

***A Comparative Analysis of Leadership Development Models
In Post-Baccalaureate Theological Education***

Dissertation Project Summary: A Follow-up Report

Thomas L. Kiedis

Research Purpose:

The purpose of this research was to understand the relationship between leadership development models in evangelical post-baccalaureate theological education and select outcome assessment criteria: employment, leadership effectiveness, satisfaction and tenure.

Research Questions (RQs):

1. What leadership development models for ministry exist in evangelical post-baccalaureate theological (seminary) education?
2. What relationship, if any, exists between the leadership development model a graduate experienced in seminary and ministry employment?
3. What relationship, if any, exists between the leadership development model a graduate experienced in seminary and leadership effectiveness in ministry?
4. What relationship, if any, exists between the leadership development model a graduate experienced in seminary and ministry satisfaction?
5. What relationship, if any, exists between the leadership development model a graduate experienced in seminary and ministry tenure?
6. How do these models compare with respect to the variables of ministry employment, leadership effectiveness, satisfaction and tenure?

Research Population and Sample:

The population was comprised of 131 accredited evangelical seminaries. The research sample included fifty-one of these seminaries. The 2004 graduates (a total of 2421) of these fifty-one institutions were surveyed. 490 surveys were returned (20.2% response rate).

Research Design and Process:

This social sciences project followed a sequential mixed-methods approach incorporating both qualitative and quantitative research methods. The research occurred in three phases:

1. A triangulated taxonomy of seminary leadership development models was developed.
2. Graduates of the 2004 class in the research population were surveyed to assess hiring, effectiveness, satisfaction, and tenure.
3. Statistical analysis and interpretation was performed.

Analysis of Findings:

RQ1 – Seven Leadership Development Models (LDM) were discovered. *This was the most significant finding of the research process.* See page three for a full description of the models.

RQ2 – There was no significant relationship between LDM and the time it took to be hired or with respect to the number of employers a graduate had. There was a significant relationship between the LDM and whether a graduate was ever hired. Those in the Applied and Classic models were more likely to be employed in Christian ministry.

RQ3 – There was no significant relationship between LDM and effectiveness in ministry.

RQ4 – There was no significant relationship between LDM and satisfaction in ministry.

RQ5 – There was a significant relationship between LDM and ministry tenure. Graduates of all models lasted longer in ministry than those in the Applied Model. I believe the inclusion of counseling center graduates skewed this finding.

RQ6 – There was a significant relationship between the LDM and all dependent variables taken together. Graduates of the Applied and Classic models were more likely to be hired than graduates of other models. Graduates from the Applied, Classic, Distance, Extension, and Hybrid models were all more likely to still be employed five years after their graduation.

Research Implications:

Seven implications are highlighted here. To see all the implications from this research please see Kiedis Dissertation Follow-up PowerPoint slide presentation (slides 58-64). You may also want to read pages 200-209 in the dissertation, *A Comparative Analysis of Leadership Development Models in Post-Baccalaureate Theological Education*.

1. Theological education is alive and well contrary to some of the criticism of Ferris 1982, Buzzell 1983, Simpson 1992, Barna 1993, Nelson 1994, Turner 2001, and Barnett 2003.
2. Ministry mentors play a key role in theological education—and they are hard to find.
3. Distance and hybrid education, while on the rise, are not educational panaceas.
4. Theology and philosophy must trump technology.
5. There are vast untapped possibilities for educational partnerships.
6. Disproportionate negative ministry tenure score for Apprentice graduates should serve as a cautionary warning to those responsible for interviewing and placing students.
7. Academic administrators responsible for counseling programs should evaluate entry and exit processes with a view to increase hiring rates.

Research Applications:

There are applications of this research to students, educational leaders, leadership development programs, and social science research in general. To see all the research applications please see Kiedis Dissertation Follow-up PowerPoint slide presentation (slides 65-69). You may also want to read pages 210-211 in the dissertation, *A Comparative Analysis of Leadership Development Models in Post-Baccalaureate Theological Education*.

1. Students: The LDM Taxonomy is a tool to help students evaluate prospective seminaries.
2. Educational leaders: Administrators must ask a series of questions about their LDM:
 - a. What is our predominant model for each ministerial degree preparation program?
 - b. Is our model consistent with our institutional objectives?
 - c. Is our institutional language consistent with our model?
 - d. Are we devoting appropriate monetary, personnel, and institutional resources toward this LDM? If not, what should change?
 - e. Are we requiring full participation from our faculty/students in our model?
 - f. Are we hiring toward our model?
3. Leadership Development Programs: There is a huge need to identify and equip ministry mentors. There is good work being done. A Ministry Mentor Symposium would help disseminate information and enhance learning.
4. Social Science Research: The taxonomic classification could be used to establish consistent nomenclature for leadership development models in theological education.

Taxonomic Classification of Seminary Leadership Development Models	
Model/Description	Characteristics
Applied: The Applied Model is philosophically and programmatically integrative, intentionally combining theory and practice by embedding throughout the curriculum opportunities for “hands-on” application in the church and community, both locally and globally.	Classroom: Intentional springboard to applied learning Curriculum: Praxis-centered Pedagogy: Intentional “hands-on” integration Learning: Face-to-face followed by action-learning Church: Integration with/required immersion in church Distinctive: Embedded application/authentic assessment
Apprentice: The Apprentice Model utilizes a field-based, comprehensive, full-immersion, ministry-centered pedagogy for a significant portion of the degree program. Students migrate from the seminary to a field of ministry, which becomes the classroom.	Classroom: Residential campus + Field Curriculum: Experience-centered, mission specific Pedagogy: Transmissive + Process-oriented/Active Learning: Mostly synchronous, action-learning Church: Missional preparation through the church Distinctive: Contextual on-the-job-training
Classic: The Classic Model places the academic and curricular focus in a teacher-centered, residential classroom, which is primarily knowledge or content-driven, and augmented by some field-experience and/or internship.	Classroom: Residential campus Curriculum: Teacher-centered Pedagogy: Transmissive (lecture), with supervised mentoring/ministry Learning: Face-to-face instruction Church: Introduction to the church Distinctive: Historic campus classroom preparation
Distance Education: The Distance Education Model includes educational and instructional activity in which students are separated from faculty and other students for a significant portion of their degree program (one-half of a M.A. degree or two-thirds of a M.Div. degree).	Classroom: “Without walls” Curriculum: Teacher-facilitated Pedagogy: Learner-centered; Teacher/learner partnership Learning: Asynchronous/Synchronous, Contextualized Church: Preparation while in the church Distinctive: Accessibility for those “in-ministry”
Extension Site: A geographically separate unit generally governed by the parent institution, but with local facilities and administration, a more contextualized faculty, and fewer curricular options -- providing education for students who are unable or unwilling to attend the home campus. Extension site may occur for a course, program (4 to 6 courses), or a complete degree.	Classroom: Transported to the extension site Curriculum: Dispersed, teacher-centered Pedagogy: Transmissive (lecture), with supervised mentoring/ministry Learning: Contextualized, mostly synchronous Church: Preparation while in the church Distinctive: Convenience, connectivity, economy
Hybrid: The Hybrid Model incorporates both traditional classroom instruction, and modular or distance education modes in the degree program and coursework—in preference to the exclusive use of either traditional or technological modes.	Classroom: “Bricks and clicks” Curriculum: Teacher-directed/facilitated Pedagogy: Teacher/Learner-centered Learning: Synchronous/Asynchronous, Contextualized Church: Expand the role in the church Distinctive: Convenience, technology, pedagogy
Partnership: In the Partnership Model a seminary strategically collaborates with a teaching church, parachurch ministry, or another institution for a specialized portion of the degree program, co-laboring in the task of leadership development through the design and delivery of curriculum, which usually comprises a minimum of four to six course credits.	Classroom: Campus + Partnering organization Curriculum: Seminary/Partner-centered Pedagogy: Transmissive + Process-oriented/Active Learning: Focused, mostly synchronous Church: Collaboration for the church Distinctive: “Teaching Church/Ministry”