the bottom five churches in the five conferences of the Lake Union Conference were selected and the LBQ questionnaires were sent to the pastors and their first elders. The response rate was 86 percent for the pastors and 74 percent for the first elders.

The following null hypotheses were tested in this study:

1. There is no significant difference in the frequency of specific leader behaviors of pastors of high growth and low growth churches in the Lake Union Conference.

2. There is no significant difference in the visionary leader behaviors of pastors of high growth and low growth churches in the Lake Union Conference.

3. There is no significant difference in the manage-
managerial leader behaviors of pastors of high growth and low growth churches in the Lake Union Conference.

4. There is no significant difference in the follower-centered leader behaviors of pastors of high growth and low growth churches in the Lake Union Conference.

5. There is no relationship between the visionary leader behaviors of pastors and their follower-centered leadership.

6. There is no significant difference between the perceptions of pastors and first elders on the extent of the follower-centered leader behaviors of the pastors in the Lake Union Conference.

7. There is no significant difference in the frequency of specific leader behaviors of the pastors from the five local conferences in the Lake Union Conference.

8. There is no significant difference between the total self-reported leader behaviors of pastors and those behaviors as reported by their first elders.

9. There is no significant difference between the visionary leader behaviors of pastors and those behaviors as reported by their first elders.

10. There is no significant differences between the managerial leader behaviors of pastors and those behaviors as reported by their first elders.
Conclusions

Behaviors and Growth

In the first three hypotheses, an answer was sought to the query: Do pastors of high growth churches differ significantly in their leader behaviors from pastors of low growth churches? From the analysis conducted using one-way ANOVA, no statistical significance was recorded. From this sample therefore, it was concluded that there is no significant difference in the behaviors of pastors of high growth as opposed to low growth churches.

How could this finding be explained in the light of the literature which suggests that there would be a significant difference? From Figure 2 it can be seen that the high growth pastors scored consistently higher than the low growth pastors, although not significantly so from a statistical perspective. There is therefore a tendency which is consistent with the literature. This is also true for the visionary and managerial sub-scales (Figures 3 and 4).

The issue therefore becomes: What are the implications from the fact that the differences were smaller than would be expected? It may be argued that the period of time allotted for designating a church as either high growth or low growth may have been insufficient for a pattern to be clearly delineated. This may be a possible limitation.
Figure 2: Total Leader Behavior Scores by Growth Level
Figure 3. Visionary Leader Behavior Scores by Growth Level
Figure 4. Managerial Leader Behavior Scores by Growth Level
of the study but, because of the rapid change of pastorates within the Seventh-day Adventist Church (two to three years typically), a longer period was considered unwise if a picture as near as possible to reality was to emerge.

Another caution in the use of these findings is related to the nature of the instrument used in this study. As stated in Chapter I, specific behaviors were selected in the instrument for analysis but, as is well-nigh impossible, the totality of behaviors were not measured. Error may therefore exist in the findings from the non-inclusion of specific behaviors which may have made a significant difference. It will be helpful in the future to use additional methods for the measurement of leader effectiveness so that more comprehensive findings could be presented. From this study therefore, even if high correlations were found, the findings would still have had to be used with restraint.

These limitations aside however, there should be cause for concern that so little differences have been demonstrated between the leader behaviors of pastors from high growth and low growth churches. This would seem to suggest that pastors are not making a marked difference in the quantitative growth level of their churches. While the SDA Church is doubtless thankful for the other variables at work that are facilitating continued quantitative growth in the local congregations (Oosterwal (1976) referred to many of these),
the central leader role of the pastor in this enterprise needs to be given more focused consideration.

Interestingly, the findings from this study are in agreement with those of Oosterwal's with reference to the limited role of the pastor in quantitative church growth. This is in conflict with the expressed desire of the Lake Union church constituency (Oosterwal, 1976) for a more dynamic role for the pastor in catalysing the church for growth.

The fact that two separate studies, conducted ten years apart in the same Lake Union Conference, have come up with the same finding of a limited leader role for the church pastor should arouse the attention of the leaders of the church. There seems to be a conflict between the expressed and desired role of the pastor (Ministerial Association, 1977; Oosterwal, 1976) and the demonstrated behaviors of the pastors. A possible source for this conflict may lie in a divergence of real interest between the church and its ministerial training institution. There may need to be a re-evaluation of the balance between theological content and the leadership process in the pre-service and in-service training for church pastors.

**Follower-Centered Leadership**

Both high and low growth pastors perceived themselves to be regarded similarly by their followers. Both groups
also scored significantly lower than their first elders on this index. These findings seem to suggest that there is a "delusion index" between the perceptions of the pastors and those of the elders. The pastors may be underestimating or the elders may be over-estimating the follower-centeredness of the pastors. One may be tempted to place greater reliability on the self score of the pastor and, from this perspective, the prospect is bright for greater visionary leadership and the pastors. This is so because a higher score on this index is indicative of a greater ability to influence. The fact that a positive relationship was found between visionary ability and follower-centered leadership (a major test for the visionary leader framework) supports this contention.

In terms of follower-centered leadership, the scores from the first elders demonstrate that the pastors have a greater ability to influence than the pastors are even aware of. The suggestion for an on-going program of training in leadership is therefore supported.

**Conference of Employment**

Hypothesis seven analyzed differences according to local conference of employment. The results of the one-way ANOVA showed that the local conference of employment did make a significant difference in the leader behavior scores of the pastors.
The pastors from the Lake Region Conference scored significantly higher than pastors from all the other conferences except Michigan. A caution, however, needs to be placed on the use of the LSD analysis (Table 19) for there were unequal numbers in the sample. Illinois, for instance, only had seven of their ten pastors reporting; Lake Region, eight; Indiana and Michigan, nine each; and Wisconsin, ten (Table 6).

There seems to be some variables within the Lake Region Conference, however, which distinguish it as being facilitative of growth. Racial and cultural factors may be advanced as possible causes for this phenomenon but these are not addressed in this study. Further study in this area is recommended.

**Pastor Versus Elder Difference**

Hypotheses eight through ten analyzed the differences in scoring between the mean scores for pastors and the first elders. The results showed no significant difference in the scoring patterns of pastors and first elders. This finding is in harmony with the previous studies which were conducted using the LBQ instrument. Based on these tests therefore, the visionary leader framework stands supported.

**The Visionary Leader Framework**

This study was an exploratory test of the visionary
leader framework in a church setting. The results of this study indicated both conflicting and supportive evidence for the model. While there was a tendency for pastors from high growth churches to be more effective than pastors from low growth situations, this was not so to a statistically significant extent. There was support for the view that there was a positive relationship between the visionary score and follower-centered leadership. There was also support for the position that there would be no significant difference between the scores for self and other.

Recommendations for Further Study

Further research is recommended in this area in which other variables may be investigated in an effort to find out what variables facilitate the achievement of the ultimate mission and growth of the church. This is an issue that continues to occupy the minds of researchers in the profit sector and the church needs to focus greater attention on this, for members, like customers, need to be influenced toward goal accomplishment. Their allegiance should spring willingly, not from fear or compulsion. "Knowing the fear (reverential respect and love) of the Lord, we persuade men" (2 Corinthians 5:11).

The following recommendations are therefore provided:

1. Additional research studies be pursued on the local
church with the aim of clearly identifying the variables which make for effectiveness in terms of the mission of the church. This recommendation is based on the importance of the local church in the ultimate growth of the world today.

2. This study should be replicated using a larger sample from across North America. Such a sample should be chosen at random so that inference may be made for the present and future training of clergy for the Seventh-day Adventist Church in North America.

3. In view of the pastor's central position in the church structure and his expressed role as stated in the Manual for Ministers, church administrators should give continuing study to the role and function of the local church pastor in terms of the ultimate mission of the church.

4. The pre-service and in-service training programs for church pastors in the organization should be re-evaluated with greater consideration being given to the leader role of the church pastor.

5. The SDA Theological Seminary should give consideration to the development of a required course in its ministerial training curriculum aimed at equipping the pastor with the behavioral skills necessary for effectively leading the local church.

6. The local Seventh-day Adventist church should
foster the optimum use of the talents and abilities resident in its membership in carrying out the mission of the church.

7. A multivariate study should be pursued to analyze the significance of racial and cultural factors in church growth.

8. Continuing work on the Visionary Leader Framework should be pursued.
Appendix A

Letter of Permission for Use of Instruments
February 19, 1986

Mr. Clinton Valley
Department of Educational Leadership
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI 49008

Dear Mr. Valley:

Enclosed are the materials we spoke of. The first paper was the one I delivered in Lubbock, the second is the revision of that paper that will appear in a book later this year, and the third is a "popular" version of the executive leadership part of the theory that will soon appear in Training and Development Journal.

I have enclosed a copy of the current versions of the LBQ-Self, the LBQ-Other, and the Trainers Guide. You have my permission to retype the fifty items on each of the questionnaires and use them as part of a research questionnaire, as part of your doctoral studies. No further reproduction or use is permitted, nor may you copy or reproduce the materials in their present form (which was designed for use in management training programs). In return for permission to use these instruments, you agree to provide me with a copy of the complete data set.

I will be glad to assist you in any way that I can, in your doctoral research work.

Best regards,

Marshall Sashkin
Appendix B

Letter to President, Lake Union Conference
10 February 1986

Elder Robert Carter, President
Lake Union Conference of SDA
Box C
Berrien Springs
Michigan 49103

Dear Elder Carter:

I am now at the dissertation stage of my doctoral degree program and my interests are in doing a study that would be germane to the ministry in the Lake Union Conference.

I have chosen as a research topic: The Relationship Between the Leader Behaviors of Pastors and Church Growth in the Lake Union Conference. I plan to seek through a questionnaire instrument the perceptions of pastors and first elders on what behaviors enhance effectiveness as a church pastor.

I am requesting permission from the Union to conduct this study among the pastors and first elders in the Union. On the completion of the study, I will be more than happy to share the results with the Union and the constituent local conferences.

Thank you for your attention. I eagerly look forward to hearing your positive response.

Sincerely,

Clinton A. Valley
Appendix C

Union President's Letter to Pastors and First Elders in the Sample
April 18, 1986

Dear Fellow-worker:

Christian greetings! The Lake Union Conference has recently given approval for a study on church growth to be conducted within the Union. Some pastors and their first elders were especially selected to participate in this study, and I am pleased to inform you that you are one of them.

The burden of a finished work surely engulfs us all. The findings from this study will greatly help in planning new models for pastoral ministry and growth in the Seventh-day Adventist Church so that we may be able to more effectively carry out the mission of our Lord and hasten His glorious return.

In a few days you will be receiving a copy of the questionnaire in the mail. Please take a few minutes and fill it out as soon as it comes so that the researcher may be able to present some results to us as quickly as possible. The material is confidential and only over-all responses will be reported.

Thank you for giving early attention to this item as it comes to you.

Sincerely,

Robert H. Carter
PRESIDENT

Office of the President
Box C
Berrien Springs, Michigan 49103
(616) 473-4541

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Appendix D

Cover Letter to Population Sample
I am excited about sharing this piece of good news with you.

The Church is concerned about the critical role of the pastor as the leader of the local church, and not merely the manager of some branch outlet. This is great news to me as a pastor.

The Lake Union Conference has therefore given approval for a study to be conducted on the role of the church pastor. The results of this study will have implications for ministerial training in leadership, and also help to define and clarify the position and role of the pastor in the overall program of the Church.

I therefore wish to encourage you to take a few moments and complete the enclosed questionnaire. It should take you no more than 20 minutes. Your candid responses are vital to this study. I will really appreciate your help. The responses are absolutely confidential and only group responses will be reported.

As a reward for your help, I will be happy to send you a copy of my findings. If you so desire, please place an "X" below and return this letter with your questionnaire.

Thank you again for your help.

Sincerely your brother,

Clinton Valley W. E. Minder, Director
Researcher

Encl.

Please send me a copy of your findings.
Appendix E

Follow-up Letter to Non-Respondents
May 19, 1986

Isn’t it amazing how time rushes on! There are just so many things to do and so little time to do them. I can therefore easily understand how you may have missed returning the Leader Behavior questionnaire we sent you recently.

But your response is greatly needed if we are to produce balanced and representative findings in this study. Would you therefore take a few minutes today to complete and return the survey?

Please remember to indicate if you desire to receive a copy of the findings. Thanks so much for your help. I really need to complete this study now.

Sincerely your brother,

[Signature]

Clinton Valley
Researcher

W. E. Minder, Director
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Please send me a copy of your findings.
Appendix F
Leader Behavior Questionnaire (Self)
PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

These consist of pages:

135-139, 141-144, 146-148
Appendix G
Leader Behavior Questionnaire (Other)
Appendix H

Significant Statements by Ellen G. White on the Pastor's Role in Church Growth
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