

AN EXAMINATION OF DIFFERENCES IN LEADERSHIP DESCRIPTION,  
EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-REPORTED LEVELS OF SATISFACTION,  
AND VOCATIONAL STATUS IN A MIXED SAMPLE OF DOCTOR OF MINISTRY  
STUDENTS

by

Dwight Cecil Rice

Liberty University

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Liberty University

April, 2014

AN EXAMINATION OF DIFFERENCES IN LEADERSHIP DESCRIPTION,  
EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, A SELF-REPORTED SATISFACTION PROFILE,  
AND VOCATIONAL STATUS IN A MIXED SAMPLE OF DOCTOR OF MINISTRY  
STUDENTS

A Dissertation Proposal

Submitted to the  
Faculty of Liberty University  
in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

By

Dwight Cecil Rice

© APRIL 2014

Liberty University, Lynchburg, Virginia

April 2014

Dissertation Committee Approval:

|                              |                       |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| <u>Dr. John C. Thomas</u>    | <u>April 29, 2014</u> |
| Chair                        | date                  |
| <u>Dr. Ronald E. Hawkins</u> | <u>April 29, 2014</u> |
| Reader                       | date                  |
| <u>Dr. Victor D. Hinson</u>  | <u>April 29, 2014</u> |
| Reader                       | date                  |

An Examination of Differences in Leadership Description, Emotional Intelligence, a Self-  
Reported Satisfaction Profile, and Vocational Status in a Mixed Sample of Doctor of  
Ministry

Dwight Cecil Rice

Center for Counseling and Family Studies

Liberty University, Lynchburg, Virginia

Doctor of Philosophy in Pastoral Counseling

## Abstract

This study examined differences in ministerial students' leadership description, emotional intelligence, self-reported levels of satisfaction, and whether or not a participant experienced a forced resignation or termination (i.e., vocational status). Using a cross-sectional, non-experimental design, 110 Doctor of Ministry students at an evangelical seminary in the southeastern United States responded to the survey. Statistically, data was analyzed using ANCOVAs, Bonferroni corrections, and t-tests. Due to the sample's small  $N=110$ , most comparative analyses showed no significant differences among groups. As a result, the present findings do not allow for definitive conclusions or inferences regarding differences in participants' leadership description, emotional intelligence, satisfaction profile, and vocational status.

## DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my beautiful wife, Susan. I am so grateful for her *divine assistance* during the long and arduous journey of the dissertation. In fact, if I had the wisdom of an Einstein and the vocabulary of a Webster, I could not begin to depict what it was like to have her in my heart and noticeably by my side during this process. My heart overflows with the reality that I am the most blessed man on earth! Thank you my dear for being my 7/8<sup>th</sup> and the good Lord's practical savior in my life!!! Your spark and bark helped me put the "comic book" on the shelf!!!

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

As I write these few words, one of the favorite poems of “RG” LaTourneau, a Christian business man and earthmoving innovator, comes to mind.

A lion met a tiger as they drew beside a pool.  
Said the tiger to the lion, “Why are you roaring like a fool?”  
“That’s not foolish,” said the lion with a twinkle in his eyes,  
“They call me the king of beasts, because I advertise.”

A rabbit heard them talking and ran home like a streak,  
He thought he’d try the lion’s plan, but his roar was but a squeak.  
A fox came to investigate and had luncheon in the woods,  
So when you advertise my friends, make sure you got the goods.

I came to LU in obedience to a Word from God (i.e., be diligent to present yourself approved to God; 2 Tim. 2:15). Knowing the challenges of today’s academic arena, I also knew my DMin squeaked more than it roared. Having earned this PhD, I know that its roar would not have been heard without the goods that got me over the finish line. Those “goods” are “fans of Dwight”! Many will go unnamed, but I salute two bunches – the edifiers and solidifiers!

The Edifiers. Thanks kids (Caleb, Josh, Lori, Lydia, Josh, Caden, and LilyKate) for the thoughtful words and wonderments you have provided throughout the dissertation! You are the best!! Thanks praying friends (Victor & Peggy, Max & Nancy, Hobo, and Hitomi) for being and giving so many blessings! Hobo, you are a hoot of a friend!! By the way, Hitomi, did we not have “fun” making stat-castles in our statistical sandbox? Much thanks, you kept me high and dry in the swells of the research process! And, my hand goes out once more in thanks to my former DMin. students who

participated in this study. I am also grateful for the many unnamed edifiers who have echoed what Mark, a dear fellow-PhD'er, said after a fishing trip: "I am standing at the finish line, Dwight. You are around the last curve. Do not listen to your legs or your burning lungs (a running illustration). Just steel yourself and press on! Let us get this behind us!?"

The Solidifiers. While the edifiers built me up, the solidifiers intentionally helped me bring the dissertation home. Thanks Doc (i.e., Dr. Ron Hawkins) for planting this study in my heart; your mentorship was the solid ground upon which it was built. Thanks Dr. Scott Hawkins for stepping in with a strategic recommendation that literally made the finish possible. Thanks Dr. John Thomas for stepping up to the plate and making a huge difference in the outcome. I am so grateful to God that he had Scott re-engineer the process and for the fire you applied to my dross. Thanks for the "silver-souled" touch! Thanks Dr. Victor Hinson, what a friend and colleague you have been throughout my time at Liberty University! Your friendship and partnership in the dissertation gauntlet regularly encouraged me to keep chasing the finish line.

Finally, I can say to the next EdD or PhD student, "Continue to work on the dissertation in the midst of good company, and you will have the goods to "stick a fork in it and call it done too!"

## CONTENTS

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Dedication .....  | v  |
| Acknowledgements .....                                  | vi |
| List of Tables .....                                    | x  |
| CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION .....                         | 1  |
| Background of the Problem .....                         | 2  |
| Statement of the Problem .....                          | 5  |
| Purpose of the Study .....                              | 6  |
| Research Questions .....                                | 6  |
| Importance and Implications .....                       | 7  |
| Definition of Terms .....                               | 8  |
| Delimitations, Limitations, and Assumptions .....       | 10 |
| Theoretical Considerations .....                        | 11 |
| Organization of the Remainder of the Study .....        | 16 |
| CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW .....                    | 18 |
| Clergy's Inability to Get along with Parishioners ..... | 18 |
| Leadership Description .....                            | 21 |
| Emotional Intelligence .....                            | 27 |
| A Satisfaction Profile .....                            | 29 |
| CHAPTER THREE: METHODS .....                            | 32 |
| Nature and Rationale for the Study .....                | 32 |
| Study Participants .....                                | 33 |
| Research Questions and Hypotheses .....                 | 34 |
| Measures .....  | 36 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Study Procedures .....                                       | 42  |
| Data Analysis.....   | 43  |
| Ethical Considerations.....                                  | 47  |
| Chapter Summary.....   | 48  |
| CHAPTER FOUR: DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS.....              | 49  |
| Summary.....   | 49  |
| Participants .....   | 50  |
| Data Analysis.....   | 51  |
| Research Question Findings .....                             | 53  |
| Chapter Summary.....   | 64  |
| CHAPTER FIVE: RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... | 66  |
| Summary of Purpose .....                                     | 66  |
| Overview of Results .....                                    | 69  |
| Conclusions .....  | 72  |
| Conclusion Section Summary .....                             | 82  |
| Recommendations .....  | 83  |
| Future Research .....  | 85  |
| Summary.....   | 87  |
| REFERENCES .....   | 89  |
| Appendix A Institutional Review Board Materials .....        | 102 |
| Appendix B Tables .....                                      | 111 |
| Appendix C Permissions.....                                  | 126 |

List of Tables

Table 1.1 BeMIS Adjective Check List Scales Employed in this Study as Leadership  
Description .....111

Table 3.1 BeMIS Adjective Check List Scales Employed in this Study as Leadership  
Description .....112

Table 4.1 Demographic Characteristics of Participants.....113

Table 4.2 BeMIS Adjective Check List Scales Employed in this study as Leadership  
Description .....114

Table 4.3 Descriptive Statistics Emotional Intelligence .....115

Table 4.4 Descriptive Statistics Marital Satisfaction .....116

Table 4.5 Descriptive Statistics Vocational Satisfaction .....117

Table 4.6 Descriptive Statistics Relational Satisfaction .....118

Table 4.7 Descriptive Statistics Emotional Intelligence and Vocational Status.....119

Table 4.8 T-tests Emotional Intelligence and Vocational Status .....120

Table 4.9 Leadership Description Scales and Vocational Status.....121

Table 4.10 T-tests results Leadership Scales and Vocational Status .....122

Table 4.11 Satisfaction Scales and Vocational Status .....123

Table 4.12 T-tests Satisfaction Scales and Vocational Status .....124

Table 5.1 BeMIS Adjective Check List Scales Employed in this study as Leadership  
Description .....125

## CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

### Introduction to the Problem

LifeWay Christian Resources (2008), a Southern Baptist Convention (SBC) entity, conducted a decade long study (1996-2006) to identify reasons for clergy terminations. As a result of that study, unmanaged leadership styles and poor people skills were listed in the top ten antecedents to SBC clergy forced terminations (Turner, 2006; Turner, 2007). Other studies (Barfoot, Winstorn, & Wickman, 2005) described these two precursors to termination as personality conflict with others in leadership or the congregation (Goodwin, 1997) and interpersonal incompetence (Schuller, 1985). Bob Sheffield, a retired SBC pastoral ministries' specialist involved in the SBC study, commented that from the beginning of the study these antecedents have been in the top five every year. "The only difference is in their order from year to year. We consistently see the inability to develop and maintain healthy relationships within the church as the reason for dismissals" (as cited in Turner, 2007, p. 39). Against the backdrop of this reflection, the reader is informed that this study sources from an educational context whereby meaningful insights from course readings and assessments were utilized to foster relational and leadership competencies. Concomitantly, this study sought to evaluate classroom data from a scholarly perspective, in order to add to the body of knowledge regarding the relational growth and development of seminary students actively engaged in contemporary ministry.

## Background of the Problem

According to a decade and half long study of active participants in ministry, conducted by the Francis A. Schaeffer Institute of Church Leadership Development (Krejcir, 2007), a general inability to get along with parishioners and the phenomenon of short-term pastorates, may be related to a lack of appropriate training at the seminary level. Seven hundred, ninety active pastors surveyed reported being "...unqualified and/or poorly trained by their seminaries to lead and manage the church or to counsel others...; [this perception] left them disheartened in their ability to pastor" (p. 2). Further research is needed, but it seems plausible that a lack of interpersonal and leadership training may have contributed to thirty five to forty percent of pastors and eighty to eighty-five percent of seminary graduates becoming sufficiently disheartened to leave vocational posts within five years of entering ministry (Kanipe, 2007; Krejcir, 2007).

In this respect, the clergy literature has given much attention to contemporary ministry's stressful context. Dudley and Roozen (2001), Maxwell (1996), Fuller Institute of Church Growth (1991), The Barna Group (2001), Miller (2000), LaRue (2000, 2001) identified several risk factors influencing today's clergy and parishioner relationship. London and Wiseman (1993/2003) highlighted many of these factors in their work *Pastors at Greater Risk*. Of the seventy-seven factors identified, the following insights described the challenges experienced in ministry's highly relational network (as cited in London & Wiseman, pp. 20, 34, 62, 86): church-goers expect their pastor to juggle an average of 16 major tasks; 50 percent of clergy feel unable to meet the needs of the job; 80 percent believe that pastoral ministry negatively affects their family; 80 percent of

pastors say they have insufficient time with spouse; 24 percent of pastors have received marital counseling; the clergy has the second highest divorce rate among all professions; 98 percent of church conflict involves interpersonal issues; and 31 percent of pastors indicated that conflict management was lacking in their seminary or Bible college training. In as much, a comprehensive review of the literature (i.e., scholarly and non-scholarly in nature) confirmed that ministerial participants must be better prepared to manage the risks and resulting interpersonal challenges of contemporary ministry.

Until recently, much of the literature surrounding clergy dysfunction has been reparative in nature (i.e., helping the wounded minister with healing choices; Morris & Blanton, 1994; Tanner, Wherry, & Zvonkovic, 2009; Tanner, 2013). In the last two decades, a small but flourishing preventative care discussion has challenged educators to go beyond training ministerial students in the traditional “how-to-dos” of ministry and to focus on developing resilient ministers (Burns, Chapman, & Guthrie, 2013; McIntosh & Rima, 1997/2007; Meek et al., 2003). The reader should recognize that ministerial students, especially those actively engaged in contemporary ministry, occupy seats in suitable contexts for fostering resiliency and relational transformation. By virtue of accessibility, educators also have a meaningful context to equip students with the ability to identify intrapersonal and interpersonal needs and to pursue appropriate resources for the development of relational skills essential to fruitful and sustainable vocational ministry.

In view of the fact that the context for this study was suitable for promoting helpful attitudes toward the relational challenges of contemporary ministry, data was

collected from a sample of Doctor of Ministry (D.Min.) students enrolled in a growth and development course at an evangelical university in the southeastern United States.

According to the course syllabus, students are exposed to “[a]n in-depth look at the person in the ministry. Extensive testing will form the foundation for this course and the results of the testing will be used to develop a growth profile for the individual student.”

The course rationale states:

D.Min. students are required to take this course in order to develop an awareness of the myriad of challenges and opportunities facing ministry leaders today. The course also supports the development of a personal strategy to facilitate longevity in service, increased competency and personal growth in ministry and facilitates its application in his/her personal, spiritual, marital, familial, and ministry life. (p. 1)

The course was facilitated by professors who challenged their students to holistically describe and develop their God-given templates and relational styles. The professors sought to expose learners to truths, insights, and techniques that assist with getting their “me” in sync with following Jesus Christ, their Leader (i.e., becoming an authentic example of character-driven leadership; 1 Peter 2: 21; Sosik, 2006). According to the course’s lead professor, Dr. Ron Hawkins asserts that this effort informs the development of “wisdom strategies” (i.e., “Spiritual Formation and Self-Care; Classroom lecture, 2012) for pursuing the imitation of Christ under the authority of the Word of God, through the person and work of the Holy Spirit within a healthy community of accountability. In sum, the learning experience was designed to inform students’ intra/interpersonal maturation process and to foster resilience and long-term fruitful ministry.

## The Statement of the Problem

Research indicates one fourth of ministers surveyed have been terminated at least once over the span of their vocation (LaRue, 1996; Tanner & Zvonkovic, 2011). Studies within the Southern Baptist Convention, America's largest evangelical denomination, reported an annual average of 1056 involuntary terminations in 1984 (Willis, 2001) with an annual increase of 400 in 1988 (Barfoot, Winstorn, & Wickman, 2005). According to church growth expert, Thom Rainer (2001), forced terminations contributed to average ministry tenures of 3.8 years.

Until recently, in comparison to other professions, the ministerial arena received little contextualized help from social science researchers in developing and maintaining relationships unique to contemporary pastoral ministry (Neff, 2006, p. 5) even though Weaver, Samford, Kline, Lucas, Larson, and Koenig (1997) analyzed eight APA journals and discovered 70%-90% of clergy surveyed recognized the need for further training but did not pursue it (p. 473). As mentioned at the beginning, a possible contributing factor to this "general inability to get along" may be that many ministers accepted leadership assignments without sufficient self-awareness and interpersonal skills to develop and maintain healthy relationships with followers (Foster, Dahill, Golemon, & Tolentino, 2006, pp. 366-369). Interestingly, a landmark study conducted in the mid-seventies by the American Association of Theological Schools noted that Southern Baptists have generally assessed interpersonal skills as important but not essential for beginning ministers; character and personal spirituality were the top priority (Songer, 1980). In light of the denomination's relational dilemma and its longstanding expectation for

ministers to be “mature, adaptable, and balanced people (p. 296), it seems that a strategic emphasis on intrapersonal/interpersonal description and development must accompany the pursuit of godly character.

### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine differences in ministerial students’ leadership description, emotional intelligence, self-reported levels of satisfaction, and vocational status. More specifically, it examined differences in the description of leadership behavior as assessed by the Behavioral Management Information Systems Adjective CheckList (BeMIS; Collins, 2005), global emotional intelligence (Petrides & Furnham, 2006), self-reported levels of marital, vocational, and relational satisfaction, and whether or not a participant experienced a forced resignation or termination (i.e., vocational status). This study used a cross-sectional, non-experimental design where a sample of Doctor of Ministry students were administered self-report measures of Leadership Description, Emotional Intelligence, Marital Satisfaction, Vocational Satisfaction, Relational Satisfaction, and Vocational Status.

### Research Questions

The central question in this research endeavor asks: “what are the differences in leadership description, emotional intelligence, satisfaction, and vocational status in a sample of Doctor of Ministry Students?” Five specific research questions were examined to determine if there were significant differences:

1. Do participants' emotional intelligence scores differ significantly depending on the intensity of leadership description (Low, Medium, High) within their BeMACL scales after controlling for the effects of social desirability?
2. Do participants' satisfaction profiles (i.e., marital, vocational, relational satisfaction) differ significantly depending on the intensity of leadership description (Low, Medium, High) within their BeMACL scales after controlling for the effects of social desirability?
3. Is there a significant emotional intelligence difference between those participants who have experienced a forced exit (i.e., forced resignation or termination) and those who have not experienced a forced exit?
4. Is there a significant difference in participants' intensity of leadership description (Low, Medium, High) depending on whether they experienced a forced exit (i.e., forced resignation or termination) or did not experience a forced exit?
5. Are there significant differences between those who have experienced a forced vocational exit (i.e., forced resignation or termination) and those who have not experienced a forced exit on participants' satisfaction profiles (i.e., marital, vocational, relational)?

### Importance and Implications

Current studies on what it takes for clergy to have sustainable and fruitful vocational ministries are linked to themes such as spiritual formation, self-care,

leadership development and management, emotional and cultural intelligence, and various satisfaction profiles (e.g., marital, vocational, relational; Burns et al., 2013, pp. 12-14). Few empirical studies have investigated the display of these themes in a seminary context with those who are engaged in vocational ministry leadership. The notion of maintaining a vigilant examination of these differences may, in time, prove to significantly influence the development of preventative care strategies and relational competencies. Furthermore, Hollander's (2009) inclusive leadership research has confirmed that this study's use of adjective checklist methodology (Collins, 2005, p. 12) to describe leadership behavior may be useful to the recognition of low-quality relational behavior and to the development and management of relational competencies (Day & Antonakis, 2004/2012, p. 294). For instance, this study's use of adjective checklist methodology to describe a vocational ministry leader's needs and aspirations for change (Gough & Heilbrun, 1965/1983, p. 1) may be a significant adjunct to effect transformation in a student's interpersonal arena.

#### Definition of Terms

*Doctor of Ministry Students.* The designation of graduate students with at least 3 years of vocational ministry experience and actively engaged in seminary training at an evangelical university in the southeastern United States.

*Emotional Intelligence.* According to Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee (2004), emotional intelligence is the ability to proactively manage one's own emotions and to appropriately respond to the emotions of others (p. 30). More specifically, EI refers to the

“capacity for recognizing our own feelings and those of others, for motivating ourselves, and for managing emotions well in ourselves and in our relationships” (Goleman, 1998, p. 317). Assessed globally by the TEIQue Short-form, Petrides (2009) identifies this leadership competency as the score of “a broad index of general emotional functioning” (p. 63). Emotional intelligence means that a leader is attuned to followers’ feelings and relationally-wise enough to move them in a positive emotional direction (Goleman et al., 2004, p. 20).

*Leadership Description.* The identification of characteristics useful to the development of an authentic leadership style. Adjective checklist methodology (BeMIS iteration; Collins, 2005) is used to describe helpful and harmful leadership behavior. The intensity of leadership description is labeled as Low (i.e., under-developed/under-expressed behavior; Medium (i.e., normal behavior); High (i.e., under-developed/over-developed expressed behavior). Growth and development strategies are informed by the description of real-time behavior, as well as the intent or aspiration for change (i.e., differences between Real and Ideal Self Standard Scores; Collins, p. 10). See Table 1.1 for BeMIS ACL scales used to inform leadership description.

Table 1.1

*BeMIS Adjective Check List Scales Employed in this Study as Leadership Description*

|             |            |            |                      |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------------|
| Dominance   | Autonomy   | Nurturance | Counseling Readiness |
| Achievement | Aggression | Deference  | Personal Adjustment  |

*Marital Satisfaction.* The global, subjective assessment “of attitude or sentiment toward one’s own marriage” (Bradbury, Fincham, & Beach, 2000; Commodore, 2004;

Gottman, 2003; Morris, 1992; Straub, 2009). This aspect of participants' satisfaction profile relates to the degree one is able to receive influence from one's mate, as well as realize receptivity to influence given.

*Relational Satisfaction.* The global assessment of one's relationship with his/her governing board (Gottman, 2003; Straub, 2009). This aspect of participants' satisfaction profile relates to the sense of feeling safe and respected by other decision-makers.

*Vocational Ministry.* The identification of ministry posts considered to be one's vocation in contemporary evangelical ministry (e.g., single staff pastor; senior/lead pastor; associate staff pastor; missionary, evangelist; educator; etc.).

*Vocational Satisfaction.* The global assessment of one's satisfaction with his/her role in ministry (Carroll, 2006; Faucett, Corwyn, & Poling, 2013; Kemery, 2006; Mueller & McDuff, 2004). This aspect of participants' satisfaction profile relates to the sense of being able to meaningfully contribute and influence followers through a specific role.

*Vocational Status.* The demographic self-report response to whether a vocational ministry leader did or did not experience a forced resignation and/or termination.

### Delimitations, Limitations, and Assumptions

This study is limited to a convenience sample of Graduate Students enrolled in a Doctor of Ministry program at an evangelical university in the southeastern United States. It was also limited to those possessing satisfactory English skills. This researcher agreed with his dissertation chair's suggestion to remove Korean subjects ( $n=65$ ) due to having observed their difficulty with various nuances of the adjectives used in the BeMIS

Adjective Check List (BeMACL; Collins, 2005). No Korean form of the BeMACL was available. Due to this sample's distinct world view, results may not be generalized to other convenience samples with differing world views. Also, this sample size is considered small ( $n=110$ ) for this study, especially with the multiple comparisons required. Therefore, results may not be generalized to other seminary populations and may not represent seminary population at large. This limitation will be explained further in Chapter Five: Results, Conclusions, and Recommendations.

This study utilizes two self-report, empirically validated surveys, three rationally developed self-report questions, and one demographic question. Since the construct validity of self-report measures is debatable, a social desirability scale was added to account for bias in self-presentation management (Vogt & Johnson, 1993/2011, p. 368; Warner, 2007/2013, pp. 125-126). Additional consideration should be taken into account for the study's self-report data. Also, the data was taken from a convenience sample spanning five years (2005-2011). It is not clear how the span of time and placement in/or completion of the Doctor of Ministry program affected the sample. Therefore, these results cannot be generalized to a broader population.

### Theoretical Considerations

This section presents and explains the variables that were the focus of this study. It also provides an organizational framework for identifying the concepts used in the study.

### *Leadership Description*

Leadership Description (LD) is a recent development in leadership studies. Moving beyond the identification of one's leadership style, this paradigm seeks to describe characteristics of leadership (e.g., the darkside of personality: McIntosh & Rima, 1997/2007; competency versus incompetency: Day, 2004/2012; bright traits & effects versus dark traits & effects: Judge & Long, 2004/2012). LD is a transformative way of thinking (i.e., expedient transformation of practice; Wilson & Hoffmann, 2007) about the development of leadership trajectories (i.e., pursuing balance between project and people orientations; Day, Harrison, & Halpin, 2009). In the context of this study, LD identifies behavioral needs (Collins, 2005, p. 12) that may be resourced in the pursuit of authentic leadership. The basic assumption of this study is that ministerial students could become authentic leaders by learning to describe and manage how they think and behave (Avolio & Gardner, 2005) and, as followers of Christ, learn to invite the upward influence (i.e., upward feedback) of their followers (Stowell, 2014) in order to positively influence their local kingdom contexts.

Robert Dale in "Leadership-Followership: The Church's Challenge" described leadership as "an action-oriented, interpersonal influencing process" (Dale, 1987, p. 23) with additional insight explaining how the process affects kingdom participants in a specific place at a specific time (Trull & Carter, 1993/2004, p. 97). Other experts frequently note that this process is commonly misunderstood or marginalized in most organizations (Avolio, 1999/2011; Day & Antonankis, 2004/2012; Sosik & Jung, 2010), including vocational Christian ministry (Burns, Chapman, & Guthrie, 2013; Lawrenz,

2012). Well known Christian researcher, George Barna (1993) claims leadership is one of the indispensable characteristics for transformative ministry. In seeking to understand why so few churches were having a positive impact on people's lives, he concluded that it is largely due to a lack of leadership (p. 117) and also linked to churches assuming that a seminary education certifies the called as a capable leader who has passed the institution's screening process (p. 139). Thus, it comes as no surprise for clergy and churches alike to be damaged by a misunderstood or mismanaged leadership profile, especially with Barna's assertion that seminaries must become better informed and strategic with leadership training and supervision (pp. 137 -151). Interestingly, experts in the leadership field (Day & Antonakis, 2004/2012) affirm discipline specific training (e.g., theology) yet, stress that a more holistic research-based paradigm is necessary to understand how leadership outcomes are influenced by disposition, style, and the individual differences of followers presenting at a specific time in a specific context (p. 16). Altemeyer and Nicol avow, apart from these considerations, the potential for leaders to express the dark side or unmanaged side of leadership traits increases (as cited in Day & Antonakis, p. 192 ; e.g., dominance described by followers as power hungry, manipulative, and inconsiderate). In sum, effective leadership training, especially at the seminary level, will provide future leaders with language and skills to describe and manage various influences shaping one's inner life (i.e., thoughts, motives, values, needs, aspirations), as well as, one's outer life stylistic demeanor (i.e., actions, decisions, communication patterns, relational styles).

Although the literature discusses many leadership styles, this study of the leadership construct is grounded by the assumption that no one style fits all contexts. According to Dale (1987), “When leaders in ministry use one style of leadership exclusively, they discover that they are ineffective in circumstances that do not mesh well with their rigid approach” (p. 23; Dale, 1984). In light of experts’ discussion of bright (i.e., socially desirable leadership behavior) and dark (i.e., socially undesirable) leadership traits (Day & Antonakis, 2004/2012, p. 187-196), it seems reasonable to ask vocational ministry student-leaders to identify and evaluate unexamined or unknown behavioral tendencies before these are revealed in an emotionally charged, relational explosion. According to seminary leadership professors, Gary McIntosh and Samuel Rima (1997/2007) when leaders refuse to look at their inner-man tendencies, some form of leadership failure will occur. In the last decade, a greater emphasis has been given to the description and evaluation of one’s behavior rather than ascription to a specific leadership style.

The examination of this construct was delimited to a self-report description of leadership behavior rather than a multi-faceted leadership assessment (i.e., The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire; Bass & Avolio, 2000) to discuss styles such as laissez faire, transactional, and transactional-transformational. This delimitation was necessary due to the data collected in this study’s convenience sample utilized adjective checklist methodology than traditional terms to describe helpful and harmful leadership behavior.

### *Emotional Intelligence and Satisfaction*

Vocational ministry leaders experience and express emotions within a highly relational network filled with others' experience with and expression of emotions. Interestingly, Peter Scazzerro (2006) discovered that pastors can be deeply committed and engaged in the spiritual disciplines, yet "remain emotionally unaware and socially maladjusted" (p. 44). A recent six year qualitative study, of seventy-three pastors qualified by peers as exhibiting fruitfulness in ministry, reported that most lacked emotional maturity due to entering "the ministry with little experience understanding themselves or others, especially in the area of emotions" (Burns, Chapman, & Guthrie, 2013, p. 107). Concomitantly, the failure to understand the various emotional dynamics influencing the shepherd-saint relationship has resulted in the inability to get along with others.

In this study, Emotional Intelligence (EI) is described as the ability to proactively manage one's own emotions and to appropriately respond to the emotions of others (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2004, p. 30). In order to gain a succinct picture of participants' emotional competency, Emotional Intelligence was delimited to a global identification of the construct rather than the individual examination of its four leadership competencies: self-awareness; self-management; social awareness; and relationship management. This delimitation was necessary due to the data collected in this study's convenience sample utilized a global EI measure. A similar delimitation was necessary for marital (Commodore, 2004; Gottman, 2003; Morris, 1992; Straub, 2009), vocational (Carroll, 2006; Faucett, Corwyn, & Poling, 2013; Kemery, 2006; Mueller & McDuff,

2004), and relational satisfaction (Gottman, 2003; Straub, 2009) as non-empirical self-report questions were used in the convenience sample.

In order for vocational ministry leaders to develop healthy emotional functioning and optimum levels of satisfaction, a recent Pastors Summit identified four contextual problems that tend to suppress emotional awareness and decrease satisfaction: people pleasing; emotion-faking; a lack of reflection; and conflict avoidance. Consequently, satisfaction with one's ability to communicate and connect with others diminishes as the inability to actively listen and express empathy significantly increases (Burns, Chapman, & Guthrie, 2013, p. 108). According to Nelis, Kotsou, Quoidbach, Hansenne, Weytens, Dupuis, and Mikolajczak (2011), when interpersonal competencies are developed under supervision in real-life settings, marital, vocational, and relational satisfaction increases (p. 355). Thus, another argument is presented for effecting change at the seminary level as the typical pastor has to learn emotional intelligence in the day to day struggles of ministry and often without appropriate supervision/mentorship.

### Organization of the Remainder of the Study

A five-chapter dissertation format was followed in this study. Chapter One has provided an overview of the research problem, has discussed the importance and implications of the study, and has defined key concepts. Chapter Two presents a review of the literature on leadership, emotional intelligence, a satisfaction profile (i.e., marital, vocational, and relational), and vocational status. Chapter Three describes the methodology deployed in this present study. The research design, description of the

participants, procedures, and measures are discussed. Chapter Four details the collection and analysis of data using appropriate statistical procedures. The findings of the study are presented in relation to the identified research questions. Lastly, Chapter Five presents the results of the study, conclusions, recommendations based upon current findings and reflections from end of study exploratory analysis.

## CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter reviews literature relevant to this present study. The objective of this literature review is to bring together helpful knowledge of leadership description, emotional intelligence, a satisfaction profile, and vocational status.

First, the chapter reviews the pertinent literature regarding clergy's inability to get along with parishioners. Second, leadership is discussed in terms of definition, style, and description of balanced leadership behavior. Third, emotional intelligence is discussed and identified as an informed disposition with emotional skills. Finally, marital satisfaction, vocational satisfaction, and relational satisfaction is discussed as components of this study's satisfaction profile.

### Clergy's Inability to Get Along with Parishioners

An old adage is often true: "The church is always full when a pastor is hired or fired." Research indicates one fourth of ministers surveyed have been terminated at least once over the span of their vocation (LaRue, 1996; Tanner & Zvonkovic, 2011). Studies within the Southern Baptist Convention, America's largest evangelical denomination, reported an annual average of 1056 involuntary terminations in 1984 (Willis, 2001) with an annual increase of 400 in 1988 (Barfoot, Winstorn, & Wickman, 2005). According to church growth expert, Thom Rainer (2001), forced terminations contributed to average ministry tenures of 3.8 years.

According to a decade and half long study of active participants in ministry, conducted by the Francis A. Schaeffer Institute of Church Leadership Development (Krejcir, 2007), a general inability to get along with parishioners and the phenomenon of short-term pastorates, may be related to a lack of appropriate training at the seminary level. Seven hundred, ninety active pastors surveyed reported being "...unqualified and/or poorly trained by their seminaries to lead and manage the church or to counsel others...; [this perception] left them disheartened in their ability to pastor" (p. 2). Further research is needed, but it seems plausible that a lack of interpersonal and leadership training may have contributed to thirty five to forty percent of pastors and eighty to eighty-five percent of seminary graduates becoming sufficiently disheartened to leave vocational posts within five years of entering ministry (Kanipe, 2007; Krejcir, 2007).

Until recently, in comparison to other professions, the ministerial arena received little contextualized help from social science researchers in developing and maintaining relationships unique to contemporary pastoral ministry (Neff, 2006, p. 5) even though Weaver, Samford, Kline, Lucas, Larson, and Koenig (1997) analyzed eight APA journals and discovered 70%-90% of clergy surveyed recognized the need for further training but did not pursue it (p. 473).

Another possible contributing factor to this "general inability to get along" may be that many ministers accepted leadership assignments without sufficient self-awareness and interpersonal skills to develop and maintain healthy relationships with followers (Foster, Dahill, Golemon, & Tolentino, 2006, pp. 366-369). Interestingly, a landmark study conducted in the mid-seventies by the American Association of Theological

Schools noted that Southern Baptists have generally assessed interpersonal skills as important but not essential for beginning ministers; character and personal spirituality were the top priority (Songer, 1980). In light of the denomination's relational dilemma and its longstanding expectation for ministers to be "mature, adaptable, and balanced people (p. 296), it seems that a strategic emphasis on intrapersonal/interpersonal description and development must accompany the pursuit of godly character.

In as much, the clergy literature has given much attention to contemporary ministry's stressful context. Dudley and Roozen (2001), Maxwell (1996), Fuller Institute of Church Growth (1991), The Barna Group (2001), Miller (2000), LaRue (2000, 2001) identified several risk factors influencing today's clergy and parishioner relationship. London and Wiseman (1993/2003) highlighted many of these factors in their work *Pastors at Greater Risk*. Of the seventy-seven factors identified, the following insights described the challenges experienced in ministry's highly relational network (as cited in London & Wiseman, pp. 20, 34, 62, 86): church-goers expect their pastor to juggle an average of 16 major tasks; 50 percent of clergy feel unable to meet the needs of the job; 80 percent believe that pastoral ministry negatively affects their family; 80 percent of pastors say they have insufficient time with spouse; 24 percent of pastors have received marital counseling; the clergy has the second highest divorce rate among all professions; 98 percent of church conflict involves interpersonal issues; and 31 percent of pastors indicated that conflict management was lacking in their seminary or Bible college training.

Until recently, much of the literature surrounding clergy dysfunction has been reparative in nature (i.e., helping the wounded minister with healing choices; Morris & Blanton, 1994; Tanner, Wherry, & Zvonkovic, 2009; Tanner, 2013). In the last two decades, a small but flourishing preventative care discussion has challenged educators to go beyond training ministerial students in the traditional “how-to-dos” of ministry and to focus on developing resilient ministers (Burns, Chapman, & Guthrie, 2013; McIntosh & Rima, 1997/2007; Meek et al., 2003). The reader should recognize that ministerial students, especially those actively engaged in contemporary ministry, occupy seats in suitable contexts for educational institutions and professors to foster resiliency and relational transformation.

### Leadership Description

This chapter section discusses the background of leadership description, leadership as an interpersonal process, and a guiding leadership assumption. The last part of this section briefly conceptualizes the organization of leadership description.

The discussion about leadership has become so prolific in the literature that even the most inattentive reader could easily find something to catch the attention. In reality, the length and depth to which the discussion has grown in the last decade is not surprising as it is a universal activity evident in all civilizations (i.e., humans) and creation (i.e., animals) alike. Correspondingly, the volume of material written about the examination of this phenomenon is quite daunting to review, yet is more doable and meaningful as focus on a specific interest is developed. The concept of leadership description, as a viable

paradigm in the context of evangelical vocational ministry, is the interest of this chapter section in the review of the literature.

By way of background, most clergy leadership studies have emphasized the identification of different leadership styles (e.g., transactional, transformational; Carter, 2009; Kanungo & Mendonca, 1994; Lichtman, 1990; Rowold, 2008). Moving beyond stylistic identification, recent studies offer descriptive categorizations of leadership characteristics (e.g., the darkside of personality: McIntosh & Rima, 1997/2007; competency versus incompetency: Day, 2004/2012; bright traits & effects versus dark traits & effects: Judge & Long, 2004/2012). With a precedent for description identified, the reader is informed that Leadership Description is a transformative way of thinking (i.e., reflective and strategic transformation of behavior and practice; Wilson & Hoffmann, 2007) about the development of leadership trajectories (e.g., pursuing balance between project and people orientations; Day, Harrison, & Halpin, 2009). Conceptually, Leadership Description is as a means to identify behavioral needs and aspirations (Collins, 2005, p. 12) to be resourced by the development of authenticity (i.e., self-aware and self-regulated leadership; Judge & Long, 2004/2012, p. 199-200). This will be discussed further, but the reader should consider the guiding assumption that ministerial students *can* become authentic leaders by learning to describe and manage how they think and behave (Avolio & Gardner, 2005) and, as followers of Christ, learn to invite the upward influence (i.e., upward feedback) of followers (Stowell, 2014) by positively influencing their local kingdom contexts. This assumption is critical to a ministerial student's proper engagement in leadership's interpersonal influencing process.

### *Leadership: An Interpersonal Process*

In a local context, leadership influence becomes known through a relational process. Robert Dale in “Leadership-Followership: The Church’s Challenge” described leadership as “an action-oriented, interpersonal influencing process” (Dale, 1987, p. 23) which others suggest affects kingdom participants in a specific place at a specific time (Trull & Carter, 1993/2004, p. 97). Leading experts in the field note that this process is commonly misunderstood or marginalized in most organizations (Avolio, 1999/2011; Day & Antonankis, 2004/2012; Sosik & Jung, 2010), including vocational Christian ministry (Burns, Chapman, & Guthrie, 2013; Lawrenz, 2012). Well known Christian researcher, George Barna (1993) claims leadership is one of the indispensable characteristics for transformative ministry.

In seeking to understand why so few churches were having a positive impact on people’s lives, Barna (1993) concluded that it is largely due to a lack of appropriate leadership (p. 117) and also linked to churches assuming that a seminary education certifies the called as a capable leader who has passed the institution’s screening process (p. 139). Thus, it comes as no surprise for clergy and churches alike to be damaged by a misunderstood or mismanaged leadership profile, especially with Barna’s assertion that seminaries must become better informed and strategic with leadership training and supervision (pp. 137 -151). Interestingly, experts in the leadership field affirm discipline specific training (e.g., theology; Christine, 2010) yet, stress that a broader research-based paradigm (Anthony & Estep Jr., 2005; Tidwell, 1985) is necessary to understand how leadership outcomes are influenced by disposition, style, and the individual differences of

followers presenting at a specific time in a specific context (Day & Antonankis, 2004/2012) p. 16). Altemeyer and Nicol avow, apart from these considerations, the potential for leaders to express the dark side or unmanaged side of leadership traits increases (as cited in Day & Antonankis, p. 192 ; e.g., dominance described by followers as power hungry, manipulative, and inconsiderate). In short, leadership training, especially at the seminary level, must provide future leaders with language and skills to describe and manage various influences shaping one's inner life (i.e., thoughts, motives, values, needs, aspirations), as well as, one's outer life stylistic demeanor (i.e., actions, decisions, communication patterns, relational styles).

#### *A Guiding Leadership Assumption*

While there has been much discussion regarding leadership styles, the guiding assumption that no one style fits all contexts does imply mismatches or inflexible matches may occur in local ministry settings (Dale, 1984; Mueller & McDuff, 2004). According to Dale (1987), "When leaders in ministry use one style of leadership exclusively, they discover that they are ineffective in circumstances that do not mesh well with their rigid approach" (p. 23). Since every leader has strengths and weaknesses influencing his/her leadership delivery this guiding assumption supports current efforts to identify and describe bright (i.e., socially desirable leadership behavior) and dark (i.e., socially undesirable) leadership traits (Day & Antonankis, 2004/2012, p. 187-196). With this effort in mind, it seems reasonable to utilize available contexts (i.e., ministerial conferences/associations, seminaries) whereby ministers, as well as ministerial students, could identify and evaluate unexamined or unknown behavioral tendencies before these

are revealed in an emotionally charged, relational explosion. According to seminary leadership professors, Gary McIntosh and Samuel Rima (1997/2007) when leaders refuse to look at their inner-man tendencies, some form of leadership failure will occur.

Thankfully, a trend seems to be developing in the clergy resiliency discussion wherein a greater emphasis is given to the description and evaluation of one's leadership behavior rather than ascription to a specific leadership style. According to Kouzes and Posner's *The Truth About Leadership*, the best leaders have learned how to describe and manage what is helpful and harmful in their leadership profiles in order to meaningfully align with the needs of their context (2010, pp. 120-121). Burns et al. (2013) posit that leadership description is best developed as a leader practices collaborative reflection both during and after a context's presenting situation(s) (p. 201). In other words, *best leaders* thrive rather than survive as a result of the "bounce" reflective work produces in meaningful company. Reflective work presses the bothered or busy leader's pause button, in order to gain a fresh perspective of "What is best next?" Though this "pause-in-process" notion is grounded in recent leadership literature (Lawrenz, 2012; Perman, 2014, pp. 137-138), it has already been grounded by *Inspiration's* longing for authenticity (i.e., being and doing what is best). Note this emphasis in the Apostle Paul's prayer for the Philippian church workers:

[9] This is my prayer for you: that your love will grow more and more; that you will have knowledge and understanding with your love; [10] that you will see the difference between good and bad and will choose the good; that you will be pure

and without wrong for the coming of Christ; [11] that you will be filled with the good things produced in your life by Christ to bring glory and praise to God.

(Philippians 1:8-11 NCV)

Leadership description is necessary for anyone to learn what is best now in order to do what is best next.

### *Organization of Leadership Description*

The belief that leadership description may be organized as active-task orientation and passive-people orientation is soundly supported in the literature (Blake & Mouton, 1964; Blake & Mouton, 1994; Burns, Chapman, & Guthrie, 2013; MindTools.com, 2014; Sosik & Jung, 2010). As mentioned previously, the belief that no one orientation fits all contexts is a guiding assumption (Antonakis, 2004/2012; Bass, 1985; Trull & Carter, 1993/2004) and as such, the art of pursuing balanced leadership behavior (Avolio, Zhu, Koh, & Bahatia, 2004; Barna, 1993; Bass, 1974/2008; Colbert, Kristof-Brown, Bradley, & Barrick, 2008; DePree, 1989) is describable (Avolio, 1999/2011; Judge & Bono, 2000), manageable (Judge & Long, 2004/2012), and essential to the future health of the church and the effectiveness of vocational leaders (Lewis, Cordeiro, & Bird, 2005; McIntosh & Rima, 1997/2007; Malphurs, 2003; Rainer, 2005; Rainer & Rainer, 2008; Schwarz, 1996; Wilson & Hoffmann, 2007). As a whole, the reflective work of leadership description fosters “positive forms of leadership” (i.e., psychological capital – cultivated optimism, hope, efficacy, and resiliency; Avolio, 1999/2011, pp. 207, 208) and higher levels of authentic leadership quotient (i.e., a transformative paradigm: the ability to describe-develop-manage personality, practice integrity, and effectively relate to the

needs of a vocational context; Stetzer, & Rainer, 2010; Stowell, 2014; Wilson & Hoffmann, 2007, pp. 220-225). As a relational experience, the leadership construct is related to emotional intelligence.

### Emotional Intelligence

Recent studies have related leadership with emotional intelligence (Bar-On & Handley, 1999; Bar-On & Parker, 2000; Carmel & Josman, 2006; Cherniss & Goleman, 2001; Dries & Pepermans, 2007; Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002; Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2004; Lyons & Schneider, 2005; McKee, Boyatzis, & Johnston, 2008; Stein & Book, 2006; Stein, Papadpigiannis, Yip, & Sitarenios, 2009). According to Sosik and Jung (2010), the literature clearly "...proposes that emotional awareness and control is essential to leadership effectiveness." (p. 23). Other EI experts claim that "Great leadership works through emotions." (Goleman et al., 2004, p. 3); however, markedly differ in the way emotions are processed. "Although some of us are able to identify our emotions, express them in socially acceptable manner, and regulate them when they are inappropriate, others have a hard time interpreting their emotions and seem most of the time overwhelmed by them." (Nelis et al., 2011, p. 354). Therefore, emotional intelligence supports leadership competency.

As a construct, emotional intelligence is considered in this study to be a competency (i.e., an informed disposition with skills; Mayer & Salovey, 1997; Petrides & Furnam, 2003, p. 40) that acknowledges "differences in identifying, expressing, understanding, regulating, and using emotions" (Mikolajczak, Petrides, Coumans, &

Luminet, 2009; Nelis et al., 2011, p. 354). Emotional intelligence is a meaningful construct.

Operationally, Emotional Intelligence (EI) is described as the ability to proactively manage one's emotions and to appropriately respond to the emotions of others (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2004, p. 30). In order to gain a general picture of emotional competency, EI will be delimited in this study to a global identification of the construct rather than the individual examination of its four leadership competencies: self-awareness; self-management; social awareness; and relationship management.

Studies have shown that EI is a measureable skill of effective leadership within church contexts (Oney, 2010; Ott, 2003; Palser, 2005), especially in conflict management (Gambill, 2008) and turnaround situations (Bryant, 2011; Roth, 2011). Vocational ministry leaders experience and express emotions within a highly relational network filled with others' experience with and expression of emotions. Interestingly, Peter Scazzerro (2006) discovered that pastors can be deeply committed and engaged in the spiritual disciplines, yet "remain emotionally unaware and socially maladjusted" (p. 44). Burns, Chapman, and Guthrie (2013) claim that too many ministers enter contemporary ministry lacking experience in understanding themselves or others, especially in the area of emotions. Burns et al. recent six year qualitative study, of seventy-three pastors qualified by peers as exhibiting fruitfulness in ministry, reported that most lacked emotional maturity due to entering "the ministry with little experience understanding themselves or others, especially in the area of emotions" ( p. 107). Concomitantly, a

failure to understand various emotional dynamics influencing the shepherd-saint relationship often results in an inability to get along with others.

### A Satisfaction Profile

The concepts discussed in this chapter section are concisely discussed and delimited in the study for two reasons. First, the research questions related to satisfaction in Chapter Three: Methods are directly linked to questions often posed in the classroom context of this study's convenience sample. Though the concepts are research-based, the reader should be aware that this discussion is based on snapshot reviews from the literature. Secondly, rather than driven by theory, the questions are exploratory in nature and interested in observed differences. Consequently, the questions do not relate to specific item analyses from empirically validated instruments.

#### *Marital Satisfaction*

Contemporary ministry challenges are not making it any easier for clergy at home. As the context of the study already established at the beginning of Chapter Two, the most difficult challenges clergy struggle to manage are related to his/her own marriage and family. Several experts agree that being ministers and being married, as most ministers are, makes assessing marital satisfaction complicated (Morris, 1992; (Morris & Blanton, April, 1994; Richmond, Raymond, & Rogers, 1985), especially when clergy and spouses are hesitant to express dissatisfaction about that which is recognized as a sacred matter (Pargament & Mahoney, 2005). According to Meek et al. (2003) the

single most important indicator of marital satisfaction is that mates in ministry are “intentional about creating balance and maintaining strong, but flexible, boundaries in their lives” (p. 342). As a result, an environment is often established where one is able to receive influence from one’s mate, as well as realize receptivity to influence given (Gottman, 2003; Straub, 2009). In short, marital satisfaction will be viewed in this study as a global subjective assessment of attitude or sentiment toward one’s own marriage (Bradbury, Fincham, & Beach, 2000; Commodore, 2004).

### *Vocational Satisfaction*

Vocational Satisfaction is viewed in this study as an evaluation of one’s satisfaction with his/her role in ministry (Carroll, 2006; Faucett, Corwyn, & Poling, 2013; Kemery, 2006; Mueller & McDuff, 2004). For example, vocational satisfaction relates to the sense of being able to meaningfully contribute and influence followers through a specific role. Vocational Satisfaction increases when clergy view the “job” or role as a significant place of influence (Lawrenz, 2012), that is, a sacred trust from God (Stewart-Sicking, Ciarrocchi, Hollensbe, & Sheep, 2011). However, when challenges arise in this sacred trust, clergy often feel morally constrained to understate dissatisfaction (Rose, 1999). Studies indicate that over time (Brown, 1993), positive forms of leadership behavior build and maintain healthy relationships with other leaders and followers (Avolio, 1999/2011, pp. 207-210; Foster, Dahill, Golemon, & Tolentino, 2006, pp. 366-369).

### *Relational Satisfaction*

Relational Satisfaction is operationalized as a general evaluation of one's relationship with his/her governing board and is related to the sense of feeling safe and respected by other decision-makers (Gottman, 2003; Straub, 2009). According to Meek, et al. (2003), clergy, like all professionals need communication, support, mentoring, vision-casting, and friendship. In most cases, a pastor hopes the church's leadership will be with and for him/her from the honeymoon, through the ebb and flow of local ministry challenges, and on to the end of his pastoral career. Meek et al. show relational satisfaction increases when the organization's leadership helps its minister "to set standards that model a well-balanced life for parishioners" (p. 345). Trihub, McMinn, Buhrow Jr., & Johnson's (2010) research into denominational support for clergy's well-being, posit having this kind of intimate relationship with a governing body of leaders reduces work-related stressors and decreases seasons of dissatisfaction and burnout. In conclusion, a leader, meaningfully and consistently supported by his closest decision-makers, is able to invest and engage "without fear of negative consequences to self-image, status, or career" (Kahn, 1990, p. 705).

As a whole, satisfaction with one's ability to relate to others diminishes as the inability to actively listen and express empathy significantly increases (Burns, Chapman, & Guthrie, 2013, p. 108). According to Nelis, Kotsou, Quoidbach, Hansenne, Weytens, Dupuis, and Mikolajczak (2011), when interpersonal competencies are developed under supervision in real-life settings, marital, vocational, and relational satisfaction increases (p. 355). In short, general satisfaction is very relational in nature.

## CHAPTER THREE: METHODS

The purpose of this study is to examine differences in ministerial students' leadership description, emotional intelligence, self-reported levels of satisfaction, and vocational status. The first two chapters of this present study have described the importance of examining ministerial students' leadership description, emotional intelligence, satisfaction, and vocational status. In Chapter Three, the researcher presents the methods whereby differences in these variables were evaluated. This chapter delineates the nature of the study, participants, hypotheses, measures, procedures, and analysis.

### Nature and Rationale for the Study

Since this study did not alter the context or situation of participants, a non-experimental cross-sectional research design was applied to a convenience sample of Doctor of Ministry students (Vogt & Johnson, 1993/2011, p. 253; Warner, 2007/2013, p. 4). According to Creswell (2003), the non-experimental, cross-sectional survey design was appropriate with the participants economic and time restrictions (pp. 154-156).

Quantitative statistical analysis was used to test this study's research hypotheses. According to Patten (2004), when a study uses a survey to describe variables or categories (e.g., attitudes, beliefs, behavior) with the intent of describing differences and/or making inferences to a larger population, quantitative analysis is appropriate (pp. 9, 19-20). For example, this study's survey sought to collect descriptive data regarding differences in participants' Leadership Description and Vocational Status (i.e., LD and VS as independent variables) and participants' Emotional Intelligence and Satisfaction

profile (i.e., EI and S as dependent variables). In short, a non-experimental cross-sectional design seemed appropriate for a quantifiable description of the relational dynamics examined in this study.

### Study Participants

Participants in this study were voluntarily recruited from students enrolled in a Doctor of Ministry program at an evangelical university in the southeastern United States. The participants were selected from those enrolled in a class about the growth and development of the contemporary minister. Students were informed of an opportunity to participate in this researcher's (i.e., as the co-teacher in the course) doctoral dissertation study. A brief description of the study and expectations for participation were provided in the email invitation. Those who replied to the email were given additional information and agreement to participate was requested. One hundred, thirty seven students agreed to participate. A power analysis indicated that 130 participants would be needed to satisfactorily examine the proposed research questions (i.e., G\*Power analysis; Berger, 2012). The resulting sample size was a concern as only 110 participants completed the survey; however, the reader is informed that this researcher followed "sage-on-the-stage" advice and used as many subjects as possible (Portney & Watkins, 1993/2000, p. 403) and that he could get and afford (Olejnik, 1984, p. 40). As a result, the outcome of this study is embryonic in nature, and dependent on the care of future studies with larger populations.

## Research Questions and Hypotheses

Five research questions were investigated in this present study. Hypotheses associated with each question are also presented. The questions and hypotheses were as follows:

1. Do participants' emotional intelligence scores differ significantly depending on the intensity of leadership description (Low, Medium, High) within their BeMACL scales (see Table 3.1) after controlling for the effects of social desirability? The hypothesis is that those with higher emotional intelligence scores differ significantly depending on the intensity of leadership description (Low, Medium, High) within their BeMACL scales (see Table 3.1). The null hypothesis is that those with higher emotional intelligence scores do not differ significantly depending on the intensity of leadership description (Low, Medium, High) within their BeMACL scales.
2. Do participants' satisfaction profiles (i.e., marital, vocational, relational satisfaction) differ significantly depending on the intensity of leadership description (Low, Medium, High) within their BeMACL scales (see Table 3.1) after controlling for the effects of social desirability? The hypothesis is that those with higher satisfaction profiles (i.e., marital, vocational, relational) differ significantly depending on the intensity of leadership description (Low, Medium, High) within their BeMACL scales. The null hypothesis is that those with higher satisfaction profile scores do not differ significantly depending on the intensity of leadership description (Low, Medium, High) within their BeMACL scales.

3. Is there a significant emotional intelligence difference between those participants who have experienced a forced exit (i.e., forced resignation or termination) and those who have not experienced a forced exit? The hypothesis is that those participants who have experienced a forced exit do not have higher emotional intelligence than those who have experienced a forced exit. The null hypothesis is that those participants who have not experienced a forced exit do not have higher emotional intelligence than those who have experienced a forced exit.
4. Is there a significant difference in participants' intensity of leadership description (Low, Medium, High; see Table 3.1) depending on whether they experienced a forced exit (i.e., forced resignation or termination) or did not experience a forced exit? The hypothesis is that there is a significant difference in participants' intensity of leadership description (Low, Medium, High) between those who have experienced a forced vocational exit (i.e., forced resignation or termination) and those who have not experienced a forced exit. The null hypothesis is that there is not a significant difference in participants' intensity of leadership description (Low, Medium, High) between those who have experienced a forced vocational exit (i.e., forced resignation or termination) and those who have not experienced a forced exit.
5. Are there significant differences between those who have experienced a forced vocational exit (i.e., forced resignation or termination) and those who have not experienced a forced exit on participants' satisfaction profiles (i.e., marital, vocational, relational)? The hypothesis is that there are significant differences between those who have experienced a forced vocational exit (i.e., forced

resignation or termination) and those who have not experienced a forced exit on ministerial participants' satisfaction profiles (i.e., marital, vocational, relational satisfaction). The null hypothesis is that there are not significant differences between those who have experienced a forced vocational exit (i.e., forced resignation or termination) and those who have not experienced a forced exit on ministerial participants' satisfaction profiles (i.e., marital, vocational, relational satisfaction).

Table 3.1

| <i>BeMIS Adjective Check List Scales Employed in this Study as Leadership Description</i> |            |            |                      |
|---|------------|------------|----------------------|
| Dominance   | Autonomy   | Nurturance | Counseling Readiness |
| Achievement   | Aggression | Deference  | Personal Adjustment  |

### Measures

This researcher examined leadership description (i.e., real-self standard scores' intensity of description as assessed by the BeMIS Adjective Check List; see Table 3.1 for scales employed in this study), emotional intelligence (i.e., global emotional intelligence as measured by the TEIQue Short Form: Appendix A Institutional Review Board), satisfaction profiles (i.e., relational, marital, vocational: Appendix A), and vocational status (i.e., I have experienced a forced resignation or termination?; I have never experienced a forced resignation or termination?: Appendix A) in a mixed sample of doctor of ministry students after controlling for the tendency to answer questions in a socially desirable way.

This study's measures are widely used and relate specifically to the concepts tested in this study (i.e., leadership: Burns, Chapman, & Guthrie, 2013; Collins & Adair, 1993; Day & Antonakis, 2004/2012; Gough & Heilbrun, 1965/1983; Oswald, 1991; Wilson & Hoffmann, 2007), and emotional intelligence (Mayer & Salovey, 1997; Petrides & Furnham, 2006). Each of the rationally developed self-report questions in this study were designed to relate to a general assessment of marital satisfaction (Commodore, 2004; Gottman, 2003; Morris, 1992; Straub, 2009), vocational satisfaction (Carroll, 2006; Faucett, Corwyn, & Poling, 2013; Kemery, 2006; Mueller & McDuff, 2004), relational satisfaction (Gottman & Krokoff, 1989; Straub, 2009), and vocational status (Barfoot, Winston, & Wickman, 2005; Barna, 1993; Beebe, May 2007; Brown, 1993; Tanner, Zvonkovic, & Tanner, 2013).

### *Demographic Information*

Participants completed a demographic section in the online survey (i.e., Dwight's Dissertation Data Survey; Appendix A), which included descriptive information such as their age, ethnicity, marital status, years married, vocational ministry assignment, average vocational tenure, and length at current vocational assignment. A final inquiry asked participants to indicate if they had experienced a forced resignation, termination, or both.

### *BeMIS Adjective Check List*

This study used archival data collected through the adjective check list instrument from Measurement And Planned Development Inc (MAPInc). Daniel R. Collins, Ed.D., founded the company in 1993 for the purpose of developing and distributing software

that would administer, score, and interpret Harrison and Gough's Adjective Check List assessment (ACL; 1965/1983); BeMIS IV is the current iteration of this software ([www.BemisAdmin.com/DataA](http://www.BemisAdmin.com/DataA) Appendix A; accessed January 4, 2014). BeMIS' efficacy for assisting with career development is well recognized (Center for Credentialing & Education, n.d.; Mind Garden, 2013) as it effectively measures, interprets, and reports on a number of global personality factors (i.e., productiveness, assertiveness, sociability, individuality, well-being, & submissiveness), personality tendencies (i.e., 37 scales; e.g., achievement, dominance, autonomy, social energy, etc.), character strengths and virtues, and even suggests insights into one's emotional disposition (e.g. emotional intelligence; Goleman 1995, 2002). Though several BeMIS report options are available (e.g., Individual, Real-Ideal, Relationship), the Real-Ideal data type option is always administered in this study's population.

The BeMIS statistical, graphical, and narrative data for the ACL's six factors and 37 scales was generated in the Real-Ideal mode; the selection of adjectives identified current (Real standard scores) and preferred (Ideal standard scores) behavior (i.e., recommended ACL administration; Collins, 2005, p. 8). Average score for each behavior is 50 with a standard deviation of 10. As scores move away from 50 the intensity and meaning of behavior is more easily described (p. 10). Interestingly, a recent review of adjective check list methodology, Robert Craig (2005) noted that Gough's ACL manual lacked in authorial instructions (p. 183); therefore, Collins and Adair's *The Adjective Check List Interpretive Report* (1987) is a value-added to the BeMACL survey.

Gough's ACL is a versatile tool for assessing personality and can be used for observer and self-description within individual and relationship counseling settings, team

building, personal and career development, and identification of conflict (Dy-Liacco, 2009). It is composed of 300 adjectives, present in the vernacular of everyday life. For counselors and educators, the ACL is very flexible, deceptively simple, and not limited to “item content” analysis (Collins & Adair, 1987, p. 7). Some latitude with clustering scales seems reasonable as most of the 300 adjectives were rationally clustered based on their inferred psychological meaning; four of the scales were empirically developed (i.e., Counseling Readiness, Personal Adjustment, Self-Satisfaction, and Structure-Valuing; Craig, 2005, p. 181). Norms for the ACL are based on almost 10,000 participants (i.e., 4,144 females and 5,238 males; Dy-Liacco, 2009). The ACL’s alpha coefficients have a median of .76 for males with a median of .75 for females. Test-retest correlations for males were .65 and .71 for females. Gough and Heilbrun (1965/1983) reported reliability coefficients were within an acceptable range for personality measures (p. 30).

#### *Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire-Short Form*

A self-report measure of emotional intelligence was assessed through the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire-Short Form (TEIQue-SF version 1.00 Appendix A; Petrides, 2009; Petrides & Furnham, 2006). The assessment consists of 30 items designed to measure global trait emotional intelligence (e.g., “Expressing my emotions with words is not a problem for me”; “I can deal effectively with people”; “On the whole, I’m able to deal with stress”). This measure is a short version of the TEIQue and includes two items from each of the 15 facets in the full form. Based mostly on correlations with total facet scores, two items from each facet were selected for the short form, which uses a 7 item Likert-type scale (i.e, 1-Completely Disagree to 7-Completely Agree). The TEIQue-SF

has shown excellent psychometric properties with an internal consistency of .89. The scoring key requires reverse scoring (i.e., questions: 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12-14, 16, 18, 22, 25, 26, 28). A global emotional trait EI score is calculated by summing up the item scores and dividing by the total number of items.

### *Satisfaction Profile*

In collaboration with this researcher's dissertation chair, five Likert-type scale questions (i.e., 1 "Very Unsatisfied" to 7 "Very Satisfied") were developed for the online survey. In light of the challenges of this study's small  $n$  (110), three questions were chosen to assess fewer variables in respondents' satisfaction profile (i.e., 1 - Marital Satisfaction: "What is your current level of satisfaction with your marriage?"; Commodore, 2004; Gottman, 2003; Morris, 1992; Straub, 2009; 2 - Vocational Satisfaction: "What is your current level of satisfaction with your role in ministry?"; Carroll, 2006; Faucett, Corwyn, & Poling, 2013; Kemery, 2006; Mueller & McDuff, 2004; and 3 - Relational Satisfaction: "What is your current level of relational satisfaction with your governing board?"; Barfoot, Winston, & Wickman, 2005; Barna, 1993; Beebe, May 2007; Brown, 1993; Tanner, Zvonkovic, & Tanner, 2013). Though these questions were similar to the ones occasionally posed to respondents in their classroom learning experience and linked to concepts in the literature, none were borrowed from an empirically validated satisfaction instrument.

### *Vocational Status*

In collaboration with this researcher's dissertation chair, one self-report question was chosen from the demographic section to determine whether or not a forced resignation or termination had occurred (i.e., "Have you personally experienced any of the following during the course of your vocational journey: Forced Resignation; Termination; Both; Neither?"). Responses were totaled for analysis: 1) self-reported forced resignation and/or forced termination; and 2) self-report of having never experienced a forced resignation or forced termination.

### *Social Desirability*

Thomas and Cornwall (1990) recommend that social desirability effects be considered in highly religious samples (i.e., tendency to answer questions as "good" people "should"; Vogt & Johnson, 1993/2011, p. 368). Social Desirability is assessed by the 13 item Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, Short Version C (see Appendix A). This scale is designed to rate a respondent's tendency to answer questions in a way that would make him/her look desirable (e.g., impression management; faking good). Participants respond in a true or false manner with 5 items keyed in positive direction and 8 in the negative direction. Composite scores will range from 0 to 13 (i.e., low social desirability to high). This scale was created using 608 undergraduate student participants who had taken the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSDS). The reliability of the MCSD-C was .76. The validity coefficient of the MCSDS-C with the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale was .93 (Reynolds, 1982).

## Study Procedures

This study was proposed to the Liberty University Institutional Review Board (IRB) in March 2011 and updated June 2011 when seventy BeMACL reports were lost due to a technical error in the faculty sponsor's data base. The update permitted more data to be collected resulting in one hundred, thirty four BeMACL reports on file for this study's convenience sample. Interestingly, of the one hundred, thirty four consents to participate, one hundred and ten participants successfully completed the study resulting in a surprisingly high response rate (i.e., 82%).

Participants received a consent form by email requesting student participation in this study. An attached consent form presented a concise invitation, requested release of the student's Adjective Checklist file, delineated the purpose and procedures of the study, the risks and benefits of being in the study, the assurance of confidentiality, and the amount of time it would take to complete the study's online survey (i.e., Dwight's Dissertation Data Survey [DDDS]: see Appendix A).

When consent was granted, participants were asked to anticipate another email (i.e., subject line: Phase Two of DCR Research) which provided the URL and confidential access code to complete the free online survey. Those who did not respond within a week received another invitation, instructions, and the previously attached Consent Form (see Appendix A).

Students were invited to ask questions of this researcher or his faculty sponsor before returning the signed/dated form by email attachment; only four interacted with this researcher before granting consent. Assurance was given that a decline to participate or a withdrawal from the study at any time would not affect current or future relations with

the evangelical university. After returning the signed Consent Form, participants received a prompt thank you and directions for completing the online survey.

Participants accessed the survey instrument through an internet link to [www.surveymonkey.com](http://www.surveymonkey.com) and the DDDS (Appendix A). The first page requested the password to open the survey. Upon opening the fifty seven question survey, participants entered a confidential participation code (i.e., question #1). The DDDS presented instruments and corresponding instructions in the following order: Trait Emotional Intelligence –Short Form (TEIQue-SF: i.e, Qs 2-31); levels of satisfaction (i.e., spiritual: Q-32; marital: Q-33; vocational - role in ministry: Q-34; relational - relationship with governing board: Q-35; and life & ministry as a whole: Q-36); Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Questionnaire short form C (MCSD-C: i.e., Qs 37-49); and a demographic section (Qs 50-57).

Once participants completed the survey, they were instructed to press the "Done" button, which then uploaded the responses into the SurveyMonkey® database. Once all data was collected, the researcher downloaded the data from the SurveyMonkey® database for statistical analysis.

### Data Analysis

Data was analyzed using the Predictive Analysis Software (PASW) Statistics GradPack 18 (SPSS Inc., 2009). Descriptive statistics were obtained and ANCOVAs, Bonferroni corrections, and T-tests were conducted to examine leadership description, emotional intelligence, a satisfaction profile, and vocational status after controlling for the effects of social desirability. Descriptive statistics are helpful in the summarization

and comprehension of data, especially trends toward significance (Patten, 1997/2004, p. 97). The ANCOVA is necessary when seeking to equalize differences between two variables or groups/sub-groups when controlling for a covariant (Salkind, 2000/2004, p. 299) such as social desirability. In as much, with this study's need to test the significance of several categories, Bonferroni corrections are necessary to identify the location of a significant difference (Warner, 2007/2013, p. 98-99). This section will discuss the statistical analysis in conjunction with each Research Question.

#### *Analysis of Research Question One*

In order to examine whether or not participants' emotional intelligence scores differ significantly depending on the intensity of leadership description (Low, Medium, High), nine one-way ANCOVAs were conducted. Each of the BeMACL scales (i.e., achievement, dominance, autonomy, aggression, nurturance, deference, counseling readiness, personal adjustment) was treated as an independent variable with emotional intelligence (i.e., Global TEIQue-SF score) treated as the dependent variable. The MCSDS-C total score was treated as a covariant. A post-hoc analysis (i.e., Bonferroni correction) was conducted when an ANCOVA showed significant results. A Pairwise Comparison alpha of .006 was used to determine statistical significance. The null hypothesis is that those with higher emotional intelligence scores do not differ significantly depending on the intensity of leadership description (Low, Medium, High) within their BeMACL scales.

### *Analysis of Research Question Two*

In order to examine whether or not participants' satisfaction profiles (i.e., marital, vocational, relational satisfaction) differ significantly depending on the intensity of leadership description (Low, Medium, High), nine one-way ANCOVAs were conducted. Each of the BeMACL scales (i.e., achievement, dominance, autonomy, aggression, nurturance, deference, counseling readiness, personal adjustment) was treated as an independent variable with emotional intelligence (i.e., Global TEIQue-SF score) treated as the dependent variable. The MCSDS-C total score was treated as a covariant. A post-hoc analysis (i.e., Bonferroni correction) was conducted when an ANCOVA showed significant results. A Pairwise Comparison alpha of .006 was used to determine statistical significance. The null hypothesis is that those with higher satisfaction profile scores do not differ significantly depending on the intensity of leadership description (Low, Medium, High) within their BeMACL scales.

### *Analysis of Research Question Three*

In order to examine whether or not there is a significant emotional intelligence difference between those participants who have experienced a forced exit (i.e., forced resignation or termination) and those who have not experienced a forced exit, a t-test was conducted using the demographic question about vocational status (i.e., experienced forced exit; not experienced a forced exit) as the independent variable and emotional intelligence (i.e., TEIQue-SF global score) as the dependent variable. The null hypothesis

is that those participants who have not experienced a forced exit do not have higher emotional intelligence than those who have experienced a forced exit.

#### *Analysis of Research Question Four*

In order to examine if there is a significant difference in participants' intensity of leadership description (Low, Medium, High) depending on whether or not a forced exit (i.e., forced resignation or termination), eight t-tests were run using each BeMACL scale (i.e., Achievement, Dominance, Autonomy, Aggression, Nurturance, Deference, Counseling Readiness, Personal Adjustment) as the dependent variable and vocational status (i.e., experienced a forced exit, not experienced a forced exit) as the independent variable. The null hypothesis is that there is not a significant difference in participants' intensity of leadership description (Low, Medium, High) between those who have experienced a forced vocational exit (i.e., forced resignation or termination) and those who have not experienced a forced exit.

#### *Analysis of Research Question Five*

In order to examine if there are significant differences between those who have experienced a forced vocational exit (i.e., forced resignation or termination) and those who have not experienced a forced exit on participants' satisfaction profiles (i.e., marital, vocational, relational), three t-tests were run using Vocational Status as the independent variable and satisfaction scales (i.e., Marital Satisfaction, Vocational Satisfaction, Relational Satisfaction) as dependent variables. The null hypothesis is that there are not significant differences between those who have experienced a forced vocational exit (i.e.,

forced resignation or termination) and those who have not experienced a forced exit on ministerial participants' satisfaction profiles (i.e., marital, vocational, relational satisfaction).

### Ethical Considerations

Approval to conduct this study was obtained from Liberty University's Internal Review Board (IRB). Since students were recruited from a doctoral course, each potential participant was ensured that willingness to participate would not impact course grade.

Completed surveys were totally anonymous without means of identifying the respondent. Additionally, an informed consent form and a statement of research purpose were provided along with the contact information of the researcher and his faculty sponsor in case of emerging additional questions regarding the survey. See Appendix A.

For confidentiality of the participants, secondly, all data collected from the sample were used only for the current research purpose and was not distributed, shared, or circulated for any other purpose. In the case of this study being published in the future, only aggregate statistical data will be reported or cited; no raw data or original copies of the survey will be circulated.

Access and storage of data after the participant had completed the battery of tests would be kept secure in a computer database. Access to the data set was only to be given to the researchers and the statisticians that determined the results of the study. The storage of the data was stored in password protected files on a password protected hard drive and kept in the researcher's possession at all times.

### Chapter Summary

In this chapter, the methods for this present study were discussed. In addition to the stated research questions and hypotheses, characteristics of participants, procedures, and measurements used in this study were presented. Finally, a delineation of data analysis was presented to test hypotheses.

## CHAPTER FOUR: DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

In this chapter the researcher presents the results from an examination of differences in ministerial participants' leadership description, emotional intelligence, a satisfaction profile, and vocational status after controlling for the effects of social desirability. This chapter will first present a summary of the nature of the study. Next, the descriptive statistic results of the participants will be provided. Preparation of data will be discussed with the analysis and summary of results associated with each research question.

### Summary

This present study used a non-experimental cross-sectional research design to investigate participants' leadership description and vocational status as independent variables and participants' emotional intelligence and satisfaction as dependent variables. Experts in the clergy literature have identified these topics as essential reflections for preventing ministry failure (Brown, 1993; Wilson & Hoffmann, 2007) and for fostering resiliency (Burns, Chapman, & Guthrie, 2013; Meek et al., 2003). In the service of meaningful reflection, the researcher queried whether there is a quantifiable explanation of differences in participants' leadership description, emotional intelligence, satisfaction profile, and vocational status. In short, this study sought to add to the body of knowledge related to ministerial training, namely, improvement in leadership self-awareness, self-regulation, and relationship management.

This study employed the following measures: the Behavioral Management Information System's (BeMIS) iteration of the Adjective Check List (ACL) measured differences in participants' leadership description within their BeMACL scales (i.e., Real Standard Scores; Low; Medium; High; see Table 4.2); the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire – Short Form (TEIQue-SF) measured emotional intelligence (i.e., TEIQue-SF global score); three, rationally determined, 7 point Likert scale self-report questions measured marital satisfaction, vocational satisfaction, and relational satisfaction; vocational status was examined by one demographic question (i.e., Q-55: Have you personally experienced any of the following: forced resignation? termination? both? or neither?); and the tendency to respond in a socially desirable way was measured by the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, Short Version C (MCSDS-C).

### Participants

One hundred and ten students enrolled in a Doctor of Ministry program at an evangelical university in the southeastern United States agreed to participate in this present study. Students were recruited from a particular seminary class that addressed the growth and development of the contemporary minister. No incentives were offered to participants. For statistical purposes a minimum of one hundred thirty participants were needed. In total, one hundred ten students took the online survey and 100% of those surveys were useable. As this smaller than anticipated sample reduced statistical power, it was noted as a limitation in this study.

Table 4.1 provides participants' demographic characteristics. Participant age ranged from 25 to 70; majority was 40-59 years old (i.e., 40-49  $n = 35$ : 31.8%; 50-59  $n =$

42: 38.2%). Almost 22% were in the 30-39 year range ( $n = 24$ ) with approximately 8% representing the youngest (i.e., 25-29  $n = 3$ ) and oldest (i.e., 60-70  $n = 6$ ). The majority of participants identified themselves as “White” (79.1%  $n = 87$ ); approximately 18% identified themselves as “Black” ( $n = 20$ ). Almost 91% ( $n = 100$ ) of the participants were married, while almost 2% ( $n = 2$ ) had never been married; a little more than 7% ( $n = 8$ ) were separated, divorced, or remarried. The number of years married ranged from 1 to 50; the majority were married 10-29 years (62.2%  $n = 66$ ) with almost 13% ( $n = 14$ ) married 9 years or less. Only 4.5% ( $n = 5$ ) were married over 40 years. The majority of participants were male ( $n = 102$ ; 93%; female  $n = 8$ ; 7%).

The following vocational ministry assignments were identified: 6.4% lay worker ( $n = 7$ ); 6.4% bi-vocational pastor ( $n = 7$ ); 1.8% bi-vocational staff member ( $n = 2$ ); 13.6% single-staff pastor ( $n = 15$ ); 33.6% senior/lead pastor ( $n = 37$ ); 15.5% associate staff member ( $n = 17$ ); 7.3% missionary ( $n = 8$ ); 2.7% evangelist ( $n = 3$ ); 7.3% educator ( $n = 8$ ); and 4.5% administrator/executive pastor ( $n = 5$ ). The average of vocational tenure primarily ranged from 1-19 years (i.e., 1-4  $n=34$ : 30.9%; 5-9  $n=40$ : 36.4%; 10-19  $n=30$ : 27.3%); approximately 5% ( $n=5$ ) averaged more than 20 years. Approximately 73% ( $n=80$ ) reported no forced exit from a vocational setting while almost 27% ( $n=29$ ) experienced either a forced resignation or forced termination.

### Data Analysis

Data preparation and subsequent analyses were conducted using the Predictive Analysis Software (PASW) Statistics GradPack 18 (SPSS Inc., 2009). Prior to analysis, the BeMIS Adjective Check List (BeMAACL) data was manually entered, coded, and

reviewed for accuracy. Data from the SurveyMonkey© file was loaded into SPSS and labeled to identify demographic information and items presented in the scales. After all data was entered, it was reviewed again for accuracy. Prior to analysis, 22 items were reverse coded (See Appendix A). Explanation of recoding is provided with each question's analysis. The study attempted to answer five research questions. The following section will present the results of the analyses by research question.

Table 4.1

*Demographic Characteristics of Participants*

| Demographic              | Type                 | N   | %    |
|--------------------------|----------------------|-----|------|
| Age                      | 25-29                | 3   | 2.7  |
|                          | 30-39                | 24  | 21.8 |
|                          | 40-49                | 35  | 31.8 |
|                          | 50-59                | 42  | 38.2 |
|                          | 60-70                | 6   | 5.5  |
| Ethnicity                | Black                | 20  | 18.2 |
|                          | White                | 87  | 79.1 |
|                          | Other                | 1   | 0.9  |
| Gender                   | Female               | 8   | 0.7  |
|                          | Male                 | 102 | 92.7 |
| Relationship Status      | Never Married        | 2   | 1.8  |
|                          | Married              | 100 | 90.9 |
|                          | Separated            | 1   | 0.9  |
|                          | Divorced             | 1   | 0.9  |
|                          | Remarried            | 6   | 5.5  |
| Years Married            | 1-9                  | 14  | 13.2 |
|                          | 10-19                | 33  | 31.1 |
|                          | 20-29                | 33  | 31.1 |
|                          | 30-39                | 21  | 19.8 |
|                          | 40-49                | 4   | 3.8  |
|                          | 50-69                | 1   | 0.9  |
| Vocational Ministry Post | Lay Worker           | 7   | 6.4  |
|                          | Bi-Vocational Pastor | 7   | 6.4  |
|                          | Bi-Vocational Staff  | 2   | 1.8  |
|                          | Single Staff Pastor  | 15  | 13.6 |
|                          | Senior/Lead Pastor   | 37  | 33.6 |

|                              |                    |    |      |
|------------------------------|--------------------|----|------|
|                              | Associate Staff    | 17 | 15.5 |
|                              | Missionary         | 8  | 7.3  |
|                              | Evangelist         | 3  | 2.7  |
|                              | Educator           | 8  | 7.3  |
|                              | Admin/Exec Pastor  | 5  | 4.5  |
|                              | Not Currently in   | 1  | 0.9  |
| Average Tenure in Vocational | Ministry           | 34 | 30.9 |
| Ministry                     | 1-4 years          | 40 | 36.4 |
|                              | 5-9                | 30 | 27.3 |
|                              | 10-19              | 5  | 4.5  |
|                              | 20-29              | 1  | .9   |
|                              | 30-40              | 19 | 17.4 |
| Vocational Status            | Forced Resignation | 10 | 9.2  |
|                              | Forced Termination | 80 | 73.4 |
|                              | Neither            |    |      |

Table 4.2

*BeMIS Adjective Check List Scales Employed in this Study as Leadership Description*

|             |            |            |                      |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------------|
| Dominance   | Autonomy   | Nurturance | Counseling Readiness |
| Achievement | Aggression | Deference  | Personal Adjustment  |

### Research Question Findings

This section will provide the results of the data according to each research question.

#### Research Question One

The first research question asked: Do participants' emotional intelligence scores differ significantly depending on the intensity of leadership description (Low, Medium, High) within their BeMACL scales (see Table 4.2) after controlling for the effects of social desirability?

To examine Hypothesis 1, nine one-away ANCOVAs were conducted with each of the BeMACL scales (i.e., achievement, dominance, autonomy, aggression, nurturance,

deference, counseling readiness, personal adjustment) treated as an independent variable, emotional intelligence (i.e., TEIQue-SF global score) as the dependent variable while treating MCSDS-C total score as a covariant. To minimize the chance of committing a Type 1 error with these multiple comparisons, a post-hoc analysis (i.e., Bonferroni correction) was conducted when an ANCOVA showed significant results. A Pairwise Comparison alpha of .006 was used to determine statistical significance.

### *Summary of Results*

The ANCOVAs showed that the intensity of description in the Achievement and Dominance scales reflected a significant difference in participants' emotional intelligence (see Table 4.3). For immediate recognition, the difference in Achievement was  $F = 7.962$ ,  $p = .001$  and in Dominance  $F = 5.3970$ ,  $p = .006$ . The first Bonferroni post hoc analysis (i.e., Achievement) showed that those who were High (i.e., overdeveloped behavior) on the Achievement scale had significantly higher emotional intelligence than those who were Low (underdeveloped behavior; Mean difference = 2.194;  $p < .000$ ). Those who were Medium (normal behavior) on Achievement had significantly higher emotional intelligence than those who were low on the Achievement scale (Mean difference = 2.000,  $p = .001$ ).

The second Bonferroni post hoc analysis (i.e., Dominance) showed that those who were High (overdeveloped behavior) on the Dominance scale had significantly higher emotional intelligence than those who were Low (underdeveloped behavior; Mean difference = .930;  $p = .004$ ). Those who were Medium (normal behavior) on Dominance had significantly higher emotional intelligence than those who were low on the

Dominance scale (Mean difference = 2.000,  $p = .001$ ). The other BeMACL scales (i.e., Autonomy, Aggression, Nurturance, Deference, Counseling Readiness, Personal Adjustment) did not show a significant difference in ministerial participants' emotional intelligence. Thus, the null hypothesis was partially rejected with two of the eight BeMACL scales reflecting significantly higher emotional intelligence. In this small sample, however, it is worth noting the following trends toward significance: Counseling Readiness  $F = 3.43$ ,  $p = .036$  and Personal Adjustment  $F = 3.204$ ,  $p = .045$ .

Table 4.3

*Descriptive Statistics Emotional Intelligence*

| BeMACL Scales             |      | Total EI |        |       | Ttl <sup>3</sup> | ANCOVA F | ANCOVA p |
|---------------------------|------|----------|--------|-------|------------------|----------|----------|
|                           |      | Low      | Medium | High  |                  |          |          |
| Achievement               | Mean | 3.53     | 5.54   | 5.72  | 5.56             | 7.96     | 0.001*   |
|                           | SD   | .        | 0.62   | 0.40  | 0.61             |          |          |
|                           | N    | 1        | 86     | 23    | 110              |          |          |
| Dominance                 | Mean | 4.87     | 5.57   | 5.70  | 5.56             | 5.39     | 0.006*   |
|                           | SD   | 0.77     | 0.62   | 0.40  | 0.61             |          |          |
|                           | N    | 5        | 86     | 19    | 110              |          |          |
| Autonomy                  | Mean | 5.53     | 5.52   | 5.88  | 5.56             | 3.15     | 0.047    |
|                           | SD   | 0.77     | 0.59   | 0.33  | 0.61             |          |          |
|                           | N    | 18       | 81     | 11    | 110              |          |          |
| Aggression                | Mean | 5.92     | 5.48   | 5.75  | 5.56             | 2.45     | 0.092    |
|                           | SD   | 0.52     | 0.62   | 0.48  | 0.61             |          |          |
|                           | N    | 12.00    | 83.00  | 15.00 | 110              |          |          |
| Nurturance                | Mean | 5.71     | 5.49   | 5.99  | 5.56             | 2.41     | 0.095    |
|                           | SD   | 0.46     | 0.63   | 0.39  | 0.61             |          |          |
|                           | N    | 12       | 87     | 11    | 110              |          |          |
| Deference                 | Mean | 5.79     | 5.54   | 5.49  | 5.56             | 2.48     | 0.088    |
|                           | SD   | 0.46     | 0.59   | 0.79  | 0.61             |          |          |
|                           | N    | 14       | 81     | 15    | 110              |          |          |
| Coun. Read. <sup>1</sup>  | Mean | 5.78     | 5.55   | 5.18  | 5.56             | 3.43     | 0.036**  |
|                           | SD   | 0.40     | 0.60   | 0.91  | 0.61             |          |          |
|                           | N    | 17       | 85     | 8     | 110              |          |          |
| Per. Adjtmnt <sup>2</sup> | Mean | 5.23     | 5.57   | 6.07  | 5.56             | 3.204    | 0.0450** |

|    |      |      |      |      |
|----|------|------|------|------|
| SD | 1.11 | 0.52 | 0.32 | 0.61 |
| N  | 11   | 93   | 6    | 110  |

---

\*Mean difference is significant at .006 level

\*\* Trends toward significance  $p < .045$

<sup>1</sup>Counseling Readiness

<sup>2</sup>Personal Adjustment

<sup>3</sup>Total

## Research Question Two

The second research question asked: Do participants' satisfaction profiles (i.e., marital, vocational, relational satisfaction) differ significantly depending on the intensity of leadership description (Low, Medium, High) within their BeMACL scales (see Table 4.2) after controlling for the effects of social desirability?

To examine Hypothesis 2, nine one-way ANCOVAs were conducted with each of the BeMACL scales treated as an independent variable (i.e., achievement, dominance, autonomy, aggression, nurturance, deference, counseling readiness, personal adjustment) and satisfaction (i.e., a) marital satisfaction; b) vocational satisfaction; c) relational satisfaction) as the dependent variable while treating MCSDS-C as a covariant. To minimize the chance of committing a Type 1 error with these multiple comparisons, a post-hoc analysis (i.e., Bonferroni correction) was conducted when an ANCOVA showed significant results. A Pairwise Comparison alpha of .006 was used to determine statistical significance.

### *Summary of Results*

The ANCOVAs showed that none of the BeMACL leadership description scales (i.e., achievement, dominance, autonomy, aggression, nurturance, deference, counseling

readiness, personal adjustment) showed significant differences in ministerial participants': a) marital satisfaction, b) vocational satisfaction, or c) relational satisfaction. Thus, the null hypothesis was not rejected. In this small sample, however, it is worth noting that Dominance trended toward significance in Marital Satisfaction,  $F = 4.569, p = .012$  (see Table 4.4) and in Vocational Satisfaction,  $F = 4.466, p = .014$ . Other trends toward significance were: Aggression in Vocational Satisfaction,  $F = 4.012, p = .021$  (see Table 4.5) and Relational Satisfaction,  $F = 3.505, p = .034$ ; Nurturance in Relational Satisfaction,  $F = 4.538, p = .013$  (see Table 4.6); and Personal Adjustment in Relational Satisfaction,  $F = 5.237, p = .007$  (see Table 4.6).

Table 4.4

*Descriptive Statistics Marital Satisfaction*

| BeMACL Scales |      | <u>Marital Satisfaction</u> |        |      |       | ANCOVA<br>F | ANCOVA<br>p |
|---------------|------|-----------------------------|--------|------|-------|-------------|-------------|
|               |      | Low                         | Medium | High | Total |             |             |
| Achievement   | Mean | 5.00                        | 5.72   | 5.57 | 5.68  | 196.0       | 0.922       |
|               | SD   |                             | 1.36   | 1.78 | 1.45  |             |             |
|               | N    | 1                           | 86     | 23   | 110   |             |             |
| Dominance     | Mean | 4.20                        | 5.67   | 6.11 | 5.68  | 4.569       | 0.012**     |
|               | SD   | 2.17                        | 1.40   | 1.24 | 1.45  |             |             |
|               | N    | 5                           | 86     | 19   | 110   |             |             |
| Autonomy      | Mean | 5.44                        | 5.64   | 6.36 | 5.68  | 2.700       | 0.072       |
|               | SD   | 1.69                        | 1.41   | 1.21 | 1.45  |             |             |
|               | N    | 18                          | 81     | 11   | 110   |             |             |
| Aggression    | Mean | 5.83                        | 5.63   | 5.87 | 5.68  | 0.276       | 0.759       |
|               | SD   | 1.80                        | 1.35   | 1.73 | 1.45  |             |             |
|               | N    | 12                          | 83     | 15   | 110   |             |             |
| Nurturance    | Mean | 5.67                        | 5.67   | 5.82 | 5.68  | 0.410       | 0.960       |
|               | SD   | 1.83                        | 1.35   | 1.83 | 1.45  |             |             |
|               | N    | 12                          | 87     | 11   | 110   |             |             |

|                           |      |      |      |      |      |       |       |
|---------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|
| Deference                 | Mean | 6.07 | 5.65 | 5.47 | 5.68 | 1.430 | 0.244 |
|                           | SD   | 1.38 | 1.39 | 1.81 | 1.45 |       |       |
|                           | N    | 14   | 81   | 15   | 110  |       |       |
| Coun. Read. <sup>1</sup>  | Mean | 6.12 | 5.65 | 5.13 | 5.68 | 1.724 | 0.183 |
|                           | SD   | 1.05 | 1.49 | 1.64 | 1.45 |       |       |
|                           | N    | 17   | 85   | 8    | 110  |       |       |
| Per. Adjtmnt <sup>2</sup> | Mean | 5.45 | 5.66 | 6.50 | 5.68 | 0.707 | 0.495 |
|                           | SD   | 1.97 | 1.41 | 0.55 | 1.45 |       |       |
|                           | N    | 11   | 93   | 6    | 110  |       |       |

\*\* Trends toward significance  $p < .045$

<sup>1</sup>Counseling Readiness

<sup>2</sup>Personal Adjustment

Table 4.5

*Descriptive Statistics Vocational Satisfaction*

| BeMACL Scales |      | Vocational Satisfaction |        |           |       | ANCOVA<br>F | ANCOVA<br>p |
|---------------|------|-------------------------|--------|-----------|-------|-------------|-------------|
|               |      | Low                     | Medium | High      | Total |             |             |
| Achievement   | Mean | 3.00                    | 4.95   | 5.65      | 5.08  | 3.811       | 0.250       |
|               | SD   |                         | 1.45   | 0.88      | 1.39  |             |             |
|               | N    | 1                       | 86     | 23        | 110   |             |             |
| Dominance     | Mean | 4.60                    | 4.95   | 5.79      | 5.08  | 4.466       | 0.014**     |
|               | SD   | 1.14                    | 1.46   | 0.79      | 1.39  |             |             |
|               | N    | 5                       | 86     | 19        | 110   |             |             |
| Autonomy      | Mean | 5.00                    | 5.00   | 5.82      | 5.08  | 2.458       | 0.091       |
|               | SD   | 1.19                    | 1.46   | 0.98      | 1.39  |             |             |
|               | N    | 18.0<br>0               | 81.00  | 11.0<br>0 | 110   |             |             |
| Aggression    | Mean | 5.58                    | 4.87   | 5.87      | 5.08  | 4.012       | 0.021**     |
|               | SD   | 1.00                    | 1.46   | 0.74      | 1.39  |             |             |
|               | N    | 12                      | 83     | 15        | 110   |             |             |
| Nurturance    | Mean | 5.33                    | 4.95   | 5.82      | 5.08  | 1.391       | 0.253       |
|               | SD   | 1.56                    | 1.40   | 0.87      | 1.39  |             |             |
|               | N    | 12                      | 87     | 11        | 110   |             |             |
| Deference     | Mean | 5.79                    | 4.95   | 5.13      | 5.08  | 2.831       | 0.063       |
|               | SD   | 0.89                    | 1.43   | 1.41      | 1.39  |             |             |
|               | N    | 14                      | 81     | 15        | 110   |             |             |

|                           |      |      |      |      |      |       |       |
|---------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|
| Coun. Read. <sup>1</sup>  | Mean | 5.53 | 5.04 | 4.63 | 5.08 | 1.65  | 0.197 |
|                           | SD   | 1.42 | 1.38 | 1.30 | 1.39 |       |       |
|                           | N    | 17   | 85   | 8    | 110  |       |       |
| Per. Adjtmnt <sup>2</sup> | Mean | 4.55 | 5.08 | 6.17 | 5.08 | 2.227 | 0.113 |
|                           | SD   | 1.92 | 1.32 | 0.75 | 1.39 |       |       |
|                           | N    | 11   | 93   | 6    | 110  |       |       |

\*\* Trends toward significance  $p < .045$

<sup>1</sup>Counseling Readiness

<sup>2</sup>Personal Adjustment

Table 4.6

*Descriptive Statistics Relational Satisfaction*

| BeMACL Scales             |      | Relational Satisfaction |            |       |        | ANCOVA F | ANCOVA p |
|---------------------------|------|-------------------------|------------|-------|--------|----------|----------|
|                           |      | Low                     | Mediu<br>m | High  | Total  |          |          |
| Achievement               | Mean | 5.00                    | 4.90       | 5.61  | 5.05   | 1.756    | 0.178    |
|                           | SD   |                         | 1.69       | 1.50  | 1.67   |          |          |
|                           | N    | 1                       | 86         | 23    | 110    |          |          |
| Dominance                 | Mean | 5.20                    | 4.90       | 5.68  | 5.05   | 2.295    | 0.106    |
|                           | SD   | 1.79                    | 1.72       | 1.25  | 1.67   |          |          |
|                           | N    | 5                       | 86         | 19    | 110    |          |          |
| Autonomy                  | Mean | 5.28                    | 4.91       | 5.64  | 5.05   | 1.095    | 1.338    |
|                           | SD   | 1.56                    | 1.62       | 2.11  | 1.67   |          |          |
|                           | N    | 18                      | 81         | 11    | 110    |          |          |
| Aggression                | Mean | 5.92                    | 4.80       | 5.73  | 5.05   | 3.505    | 0.034**  |
|                           | SD   | 1.00                    | 1.67       | 1.75  | 1.67   |          |          |
|                           | N    | 12.00                   | 83.00      | 15.00 | 110.00 |          |          |
| Nurturance                | Mean | 5.92                    | 4.79       | 6.09  | 5.05   | 4.538    | 0.013**  |
|                           | SD   | 0.90                    | 1.75       | 0.70  | 1.67   |          |          |
|                           | N    | 12                      | 87         | 11    | 110    |          |          |
| Deference                 | Mean | 5.57                    | 4.91       | 5.27  | 5.05   | 1.184    | 0.310    |
|                           | SD   | 1.74                    | 1.67       | 1.53  | 1.67   |          |          |
|                           | N    | 14                      | 81         | 15    | 110    |          |          |
| Coun. Read. <sup>1</sup>  | Mean | 5.59                    | 4.94       | 5.00  | 5.05   | 1.221    | 0.299    |
|                           | SD   | 1.12                    | 1.78       | 1.20  | 1.67   |          |          |
|                           | N    | 17                      | 85         | 8     | 110    |          |          |
| Per. Adjtmnt <sup>2</sup> | Mean | 3.64                    | 5.15       | 6.00  | 5.05   | 5.237    | 0.007**  |
|                           | SD   | 2.38                    | 1.53       | 0.63  | 1.67   |          |          |
|                           | N    | 11                      | 93         | 6     | 110    |          |          |

\*\* Trends toward significance  $p < .045$

<sup>1</sup>Counseling Readiness

<sup>2</sup>Personal Adjustment

### Research Question Three

The third research question asked: Is there a significant emotional intelligence difference between those participants who have experienced a forced vocational exit (i.e., forced resignation or termination) and those who have not experienced a forced exit?

To examine Hypothesis 3, a *t*-test was conducted using vocational status (i.e., experienced forced exit; not experienced a forced exit) as the independent variable and emotional intelligence (i.e., TEIQue-SF global score) as the dependent variable.

### *Summary of Results*

The *t*-test did not show a statistically significant result (see Tables 4.7, 4.8). Thus, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Table 4.7

#### *Descriptive Statistics Emotional Intelligence and Vocational Status*

| Vocational Status    | N  | Emotional Intelligence |      |      |
|----------------------|----|------------------------|------|------|
|                      |    | Mean                   | SD   | SEM  |
| experienced exit     | 30 | 5.53                   | 0.64 | 0.12 |
| not experienced exit | 80 | 5.57                   | 0.60 | 0.07 |

SEM= Standard Error Mean

Table 4.8

#### *T-tests results Emotional Intelligence and Vocational Status*

|                             | Emotional Intelligence |       |      |                 |      |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|-------|------|-----------------|------|
|                             | t                      | df    | p    | Mean Difference | SED  |
| Equal variances not assumed | -0.33                  | 49.46 | 0.74 | -0.04           | 0.13 |

SED=Standard Error Difference

#### Research Question Four

The fourth research question asked: Is there a significant difference in participants' intensity of leadership description (Low, Medium, High) depending on whether they experienced a forced exit (i.e., forced resignation or termination) or did not experience a forced exit?

To examine Hypothesis 4, eight *t*-tests were run using BeMACL leadership scales (i.e., Achievement, Dominance, Autonomy, Aggression, Nurturance, Deference, Counseling Readiness, Personal Adjustment) as the dependent variable and Vocational Status (i.e., experienced a forced exit, not experienced a forced exit) as the independent variable.

#### *Summary of Results*

The *t*-tests showed no significant differences between those who have experienced a forced exit (i.e., forced resignation or termination) and those who have not experienced a forced exit in vocational status on their leadership scales (i.e., Achievement, Dominance, Autonomy, Aggression, Nurturance, Deference, Counseling Readiness, Personal Adjustment; see Tables 4.9, 4.10). Thus, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Table 4.9

#### *Leadership Description Scales and Vocational Status*

|                           | Vocational Status    | N  | Mean  | SD    | SEM  |
|---------------------------|----------------------|----|-------|-------|------|
| Achievement               | experienced exit     | 30 | 53.63 | 7.98  | 1.46 |
|                           | not experienced exit | 80 | 54.14 | 7.32  | 0.82 |
| Dominance                 | experienced exit     | 30 | 51.07 | 8.83  | 1.61 |
|                           | not experienced exit | 80 | 53.39 | 7.56  | 0.85 |
| Autonomy                  | experienced exit     | 30 | 46.60 | 10.67 | 1.95 |
|                           | not experienced exit | 80 | 49.48 | 9.33  | 1.04 |
| Aggression                | experienced exit     | 30 | 48.97 | 8.88  | 1.62 |
|                           | not experienced exit | 80 | 51.43 | 9.01  | 1.01 |
| Nurturance                | experienced exit     | 30 | 51.73 | 7.05  | 1.29 |
|                           | not experienced exit | 80 | 49.81 | 8.77  | 0.98 |
| Deference                 | experienced exit     | 30 | 53.00 | 9.99  | 1.82 |
|                           | not experienced exit | 80 | 49.25 | 9.92  | 1.11 |
| Coun. Read. <sup>1</sup>  | experienced exit     | 30 | 48.47 | 9.12  | 1.67 |
|                           | not experienced exit | 80 | 46.81 | 7.55  | 0.84 |
| Per. Adjtmnt <sup>2</sup> | experienced exit     | 30 | 50.00 | 6.97  | 1.27 |
|                           | not experienced exit | 80 | 48.83 | 7.45  | 0.83 |

SEM= Standard Error Mean

<sup>1</sup>Counseling Readiness

<sup>2</sup>Personal Adjustment

#### Research Question Five

This research question asked: Are there significant differences between those who have experienced a forced vocational exit (i.e., forced resignation or termination) and those who have not experienced a forced exit on participants' satisfaction profiles (i.e., a) marital satisfaction, b) vocational satisfaction, c) relational satisfaction)?

To examine Hypothesis 5, three *t*-tests were run using Vocational Status as the independent variable and satisfaction scales (i.e., Marital Satisfaction, Vocational Satisfaction, Relational Satisfaction) as dependent variables.

Table 4.10

*T-tests results Leadership Scales and Vocational Status*

|                              |                                     | t     | P    | Mean<br>Difference | SED  |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------|------|--------------------|------|
| Achievement                  | Equal variances<br>n/a <sup>3</sup> | -0.30 | 0.76 | -0.50              | 1.67 |
| Dominance                    | Equal variances<br>n/a              | -1.28 | 0.21 | -2.32              | 1.82 |
| Autonomy                     | Equal variances<br>n/a              | -1.30 | 0.20 | -2.88              | 2.21 |
| Aggression                   | Equal variances<br>n/a              | -1.29 | 0.20 | -2.46              | 1.91 |
| Nurturance                   | Equal variances<br>n/a              | 1.19  | 0.24 | 1.92               | 1.62 |
| Deference                    | Equal variances<br>n/a              | 1.76  | 0.08 | 3.75               | 2.13 |
| Coun. Read. <sup>1</sup>     | Equal variances<br>n/a              | 0.89  | 0.38 | 1.65               | 1.87 |
| Per.<br>Adjtmnt <sup>2</sup> | Equal variances<br>n/a              | 0.77  | 0.44 | 1.18               | 1.52 |

SED= Standard Error Difference

<sup>1</sup>Counseling Readiness

<sup>2</sup>Personal Adjustment

<sup>3</sup>Equal Variances not Assumed

*Summary of Results*

The *t*-tests showed no significant differences between those who have experienced a forced vocational exit (i.e., forced resignation or termination) and those who have not experienced a forced exit on their satisfaction scales (i.e., marital satisfaction, vocational satisfaction, and relational satisfaction) (see Tables 4.11, 4.12).

Thus, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Table 4.11

*Satisfaction Scales and Vocational Status*

|                         | Vocational Status    | N  | Mean | SD   | SEM  |
|-------------------------|----------------------|----|------|------|------|
| Marital Satisfaction    | experienced exit     | 30 | 5.83 | 0.99 | 0.18 |
|                         | not experienced exit | 80 | 5.63 | 1.59 | 0.18 |
| Vocational Satisfaction | experienced exit     | 30 | 5.03 | 1.27 | 0.23 |
|                         | not experienced exit | 80 | 5.10 | 1.44 | 0.16 |
| Relational Satisfaction | experienced exit     | 30 | 5.10 | 1.40 | 0.26 |
|                         | not experienced exit | 80 | 5.03 | 1.76 | 0.20 |

SEM Standard Error Mean

Table 4.12

*T tests Satisfaction Scales and Vocational Status*

|                         |                 |                  | t     | P    | Mean Difference | SED  |
|-------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------|------|-----------------|------|
| Marital Satisfaction    | Equal variances | n/a <sup>1</sup> | 0.83  | 0.41 | 0.21            | 0.25 |
| Vocational Satisfaction | Equal variances | n/a              | -0.24 | 0.81 | -0.07           | 0.28 |
| Relational Satisfaction | Equal variances | n/a              | 0.23  | 0.82 | 0.08            | 0.32 |

SED= Standard Error Difference

<sup>1</sup>Equal Variances not Assumed

## Chapter Summary

This chapter reviewed the results of the data collection for this present study.

Each research question was analyzed in accordance with the findings. The null hypothesis in research question one was partially rejected. Emotional Intelligence was significantly higher when the intensity of achievement and dominance increased in leadership description. Trends toward significance were observed. The null hypothesis in research question two was not rejected. No significant differences in marital, vocational, and relational satisfaction occurred depending on the intensity of leadership description.

Trends toward significance were observed. The null hypotheses in research questions three, four, and five were not rejected. No significant differences occurred in participants' Emotional Intelligence, Leadership Description, Satisfaction Profile (i.e., marital, vocational, relational) and Vocational Status.

## CHAPTER FIVE: RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter advances the summary, conclusions, and recommendations from this present study. The chapter will contain a summary of the purpose of the study, as well as an overview of the results. Finally, the conclusions, recommendations, and suggestions for future research will be described.

### Summary of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine differences in ministerial students' leadership description, emotional intelligence, self-reported levels of satisfaction, and vocational status. More specifically, it examined differences in the description of leadership behavior as assessed by the Behavioral Management Information Systems Adjective CheckList (Collins, 2005), global emotional intelligence (Petrides & Furnham, 2006), self-reported levels of marital, vocational, and relational satisfaction, and whether or not a participant has experienced a forced resignation or termination (i.e., vocational status). This study attempted to add to the body of knowledge related to ministerial training, namely, improvement in leadership self-awareness, self-regulation, and relationship management.

In keeping with the intended research purpose, the reader is reminded of the five relevant questions and concomitant hypotheses that guided this study:

1. Do participants' emotional intelligence scores differ significantly depending on the intensity of leadership description (Low, Medium, High) within their BeMACL scales (see Table 5.1) after controlling for the effects of social

desirability? The hypothesis is that those with higher emotional intelligence scores differ significantly depending on the intensity of leadership description (Low, Medium, High) within their BeMACL scales. The null hypothesis is that those with higher emotional intelligence scores do not differ significantly depending on the intensity of leadership description (Low, Medium, High) within their BeMACL scales.

2. Do participants' satisfaction profiles (i.e., marital, vocational, relational satisfaction) differ significantly depending on the intensity of leadership description (Low, Medium, High) within their BeMACL scales (see Table 5.1) after controlling for the effects of social desirability? The hypothesis is that those with higher satisfaction profiles (i.e., marital, vocational, relational) differ significantly depending on the intensity of leadership description (Low, Medium, High) within their BeMACL scales. The null hypothesis is that those with higher satisfaction profile scores do not differ significantly depending on the intensity of leadership description (Low, Medium, High) within their BeMACL scales.
3. Is there a significant emotional intelligence difference between those participants who have experienced a forced exit (i.e., forced resignation or termination) and those who have not experienced a forced exit? The hypothesis is that those participants who have experienced a forced exit do not have higher emotional intelligence than those who have not experienced a forced exit. The null hypothesis is that those participants who have not experienced a forced exit do not have higher emotional intelligence than those who have experienced a forced exit.

4. Is there a significant difference in participants' intensity of leadership description (Low, Medium, High; see Table 5.1) depending on whether they experienced a forced exit (i.e., forced resignation or termination) or did not experience a forced exit? The hypothesis is that there is a significant difference in participants' intensity of leadership description (Low, Medium, High) between those who have experienced a forced vocational exit (i.e., forced resignation or termination) and those who have not experienced a forced exit. The null hypothesis is that there is not a significant difference in participants' intensity of leadership description (Low, Medium, High; Table 5.1) between those who have experienced a forced vocational exit (i.e., forced resignation or termination) and those who have not experienced a forced exit.
5. Are there significant differences between those who have experienced a forced vocational exit (i.e., forced resignation or termination) and those who have not experienced a forced exit on participants' satisfaction profiles (i.e., marital, vocational, relational)? The hypothesis is that there are significant differences between those who have experienced a forced vocational exit (i.e., forced resignation or termination) and those who have not experienced a forced exit on ministerial participants' satisfaction profiles (i.e., marital, vocational, relational satisfaction). The null hypothesis is that there are not significant differences between those who have experienced a forced vocational exit (i.e., forced resignation or termination) and those who have not experienced a forced exit on ministerial participants' satisfaction profiles (i.e., marital, vocational, relational satisfaction).

Table 5.1

*BeMIS Adjective Check List Scales Employed in this Study as Leadership Description*

|             |            |            |                      |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------------|
| Dominance   | Autonomy   | Nurturance | Counseling Readiness |
| Achievement | Aggression | Deference  | Personal Adjustment  |

## Overview of Results

The focus of this chapter is to discuss the conclusions, recommendations, and implications for future research in light of the results described in chapter four. Prior to this response, a brief summary of the research results that were presented in the preceding chapter will be reviewed. This chapter section will first describe the demographics of the research participants and then review the study findings.

## Research Respondent Demographics

This study surveyed a population of 134 Doctor of Ministry students from an evangelical Christian university in the southeastern United States. From this population, 110 usable returned surveys were analyzed yielding a response rate of 82%. Of the returned surveys, 7 (6.4%) were from lay workers, 7 (6.4%) from bi-vocational pastors, 2 (1.8%) from bi-vocational staff members, 15 (13.6%) from single-staff pastors, 37 (33.6%) from senior/lead pastors, 17 (15.5%) from associate staff members, 8 (7.3%) from missionaries, 3 (2.7%) from evangelists, 8 (7.3%) from educators, 5 (4.5%) of the surveys were from administrative/executive pastors. The majority of the research respondents were males (79.1%), White (79.1%), 40-59 years old (70%), and married (91%) from 10-29 years (62.2%). The majority of respondents had served in vocational ministry settings for less than 10 years. Approximately one-fourth (27%) of the

respondents reported having experienced either a forced resignation or forced termination.

### Research Findings

The data from this study's convenience sample was analyzed using one-way ANCOVAs, post hoc analyses, and *t*-tests. The first data analysis consisted of the BeMACL leadership description scales (i.e., achievement, dominance, autonomy, aggression, nurturance, deference, counseling readiness, personal adjustment) and global emotional intelligence scores. A Bonferroni post-hoc analysis was conducted when an ANCOVA showed significance. To determine statistical significance, a Pairwise Comparison alpha of .006 was used. Results showed that the Achievement and Dominance scales reflected a significant difference in participants' emotional intelligence: Achievement:  $F=7.962, p=.001$ ; Dominance:  $F=5.3970, p=.006$ ). The first Bonferroni post hoc analysis (i.e., Achievement) showed that those who were High (i.e., overdeveloped behavior) on the Achievement scale had significantly higher emotional intelligence than those who were Low (underdeveloped behavior; Mean difference = 2.194;  $p < .000$ ). The second Bonferroni post hoc analysis (i.e., Dominance) showed that those who were High (overdeveloped behavior) on the Dominance scale had significantly higher emotional intelligence than those who were Low (underdeveloped behavior; Mean difference = .930;  $p = .004$ ). The other BeMACL scales (i.e., Autonomy, Aggression, Nurturance, Deference, Counseling Readiness, Personal Adjustment) did not show a significant difference in ministerial participants' emotional intelligence. Thus, the null hypothesis was partially rejected with two of the eight BeMACL scales reflecting

significantly higher emotional intelligence. Positive levels of achievement and dominance seem to be key factors in participants' emotional intelligence. In this small sample, however, it is worth noting the following trends toward significance: Counseling Readiness  $F = 3.43$ ,  $p = .036$  and Personal Adjustment  $F = 3.204$ ,  $p = .045$ .

The second data analysis consisted of the BeMACL leadership description scales (i.e., achievement, dominance, autonomy, aggression, nurturance, deference, counseling readiness, personal adjustment) and ministerial participants': a) marital satisfaction, b) vocational satisfaction, or c) relational satisfaction. The ANCOVAs showed no significant differences in participants' leadership description and satisfaction profile, thus, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

A third data analysis consisted of participants' emotional intelligence global scores and self-reported vocational status (i.e., experienced a forced exit; not experienced a forced exit). The one  $t$ -test conducted did not show a statistically significant result, thus, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

The fourth data analysis consisted of differences in participants' intensity of leadership description and vocational status (i.e., experienced a forced exit; not experienced a forced exit). The eight  $t$ -tests conducted showed no significant differences in leadership description and vocational status. Thus, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

This study's final data analysis consisted of differences in vocational status (i.e., experienced a forced exit; not experienced a forced exit) and participants' satisfaction profiles (i.e., a) marital satisfaction, b) vocational satisfaction, c) relational satisfaction).

None of the three *t*-tests showed significant differences in participants' satisfaction profile and vocational status, thus, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

### Conclusions

This chapter section will discuss conclusions that can be drawn from the results of this study. The presentation of the conclusions is organized into five sections: (a) those conclusions that can be made from the examination of Leadership Description (LD) and Emotional Intelligence (EI), (b) those conclusions that can be made from the examination of Leadership Description and a satisfaction profile (i.e., marital, vocational, and relational), (c) those conclusions that can be made from the examination of Emotional Intelligence and Vocational Status, (d) those conclusions that can be made from the examination of Leadership Description and Vocational Status, (e) those conclusions that can be made from the examination of Vocational Status and a satisfaction profile (i.e., marital, vocational, and relational), and (f) a summary of this section.

#### Conclusions on Leadership Description and Emotional Intelligence

The belief that leadership description may be organized as active-task orientation and passive-people orientation is soundly supported in the literature (Blake & Mouton, 1964; Blake & Mouton, 1994; Burns, Chapman, & Guthrie, 2013; MindTools.com, 2014; Sosik & Jung, 2010). This belief is grounded in the assumption that no one orientation fits all contexts (Antonakis, 2004/2012; Bass, 1985; Trull & Carter, 1993/2004) and that the art of pursuing balanced leadership behavior (Avolio, Zhu, Koh, & Bahatia, 2004; Barna, 1993; Bass, 1974/2008; Colbert, Kristof-Brown, Bradley, & Barrick, 2008;

DePree, 1989) is describable (Avolio, 1999/2011; Judge & Bono, 2000), manageable (Judge & Long, 2004/2012), and essential to the future health of the church and the effectiveness of its vocational leaders (Lewis, Cordeiro, & Bird, 2005; McIntosh & Rima, 1997/2007; Malphurs, 2003; Rainer, 2005; Rainer & Rainer, 2008; Schwarz, 1996; Wilson & Hoffmann, 2007). The leader-centric literature claims balanced leadership behavior possesses “positive forms of leadership” states (i.e., psychological capital – cultivated optimism, hope, efficacy, and resiliency; Avolio, 1999/2011, pp. 207, 208) and higher levels of leadership quotient (i.e., a transformative paradigm: the ability to describe-develop-manage personality, practice integrity, and effectively relate to the needs of a vocational context; Stetzer, & Rainer, 2010; Stowell, 2014; Wilson & Hoffmann, 2007, pp. 220-225).

Recent studies have related leadership description with emotional intelligence (Bar-On & Handley, 1999; Bar-On & Parker, 2000; Carmel & Josman, 2006; Cherniss & Goleman, 2001; Dries & Pepermans, 2007; Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002; Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2004; Lyons & Schneider, 2005; McKee, Boyatzis, & Johnston, 2008; Stein & Book, 2006; Stein, Papadpgiannis, Yip, & Sitarenios, 2009). According to Sosik and Jung (2010), the literature clearly “...proposes that emotional awareness and control is essential to leadership effectiveness.” (p. 23). EI experts claim that “Great leadership works through emotions.” (Goleman et al., 2004, p. 3) and, therefore, leaders must develop the ability to proactively manage their emotions and to respond appropriately to the emotions of others (p. 30). Over the last decade, the clergy literature has related leadership description with emotional intelligence as well.

Burns, Chapman, and Guthrie (2013) claim that too many ministers enter contemporary ministry lacking experience in understanding themselves or others, especially in the area of emotions. Burns et al., seven year qualitative study of male-married pastors (i.e., subjects considered to possess ‘ministry excellence’), surprisingly, discovered that many “bemoaned their own lack of emotional maturity” (p. 107). As emotions play a significant role in the highly relational network of ministry, it is important that leaders understand how they feel and make others feel. In the last decade, increased attention has been given to leadership effectiveness and emotional intelligence. Recent studies have shown that EI is a measureable skill of effective leadership within church contexts (Oney, 2010; Ott, 2003; Palser, 2005), especially in conflict management (Gambill, 2008) and turnaround situations (Bryant, 2011; Roth, 2011). The growing attention to emotional intelligence supports the need for the development of EI competencies in ministerial training.

This particular research question asked if those respondents with higher emotional intelligence scores differed significantly on their leadership description. Findings from this present analysis not only provide insight for future scholarly research but add to the body of knowledge pertaining to the training of ministerial students. This question used scales from the BeMIS Adjective Checklist (Collins, 2005; Collins & Adair, 1987) to organize the description of active-task (i.e., achievement, dominance, autonomy, aggression) and passive-people (i.e., nurturance, deference, counseling readiness, personal adjustment) orientations. Petrides and Furnham’s (2006) TEIQue-Short Form collected respondents’ global intelligence scores derived from four EI factors (i.e, well-being; self-control; emotionality; sociability; Petrides, 2009). As previously mentioned,

studies have found that effective leadership behavior generally relates to higher levels of emotional intelligence.

When the data was analyzed, higher levels of achievement and dominance showed a significant difference in respondents' emotional intelligence. Interestingly, while Achievement and Dominance offer active-task oriented description, these scales alone are not indicative of balanced leadership behavior. According to Collins and Adair's (1987) interpretation of the Achievement scale (i.e., to strive to be outstanding in pursuits of socially recognized significance; p. 12), higher levels may mean one is determined to do well and possesses a strong need to live up to his/her own high and socially commendable performance criteria. According to the interpretation of the Dominance scale (i.e., to seek and maintain a role as a leader in groups, or to be influential and controlling in relationships, p. 13), leaders with sufficient social poise and presence may be able to direct others toward the attainment of organizational goals without appearing domineering. However, both characteristics combined and overexpressed (i.e., with elements of coercion and power-seeking; Van Vugt, 2006) could diminish or ignore people-oriented behaviors such as nurturance (i.e., to engage in behaviors that provides material or emotional benefits to others; p. 10). Avoilo (2011) suggests active-task oriented leaders may not know have sufficient self-awareness to recognize the need to shift attention to a more passive-people orientation (p. 50). Yet, in this instance, sufficient self-awareness and self-regulation seems to be in play as relationally transformative decisions are linked to higher levels of emotional intelligence (Sosik & Jung, 2010, p. 109). For example, trends toward significance to be observed in this analysis, Counseling Reading  $F = 3.43, p = .036$  and Personal Adjustment  $F = 3.204,$

$p = .045$ , seem to indicate the possibility of respondents seeking mentorship or coaching (Collins & Adair, p. 38) during times of interpersonal or situational demands (p. 44) in order to cope more effectively with the challenges of ministry's highly relational network. More research is needed but these trends toward significance may be one explanation for participants' global emotional intelligence, *mean* 5.56, being higher than the TEIQue-SF normative mean (i.e., 5.11; Petrides, 2009, p. 77). In short, a larger sample would be helpful for teasing out more meaning, yet it seems participants with higher emotional intelligence scores may think they are effectively managing their emotions and responding appropriately to the emotions of others.

#### Conclusions on Leadership Description and Satisfaction

This particular research question asked if respondents' satisfaction profile scores differed significantly depending on the intensity of leadership description. This analysis assumes that marital, vocational, and relational satisfaction relates to leadership description. Experts (Avolio, 1999/2011, pp. 207-210; Hollenbeck, McCall, & Silzer, 2006, pp. 402-403; Seifrid, 2003, p. 2) contend that authentic or balanced leaders display positive leadership behaviors or competencies regardless of relational context (i.e., work, colleagues, or home). Others agree that this type of consistency may produce satisfaction in various situations or environments (Kousner & Posner, 1995, p. 335; Stowell, 2014, p. 23-29).

Relatively, Marital Satisfaction is the global evaluation of the state of one's marriage (i.e., satisfaction relates to being able to receive and give influence in the relationship; Bradbury, Fincham, & Beach, 2000; Commodore, 2004; Gottman, 2003;

Morris, 1992; Straub, 2009). Vocational Satisfaction is the global evaluation of one's satisfaction with his/her role in ministry (i.e., satisfaction relates to a sense of being able to meaningfully contribute and influence followers through a specific role; Carroll, 2006; Faucett, Corwyn, & Poling, 2013; Kemery, 2006; Mueller & McDuff, 2004). Relational Satisfaction is the global evaluation of one's relationship with his/her governing board (i.e., satisfaction relates to the sense of feeling safe and respected by other decision-makers; Gottman, 2003; Straub, 2009).

In this analysis, none of the BeMACL leadership description scales showed significant differences in ministerial participants': a) marital satisfaction, b) vocational satisfaction, or c) relational satisfaction. One possible explanation may be that the sample size was too small to recognize any magnitude of difference in participants' satisfaction profile (i.e., effect size; Portney & Watkins, 1993/2000, p. 403). In as much, a few trends toward significance should be noted.

Participants' Dominance trends toward significance in Marital Satisfaction,  $F = 4.569$ ,  $p = .012$  and Vocational Satisfaction,  $F = 4.466$ ,  $p = .014$  may be indicative of authentic influence being exercised in the home as well as work (Collins & Adair, p. 13). Trends toward significance with Nurturance,  $F = 4.538$ ,  $p = .013$  and Personal Adjustment in Relational Satisfaction,  $F = 5.237$ ,  $p = .007$  may indicate the presence of positive emotional responses/benefits (p. 18) fostering a sense of being at ease with other decision-makers (p. 44). In short, a larger sample would be helpful for teasing out more meaning, but it seems higher levels of Nurturance and Personal Adjustment contribute to having a satisfying relationship with other decision-makers in vocational ministry.

## Conclusions on Emotional Intelligence and Vocational Status

This particular research question asked if respondents' emotional intelligence scores differed significantly depending on their vocational status experience. This analysis assumes those who have not experienced an interruption in vocational ministry status (i.e., have experienced a forced exit versus have not experienced a forced exit) have higher levels of emotional intelligence. According to Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee (2004), emotional intelligence is the ability to proactively manage one's own emotions and to appropriately respond to the emotions of others (p. 30). More specifically, EI refers to the "capacity for recognizing our own feelings and those of others, for motivating ourselves, and for managing emotions well in ourselves and in our relationships" (Goleman, 1998, p. 317). The clergy literature has identified emotional intelligence as an essential leadership competency (i.e., supports the ability to thrive while navigating the challenges of getting along with others; Burns, Chapman, & Guthrie, 2013; Lopes, Salovey, & Straus, 2002). Furthermore, the nurturance of emotional intelligence is essential to spirituality (Scazzero, 2006; Willard, 2002) and retainable vocational status (i.e. have experienced a forced exit versus have not experienced a forced exit; Brown, 1993, pp. 181-184; Forrester, 1988, p. 75; Palser, 2005, p. 9). Studies show that the experience of a forced pastoral exit (e.g., the mobbing action of a forced termination; Tanner, Zvonkovic, M., & Adams, 2011) often negatively affects well-being and requires reparative care (Tanner, Wherry, & Zvonkovic, 2009). It is reasonable to conclude that those who have trouble getting along with others may not have higher levels of emotional intelligence and that those who have experienced the trauma of a forced pastoral exit would have diminished emotional intelligence.

Though the clergy literature identified emotional intelligence as a meaningful contributor in ministry's highly relational network, no significance difference was noted between those who have experienced a forced exit and those who have not experienced a forced exit from vocational ministry. One explanation might be that while it was appropriate to treat the TEIQue-SF emotional intelligence global score as a peripheral variable in scholarly investigation (Petrides, 2009, p. 7), the small sample size diminished its utility for establishing a broad index for general emotional functioning between observed group differences:  $n=30$  have experienced a forced exit, *mean 5.53 standard deviation 0.64*; and  $n=80$  have not experienced a forced exit, *mean 5.57 standard deviation 0.60*. As an aside, this analysis showed that this sample's vocational status showed a higher percentage of forced exits (i.e., 37.5 % experienced a forced exit) than the literature's reported range (i.e., 25.3%, Crowell, 1995; 28.3%, Tanner, Zvonkovic, M., & Adams, 2011). In conclusion, this analysis did not reject the null hypothesis even with participants' global emotional intelligence, *mean 5.56*, being higher than the TEIQue-SF normative mean (i.e., 5.11; Petrides, 2009, p. 77).

#### Conclusions on Leadership Description and Vocational Status

This particular research question asked if respondents' leadership description differed significantly between those who have experienced a forced vocational exit and those who have not experienced a vocational exit (i.e., demographic survey question about vocational status). This is an important question for reparative and preventative care strategies as the literature indicates at least one fourth of ministers have been terminated at least once over the span of their vocation (LaRue, 1996; Tanner &

Zvonkovic, 2011). In contrast, studies indicate that balanced leadership behavior builds and maintains healthy relationships with other leaders and followers (Avolio, 1999/2011, pp. 207-210; Foster, Dahill, Golemon, & Tolentino, 2006, pp. 366-369). Interestingly, this analysis did not identify any significant differences or trends toward significance in the eight categories of leadership description depending on participants' self-reported vocational status. One possible explanation may be that the sample size was too small for this study's non-experimental design to detect leadership description differences between its two distinct groups (i.e., those who have experienced a forced exit and those who have not experienced a forced exit). For example, if the group observed to have experienced a forced exit,  $n=30$  were instead  $n=60$ , the sampling distribution would become more compact and create more power to identify statistical significance (Thorne & Giesen, 2000/2003, p. 196). In this case, a larger sample size may provide self-efficacy insight into respondents' engagement or ownership in balancing their active-task and passive-people leadership behaviors (Avolio, 1999/2011, p. 213; Bandura, 1997). In conclusion, no significant differences in leadership description and vocational status were found.

### Conclusions on Vocational Status and Satisfaction

This final research question asked if there were significant differences between those who experienced a forced vocational ministry exit (i.e., forced resignation or termination) and those who have not experienced a forced exit on participants' satisfaction profile (i.e., marital, vocational, relational). In light of the many stressors in contemporary minister, it is reasonable to assume clergy will experience periods of marital, vocational, and relational dissatisfaction, especially when a forced resignation or

termination has been experienced. In this study, Marital Satisfaction (MS) is an attitude or sentiment toward one's own marriage (Bradbury, Fincham, & Beach, 2000; Commodore, 2004; Gottman, 2003; Morris, 1992; Straub, 2009). More specifically, Marital Satisfaction is experienced to the degree one is able to receive influence from one's mate, as well as realize receptivity to influence given.

Vocational Satisfaction is viewed in this study as an evaluation of one's satisfaction with his/her role in ministry (Carroll, 2006; Faucett, Corwyn, & Poling, 2013; Kemery, 2006; Mueller & McDuff, 2004). For example, vocational satisfaction relates to the sense of being able to meaningfully contribute and influence followers through a specific role. Higher levels of Vocational Satisfaction are achieved when clergy view the "job" or role as a significant place of influence (Lawrenz, 2012), that is, a sacred trust from God (Stewart-Sicking, Ciarrocchi, Hollensbe, & Sheep, 2011). Studies indicate that positive forms of leadership behavior build and maintain healthy relationships with other leaders and followers (Avolio, 1999/2011, pp. 207-210; Foster, Dahill, Golemon, & Tolentino, 2006, pp. 366-369).

The last category in this study's satisfaction profile is Relational Satisfaction (RS). RS is operationalized as a general evaluation of one's relationship with his/her governing board (Gottman, 2003; Straub, 2009). This aspect of participants' satisfaction profile relates to the sense of having psychological safety with other decision-makers. In other words, the leader is able to invest and engage "without fear of negative consequences to self-image, status, or career" (Kahn, 1990, p. 705).

Though a satisfaction profile is not designated as a means to focus on the actual tasks of vocational ministry, the literature does relate it to what is going on in the man or

woman shaping a congregation (Carroll, 2006), or for a season perhaps, forced out of a ministry context. Yet, in this analysis, no significant differences were found in participants' satisfaction profile between those who have or have not experienced a forced vocational exit. One possible explanation may be that the sample size was too small for this study's non-experimental design to detect satisfaction profile differences between its two distinct groups (i.e., those who have experienced a forced exit and those who have not experienced a forced exit). If the sample was too small, it would seem reasonable to conclude that it would not be able to pick up clergy's tendency to understate dissatisfaction (Mueller & McDuff, 2004) related to those relationships and contexts considered sacred and holy (Pargament & Mahoney, 2005). In short, this analysis was not able to pick up any significant effects from participants' satisfaction profile when comparing participants' vocational status.

#### *Conclusion Section Summary*

In summary, this study has been an attempt to examine differences in leadership description, emotional intelligence, a satisfaction profile, and vocational status in a sample of Doctor of Ministry students from an evangelical university in the southeastern United States. Though statistical power was limited by the size of this study's convenience sample, analysis discovered significant differences and trends toward significance in emotional intelligence and a satisfaction profile according to the intensity of participants' leadership description. Leadership description is a means of identifying leadership behavior (e.g., Low – under-expressed; Medium – normal; High – over-expressed). The Emotional Intelligence score collected attempted to provide a global

index of general emotional functioning. Higher emotional intelligence was evident when over-expressed Dominance and Achievement were supported to some degree by the tendency to seek mentorship or coaching (i.e., Counseling/Coaching Readiness) in order to cope with relational and contextual challenges (i.e., Personal Adjustment). The tendency to provide some measure of influence (i.e., Dominance) at home and work relates to some degree with Marital and Vocational Satisfaction. The ability to be relationally oriented (i.e., Nurturance) and at ease with ministry's interpersonal and contextual challenges (i.e., Personal Adjustment) tends to increase Relational Satisfaction. As a whole, small sample sizes tend to create missing links in the examination of leadership description, emotional intelligence, satisfaction, and vocational status.

### Recommendations

In order to get along with others in the milieu of contemporary ministry's highly relational network, ministerial students need to be supervised in the real-time development of authentic leadership and emotional guidance skills in order to foster sustainable, fruitful work and experience higher levels of marital, vocational, and relational satisfaction. In as much, the reader is informed that any attempt to use a convenience sample to add relevant knowledge to the relational growth and development of Doctor of Ministry students, should make sure that the sample is fit to travel the rigors of scholarly research. The presence of fit should be established with more thought being given to the appropriateness and size of a convenience sample so that it might enrich a study's hypotheses and yield (Kazdin, 1987/2003, p. 154). Also, make sure the sample

size can handle surprises; plan to anticipate a 20% loss of participants and/or data because “less is more” does not always create good fit in quantitative statistical analysis.

This study used a power analysis to identify sample size but did not sufficiently plan for data loss. As a result, a significant limitation was created as twenty-four consenting participants did not complete the survey. The resulting small  $N=110$  increased the chance of making Type 1 errors (i.e., alpha error – rejecting a true null hypothesis; Vogt & Johnson, 1993/2011, p. 7) especially when making multiple comparisons such as with the nine ANCOVAs run in Research Question One and Research Question Two. The Type 1 error was decreased with a Bonferroni correction which divides the alpha level (.05) by the number of comparisons (i.e. 9). However, when decreasing the chance of making a Type 1 error, the chance of making Type 2 error increases (i.e., beta error – failing to reject the null hypothesis when it should have been rejected, resulting in missing an effect of an independent variable; Jackson, 2003/2006, p. 258). Therefore, results may indicate “no significant difference found” among groups when in reality there were significant differences. As a whole, there was not enough  $N$  to create equal  $n$  for each group. This fact meant that data did not meet the assumption “equality of variance among the groups” necessary for accurate ANCOVA results (Warner, 2007/2013, p. 692). To acknowledge the lack of equality of variance among group comparisons, SPSS<sup>®</sup> “Equal Variances Not Assumed” (George & Mallery, 2006, p. 147) was used in running the ANCOVAs. In conclusion, if the reader is a doctoral student anticipating research design and methodology, prepare well to collect a suitable  $N$  or do not be surprised if your dissertation committee members enter a witness protection program post-defense.

### Future Research

Though this study did not significantly add to the body of knowledge for ministerial training, its focus supported the notion that evangelical seminaries are ripe for scholarly research; more specifically, studies that would target leadership self-awareness, self-regulation, and relationship management of seminary students actively engaged in supervised ministry. For example, this researcher has pondered how this study might inform reflective mentoring and/or counseling activities (e.g., reflective journaling in the milieu of ministry; i.e., a R.I.M.M. Journal). A recent notion posed in the clergy literature is that “Pastors grow in leadership expertise as they practice reflection both during and after presenting situations” (Burns et al., 2013, p. 201). The late MIT professor Donald A. Schon (1983) calls this “reflection-*n*-action”. Given the lack of significance in this study, this last section considered how the notion of reflection might inform future research, both, qualitatively and quantitatively. Thomas (2006) highlighted the fact that qualitative methodology “provides perspective rather than objective truth, and theories of action instead of generalizations” (p. 176). For example, Burns et al. (2013) suggests that “learning to lead via reflection can happen in many contexts and with a variety of persons, in both formal and informal ways” (p. 203). Qualitative methodology is one way researchers could slow down and harvest meaningful insights from various contexts for the development for leadership expertise.

Future research into leadership description should consider using the BeMIS iteration (Collins, 2005) of Gough and Helibrun’s (1983) Adjective Checklist to its fullest. In this study, the researcher only examined one application of its use in the classroom, namely, Real-Self standard scores. The BeMIS iteration also provides Ideal-

Self standard scores to assess aspiration for change (Collins, p. 12). Knowing a participant's aspiration for change may inform the development of a strategic wisdom strategy (e.g., a T.R.R.I.P./transformative reflection and relocation in progress) to check and control the process of moving away from undesired behavior toward the development of desired behavior.

Another BeMIS ACL option for data mining is provided through the survey's percentile rank scores; an option favored by this researcher's faculty sponsor. The reader is informed that this researcher recognized his sponsor as the Adjective Check List expert overseeing its use. Ronald E. Hawkins' (1988) research and application of the ACL through years of life-long ministry and academia have made him a timely resource in this research adventure. His notion that meaningfully clustered ACL scales would likely provide fodder for classroom discussion, even with a group's small  $n$ , informed trend analysis. The reader should know Hawkins' suggested use of the ACL was supported by Craig's (2005) meta-analysis of adjective checklist methodology.

Furthermore, this researcher confirmed Hawkins' clustering notion during a season of prescribed "fun" analysis. For example, one analysis asked if having a specific relationally-oriented, leadership profile or not having this profile would differ significantly on participants' EI and satisfaction profile. A profile was created by identifying those participants meeting the following criteria: Nurturance/High ( $SS > 54.3 =$  top 33.3%), Counseling Readiness/Medium ( $SS > 45.7 < 54.3 =$  middle 33.3%), and Personal Adjustment/High ( $SS > 54.3 =$  top 33.3%). An  $n=4$  had this profile and  $n=106$  did not have this profile. T-test (equal variance not assumed) results showed that those having this profile had significantly higher EI than those who did not have this profile,

$t=3.777, p=.02$ . Another t-test showed that those having this profile had significantly higher Marital Satisfaction than those who did not have this profile,  $t=3.86, p=.011$ . The next t-test results showed that those having this profile had significantly higher Relational Satisfaction than those who did not have this profile,  $t=2.87, p=.050$ . A final t-test did not show those having this profile differed significantly on Vocational Satisfaction from those who did not have this profile. In short, the BeMIS ACL percentile scores may provide meaningful research opportunities.

Finally, additional data mining may be achieved through BeMIS ACL's utility for 360 Degree Analyses (Collins, 2005, p. 10). This research opportunity relates to the literature's emphasis on 360° feedback (Burns et al., 2013, p. 202; Sosik & Jung, 2010, p. 71). The ACL is not only a versatile tool for self-description but provides a means for others to describe their experience with a leader's behavior (Dy-Liacco, 2009, p. 1). Research shows that followers want to engage in upward influence (Kipnis & Schmidt, 1980) and meaningfully provide positive feedback (Walker & Smither, 1999) as a way of identifying with a leader (Bass, 1974/2008). Planning qualitative research with a 360 degree analysis would enrich the description of helpful and harmful leadership behavior, as well as create a timely pause for authentic reflection in the classroom.

### Summary

This study sought to make-meaning from the differences in ministerial students' leadership description, emotional intelligence, self-reported levels of satisfaction, and vocational status. More specifically, a total of 110 Doctor of Ministry students at an evangelical seminary in the southeastern United States responded to eight demographic

questions, five rationally developed self-report questions, and three empirically-tested measures: the Behavioral Management Information Systems Adjective Checklist; the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire-Short form (TEIQue-SF); and the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, Short Version C (MCSD-C). The BeMIS ACL (Collins, 2005) is an instrument composed of 300 adjectives used in everyday life. The ACL can be used for observer and/or self-descriptions. The TEIQue-Sf (Petrides & Furnham, 2006) is a 30 item questionnaire from which emotional intelligence was assessed to provide a global index of emotional functioning. The MCSD-C (Thomas & Cornwall, 1990) is a 13 item questionnaire designed to rate a respondent's tendency to answer questions in a way that would make him/her look desirable (e.g., impression management; faking good). Statistically, data was analyzed using ANCOVAs, Bonferroni corrections, and t-tests. Due to the sample's small  $N=110$ , most comparative analyses showed no significant differences among groups. The statistical power of the sample size was described as a significant limitation in this study. As a result, the present findings do not allow for definitive conclusions or inferences regarding differences in participants' leadership description, emotional intelligence, satisfaction profile, and vocational status. Since the areas of interest are so clearly related to the literature's discussion of training ministerial students, one should not hesitate to examine these topics in future research.

## REFERENCES

- Anthony, M. J., & Estep Jr., J. (2005). *Management essentials for Christian ministries*. Nashville, TN: Broadman and Holman.
- Antonakis, J. (2012). *Transformational and charismatic leadership* (2nd ed.) (D. V. Day & J. Antonakis, Eds.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE. (Original work published 2004)
- Association of Theological Schools. (1985, June). *The conference on student development in theological education*. Pittsburg, PA: Schuller, D
- Avolio, B. J. (2011). *Full range leadership development* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Sage. (Original work published 1999)
- Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *16*, 315-338.
- Avolio, B. J., Zhu, W., Koh, W., & Bahatia, P. (2004). Transformational leadership and organizational commitment: Mediating role of psychological empowerment and moderating role of structural distance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *25*, 951-968. Retrieved January 10, 2014, from JSTOR Web site: <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/stable/4093779>
- Balswick, J. (1988). A complimentary empowering model of ministerial leadership. *Pastoral Psychology*, *37*(1), 3-14.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Barfoot, D. S., Winstorn, B. E., & Wickman, C. (2005, June). *Forced pastoral exits: An exploratory study*. Retrieved July 12, 2013, from PIR Ministries Web site: <http://www.pirministries.org/resources/Forced%20Pastoral%20Exits.pdf>
- Barna, G. (1993). *Today's pastors: A revealing look at what pastors are saying about themselves, their peers and the pressures they face*. Ventura, CA: Regal Books.
- Bar-On, R., & Handley, R. (1999). *Optimizing people*. New Braunfels, TX: Pro-Philes Press.
- Bar-On, R., & Parker, J. D. A. (Eds.). (2000). *The handbook of emotional intelligence*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bass, B. M. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Free Press. (Original work published 1974)

- Bass, B. M. (Winter 1985). Leadership: Good, better, and best. *Organizational Dynamics*, 13(3), 26-40.
- Bass, B., & Avolio, B. (2000). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire* (2nd ed.). Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.
- Berger, D. (2012, August). *Introduction to power analysis with G\*Power 3*. Retrieved September 1, 2012, from WISE Web site:  
<http://wise.cgu.edu/downloads/Power%20Analysis%20with%20GPower%20120409.pdf>
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid: Key orientations for achieving production through people*. Houston, TX: Gulf.
- Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1994). *The managerial grid*. Houston, TX: Gulf.
- Bradbury, T. N., Fincham, F. D., & Beach, S. R. H. (2000). Research on the nature and determinants of marital satisfaction: A decade in review. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62(4), 964-980. Retrieved October 1, 2013, from Liberty University Web site: <http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/docview/219769639/fulltextPDF?accountid=12085>
- Brown, R. W. (1993). *Restoring the vow of stability: The keys to pastoral longevity*. Camp Hill, PA: Christian Publications.
- Bryant, H. C. (2011). *Emotional intelligence: The biblical connection*. Detroit, MI: G. Publishing, LLC.
- Burns, B., Chapman, T. D., & Guthrie, D. C. (2013). *Resilient ministry: What pastors told us about surviving and thriving*. Downers Grove, IL: Inter Varsity Press.
- Carmel, A., & Josman, Z. E. (2006). The relationship among emotional intelligence, task performance, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Human Performance*, 19(4), 403-419.
- Carroll, J. W. (2006). *God's potters: Pastoral leadership and the shaping of congregations*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Carter, J. C. (2009). Transformational leadership and pastoral effectiveness. *Pastoral Psychology*, 58(March), 261-271.
- Cherniss, C., & Goleman, D. (Eds.). (2001). *The emotionally intelligent workplace*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Christine, D. W. (2010). *Baptist pastoral leadership: An analysis for curriculum development*. Dissertation Abstracts. (UMI No. 3436519)
- Colbert, A. E., Kristof-Brown, A. L., Bradley, B. H., & Barrick, M. R. (2008). CEO transformational leadership: The role of goal importance congruence in top management teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(1), 81-96. Retrieved January 10, 2014, from 360 LINK Web site: [http://rx9vh3hy4r.search.serialsolutions.com.ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/ctx\\_ver=Z39.88-2004&ctx\\_enc=info%3Aofi%2Fenc%3AUTF-8&rft\\_id=info:sid/summon.serialssolutions.com&rft\\_val\\_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:journal&rft.genre=article&rft.atitle=CEO+transformational+leadership%3A+the+role+of+goal+importance+congruence+in+top+management+teams&rft.jtitle=Academy+of+Management+journal&rft.date=2008&rft.pub=Academy+of+Management&rft.issn=0001-4273&rft.eissn=1948-0989&rft.volume=51&rft.issue=1&rft.spage=81&rft.epage=96&rft.externalDocID=566837250&paramdict=en-US](http://rx9vh3hy4r.search.serialsolutions.com.ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/ctx_ver=Z39.88-2004&ctx_enc=info%3Aofi%2Fenc%3AUTF-8&rft_id=info:sid/summon.serialssolutions.com&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:journal&rft.genre=article&rft.atitle=CEO+transformational+leadership%3A+the+role+of+goal+importance+congruence+in+top+management+teams&rft.jtitle=Academy+of+Management+journal&rft.date=2008&rft.pub=Academy+of+Management&rft.issn=0001-4273&rft.eissn=1948-0989&rft.volume=51&rft.issue=1&rft.spage=81&rft.epage=96&rft.externalDocID=566837250&paramdict=en-US)
- Collins, D. R. (2005). Introduction to BeMIS (Version IV) [Software and manual]. Williamsburg, VA: Measurement and Planned Development.
- Collins, D. R., & Adair, F. L. (1987). The adjective checklist interpretive report (Version IV) [Software and manual]. Williamsburg, VA: Measurement and Planned Development, Inc.
- Commodore, Y. A. (2004). Comparing the marital satisfaction of dual Protestant clergy couples and single Protestant clergy couples using the ENRICH scale (Doctoral dissertation, Argosy University, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts*. Retrieved June 1, 2013, from Liberty University Web site: <http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/docview/305047561>
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE. (Original work published 1994)
- Crowell, R. (1995). *Forced pastoral exits: An empirical study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, Dallas, TX.
- Dale, R. D. (1984). *Ministers as leaders*. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press.
- Dale, R. D. (1987). Leadership-followership: The church's challenge. *Southwestern Journal of Theology, Spring*, 21-26.
- Dart, J. (2008, February 26). Survey shows that pastoral posts still attract and satisfy. *Christian Century*, 125(4), 15-16.

- Day, D. V. (2012). The nature of leadership development. In D. V. Day & J. Antonakis (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (2nd ed., pp. 108-140). Washington, DC: SAGE. (Original work published 2004)
- Day, D. V., & Antonakis, J. (Eds.). (2012). *The nature of leadership* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: SAGE. (Original work published 2004)
- Day, D. V., Harrison, M. M., & Halpin, S. M. (2009). *An integrative approach to leader development: Connecting adult development, identity, and expertise*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- DePree, M. (1989). *Leadership is an art*. New York, NY: Dell.
- Dries, N., & Pepermans, R. (2007). Using emotional intelligence to identify high potential: A metacompetency perspective. *Leadership and Organization*, 28(8), 749-770.
- Faucett, J. M., Corwyn, R. F., & Poling, T. H. (2013). Clergy role stress: Interactive effects of role ambiguity and role conflict on intrinsic job satisfaction. *Pastoral Psychology*, 62(3), 291-304. Retrieved August 1, 2013, from Liberty University Web site: [http://download.springer.com/static/pdf/779/art%253A10.1007%252Fs11089-012-0490-8.pdf?auth66=1397748187\\_3605d4f74b496317d6ccff89a4ecc8d1&ext=.pdf](http://download.springer.com/static/pdf/779/art%253A10.1007%252Fs11089-012-0490-8.pdf?auth66=1397748187_3605d4f74b496317d6ccff89a4ecc8d1&ext=.pdf)
- Forrester, J. (1988). *Planning in the face of power*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Foster, C. R., Dahill, L. E., Golemon, L. A., & Tolentino, B. W. (2006). *Educating clergy: Teaching practices and pastoral imagination*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fuller Institute of Church Growth. (1991). *1991 Survey of pastors*. Pasadena, CA: Fuller Theological Seminary.
- Gambill, C. R. (2008). *Emotional intelligence and conflict management style among Christian clergy*. Doctoral dissertation. (UMI No. 3290945) Retrieved June 1, 2012, from Liberty University Web site: <http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/docview/304829433>
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2006). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference* (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York, NY: Bantam.

- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Revitalizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2004). *Primal leadership: Learning to lead with emotional intelligence*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Goodwin, E. (1997). Forced terminations and ethics. *The Servant. Publication of Ministering to Ministers Foundation, Inc*, 1(1), 1.
- Gottman, J. (2003). *Marriage clinic: A scientifically based marital therapy*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton and Company.
- Gough, H. G., & Heilbrun, A. B. (1983). *The adjective check list manual*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press. (Original work published 1965)
- Green, C. C., & Hunter, S. (2010). An initial inquiry: Why Nazarene pastors depart ministry and how they feel about it. In n/a (Ed.), *Association of Nazarene Sociologists and Researchers Conference XXIX* (p. 3). Lenexa, KS: ANSR.
- Hartford Institute for Religion Research. (March 13, 2001). *Faith communities today: A report on religion in the United States today* [Cooperative congregations study project]. Available December 9, 2011, from Faith Communities Today Web site: [hrr.hartsem.edu/cong/research1.html#FACT](http://hrr.hartsem.edu/cong/research1.html#FACT)
- Hawkins, R. E. (1988). The assessment of behavior patterns, personality characteristics and theoretical orientations for Master's level counseling students. *Dissertation Abstracts*. (UMI No. 8814584)
- Hollenbeck, G. P., McCall, M. W., & Silzer, R. F. (2006). Leadership competency models. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(4), 398-413. Retrieved April 1, 2014, from Science Direct Web site: <http://www.sciencedirect.com.ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/science/article/pii/S1048984306000403>
- Jackson, S. L. (2006). *Research methods and statistics: A critical thinking approach* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth. (Original work published 2003)
- Jenkins, M. (2002). Great expectations, sobering realities. *Congregations*, 28(3), 11-3, 24-7.
- Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 751-765.
- Judge, T. A., & Long, D. M. (2012). Individual differences in leadership. In D. V. Day & J. Antonakis (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (2nd ed., pp. 179-217). Los Angeles: Sage Publications. (Original work published 2004)

- Judge, T. A., & Long, D. M. (2012). Individual differences in leadership. In D. V. Day & J. Antonakis (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (2nd ed., pp. 179-217). Los Angeles, CA: Sage. (Original work published 2004)
- Kahn, W. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724.
- Kanipe, R. (2007, October). Clergy killers are a problem for our churches everywhere. *Wesleyan Christian Advocate*, 14, 7. Retrieved July 31, 2012, from Wesleyan Christian Advocate Web site: [http://wesleyanchristianadvocate.blogspot.com/2007.10\\_10\\_01\\_archive.html](http://wesleyanchristianadvocate.blogspot.com/2007.10_10_01_archive.html)
- Kanungo, R. N., & Mendonca, M. (1994). *What leaders cannot do without. Spirit at work: Discovering the spirituality in leadership*. San Francisco: J. A. Conger.
- Kazdin, A. E. (2003). *Research design in clinical psychology* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon. (Original work published 1987)
- Kemery, E. D. (2006). Clergy role stress and satisfaction: Role ambiguity isn't always bad. *Pastoral Psychology*, 54, 561-570.
- Kouzes, J. (1987). *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2010). *The truth about leadership: The no-fads, heart of the matter facts you need to know*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Krejcir, R. J. (2007). What is going on with the pastors in America? In *Statistics on pastors: Research from 1989 to 2006* (pp. 1-8). Retrieved November 1, 2010, from ChurchLeadership.org Web site: [www.churchleadership.org/apps/articles](http://www.churchleadership.org/apps/articles)
- LaRue, J. C. (2000, October 25). Profile of today's pastor: How prepared were you for ministry? *Leadership Journal.net*. Retrieved December 13, 2011, from Leadership Journal.net Web site: [www.christianitytoday.com/le/currenttrendscolumns/leadershipweekly/01025.html](http://www.christianitytoday.com/le/currenttrendscolumns/leadershipweekly/01025.html)
- LaRue, J. C. (2001, January 3). Pastors at work: Where the time goes. *Leadership Journal.net*. Retrieved December 13, 2011, from [www.christianitytoday.com/le/currenttrendscolumns/leadershipweekly/cln10103.html](http://www.christianitytoday.com/le/currenttrendscolumns/leadershipweekly/cln10103.html)
- Lawrenz, M. (2012). *Spiritual influence: The hidden power behind leadership*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Lewis, R., Cordeiro, W., & Bird, W. (2005). *Culture shift: Transforming your church from the inside out*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Lichtman, S. L. (1990). Effective ministerial style as perceived by denominational leadership. *Pastoral Psychology, 38*(3), 161-171.
- London, H. B., & Wiseman, N. B. (2003). *Pastors at greater risk: Real help for pastors from pastors who've been there* (Rev. ed.). Ventura, CA: Regal. (Original work published 1993)
- Lopes, P. N., Salovey, P., & Straus, R. (2002). Emotional intelligence, personality, and the perceived quality of social relationships. *Personality and Individual Differences, 35*, 641-658.
- Lyons, J. B., & Schneider, T. R. (2005). The influence of emotional intelligence on performance. *Personality and Individual Differences, 39*(4), 693-703.
- Malphurs, A. (2003). *Being leaders*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- Maxwell, J. C. (1996). *Partners in prayer*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). *Emotional development an emotional intelligence: Educational implications* (P. Salovey & D. Sluyter, Eds.). New York: Basic Books.
- McIntosh, G. L., & Rima, S. D. (2007). *Overcoming the dark side of leadership: How to become an effective leader by confronting potential failures*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker. (Original work published 1997)
- McKee, A., Boyatzis, R., & Johnston, F. (2008). *Becoming a resonant leader: Develop your emotional intelligence, renew your relationships, and sustain your effectiveness*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- Meek, K. R., McMinn, M. R., Brower, C. M., Burnett, T. D., McRay, B. W., Ramey, M. L., Swanson, D. W., & Villa, D. D. (2003). Maintaining personal resiliency: Lessons learned from evangelical protestant clergy. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 31*(4), 339-47.
- Mikolajczak, M., Petrides, K. V., Coumans, N., & Luminet, O. (2009). An experimental investigation of the moderating effects of trait emotional intelligence on laboratory-induced stress. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology, 9*, 455-477.
- Miller, K. (2000, July 12). 10 Telling statistics about pastors. *Leadership Journal.net*. Retrieved December 12, 2011, from [www.christianitytoday.com/le/currenttrendscolumns/leadershipweekly/cln](http://www.christianitytoday.com/le/currenttrendscolumns/leadershipweekly/cln)

- MindTools.com. (2014). *The Blake Mouton managerial grid: Balancing task- and people-oriented leadership* [Online Fact Sheet]. Retrieved March 30, 2014, from Mind Tools Web site: [http://www.mindtools.com/pages/article/newLDR\\_73.htm](http://www.mindtools.com/pages/article/newLDR_73.htm)
- Morris, M. L. (1992). *Clergy marital satisfaction as predicted by work/family stress*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.
- Morris, M. L., & Blanton, P. W. (April, 1994). The influence of work-related stressors on clergy husbands and their wives. *Family Relations*, 43, 189-95.
- Morris, M., & Blanton, P. W. (1994). Denominational perceptions of stress and the provision of support services for clergy families. *Pastoral Psychology*, 42, 345-364.
- Mueller, C. W., & McDuff, E. (2004). Clergy-congregation mismatches and clergy job satisfaction. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 43(2), 261-273. Retrieved July 23, 2012, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1388126>
- Neff, B. J. (2006). *A pastor's guide to interpersonal communication: The other six days*. New York, NY: The Haworth Pastoral Press.
- Nelis, D., Kotsou, I., Quoidbach, J., Hansenne, M., Weytens, F., Dupuis, P., & Mikolajczak, M. (2011). Increasing emotional competence improves psychological and physical well-being, social relationships, and employability. *American Psychological Association*, 11(2), 354-366. Retrieved May 1, 2012, from <http://psycnet.apa.org.ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/journals/emo/11/2/354.pdf>
- Olejnik, S. F. (1984). Planning educational research: Determining the necessary sample size. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 53(1), 40-48. Retrieved April 24, 2014, from Liberty.edu Web site: <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/stable/20151569>
- Oney, R. M. (2010). Exploring the causal relationship of emotional intelligence to clergy leadership effectiveness. *Dissertation Abstracts*. (UMI No. 3392554) Retrieved October 24, 2013, from Liberty University Web site: <http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/docview/305240081>
- Oswald, R. M. (1991). *Clergy self-care: Finding a balance for effective ministry*. Herndon, VA: The Alban Institute.
- Ott, S. (2003). Emotional intelligence and leadership. *Congregations*, Winter(1). Retrieved October 1, 2013, from Alban Institute Web site: Retrieved from <http://www.alban.org/conversation.aspx?id=2464>

- Palser, S. J. (2005). The relationship between occupational burnout and emotional intelligence among clergy or professional ministry workers. *Dissertation Abstracts*. (UMI No. 3162679) Retrieved October 1, 2013, from Liberty University Web site: <http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/docview/305383654>
- Pargament, K. I., & Mahoney, A. (2005). Sacred matters: Sanctification as a vital topic for the psychology of religion. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, *15*(3), 179-198.
- Patten, M. L. (2004). *Understanding research methods: An overview of the essentials* (4th ed.). Glendale, CA: Pyrczak. (Original work published 1997)
- Perman, M. (2014). *What's best next: How the Gospel transforms the way you get things done*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Petrides, K. V., & Furnam, A. (2003). Trait emotional intelligence: Behavioral validation in two studies of emotion recognition and reactivity to mood induction. *European Journal of Personality*, *17*, 39-57.
- Petrides, K. V. (2009). *Technical manual for the trait emotional intelligence questionnaires (TEIQue)* (1st edition ed.). London, UK: London Psychometric Laboratory.
- Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2006). The role of trait emotional intelligence in a gender-specific model of organizational variables. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *36*, 552-569.
- Portney, L. G., & Watkins, M. P. (2000). *Foundations of clinical research: Applications to practice* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall Health. (Original work published 1993)
- Rainer, T. S. (2005). *Breakout churches: Discover how to make the leap*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Rainer, T. S., & Rainer, S. S., III. (2008). *Essential church? Reclaiming a generation of dropouts*. Nashville, TN: B & H Publishing Group.
- Reynolds, W. M. (1982). Development of reliable and valid short forms of the Marlowe-Crowne social desirability scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *38*(1), 119-25.
- Richmond, L., Raymond, C., & Rogers, L. (1985). Clergymen, clergywomen, and their spouses: Stress in professional religious families. *Journal of Career Development*, *12*, 81-86.

- Rose, M. (1999, Fall). *Forecasting job satisfaction: What occupational profiling tells us*. Working paper 2 of the Bath University Work Centrality, Work Careers, and Household Projects presented at the Economic and Social Research Council, Bath, UK.
- Roth, J. (2011). The relationship between emotional intelligence and pastor leadership in turnaround churches. *Dissertation Abstracts*. (UMI No. 3487845) Retrieved January 1, 2012, from Liberty University Web site: <http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/docview/913502336>
- Rowold, J. (2008). *Effects of transactional and transformational leadership of pastors*. *Pastoral Psychology*, 56, 403-411.
- Salkind, N. J. (2004). *Statistics for people who (think they) hate statistics* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE. (Original work published 2000)
- Scazzero, P. (2006). *Emotionally healthy spirituality: Unleash a revolution in your life in Christ*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.
- Schaller, L. (1975). *Hey, that's our church*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon.
- Schon, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schwarz, C. A. (1996). *Natural church development: A guide to eight essential qualities of healthy churches*. Carol Stream, IL: ChurchSmart Resources.
- Seifrid, J. M. (2003). An analysis of leadership style and life stressors on marital satisfaction among conservative evangelical seminary students. *Masters Abstracts*. (UMI No. 3102054) Retrieved September 1, 2013, from Liberty University Web site: <http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/docview/305319967>
- Songer, H. S. (1980). Southern Baptists. In D. S. Schuller, M. P. Strommen, & M. L. Brekke (Eds.), *Ministry in America: A report and analysis, based on an in-depth survey of 47 denominations in the United States and Canada, with interpretation by 18 experts* (pp. 265-306). San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.
- Sosik, J. J. (2006). *Leading with character: Stories of valor and virtue and the principles they teach*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Sosik, J. J., & Jung, D. I. (2010). *Full range leadership development: Pathways for people, profit, and planet*. New York, NY: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Stein, S. J., & Book, H. E. (2006). *The EQ edge*. Mississauga, ON: Jossey-Bass.

- Stein, S. J., Papadpigiannis, P., Yip, J. A., & Sitarenios, G. (2009). Emotional intelligence of leaders: A profile of top executives. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 30(1), 87-101. Retrieved April 2, 2014, from <http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/docview/226932759/fulltextPDF?accountid=12085>
- Stetzer, E., & Rainer, T. S. (2010). *Transformational church: Creating a new scorecard for congregations*. Nashville, TN: B & H Publishing Group.
- Stewart-Sicking, J. A., Ciarrocchi, J. W., Hollensbe, E. C., & Sheep, M. L. (2011). Workplace characteristics, career/vocation satisfaction, and existential well-being in Episcopal clergy. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, 14(7), 715-730.
- Stowell, J. M. (2014). *Redefining leadership: Character-driven habits of effective leaders*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Straub, J. D. (2009). *God attachment, romantic attachment, and relationship satisfaction in a sample of evangelical college students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA.
- Tanner, M. N. (2013, Winter). The back side of the storm: Clergy families in distress. *NCFR Report Magazine*, 15-17.
- Tanner, M. N., Wherry, J. N., & Zvonkovic, A. M. (March 2009). Clergy who experience trauma as a result of forced termination. *Journal of Religion & Health*, 48(1), 1281-1295.
- Tanner, M. N., Zvonkovic, A., M., & Adams, C. (2011). Forced termination of American clergy: Its effects and connection to negative well-being. *Review of Religious Research*, 53(1), 1-19.
- The Barna Group, Ltd. (2001, March 29). *Pastors paid better, but attendance unchanged* [Update]. Retrieved December 13, 2011, from Barna Group Web site: [www.barna.org/barna-update/article/5-barna-update/39-pastors-paid-better-but-attendance-unchanged](http://www.barna.org/barna-update/article/5-barna-update/39-pastors-paid-better-but-attendance-unchanged)
- The Barna Group, Ltd. (2001, September 25). *A profile of protestant pastors in anticipation of pastor appreciation month* [Update]. Retrieved December 13, 2011, from [www.barna.org/barna-update/article/5-barna-update/59-a-profile-of-protestant-pastors-in-anticipation-of-qpastors-apprecitation-month?](http://www.barna.org/barna-update/article/5-barna-update/59-a-profile-of-protestant-pastors-in-anticipation-of-qpastors-apprecitation-month?)
- Thomas, D., & Cornwall, M. (1990). Religion and the family in the 1980s: Discovery and development. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 52, 983-92.

- Thomas, J. C. (2007). Administrative, faculty, and staff perceptions of organizational climate and commitment in Christian higher education. *Dissertation Abstracts*. (UMI No. 3244895)
- Thorne, M. B., & Giesen, J. M. (2003). *Statistics for the behavioral sciences* (4th ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill. (Original work published 2000)
- Tidwell, C. (1985). *Church administration: Effective leadership for ministry*. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman.
- Trihub, B. L., McMinn, M. R., Buhrow Jr., W. C., & Johnson, T. F. (2010). Denominational support for clergy mental health. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 38(2), 101-110.
- Trull, J. E., & Carter, J. E. (2004). *Ministerial ethics: Moral formation for church leaders* (2nd ed.). Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic. (Original work published 1993)
- Turner, C. (2006, October 2). *More than 1,300 staff dismissed in 1005; Relationship issues again take first five spots*. Retrieved July 30, 2009, from LifeWay: Biblical Solutions for Life Web site: <http://www.lifeway.com>
- Turner, C. (2007). Terminations: 1,300 staff dismissed in 2005. *Facts and Trends*, 53, 39-41.
- Van Vugt, M. (2006). Evolutionary origins of leadership and followership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10(4), 354-371. Retrieved August 1, 2013, from Liberty University Web site: [http://rx9vh3hy4r.search.serialssolutions.com.ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/?ctx\\_ver=Z39.88-2004&ctx\\_enc=info%3Aofi%2Fenc%3AUTF-8&rft\\_id=info:sid/summon.serialssolutions.com&rft\\_val\\_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:journal&rft.genre=article&rft.atitle=Evolutionary+origins+of+leadership+and+followership&rft.jtitle=PERSONALITY+AND+SOCIAL+PSYCHOLOGY+REVIEW&rft.au=Van+Vugt%2C+M&rft.date=2006&rft.pub=SAGE+PUBLICATIONS+INC&rft.issn=1088-8683&rft.eissn=1532-7957&rft.volume=10&rft.issue=4&rft.spage=354&rft.epage=371&rft.externalDBID=n%2Fa&rft.externalDocID=000242236600005&paramdict=en-US](http://rx9vh3hy4r.search.serialssolutions.com.ezproxy.liberty.edu:2048/?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2004&ctx_enc=info%3Aofi%2Fenc%3AUTF-8&rft_id=info:sid/summon.serialssolutions.com&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:journal&rft.genre=article&rft.atitle=Evolutionary+origins+of+leadership+and+followership&rft.jtitle=PERSONALITY+AND+SOCIAL+PSYCHOLOGY+REVIEW&rft.au=Van+Vugt%2C+M&rft.date=2006&rft.pub=SAGE+PUBLICATIONS+INC&rft.issn=1088-8683&rft.eissn=1532-7957&rft.volume=10&rft.issue=4&rft.spage=354&rft.epage=371&rft.externalDBID=n%2Fa&rft.externalDocID=000242236600005&paramdict=en-US)
- Vogt, W. P., & Johnson, R. B. (2011). *Dictionary of statistics & methodology: A nontechnical guide for the social sciences* (4th ed.). Washington, DC: Sage. (Original work published 1993)
- Warner, R. M. (2013). *Applied statistics from bivariate through multivariate techniques* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: SAGE. (Original work published 2007)

- Weaver, A. J., Samford, J. A., Kline, A. E., Lucas, L. A., Larson, D. B., & Koenig, H. G. (1997). What do psychologists know about working with the clergy? An analysis of eight APA journals: 1991-1994. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 28(5), 471-474.
- Wheeler, B. G., Miller, S. L., & Aleshire, D. O. (2007). How are we doing? The effectiveness of theological schools as measured by the vocations and views of graduates. *Auburn Studies*, December(13), 1-32. Retrieved from <http://174.121.120.105/~aubsem/sites/default/files/How%20are%20We%20Doing.pdf>
- Willard, D. (2002). *Renovation of the heart: Putting on the character of Christ*. Colorado Springs, CO: NavPress.
- Wilson, M. T., & Hoffmann, B. (2007). *Preventing ministry failure: A shepherd-care guide for pastors, ministers, and other caregivers*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Wind, J. P., & Rendle, G. R. (2001). *The leadership situation facing American congregations* (Alban Institute Special Report). Washington, DC: The Alban Institute.
- Yarnold, P. R., & Soltysik, R. C. (2010). *Optimal data analysis: Always optimal*. Retrieved August 22, 2013, from ODA Web site: Optimal Data Analysis: A Guidebook with Software for Windows.

## Appendix A

### Institutional Review Board Materials

Dwight C. Rice

#### Contents

1. Consent Form ..... pp. 103-4
2. 15' Online Survey ..... pp. 105-10

The following information will be collected through the [www.surveymonkey.com](http://www.surveymonkey.com) website, more specifically, Dwight's Dissertation Data Survey (DDDS):

- Participant information, self-serving information (controlling for impression management through the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale – Form C), and vocational and relational satisfaction data
  - Emotional Intelligence data will be assessed by the TEIQue-SF
3. Adjective Checklist Information from Behavioral Management Information System (BeMIS)
    - To review the Adjective Check List provided by BeMIS, enter **Ron Hawkins** when requested at this website: <http://www.BeMISdata.com/individual>
    - ACL Interpreter's Guide (available upon request)

## APPENDIX A. CONTINUED.

## CONSENT FORM

*The Influence of Leadership Description and Emotional Intelligence on a Satisfaction Profile and Vocational Status*

Dwight C. Rice  
 Liberty University  
 Center for Counseling and Family Studies

You are invited to be in a study of the influence of leadership description and emotional intelligence on satisfaction and vocational status. You were selected as a possible participant because this study involves Doctor of Ministry students at Liberty University/Seminary who have taken the Adjective Check List (ACL) in COUN/PACO 852 *The Growth and Development of the Contemporary Minister*. We ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

This study is being conducted by Dwight C. Rice under the supervision of faculty sponsor, Dr. Ronald E. Hawkins. Mr. Rice is a Ph.D. candidate, who is writing a dissertation that requires a study of this nature.

*Background Information*

The purpose of this study is to understand and further the research knowledge base on this subject.

Procedures:

If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to do the following:

- Sign this consent form and return it after asking any questions you may have.
- Understand that consent permits us to use the Adjective Check List (ACL) data collected during your COUN/PACO 852 intensive.
- Anticipate another email which will provide the URL and confidential access code to complete a free 15 minute online survey to collect participant information and vocational, relational, and emotional intelligence data.
- Be available for follow-up questions if needed for the purposes of clarifying data.

*Risks and Benefits of being in the Study*

The *risks* in this study are no more than the participant would encounter in everyday life.

The *benefits* to participation include the possibility of gaining fresh insight into his/her personal and vocational growth & development. Findings from this study will be shared with all participants upon completion of the dissertation.

## APPENDIX A. CONTINUED.

## Confidentiality:

The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report we might publish, we will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a participant.

The ACL and Online Survey data will be identified by a confidential code in order to protect the privacy and confidentiality of the participant. This anonymous data will be stored in password protected files on a password protected drive. All hard copies of forms will be stored in a locked file. After the dissertation project has been completed, data will be stored for three years and then deleted and/or shredded.

**Voluntary Nature of the Study:**

Participation in this study is voluntary and without remuneration. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with Liberty University/Seminary. If you decide to participate, you are free to not answer any question or withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships.

## Contacts and Questions:

The researcher conducting this study is Dwight C. Rice. If you have any questions now or later, you are encouraged to contact Dwight Rice at the Center for Counseling and Family Studies, Liberty University; (434)-592-3912 or by email at [dcrice@liberty.edu](mailto:dcrice@liberty.edu).

The faculty sponsor for this study is Dr. Ronald E. Hawkins, Vice Provost of Liberty University Online and Graduate Programs. You may contact Dr. Hawkins in the Executive Suite of Liberty University; (434)-592-4030 or by email at [rehawkin@liberty.edu](mailto:rehawkin@liberty.edu).

If you have any concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher and his faculty sponsor, you are encouraged to contact the Institutional Review Board, Dr. Fernando Garzon, Chair, 1971 University Blvd, Suite 2400, Lynchburg, VA 24502 or email at [fgarzon@liberty.edu](mailto:fgarzon@liberty.edu).

*You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records.*

## Statement of Consent:

I have read the above information and consent to participate in the study.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Investigator: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX A. CONTINUED.

## PARTICIPANT INFORMATION

Student's Name: (First)                      (Last)

Age: (Click on appropriate box) 30-39  40-49  50-59  60-70

Predominant Racial Background: (Click on appropriate box)

Asian  Black  Hispanic  Native American  White  Other

Present Marital Status: (Click on appropriate box)

Never Married  Married  Separated  Divorced  Remarried  Widowed

If married, have you ever been divorced? Yes  No

If currently married, how many years have you been married? (Click on appropriate box)

1-9  10-19  20-29  30-39  40-50

What is your current level of satisfaction with your marriage? (Click on appropriate box)

1  .... 2  .... 3  .... 4  .... 5  .... 6  .... 7

Very Unsatisfied

Very Satisfied

Identify your current vocational ministry assignment:

Lay worker  Intern  Bi-Vocational Pastor  Bi-Vocational Staff Member

Single Staff Pastor  Senior/Lead Pastor  Associate Staff Member

Missionary  Evangelist  Educator  Administrator  Transitional/Interim/Supply

Pastor  Interim Staff Member  Not involved in any ministry  Other -

## APPENDIX A. CONTINUED.

What has been the average length of tenure spent in various vocational ministry assignments through the years? (Click on appropriate box)

1-4  5-9  10-19  20-29  30-40

How long have you been at your current vocational ministry assignment? (Click on appropriate box)

1-4  5-9  10-19  20-29  30-40

Have you personally experienced any of the following? (Click on appropriate box)

Forced Resignation -  Termination -  Both -

Please answer each statement below by clicking on the box under the number that best reflects your current level of satisfaction. It's best to go with your first judgment and not spend too long mulling over any one question. There are seven possible responses to each statement ranging from 'Very Unsatisfied' (number 1) to 'Very Satisfied' (number 7).

What is your current level of satisfaction with your role in ministry? (Click on appropriate box)

1 -  .... 2 -  .... 3 -  .... 4 -  .... 5 -  .... 6 -  .... 7 -

Very Unsatisfied

Very Satisfied

What is your current level of relational satisfaction with your governing board? (Click on appropriate box)

1 -  .... 2 -  .... 3 -  .... 4 -  .... 5 -  .... 6 -  .... 7 -

Very Unsatisfied

Very Satisfied

What is your current level of satisfaction with life and ministry as a whole? (Click on appropriate box)

1 -  .... 2 -  .... 3 -  .... 4 -  .... 5 -  .... 6 -  .... 7 -

Very Unsatisfied

Very Satisfied

## APPENDIX A. CONTINUED.

What is your current level of satisfaction regarding your relationship with the Lord?  
(Click on appropriate box):

1 -  .... 2 -  .... 3 -  .... 4 -  .... 5 -  .... 6 -  .... 7 -

Very Unsatisfied

Very Satisfied

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale – Form C (MCSDS/C see Appendix C)  
Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true or false as it pertains to you personally. It's best to go with your first judgment and not spend too long mulling over any one question.

It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.

- True  
 False

I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.

- True  
 False

On a few occasions, I have given up something because I thought too little of my ability.

- True  
 False

There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.

- True  
 False

No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.

- True  
 False

There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone.

- True  
 False

I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.

- True  
 False

I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.

- True  
 False

## APPENDIX A. CONTINUED.

I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.

- True  
 False

I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.

- True  
 False

There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.

- True  
 False

I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.

- True  
 False

I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.

- True  
 False

## TEIQue-SF

Instructions: *Please answer each statement below by clicking on the box under the number that best reflects your degree of agreement or disagreement with that statement. Do not think too long about the exact meaning of the statements. Work quickly and try to answer as accurately as possible. There are no right or wrong answers. There are seven possible responses to each statement ranging from 'Completely Disagree' (number 1) to 'Completely Agree' (number 7).*

1 . . . . . 2 . . . . . 3 . . . . . 4 . . . . . 5 . . . . . 6 . . . . . 7

*Completely Disagree*

*Completely Agree*

|   |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Expressing my emotions with words is not a problem for me.               | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. I often find it difficult to see things from another person's viewpoint. | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. On the whole, I'm a highly motivated person.                             | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. I usually find it difficult to regulate my emotions.                     | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. I generally don't find life enjoyable.                                   | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. I can deal effectively with people.                                      | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. I tend to change my mind frequently.                                     | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> |

## APPENDIX A. CONTINUED.

|  |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 8. Many times, I can't figure out what emotion I'm feeling.                        | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.                                  | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 10. I often find it difficult to stand up for my rights.                           | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 11. I'm usually able to influence the way other people feel.                       | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 12. On the whole, I have a gloomy perspective on most things.                      | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 13. Those close to me often complain that I don't treat them right.                | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 14. I often find it difficult to adjust my life according to the circumstances.    | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 15. On the whole, I'm able to deal with stress.                                    | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 16. I often find it difficult to show my affection to those close to me.           | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 17. I'm normally able to "get into someone's shoes" and experience their emotions. | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 18. I normally find it difficult to keep myself motivated.                         | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 19. I'm usually able to find ways to control my emotions when I want to.           | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 20. On the whole, I'm pleased with my life.  | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 21. I would describe myself as a good negotiator.                                  | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 22. I tend to get involved in things I later wish I could get out of.              | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 23. I often pause and think about my feelings.                                     | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 24. I believe I'm full of personal strengths.                                      | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 25. I tend to "back down" even if I know I'm right.                                | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 26. I don't seem to have any power at all over other people's feelings.            | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> |

## APPENDIX A. CONTINUED.

|  |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |                            |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 27. I generally believe that things will work out fine in my life. | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 28. I find it difficult to bond well even with those close to me.  | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 29. Generally, I'm able to adapt to new environments.              | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 30. Others admire me for being relaxed.                            | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 6 <input type="checkbox"/> | 7 <input type="checkbox"/> |

**Appendix B**

## TABLES

Table 1.1 BeMIS Adjective Check List Scales Employed in this Study as Leadership Description

|             |            |            |                      |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------------|
| Dominance   | Autonomy   | Nurturance | Counseling Readiness |
| Achievement | Aggression | Deference  | Personal Adjustment  |

## APPENDIX B. CONTINUED.

Table 3.1 BeMIS Adjective Check List Scales Employed in this Study as Leadership Description

---

|             |            |            |                     |
|-------------|------------|------------|---------------------|
| Dominance   | Autonomy   | Nurturance | Counseling          |
| Achievement | Aggression | Deference  | Readiness           |
|             |            |            | Personal Adjustment |

---

## APPENDIX B. CONTINUED.

Table 4.1 Demographic Characteristics of Participants

| Demographic                           | Type                     | <i>N</i>   | %    |      |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------|------|------|
| Age                                   | 25-29                    | 3          | 2.7  |      |
|                                       | 30-39                    | 24         | 21.8 |      |
|                                       | 40-49                    | 35         | 31.8 |      |
|                                       | 50-59                    | 42         | 38.2 |      |
|                                       | 60-70                    | 6          | 5.5  |      |
| Ethnicity                             | Black                    | 20         | 18.2 |      |
|                                       | White                    | 87         | 79.1 |      |
|                                       | Other                    | 1          | 0.9  |      |
| Gender                                | Female                   | 8          | 0.7  |      |
|                                       | Male                     | 102        | 92.7 |      |
| Relationship Status                   | Never Married            | 2          | 1.8  |      |
|                                       | Married                  | 100        | 90.9 |      |
|                                       | Separated                | 1          | 0.9  |      |
|                                       | Divorced                 | 1          | 0.9  |      |
|                                       | Remarried                | 6          | 5.5  |      |
|                                       | Years Married            | 1-9        | 14   | 13.2 |
| Years Married                         | 10-19                    | 33         | 31.1 |      |
|                                       | 20-29                    | 33         | 31.1 |      |
|                                       | 30-39                    | 21         | 19.8 |      |
|                                       | 40-49                    | 4          | 3.8  |      |
|                                       | 50-69                    | 1          | 0.9  |      |
|                                       | Vocational Ministry Post | Lay Worker | 7    | 6.4  |
| Bi-Vocational Pastor                  |                          | 7          | 6.4  |      |
| Bi-Vocational Staff                   |                          | 2          | 1.8  |      |
| Single Staff Pastor                   |                          | 15         | 13.6 |      |
| Senior/Lead Pastor                    |                          | 37         | 33.6 |      |
| Associate Staff                       |                          | 17         | 15.5 |      |
| Missionary                            |                          | 8          | 7.3  |      |
| Evangelist                            |                          | 3          | 2.7  |      |
| Educator                              |                          | 8          | 7.3  |      |
| Admin/Exec Pastor                     |                          | 5          | 4.5  |      |
| Not Currently in                      |                          | 1          | 0.9  |      |
| Average Tenure in Vocational Ministry |                          | Ministry   | 34   | 30.9 |
|                                       |                          | 1-4 years  | 40   | 36.4 |
|                                       | 5-9                      | 30         | 27.3 |      |
|                                       | 10-19                    | 5          | 4.5  |      |
|                                       | 20-29                    | 1          | .9   |      |
|                                       | 30-40                    | 19         | 17.4 |      |
| Vocational Status                     | Forced Resignation       | 10         | 9.2  |      |
|                                       | Forced Termination       | 80         | 73.4 |      |
|                                       | Neither                  |            |      |      |

## APPENDIX B. CONTINUED.

Table 4.2 BeMIS Adjective Check List Scales Employed in this Study as Leadership Description

|             |            |            |                     |
|-------------|------------|------------|---------------------|
| Dominance   | Autonomy   | Nurturance | Counseling          |
| Achievement | Aggression | Deference  | Readiness           |
|             |            |            | Personal Adjustment |

## APPENDIX B. CONTINUED.

Table 4.3 Descriptive Statistics Emotional Intelligence

| BeMACL Scales             |      | Total EI |        |       | Ttl <sup>3</sup> | ANCOVA F | ANCOVA p |
|---------------------------|------|----------|--------|-------|------------------|----------|----------|
|                           |      | Low      | Medium | High  |                  |          |          |
| Achievement               | Mean | 3.53     | 5.54   | 5.72  | 5.56             | 7.96     | 0.001*   |
|                           | SD   | .        | 0.62   | 0.40  | 0.61             |          |          |
|                           | N    | 1        | 86     | 23    | 110              |          |          |
| Dominance                 | Mean | 4.87     | 5.57   | 5.70  | 5.56             | 5.39     | 0.006*   |
|                           | SD   | 0.77     | 0.62   | 0.40  | 0.61             |          |          |
|                           | N    | 5        | 86     | 19    | 110              |          |          |
| Autonomy                  | Mean | 5.53     | 5.52   | 5.88  | 5.56             | 3.15     | 0.047    |
|                           | SD   | 0.77     | 0.59   | 0.33  | 0.61             |          |          |
|                           | N    | 18       | 81     | 11    | 110              |          |          |
| Aggression                | Mean | 5.92     | 5.48   | 5.75  | 5.56             | 2.45     | 0.092    |
|                           | SD   | 0.52     | 0.62   | 0.48  | 0.61             |          |          |
|                           | N    | 12.00    | 83.00  | 15.00 | 110              |          |          |
| Nurturance                | Mean | 5.71     | 5.49   | 5.99  | 5.56             | 2.41     | 0.095    |
|                           | SD   | 0.46     | 0.63   | 0.39  | 0.61             |          |          |
|                           | N    | 12       | 87     | 11    | 110              |          |          |
| Deference                 | Mean | 5.79     | 5.54   | 5.49  | 5.56             | 2.48     | 0.088    |
|                           | SD   | 0.46     | 0.59   | 0.79  | 0.61             |          |          |
|                           | N    | 14       | 81     | 15    | 110              |          |          |
| Coun. Read. <sup>1</sup>  | Mean | 5.78     | 5.55   | 5.18  | 5.56             | 3.43     | 0.036**  |
|                           | SD   | 0.40     | 0.60   | 0.91  | 0.61             |          |          |
|                           | N    | 17       | 85     | 8     | 110              |          |          |
| Per. Adjtmnt <sup>2</sup> | Mean | 5.23     | 5.57   | 6.07  | 5.56             | 3.204    | 0.0450** |
|                           | SD   | 1.11     | 0.52   | 0.32  | 0.61             |          |          |
|                           | N    | 11       | 93     | 6     | 110              |          |          |

\*Mean difference is significant at .006 level

\*\* Trends toward significance  $p < .045$

<sup>1</sup>Counseling Readiness

<sup>2</sup>Personal Adjustment

<sup>3</sup>Total

## APPENDIX B. CONTINUED.

Table 4.4 Descriptive Statistics Marital Satisfaction

| BeMACL Scales             |      | <u>Marital Satisfaction</u> |        |      |       | ANCOVA<br>F | ANCOVA<br>p |
|---------------------------|------|-----------------------------|--------|------|-------|-------------|-------------|
|                           |      | Low                         | Medium | High | Total |             |             |
| Achievement               | Mean | 5.00                        | 5.72   | 5.57 | 5.68  | 196.0       | 0.922       |
|                           | SD   |                             | 1.36   | 1.78 | 1.45  |             |             |
|                           | N    | 1                           | 86     | 23   | 110   |             |             |
| Dominance                 | Mean | 4.20                        | 5.67   | 6.11 | 5.68  | 4.569       | 0.012**     |
|                           | SD   | 2.17                        | 1.40   | 1.24 | 1.45  |             |             |
|                           | N    | 5                           | 86     | 19   | 110   |             |             |
| Autonomy                  | Mean | 5.44                        | 5.64   | 6.36 | 5.68  | 2.700       | 0.072       |
|                           | SD   | 1.69                        | 1.41   | 1.21 | 1.45  |             |             |
|                           | N    | 18                          | 81     | 11   | 110   |             |             |
| Aggression                | Mean | 5.83                        | 5.63   | 5.87 | 5.68  | 0.276       | 0.759       |
|                           | SD   | 1.80                        | 1.35   | 1.73 | 1.45  |             |             |
|                           | N    | 12                          | 83     | 15   | 110   |             |             |
| Nurturance                | Mean | 5.67                        | 5.67   | 5.82 | 5.68  | 0.410       | 0.960       |
|                           | SD   | 1.83                        | 1.35   | 1.83 | 1.45  |             |             |
|                           | N    | 12                          | 87     | 11   | 110   |             |             |
| Deference                 | Mean | 6.07                        | 5.65   | 5.47 | 5.68  | 1.430       | 0.244       |
|                           | SD   | 1.38                        | 1.39   | 1.81 | 1.45  |             |             |
|                           | N    | 14                          | 81     | 15   | 110   |             |             |
| Coun. Read. <sup>1</sup>  | Mean | 6.12                        | 5.65   | 5.13 | 5.68  | 1.724       | 0.183       |
|                           | SD   | 1.05                        | 1.49   | 1.64 | 1.45  |             |             |
|                           | N    | 17                          | 85     | 8    | 110   |             |             |
| Per. Adjtmnt <sup>2</sup> | Mean | 5.45                        | 5.66   | 6.50 | 5.68  | 0.707       | 0.495       |
|                           | SD   | 1.97                        | 1.41   | 0.55 | 1.45  |             |             |
|                           | N    | 11                          | 93     | 6    | 110   |             |             |

\*\* Trends toward significance  $p < .045$

<sup>1</sup>Counseling Readiness

<sup>2</sup>Personal Adjustment

## APPENDIX B. CONTINUED.

Table 4.5 Descriptive Statistics Vocational Satisfaction

| BeMACL Scales             |      | <u>Vocational Satisfaction</u> |        |           |       | ANCOVA<br>F | ANCOVA<br>p |
|---------------------------|------|--------------------------------|--------|-----------|-------|-------------|-------------|
|                           |      | Low                            | Medium | High      | Total |             |             |
| Achievement               | Mean | 3.00                           | 4.95   | 5.65      | 5.08  | 3.811       | 0.250       |
|                           | SD   |                                | 1.45   | 0.88      | 1.39  |             |             |
|                           | N    | 1                              | 86     | 23        | 110   |             |             |
| Dominance                 | Mean | 4.60                           | 4.95   | 5.79      | 5.08  | 4.466       | 0.014**     |
|                           | SD   | 1.14                           | 1.46   | 0.79      | 1.39  |             |             |
|                           | N    | 5                              | 86     | 19        | 110   |             |             |
| Autonomy                  | Mean | 5.00                           | 5.00   | 5.82      | 5.08  | 2.458       | 0.091       |
|                           | SD   | 1.19                           | 1.46   | 0.98      | 1.39  |             |             |
|                           | N    | 18.0<br>0                      | 81.00  | 11.0<br>0 | 110   |             |             |
| Aggression                | Mean | 5.58                           | 4.87   | 5.87      | 5.08  | 4.012       | 0.021**     |
|                           | SD   | 1.00                           | 1.46   | 0.74      | 1.39  |             |             |
|                           | N    | 12                             | 83     | 15        | 110   |             |             |
| Nurturance                | Mean | 5.33                           | 4.95   | 5.82      | 5.08  | 1.391       | 0.253       |
|                           | SD   | 1.56                           | 1.40   | 0.87      | 1.39  |             |             |
|                           | N    | 12                             | 87     | 11        | 110   |             |             |
| Deference                 | Mean | 5.79                           | 4.95   | 5.13      | 5.08  | 2.831       | 0.063       |
|                           | SD   | 0.89                           | 1.43   | 1.41      | 1.39  |             |             |
|                           | N    | 14                             | 81     | 15        | 110   |             |             |
| Coun. Read. <sup>1</sup>  | Mean | 5.53                           | 5.04   | 4.63      | 5.08  | 1.65        | 0.197       |
|                           | SD   | 1.42                           | 1.38   | 1.30      | 1.39  |             |             |
|                           | N    | 17                             | 85     | 8         | 110   |             |             |
| Per. Adjtmnt <sup>2</sup> | Mean | 4.55                           | 5.08   | 6.17      | 5.08  | 2.227       | 0.113       |
|                           | SD   | 1.92                           | 1.32   | 0.75      | 1.39  |             |             |
|                           | N    | 11                             | 93     | 6         | 110   |             |             |

\*\* Trends toward significance  $p < .045$

<sup>1</sup>Counseling Readiness

<sup>2</sup>Personal Adjustment

## APPENDIX B. CONTINUED.

Table 4.6 Descriptive Statistics Relational Satisfaction

| BeMACL<br>Scales          |      | <u>Relational Satisfaction</u> |            |       |        | ANCOVA<br>F | ANCOVA<br>p |
|---------------------------|------|--------------------------------|------------|-------|--------|-------------|-------------|
|                           |      | Low                            | Mediu<br>m | High  | Total  |             |             |
| Achievement               | Mean | 5.00                           | 4.90       | 5.61  | 5.05   | 1.756       | 0.178       |
|                           | SD   |                                | 1.69       | 1.50  | 1.67   |             |             |
|                           | N    | 1                              | 86         | 23    | 110    |             |             |
| Dominance                 | Mean | 5.20                           | 4.90       | 5.68  | 5.05   | 2.295       | 0.106       |
|                           | SD   | 1.79                           | 1.72       | 1.25  | 1.67   |             |             |
|                           | N    | 5                              | 86         | 19    | 110    |             |             |
| Autonomy                  | Mean | 5.28                           | 4.91       | 5.64  | 5.05   | 1.095       | 1.338       |
|                           | SD   | 1.56                           | 1.62       | 2.11  | 1.67   |             |             |
|                           | N    | 18                             | 81         | 11    | 110    |             |             |
| Aggression                | Mean | 5.92                           | 4.80       | 5.73  | 5.05   | 3.505       | 0.034**     |
|                           | SD   | 1.00                           | 1.67       | 1.75  | 1.67   |             |             |
|                           | N    | 12.00                          | 83.00      | 15.00 | 110.00 |             |             |
| Nurturance                | Mean | 5.92                           | 4.79       | 6.09  | 5.05   | 4.538       | 0.013**     |
|                           | SD   | 0.90                           | 1.75       | 0.70  | 1.67   |             |             |
|                           | N    | 12                             | 87         | 11    | 110    |             |             |
| Deference                 | Mean | 5.57                           | 4.91       | 5.27  | 5.05   | 1.184       | 0.310       |
|                           | SD   | 1.74                           | 1.67       | 1.53  | 1.67   |             |             |
|                           | N    | 14                             | 81         | 15    | 110    |             |             |
| Coun. Read. <sup>1</sup>  | Mean | 5.59                           | 4.94       | 5.00  | 5.05   | 1.221       | 0.299       |
|                           | SD   | 1.12                           | 1.78       | 1.20  | 1.67   |             |             |
|                           | N    | 17                             | 85         | 8     | 110    |             |             |
| Per. Adjtmnt <sup>2</sup> | Mean | 3.64                           | 5.15       | 6.00  | 5.05   | 5.237       | 0.007**     |
|                           | SD   | 2.38                           | 1.53       | 0.63  | 1.67   |             |             |
|                           | N    | 11                             | 93         | 6     | 110    |             |             |

\*\* Trends toward significance  $p < .045$

<sup>1</sup>Counseling Readiness

<sup>2</sup>Personal Adjustment

## APPENDIX B. CONTINUED.

Table 4.7 Descriptive Statistics Emotional Intelligence and Vocational Status

| Vocational Status    | N  | <u>Emotional Intelligence</u> |      |      |
|----------------------|----|-------------------------------|------|------|
|                      |    | Mean                          | SD   | SEM  |
| experienced exit     | 30 | 5.53                          | 0.64 | 0.12 |
| not experienced exit | 80 | 5.57                          | 0.60 | 0.07 |

SEM= Standard Error Mean

## APPENDIX B. CONTINUED.

Table 4.8 T-tests results Emotional Intelligence and Vocational Status

|                             | <u>Emotional Intelligence</u> |       |      |                    |      |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------|------|--------------------|------|
|                             | t                             | Df    | p    | Mean<br>Difference | SED  |
| Equal variances not assumed | -0.33                         | 49.46 | 0.74 | -0.04              | 0.13 |

SED=Standard Error Difference

## APPENDIX B. CONTINUED.

Table 4.9 Leadership Description Scales and Vocational Status

|                           | Vocational Status    | N  | Mean  | SD    | SEM  |
|---------------------------|----------------------|----|-------|-------|------|
| Achievement               | experienced exit     | 30 | 53.63 | 7.98  | 1.46 |
|                           | not experienced exit | 80 | 54.14 | 7.32  | 0.82 |
| Dominance                 | experienced exit     | 30 | 51.07 | 8.83  | 1.61 |
|                           | not experienced exit | 80 | 53.39 | 7.56  | 0.85 |
| Autonomy                  | experienced exit     | 30 | 46.60 | 10.67 | 1.95 |
|                           | not experienced exit | 80 | 49.48 | 9.33  | 1.04 |
| Aggression                | experienced exit     | 30 | 48.97 | 8.88  | 1.62 |
|                           | not experienced exit | 80 | 51.43 | 9.01  | 1.01 |
| Nurturance                | experienced exit     | 30 | 51.73 | 7.05  | 1.29 |
|                           | not experienced exit | 80 | 49.81 | 8.77  | 0.98 |
| Deference                 | experienced exit     | 30 | 53.00 | 9.99  | 1.82 |
|                           | not experienced exit | 80 | 49.25 | 9.92  | 1.11 |
| Coun. Read. <sup>1</sup>  | experienced exit     | 30 | 48.47 | 9.12  | 1.67 |
|                           | not experienced exit | 80 | 46.81 | 7.55  | 0.84 |
| Per. Adjtmnt <sup>2</sup> | experienced exit     | 30 | 50.00 | 6.97  | 1.27 |
|                           | not experienced exit | 80 | 48.83 | 7.45  | 0.83 |

SEM= Standard Error Mean

<sup>1</sup>Counseling Readiness<sup>2</sup>Personal Adjustment

## APPENDIX B. CONTINUED.

Table 4.10 T-tests results Leadership Scales and Vocational Status

|                              |                                     | t     | P    | Mean<br>Difference | SED  |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------|------|--------------------|------|
| Achievement                  | Equal variances<br>n/a <sup>3</sup> | -0.30 | 0.76 | -0.50              | 1.67 |
| Dominance                    | Equal variances<br>n/a              | -1.28 | 0.21 | -2.32              | 1.82 |
| Autonomy                     | Equal variances<br>n/a              | -1.30 | 0.20 | -2.88              | 2.21 |
| Aggression                   | Equal variances<br>n/a              | -1.29 | 0.20 | -2.46              | 1.91 |
| Nurturance                   | Equal variances<br>n/a              | 1.19  | 0.24 | 1.92               | 1.62 |
| Deference                    | Equal variances<br>n/a              | 1.76  | 0.08 | 3.75               | 2.13 |
| Coun. Read. <sup>1</sup>     | Equal variances<br>n/a              | 0.89  | 0.38 | 1.65               | 1.87 |
| Per.<br>Adjtmnt <sup>2</sup> | Equal variances<br>n/a              | 0.77  | 0.44 | 1.18               | 1.52 |

SED= Standard Error Difference

<sup>1</sup>Counseling Readiness

<sup>2</sup>Personal Adjustment

<sup>3</sup>Equal Variances not Assumed

## APPENDIX B. CONTINUED.

Table 4.11 Satisfaction Scales and Vocational Status

|                         | Vocational Status    | N  | Mean | SD   | SEM  |
|-------------------------|----------------------|----|------|------|------|
| Marital Satisfaction    | experienced exit     | 30 | 5.83 | 0.99 | 0.18 |
|                         | not experienced exit | 80 | 5.63 | 1.59 | 0.18 |
| Vocational Satisfaction | experienced exit     | 30 | 5.03 | 1.27 | 0.23 |
|                         | not experienced exit | 80 | 5.10 | 1.44 | 0.16 |
| Relational Satisfaction | experienced exit     | 30 | 5.10 | 1.40 | 0.26 |
|                         | not experienced exit | 80 | 5.03 | 1.76 | 0.20 |

SEM Standard Error Mean

## APPENDIX B. CONTINUED.

Table 4.12 T tests Satisfaction Scales and Vocational Status

|                         |                                  |  | t     | P    | Mean<br>Difference | SED  |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|--|-------|------|--------------------|------|
| Marital Satisfaction    | Equal variances n/a <sup>1</sup> |  | 0.83  | 0.41 | 0.21               | 0.25 |
| Vocational Satisfaction | Equal variances n/a              |  | -0.24 | 0.81 | -0.07              | 0.28 |
| Relational Satisfaction | Equal variances n/a              |  | 0.23  | 0.82 | 0.08               | 0.32 |

SED= Standard Error Difference

<sup>1</sup>Equal Variances not Assumed

## APPENDIX B. CONTINUED.

Table 5.1 BeMIS Adjective Check List Scales Employed in this Study as Leadership Description

|             |            |            |                      |
|-------------|------------|------------|----------------------|
| Dominance   | Autonomy   | Nurturance | Counseling Readiness |
| Achievement | Aggression | Deference  | Personal Adjustment  |

## Appendix C

### PERMISSIONS

The Marlowe Crowne Social Desirability: Short form – C (13 questions) instrument was originally presented in the following study:

Reynolds, W. M. (1982). Development of reliable and valid short forms of the Marlowe-Crowne social desirability scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 38(1), 119-25.

Reproduced with permission: <https://s100.copyright.com/CustomAdmin/PLF.jsp?ref=8f8e08b6-97ba-4913-9f64-a41ec6e8f25e>

#### License Details:

|                            |                     |
|----------------------------|---------------------|
| License Number             | 3641051468770       |
| License date               | Jun 02, 2015        |
| Licensed Content Publisher | John Wiley and Sons |