



Report for The Foundation for Church Leadership

Leadership Development in Oxford Diocese

Anthony J Berry
January 2007

Acknowledgements.

The author is grateful to the clergy of the diocese for their assistance in providing information for this review and especially to Kate Stacey for her assistance with the management of the questionnaires and her conduct and transcription of the interviews. We are also grateful to the FCL for their financial assistance.

Contents

Summary

- A. Introduction**
- B. The Study- Questionnaires**
- C. The study- Interviews**
- D. Discussion**
- E. Conclusions**

Summary

1. The review of the Oxford Diocese Servant Leadership Programme conducted in the spring and summer of 2006 had four elements;
 - a. Review of the documentation at Church House and interviews with Canon Lamdin.
 - b. Interviews with the senior staff of the diocese (except the Diocesan and one Archdeacon).
 - c. A Questionnaire sent out to all previous participants of DSL.
 - d. Interviews 19 DSL participants, selected to give coverage from all of the DSL courses and also gave coverage of age, gender, location in the diocese and church tradition.

This report is based upon an analysis of the questionnaires and interviews.

2. Overall the respondents reported ;
 - (a) significant positive evaluation of the intent and design of the DSL
 - (b) significant positive impact from attendance at the DSL
 - (i) on their role in their parish and
 - (ii) on their leadership behaviours
 - (c) evidence of many new initiatives arising out of attendance at DSL.
3. The study was designed to examine explanations of the response to DSL;

The degree of intensity of the reported changes in Leadership following upon DSL was best explained by the strength of the desire for seeking change and the strength of the positive evaluation of the DSL. In turn the strength of the desire to seek change was positively correlated with the strength of the self-

reported degree of transformational leadership. The degree of intensity of reported changes in leadership were decreased as the strength of the self reported transactional leadership increased.¹²

It may be observed then that the DSL with its orientation to change met with clergy who were either change oriented or experiencing both the need to change and the need to lead change in the churches of the diocese.

4. These results were not substantially affected by either gender or by membership of a church tradition. There was some evidence that the DSL gave women “permission” to be institutional and “up front” about their leadership. Women reported a higher impact from attendance on their transformational leadership than the men.

5. Among the implications of the study is the need to build “social capital” among clergy in order to enable more effective development of their ministry.

A. Introduction.

Context.

Policy.

1. There had been a major initiative “Shaping the future Together” as a Diocesan wide repositioning of focus. This had Five Strategic Directions

- Creativity and flexibility for our Christian communities
- Encouraging and resourcing innovative forms of outreach
- Implementation at local level
- Sustainability and refocusing of financial resources
- Training for Servant leadership.

This was a response to the perceived needs of the Diocese³ in a rapidly changing world. It was discussed across the diocese in draft in Spring/Summer 2003 and approved by Diocesan Synod in November 2003. The Diocesan strategy included the development of leadership, especially that of the clergy. The organisation of the Diocese and its parishes is pastoral and geographical.

In concert with much thinking about leadership development and in concert with the ancient geographical and pastoral realities, the diocese chose to work with its model/experience of distributed leadership. This can take many forms but in Oxford (and perhaps much of the rest of the CofE) it takes the form of the Parish priest being a holder, jointly with the Bishop) of the cure of souls. So leadership is distributed. But at the same time it is also localised for clergy do not believe they have the authority to exercise leadership in the next parish. The synodical system, especially Deanery Synods provides the space for the exercise of collective leadership over a wider area but this has a patchy history. The senior staff model collective leadership

The theme of Servant leadership had a fit to the values of the suffering servant of Isaiah and of Jesus. In one sense it was a value position, which Greenleaf had borrowed, being worked with in the church. It was not about power and control.

The CME tradition in the diocese (and the wider church) has been of a voluntary nature. In this case it was decided that the Diocesan would invite all clergy to participate in the programme. This would be seen as a strong signal of the seriousness of intent and of the importance given to the work.

¹ The constructs Transformational and Transactional are drawn from recent research. Transactional leadership refers to the leader’s use of organisational resources, legitimate authority arising from the leader’s position and the power to give and withhold rewards; here followers comply. Transformational leadership sets out to engage the minds and hearts of followers; such leaders are charismatic, inspirational, intellectually stimulating and show personal consideration; followers join in.

² This was observed from the regression analysis on the new constructs arising from the factor analysis of the questionnaire responses.

³ Consideration of strategy formulation and implementation was not part of the brief for this project.

B. Review of the Programme. The Questionnaires.

1. Introduction.

Design.

The DSL was designed around this theme but with a strong awareness of the need to link interventions around learning about leadership with the natural processes of learning, which differ from individual to individual. Hence the DSL had a strong experiential core including the use of Action Learning to extend the learning processes and learning times. The Strategy was to work across the whole Diocese with Distributed Leadership, with the theology of servant hood and the processes of Action learning.

The Oxford DSL diocese strategy for leadership development was based partly upon what is commonly called Distributed Leadership, where highly significant leadership is required at every “organisational level” and as key part of the shared cure of “Bishop and Incumbent”. This approach may be contrasted to one that assumes that leadership in a multi unit organisation such as a diocese should be, or could be, centralised and top down.

The Bishop invited *all clergy* to participate in the DSL programme. The significance of this inclusive agenda, compared to the voluntary nature of much CME, elicited a positive response from clergy with all suffragan bishops commenting that the clergy “felt valued” and “visible” as a result of the process.

There is a distinction to be drawn between the processes of leadership development which arise out of what has been called “natural learning” from the unique and cumulative experience of life and ministry and that engendered by “specific interventions” such as the DSL course. Natural learning has the advantage that it can happen all the time as persons learn from their experience, but various persons have varied abilities to learn richly from their experience. The advantages of specific interventions are that the issue is brought into focus; all the people are involved, specific learning is encouraged and a stimulus and framework is given to the quality of further natural learning. The disadvantage of specific interventions is that they are of short duration and often “crammed in” to already busy lives where the best of intentions to follow up are beaten back by the flux of events. The DSL, a structured intervention, had a strong centre in Action Learning Sets to encourage the processes of natural learning in a more supportive context of fellow clergy. This mixed educational design was intended to enhance and connect the structured interventions with continuing learning. Mentoring, coaching and attendance at national and international programmes are among other approaches to continuing learning in use in the diocese.

This study was not intended to review or debate the theological and ecclesiological issues in the choice of the focus upon servant leadership, except to note that several respondents were disappointed that this review was not so focused.

3. Study Design

3.1. The working hypothesis for the study was; because natural learning dominates behaviour more than learning from structured interventions then;

Attendance at DSL would lead to no Changes in Leader behaviour and a neutral evaluation of DSL

Further it was expected that this hypothesis would be conditional upon
Individual leader behaviours; (Transformational and Transactional leadership preferences)
Gender
Church Tradition
Emotional Awareness

The initial intent was to seek the evaluations of participants of the DSL some time after they had completed the course. In addition it was decided to seek evidence of
 The effects of attending DSL on the role in the parish
 Changes in behaviour arising from attendance at the DSL
 Leadership behaviours.
 Initiatives following upon attendance at the DSL
 Emotional Awareness (in relation to Emotional Intelligence).

3.2. It would have been valuable to conduct a small number of Case studies of clergy and parishes/benefices to examine changes. However these are expensive of both time and money so this option was rejected⁴. Thus the study approach was based upon a brief 4-page questionnaire to all DSL participants and some nineteen interviews. As several other dioceses are either closely following the DSL or using considerable parts of it an opportunity arose of gaining comparative data. However these other users of DSL were quite recent, producing small populations and even with a high expected response rate to a questionnaire, such an approach would have provided only small samples. However by 2007/8 such a comparative study might prove fruitful.

A questionnaire was designed with nine sections

Section	Theme	Scaling
A	About the respondent	Age; Gender; Time in Ministry; Time in present Role
B	Parish Tradition Parish Location	10 categories 9 categories
C	Effect of Attending DSL on Role in Parish	13 Questions; five point scales
D	Changes arising from Attendance at DSL	9 questions; 5 point scale
E	Leadership Behaviours Changes in leadership reported by others to subject	13 Questions; 5 point scales Text requested
F	Views of DSL	16 questions; 5 point scales
G	Initiatives following upon attendance at DSL	5 levels; Person, Parish, Deanery; Diocese, Ecumenical: Categories of: Planned; In Progress; Completed
H	Your Ministry role	5 questions; 5 point scale
I	Comments?	Text requested

3.3. The interviews were designed to complement the questionnaire by giving respondents an opportunity to provide a context to their experience of the DSL, to reflect on their experience of leadership etc. These will be the subject of a further analysis.

Among the themes for the semi structured interviews were;

A. The understanding of leadership in the current post.
 What in the past has been helpful in developing understanding.
 Exemplars of ministerial leadership.
 Major diocesan initiatives that affect your ministry.

B. Experience of the DSL course
 Follow up any aspect of leadership development

C. Perceptions of the “state of the parish” and of the parish church.
 Initiatives that have been taken in the parish.
 In what ways have these been affected by your membership of the DSL.

D. Exercise of leadership in wider church roles.

⁴ The initial budget had to be reduced because of the limited funds available.

Exercise of leadership in community roles.
Exercise of leadership in ecumenical and/or interfaith groups.

E. The 360-degree appraisal.

These themes were designed to provide a space for elaboration of the ideas of leadership and of the context within which leadership was being exercised together with space to examine the subject's experience of the DSL. 19 interviews were conducted of 1.5 to 2 hours duration with clergy selected from the DSL courses that gave coverage across the diocese, age groups, and church tradition. They were transcribed and have been partly analysed using content analysis techniques.

4. Results from the Study

The primary data was collected from questionnaires distributed to all previous participants in the DSL programme. The data analysed below was taken from 100 responses (which was (100/230) 43% response rate. There was a small but statistically insignificant difference in the response rates for men and women.

Any questionnaire can be affected by bias in responses. There was not enough data to check for the effects on each cohort, but it was possible that the early "perceived benefits" of the programme would spill over into the likelihood of later participants having more positive expectations. Further the fact that clergy were all invited (expected) to attend by the Bishop may also have added a positive gloss on responses. In opposition to those influences it was four years since the first cohort had completed DSL and corresponding times since most of these respondents had been on the programme (a few reported that they were now on DSL2) which might have given a less rosy perspective.

The findings are presented in three stages; the first examines the raw data from the questions, explores differences in mean scores and correlation as tools of observation. The Stage II process of statistical analysis simplifies the raw data from the 63 questions to produce new constructs. The third stage is an analysis, based upon these new constructs to examine the study question.

4.1. Analysis.

The statistical analysis was undertaken using SPSS 12.1.

The analysis is presented as follows;

Stage I.

- 4.2. The Respondents
- 4.3. Effect of Attending DSL on Role in the Parish
- 4.4. Changes in Behaviour arising from attendance at DSL.
- 4.5. Leader Behaviours
- 4.6. Evaluation of DSL
- 4.7. Initiatives arising
- 4.8. Emotional Awareness.

In each of sections the first set of data from the questionnaires were descriptive statistics; mean scores to the responses to the questions and correlation of the scores to examine whether the response were "well behaved" and consistent.

Stage II.

Analysis of the simplified data.

Stage III.

Testing for explanations of the outcomes of DSL.

4.2 The respondents

4.2.1.

Table 4.2.1. The Respondents, Age, Time ordained, Time in Present Role, Gender.

Gender	Male (n=74)	Female (n=26)	All (n=100)
Age...yrs	52.2	50.3	51.7
Time in Ordained Ministry ... yrs	20.8	11.9	18.5
Time in Present Role...yrs	8.1	4.4	7.2

There is no difference in the average ages of the male and female respondents. The differences in means of time ordained and time in present post are statistically significant at the .001 level. The women have been ordained for half the time of the men; they are in post just over half the time of the men. This reflects the 1993 decision.

4.2.2. Current Parish.

(a) Parish Tradition

Table 4.2.2. Range of Reported Parish Traditions

	All
Conservative Evangelical	9
Open Evangelical	15
Central	40
Modern Catholic	14
Traditional Catholic	1
Influenced by Renewal	6
Charismatic	7
Local Ecumenical Partnership	3
Parish that has passed resolutions A & B	0
Parish under extended Episcopal Care	0

There were some multiple answers reflecting the mixed character of multi parish benefices.

(b) Parish Location

Table 4.2.3. Parish Location

	All
Industrial	3
Urban	5
Suburban	24
City centre	3
Inner city	0
Rural	24
Semi-rural	20
Country town	13
Housing estate	7

From Table 4.2.4 below it may be seen that the catholic churches are almost all in the urban areas. The evangelical churches are numerically spread across the diocese, but make up a higher proportion (40%) of the urban and suburban area churches while the greater proportion (85%) of central churches have Rural/Country town locations.

Table 4.2.4. Parish Location in relation to Parish Tradition.

Location	Urban, suburban city centre etc n=25	Rural, semi rural, Country town. n=47
Evangelical n=23	10; 0.40	13; 0.27
Central n=38	6; 0.24	32; 0.68
Catholic n=11	9; 0.36	2; 0.04

	25; 100%	47; 100%
--	----------	----------

There were some missing answers.

Table 4.2.5. Correlations of Age, Gender, Time since Ordination; Time in Present Role

	Age	Gender	T Ord.	T P. Role
Age	1.00	-	.531**	.363**
Gender		1.00	-.395**	-.322**
T Ord			1.00	.611**
T. P.Role				1.00

Significance levels ** 0.01; * 0.05

The older respondents were likely to have been longer in their present roles. Also male respondents were more likely than female respondents to have been ordained for a long time and to serve in present role for longer.

If these patterns of age, gender, tradition and location does not reflect the characteristics of clergy in the Diocese then care must be taken in extrapolating from the results.

4.3 Effect of Attending DSL on Role in Parish.

Respondents were asked to indicate what they considered the impact of attending DSL was upon leadership and other behaviours.

Table 4.3.1. Reported Effect on Role in the Parish from attendance at DSL.

Scores; <3 is Decreased; 3 = Not Changed; >3 is Increased

From attending DSL	Mean Scores		
	Males (74)	Females (26)	All (100)
My Vision Building has	3.66	3.85	3.71
My determination to lead has	3.56	3.81	3.63
My Leadership of PCC has	3.29	3.39	3.31
My Leadership of the church school has	3.04	3.29	3.12
My Leadership in the parish Church has	3.50	3.88 *	3.60
My team leadership has	3.73	3.96	3.80
My collaborative leadership has	3.70	4.00	3.78
My leadership in the community has	3.24	3.19	3.23
My satisfaction with my work has	3.19	3.42	3.25
Lay leadership in the parish has	3.72	3.92	3.77
Parish nurture initiatives have	3.60	3.52	3.58
Parish Outreach initiatives have	3.63	3.58	3.62
My work life balance has	3.03	3.08	3.04

Note; not all respondents answered all questions.

In Table 4.3.1. it is clear that the Male and Female responses are very similar. The only statistically different response was that the females reported a higher increase in the leadership in the parish , 3.88 to 3.50 (0.05 level). The least impact reported was on schools, community, work satisfaction and work life balance.

There were very few significant differences between the groups of respondents based upon Parish Tradition. The Catholic group reported a lower intention with regard to leading the PCC (sig. 0.015) and a lower impact on work satisfaction (sig. .035) than the Evangelical or Central groups. The Catholic group reported a slightly negative impact of DSL on work satisfaction.

4.4. Reported Changes in behaviours arising from participating in the DSL

Table 4.4.1. Changes in Behaviour reported arising from DLS

Respondents were invited to consider the degree of changes in their leadership behaviours arising from attendance at DSL.

Scores; <3 decreased; =3 Not changed; >3 Increased

Following Attendance at the DSL my	Mean Scores		
	Males	Females	All
Risk taking	3.44	3.58	3.48
Conflict handling	3.53	3.62	3.55
Stress management	3.37	3.12	3.31
Seeking further learning about leadership	3.51	3.69	3.56
Seeking CME	3.22	3.15	3.20
Seeking help with the parish work	3.49	3.54	3.51
Seeking Ecumenical working	3.15	3.15	3.15
Seeking help with my team work skills	3.29	3.40	3.32
Intention to seek more challenging ministry	3.34	3.31	3.33

There were no statistically significant differences in these mean scores for males and females . The least reported impact was upon Seeking CME and seeking Ecumenical working; the most impact reported was upon conflict handling and seeking further learning about leadership. There were minor and not statistically significant differences between groups based upon Parish traditions.

4.5. Reported Leadership Behaviours

Table 4.5.1. Reported Leader behaviours.

Respondents were invited to consider the degree to which they agreed that a statement described their leadership behaviours.

Scores. <3 Disagree; =3 Neutral; >3 Agree

To what extent do you agree with the following statements	Mean Scores			Reporting Impact of DSL
	Males	Females	All	
I recognise good work and promise rewards for it	3.34	3.38	3.35	4
I monitor the work of others and only intervene when necessary	3.89	3.81	3.87	5
I only intervene when work is not accomplished	3.16	3.04	3.12	1
I accept that others do the best they can	3.75	3.80	3.76	4 (17)
I provide a vision to instil pride, gain respect and trust	3.81	3.76	3.80	16
I build a shared vision	4.10	4.19	4.12	21
I create a culture that supports change	4.04	4.00	4.03	14 (51)
I inspire individuals to take self-sacrifice and commit to difficult goals	3.56	3.46	3.53	3
I intellectually stimulate people and get them to approach problems in new and different ways	3.87	3.65	3.81	11
I encourage questioning and critical thinking	4.07	4.15	4.09	10
I show consideration and give followers individual attention and coaching	4.02	4.00	4.01	6
I prefer to lead by example	3.77	4.34	3.93	5
I network and link others	3.61	3.81	3.66	6

Apart from the two statement regarding response to work, there was on average a broad measure of agreement between the males and the females.. The only significant difference between males and females was in relation to leading by example (3.77; 4.34 ; sig. at 0.001). There were no differences between the groups based upon parish traditions.

The final column in Table 4.5.1 is a count of the individual respondents reports upon which behaviour their attendance had had most impact. Not all respondents answered the question re impact and there were some individuals who gave more than one category as being impacted. There was a wide spread of impact suggesting a wide range of potential changes in leadership behaviours of this sample. It is clear that the highest impact (51) cases was on the transformational behaviours, with some impact (17) on the transactional behaviours. The impact on intellectual stimulation and critical questioning (21) was evidence of an impact upon a teaching role of the leader.

However, males reported on average 1 issue that had affected them whereas females reported on average 1.7 issues. Here we see the women reporting themselves to be impacted upon at a markedly higher level than the men. Further in relation to indicators of Transactional leadership the men reported that 13% of them were impacted compared to 27% of the women. In relation to indicators of transformational leadership the males reported that 39% of them were impacted compared to 85% of the females. It seems that the women were more open than the men to a wider range of impact by attendance at DSL and perhaps more open to transformational leadership.

4.6. Respondents Evaluation of DSL.

Table 4.6.1. Respondents Evaluation of DSL.

Scoring <3 disagree; 3 neutral; >3 agree
Mean Scores

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?	Males	Females	All
DSL had the right objectives	3.89	4.00	3.92
DSL met its objectives	3.52	3.66	3.55
DSL was helpful in creating an agenda for my further development	3.51	3.54	3.52
I have revisited the 360-degree evaluation to consider my development needs	2.44	2.54	2.47
I found the Course Content to be helpful	3.68	3.58	3.65
I found the leadership ability of the others to be a source of learning for me	3.64	3.69	3.65
I found the Action Learning set to be of value to my learning	3.76	3.77	3.76
I have continued to meet the action learning set	2.24	2.17	2.22
DSL was a good effort	3.79	3.73	3.77
DSL was more a Diocesan programme than helpful to me	2.70	2.48	2.65
DSL tended to focus my attention to leadership within the church	3.68	3.52	3.64
DSL is too limited a view of the leadership of the ordained	2.75	2.69	2.74
I need leadership development for wider community roles	2.97	3.23	3.04
DSL needs a strategic focus on the whole Diocese	3.21	3.41	3.26
The focus on leadership might undermine the authority of the parish priest	2.18	1.89	2.10
DSL needs a radical rethink to include lay people in joint development	2.94	3.24	3.02

There were no statistically significant differences in the mean scores for males and females. The catholic group were less convinced that DSL had the right objectives compared to the central or evangelical group (3.5;4.0;3.9: sig. 0.04). The scores for the perception that authority might be undermined were (2.54;2.05;1.95: sig .09) showing the catholic group to be slightly more concerned with their authority than the other groups, but note that this was still at a low level. There were minor differences in the perception about the need for leadership in wider community roles. Otherwise there were no differences in the mean responses of these groups.

4.7. Initiatives following upon attendance upon DSL.

In addition to the self reported effects the questionnaire invited respondents to give concrete examples of changes in regarding initiatives for themselves, parish, deanery, and diocese and ecumenical areas.

Table 4.7.1 Number of respondents reporting Initiatives arising out of DSL.

Locus of Initiative	Number of Initiatives Reported	Males N=74	Females N=26
Personal	56	39 53%	17 65%
Parish	56	38 52%	18 69%
Deanery	22	17 23%	5 19%
Diocese	11	9 12%	2 7%
Ecumenical	19	14 19%	5 19%

It is interesting that over half of the respondents report some initiatives (of varying complexity) directly arising out of attendance at DSL, with the greater locus being upon themselves and their parishes. Again the females reported a significantly higher level of initiatives at the personal or parish level than the males. However initiatives in deanery, diocese and parishes were reported by about 20% of the respondents. The males were slightly more likely to undertake Deanery and Diocesan initiatives than the females but both genders were equally likely to undertake Ecumenical initiatives.

4.8. Emotional Awareness indicators.

Table 4.8.1. Emotional Awareness indicators.

How often do the following statements describe your experience of yourself in your Ministry role? Scale 1-5 with 5 as high

Statement	Male	Female	All
I am aware of my emotions as they occur	4.11	4.27	4.15
I manage feelings so that they are appropriate	3.95	3.89	3.92
I motivate myself in the service of a goal	4.01	4.27	4.08
I have empathy and understanding for emotions in others	4.18	4.23	4.19
I am able to interrelate and work well with others	4.17	4.23	4.19

The responses show that the clergy here consider themselves to be high in Emotional Awareness.

4.9. Conclusion from Stage 1.

The respondents reflected a range of age, gender, parish tradition and location as well as being drawn from across the DSL courses. (S4 above)

Overall the respondents reported ;

- (1) significant positive evaluation of the intent and design of the DSL (Table 4.6.1.)
- (2) significant positive impact from attendance at the DSL
 - (a) on their role in their parish (Table 4.3.1)
 - (b) on their leadership behaviours (Table 4.4.1)
- (3) evidence of many new initiatives arising out of attendance at DSL (Table 4.7.1.)

There were very few significant differences in reported effects by gender or by church tradition, except that the women reported a greater impact on their transformational leadership than the men.

The conclusion from this stage 1 analysis is that the working hypothesis *that there would be no effect of attendance at DSL was clearly refuted*. Attendance at the DSL was reported to have had a positive and significant effects upon the subjects and their behaviours.

The next stages of the analysis was designed to examine if there were explanations for these reported changes in relation to the leader behaviour preferences reported in Table 4.5.1. This was done in Stage II by a procedure to simplify the data and then in Stage III using regression analysis.

5. Stage II Analysis.

The primary data of the responses to the questionnaire were subjected to two analyses; the first using mean values and correlations to explore how these variables were scored in relation to each other across the sample. From the correlation tables it was seen that there were many statistically significant correlations among the elements in each group of responses. This indicated that some simplification might be possible. Hence a data reduction or simplification technique, Factor analysis, was applied in order to generate fewer constructs for the next stage in the analysis.⁵ The second stage analysis, similar to that in Stage I was conducted upon the new variables constructed following from the factor analysis.

Table 5.1. The New Constructs.

Issue	Variables	Number of Elements	Scale	Mean Values		
				All	Male	Female
Effect of DSL on Role	Lead	7	7-35	25.61	25.36	26.31
	Lead Church	2	2-10	6.90	6.78	7.27
	Lead External	2	2-10	6.35	6.27	6.53
	LeadVisBuild	1	1-5	3.71	3.66	3.85
	Lead Satisfaction	2	2-10	6.30	6.22	6.50
Changes arising from DSL	Seek Change	3	3-15	10.19	10.10	10.44
	Risk/Conflict	2	2-10	7.03	6.97	7.19
	Seek FleadDev	1	1-5	3.56	3.51	3.69
	StressMgt	1	1-5	3.30	3.37	3.12
Leadership Behaviour	TransformLead	5	5-25	23.21	23.24	23.12
	TransactLead	4	4-20	14.07	14.11	13.92
	IdeasLead	2	2-10	7.90	7.95	7.81
	OtherRelLead	2	2-10	7.94	7.77	8.35
Views of DSL	DSL Positive	5	5-25	18.37	18.31	18.53
	DSL Negative	5	5-25	14.21	14.09	14.54
	DSL Other	2	2-10	7.41	7.40	7.42
	DSL Misc	3	3-15	8.89	8.91	8.83
EQ	EPref	4	4-20	16.48	16.44	16.62
	Goal Motivation	1	1-5	4.08	4.01	4.27

An analysis of variance to test for the difference in means between the groups showed that there were no statistical differences between the mean scores on the variables for males and females except for the observed difference on the value of the variable Other RelLead, due to the difference in the male and female scores (3.77;4.34: sig .001) for preference for Leading by Example.

The Correlations for the new variables suggest that there may be some substantive relationship between the factors. These are examined in the Stage III analysis below.

6. Stage III Analysis.

⁵ The detail of this may be obtained from the authors.

The third stage was designed to discover whether there was any explanatory power in the model underlying the design of this part of the study.

6.1. All data.

Here we seek to examine the proposition that Reported Leader Behaviour preferences explains the response to the DSL. This was done using linear regression analysis that produced the following equation;

$$\text{Lead} = 16.17 + 0.2\text{TFL} - 0.25\text{TAL} + 0.75\text{DSLPos} - .24\text{EPref} - .37\text{GoalMot}.$$

Adjusted RSq = .476

Where,

Lead is the intensity of Leadership
TFL is Transformational Leadership
TAL is Transactional Leadership
DSLPos is the Positive evaluation of DLS
EPref is the Emotional Awareness
GoalMot is Goal Motivation

This was a best-fit equation (based upon high Adjusted R Squared), but the statistical significance of the coefficients of the EPref and Goal Motivation constructs was low.

However this regression equation suggests that the reported outcome of the DSL in terms of increasing intensity of Leadership was positively influenced by a transformational leadership orientation, negatively influenced by a transactional leadership orientation, strongly positively influenced by a reported Positive approval of the DSL and weakly and negatively influenced by Emotional preference and goal motivation.

To examine the effect of removing the last two variables the following regression equation was produced. Here the Transformational Leadership construct was not statistically significant, probably due to its positive correlation with the DSLPos construct. One explanation for this might be that the inner design of the DSL was based upon a transformational understanding of leadership. The value of the Adjusted RSq term were much the same but the second equation was simpler.

$$\text{Lead} = 15.8 + .741\text{DSLPos} - .26\text{TAL} + .18\text{TFL} \quad \text{ARSq}=.478$$

This model then provides a prediction of the intensity of Leadership changes expected to arise from attendance at DSL. It suggests that persons with a strong Transactional Style will not change as much as those with a lower score on this variable.. And note that the stronger the Transformational Style then the higher the likelihood of the respondent having a positive evaluation of DSL. The value of the ARSq statistic is high for this kind of research and suggests that these relationships are quite strong.

6.2 Effects of Gender;

The regression equations for each group were;

$$\text{ALL} \quad \text{Lead} = 13.9 + .579\text{DSLPos} + .472\text{DSLMisc} - .232\text{TAL} \quad \text{ARSq}=.521$$

$$\text{Males} \quad \text{Lead} = 13.9 + .56\text{DSLPos} + .507\text{DSLMisc} - .236\text{TAL} \quad \text{ARSq}=.475$$

$$\text{Females} \quad \text{Lead} = 13.6 + .64\text{DSLPos} + .362\text{DSLMisc} - .187\text{TAL} \quad \text{ARSq}=.523$$

Note; these equations are slightly different from the first equation above because of changes designed to test if the data would yield an equation with higher values of adjusted R squared. The TFL variable drops out and is replaced by DSLMisc which is a second evaluation variable. Note that the DSLPos is strongly positively correlated with TFL.

There is little difference between the equations for the males and the females. In each case the dominant factor is the positive view of DSL that was reported by the respondent. Transactional leadership styles have a negative impact upon the Lead variable.

6.3. Effects of Parish Tradition.

The regression equations for each group were;

$$\text{Evangelicals} \quad \text{Lead} = 15.4 + 0.60\text{DSLPos} - .07\text{TAL} \quad \text{ARSq} = .438$$

$$\text{Central} \quad \text{Lead} = 14.1 + 0.86\text{DSLPos} - .29\text{TAL} \quad \text{ARSq} = .575$$

$$\text{EandC.} \quad \text{Lead} = 14.5 + .66\text{DSLPos} - .29\text{TAL} + .35 \text{DSL} \text{Misc} \quad \text{ARSq} = .62$$

Catholics. Not enough data points to conduct a regression analysis with statistically significant findings.

From the similarity of these equations it may be observed that there was very little effect of Church tradition on these results.

As there were no observable effects of either gender or parish tradition on these results it is suggested that this probably indicates that the response to the DSL was more based upon personal attributes or characteristics than upon gender or church tradition.

6.4 Change.

The orientation to change was captured in the new variable Seeking Change that was considered to be an outcome of DSL but also a reflection of a person's orientation. Hence using it as a surrogate for Change Orientation in analysing the Lead intensity variable produced the following

$$\text{Lead} = 9.95 + 0.636\text{SeekCh} + 0.498\text{DSLPos} \quad \text{ARSq} = .485$$

Almost identical regression equations were found for males and females. Hence we can infer that there is a strong connection between the person's degree of change orientation and the Lead variable. Note too that there is a positive and statistically significant relationship between Seeking change and transformational leadership but no relationship between Seeking Change and transactional leadership. This suggests that the context within which persons attended DSL was one that had or was encouraging a change orientation (See Sharing Life themes). Hence those persons attending DSL who were already "primed" to use it as a vehicle for change could be expected to report the greatest effect of attendance in an elegant and virtuous spiral.

6.5. Summary of results from the Questionnaires.

6.5.1. Overall the respondents reported ;
significant positive evaluation of the intent and design of the DSL
significant positive impact from attendance at the DSL
(c) on their role in their parish and
(d) on their leadership behaviours
evidence of many new initiatives arising out of attendance at DSL.

6.5.2. The study was designed to examine explanations of the response to DSL;

From the regression analysis on the new constructs arising from the factor analysis it was found that the degree of intensity of the reported changes in Leadership following upon DSL was best explained by the strength of the desire for seeking change and the strength of the positive evaluation of the DSL. In turn the strength of the desire to seek change was positively correlated with the strength of the self-reported degree of transformational leadership. The degree of intensity of reported changes in leadership were decreased as the strength of the self reported transactional leadership increased.

It may be observed then that the DSL with its orientation to change met with clergy who were either change oriented or experiencing the need to change and to lead change in the churches of the diocese.

6.5.3. These results were not substantially affected by either gender or by membership of a church tradition, except that the women reported a greater impact on their transformational leadership than the men. There was some evidence that the DSL gave women “permission” to be institutional and up front about their leadership.

C. The Study-Interviews.

C1.Senior Staff.

The major initiative of Oxford Diocese, “Sharing Life,” had led to the perceived need to develop the leadership capability of the clergy (and initially some of the lay people). It was intended to signal a required “culture change” in a changed and changing world, with clergy suffering loss of status, being more pressured in their work and being in a missionary context. There was a clear understanding of the high variety of parishes across the diocese and hence the varied context and traditions within which ministry and leadership was exercised.

The servant leadership theme resonated with the view of parish ministers as the servants of the people of God.

The DSL was seen as a broad brush for everybody, as a strong signal of the significance of the DSL given by the diocesan’s invitation to all clergy. It was considered by the SS that the DSL had had a positive impact on morale (the clergy felt cared for in their work), the diocese was having a go at development and learning and that the Action learning sets had helped to begin to cope with the isolation and sense of loneliness that clergy experience⁶. The clergy were heard and listened to. Action Learning sets enabled clergy to talk about how it really is, with no direct competition, so a place to be honest. The senior staff reported that since the DSL there had been more contact, initiated by clergy, with Bishops. The DSL was part of a wish to give a high level of permission to change.

The SS thought that it was too early to say what the overall effect of DSL was or might be. The SS, from their contact with clergy through review days, were not aware of any particular effects of DSL upon clergy leadership. They noted that the 360degree evaluation had been a bit scary for everybody, but they found it useful themselves. Some *few clergy* had given them some critiques of the design of DSL, in respect of content being familiar and of Action learning Sets being unhelpful.

Broad background problems were identified as;

*The church and its ministers do not having automatic right of access to public life and working at “the puzzle about where the church fits in the wider world”.

*The service and consumer culture leads people to try out churches to find and get what they want.

*The general calibre of people in ministry (though there is always hot competition for jobs in Oxford diocese); what we have and what we need are somewhat apart.

*The basic clergy training and the role of training incumbents needs review.

*The changing patterns of ministry; stipendiary, “NSM”, and equality of treatment;

*The new Clergy Discipline measure.

*The impact of the proposed new measure regarding Common Tenure, including appraisal and capability procedures. The new requirements for Ministry Review will mean substantial additional work.; Clergy do not always have an accurate enough assessment of themselves and peer evaluation does not work as well as is needed.

*The Cost of Ministry and its impact upon parish share.

*Capturing learning, experience and working with it in different places

*The different experience of the women, still having difficulties in feeling accepted.

⁶ Note that there are networks among some clergy.

The group of SS had begun a long-term change process; they were not so much driven by agreed strategic imperatives⁷. They were operating in a world of complexity and ambiguity and while the policy direction had been set and agreed with synod the strategic leadership in evidence had an emergent character, with engagement and movement along a lot of fronts. It was not clear how the “intelligence” gathering⁸ took place except that the SS are continually exposed and engaged both “inside” and “outside” the diocese. This feeling their way through will have to take on the appointment of a new diocesan. But the future may hold a requirement for reconsidering most aspects of the diocese and it’s working.

The SS were also invited to complete the questionnaire. Some aspects of their responses are given below.

The average self reported score by the SS for Transformational Leadership was 4.23 and this was higher than the scores for Transactional Leadership,3.25. Given that there is a persistent relationship between Transformational leadership and organisational performance these scores are encouraging. Interestingly the SS Transformational leadership score was higher than that of the clergy sample (4.23 to 3.91) and their Transactional Leadership score was lower than that of the clergy sample (3.25 to 3.52). These figures suggest that senior church leaders may have been chosen because of their Transformational leadership behaviours.

The scores on the five behaviours of successful and effective leaders were self-scored by the SS as follows;

Behaviours (Mean Scores)	Pre DSL	Post DSL	Difference
Making productive contributions through talent, knowledge, skills, and good work habits	3.50	3.75	.25
Contributing individual capabilities to the achievement of group objectives and work effectively with others	4.0	4.0	0
Organising people and resources toward the effective and efficient pursuit of predetermined objectives	3.0	3.25	0.25
Catalysing commitment to and vigorously pursuing a clear and compelling vision stimulating higher performance standards	3.50	3.50	0
Building enduring high performance through a blend of personal humility and professional will	3.70	4.0	0.30

The effect of DSL on these would be expected to be small, but it was interesting to see that the nuances were upon productive contributions, organising for effectiveness and building enduring high performance. The focus of these behaviours is on organisational performance and it would be fair to observe that the church as a whole is more concerned with persons than organisational performance. This may become an issue when the financial survival of a local church may depend upon performance achievements in membership, lived gifts in Christian lives and giving.

The SS has changed because of this initiative; the SS seeks to work transparently and to agreed policies. Sharing life, in respect of parishes, was a Diocesan Synod policy, the response is expected to be varied in the many different parishes some of which are taking it forward and some may only go along with it in the abstract. The common priesthood of all clergy was expressed by one member of the senior staff who said that “we are also continuing to discover what it means to be a priest in this time and place”.

⁷ The schools of strategy have moved from Strategy as decide and implement, via strategic positioning to emergence and on into strategy becoming less central and policy re-emerging as central value centred task in institutions in a world characterised by complexity, uncertainty and ambiguity

⁸ It was not clear whether the information system of the diocese was complete enough or whether it was available for analysis.

Comment.

Knowledge ,Organisational and leader development are increasingly seen as being strongly affected by the nature of the social capital that an organisation has. This diocesan initiative was building both human capital (better leaders who can go on learning) and social capital (better linkages between clergy, other clergy and diocesan staff). The loneliness and isolation of clergy and their expressed appreciation of being together suggest that building social capital might be an important outcome of the Sharing life initiative, especially as there is a strong argument that high social capital engenders high knowledge capital.

The Sharing Life programme could be seen as a move towards building institutional capital.

C2. Clergy Interviewees.

(i) They studied at

Cranmer; Cuddesdon 2; Mirfield; Oak Hill; Queens; Ridley 2; St John’s; St Stephen’s; Training Course 4; Westcott 4;Wycliffe.

Only Trinity was not represented.

(ii) They Served curacies at

Henley, Beaconsfield, Gerrard’s Cross, Amersham, Slough; Rural Worcestershire, Selly Park, Cockfosters, Kidbury, Ross on Wye, Portsmouth, Hull, Manchester, Darlington, Leighton Buzzard and Zimbabwe, Walthamstowe, Wheatley, Barnet.

This shows a southern bias.

(iii) Length of time in Incumbency

Length of Time	Number of Incumbencies
1-4 7	1 13
5-9 3	2 1
10-14 3	3 4
15-19 2	4 1
20+ 4	

Average length of time in incumbency is at least 6 years (a little smaller than the Q data figure.).

(iv) Ministerial Tradition

Category	Descriptors used
Catholic	Modern Catholic; Cowley Fathers, Anglo Catholic
Sacramental	Sacramental
Broad	Broad, Broad, Broad, Broad, Broad
Evangelical	Evangelical, Open Evangelical, Evangelical, Subversive Evangelical, Evangelical, Conservative Evangelical,
Ecumenical	Ecumenical
Rural	Rural
Liberal	Central Liberal
Other	Anglo catholic evangelical charismatic

This represents a wide spread of ministerial tradition.

(v) The Exemplars of Ministerial leadership were

No one person	None 5
Authority figures	Current Rector 2; Previous Rector 8; Training Incumbent 4; Bishops 4;
Renowned Figures	Historic figures 4; Current figure 6; Rowan Williams 2
Other Organisations	Other orgs 5;
Referents	College 1; Diocese 1
Family and Friends	Friends 2; Father 2

The influence of the hands on figures (incumbents, training incumbents, Bishops) is much more significant than that of the educational people.

(vi) The characteristics/ behaviours that were admired in them?

Behaviour traits	Professing Traits	Functional Traits	Achievement
Honesty, integrity*, sensitive, Accepting others****, take others seriously**, affirm, listening*, believe in, along side, committed to engage, enabling, respect, gifts, support, help, valuing others Cerebral, exciting; Creativity, ideas; Clarity of vision, visionary Inspiring Vulnerable, courage, Pastoral Sticking it out, Wisdom, Humour, Self aware of limits, skills, Grounded, Boldness, Decisive, Present, dynamism	Live by what say Rooted to area Person for people of God Prayer* and personal relationship with God Authority, Servant support, Sacrificial, Faith, To serve, Know church, God, Holy, spiritual, Incarnational theology, Discernment, Listens to what God is saying Understated Godliness.	Giving it a go*, empowering*, enabling*, reasoning, structuring, consensual leadership, engaged with community, Clear direction*, supervision, strong up front, collaborative, provide tools for others, work as a team, ability to network, plan ahead, organisational skills, follow through	Grown each Church Successful Team
16 related to others 36	18	18	2

Of the 74 characteristics that were commended there were 36 around behaviour traits of which 16 (44%) were about relationships with others. Some 18 were about being professing Christians, 18 were about functional working and only two were about achievement or success. In this these respondents have a very different perception than many outside churches, not so much of traits but of the exemplars of achievement. Hence leadership is much more about being (a Christian minister, by profession and function) rather than institution building. It may reflect a non-evaluative culture (on the surface) and a non-judgemental culture as well, but it more likely reflects the low valency to institutional growth and success. For these people leadership is mostly about relationship and symbols of profession.

(vii) Experience of the DSL course?

View	No	Comments
Very Positive	3	- Very positive - Very positive - I found it very positive
Positive	9	- Generally positive - I think there were bits that were helpful - It was helpful - The programme was good - To be honest, part of it was it was great to get away for two to three days. Some of it I found really affirming - Generally really good for a mixture of reasons - I enjoyed it - Thoroughly enjoyed it - There was so much refreshing about it that should have been done years ago
Indifferent	4	- I expect I could have picked it up on a couple of CME days - I didn't actually complete the course, and maybe that is interesting in itself - It lacked confidence - I suppose I felt it was a bit too managementy. It could have been lifted from hospital administrator or anything. I didn't feel it was specific enough
Negative	3	- Not good. It was intellectually weak - A fascinating mismatch - There was lots and lots about leadership, very little about servant hood

These interviewees were similar to the questionnaire sample. 12/19 (almost 2/3rds) were positive, 20% were somewhat indifferent and about 1/6th were negative. The interview sample was thus broadly positive about the DSL, with some negativity. To some extent a programme for everybody would not meet the actual state of development in leadership of some of the clergy.

(viii) Views of the DSL Course Content?

Two thirds of the interviewees were positive about their attendance at DSL; one sixth were neutral and one sixth were negative. These observations broadly concur with the questionnaire findings. The negatives came from one who was well informed anyway, one who thought priesthood was not properly considered (echoed in one of the neutral comments) and one who thought it was about “sharing ignorance”, presumably a reference to the action learning sets. The neutral interviewees were not negative in their acceptance of the DSL. The positive responses are self-explanatory, while acknowledging that the content could not be tailored to each individual need.

There were some strong comment from women about the idea of servant leadership being gendered; and from those who thought that the topic had not been well developed in the DSL programme.

Evaluation	Content	Servant leadership
Negative 3 persons	<p><i>*I felt it was really weak on any examples of good leadership; in fact it was all based on people sharing ignorance;</i></p> <p><i>*please don't stand there and lecture me because there is a good chance I know just as much about it as you do.</i></p> <p><i>*But you are a priest, and some of those things can block what I feel I was ordained to do, which is to concentrate on the spiritual side; reconciliation, prayer, worship, encouraging people – that is a full time job in itself. I don't think the leadership course addressed those kind of issues,</i></p>	<p><i>*It was simply using the Bible as a set of examples about leadership, without giving us any sort of theology of leadership. Does scripture or church tradition give us different models of leadership? There was nothing like that.</i></p> <p><i>*women know all about being servants, and we didn't need another guilt trip about that. I could have done with a lot more leadership and less servant.</i></p> <p><i>*What they suggested about reading was good, but it was all on the leadership, but what I wanted to know was about this very difficult thing of servant leadership. There was nothing really about servant leadership</i></p> <p><i>*I am not happy with the concept of servant leadership. I think it is gendered, I think it is a male concept</i></p>
Neutral 3 persons	<p><i>*I find DSL 2 far far better</i></p> <p><i>*it is up to you what you take from it</i></p> <p><i>*wouldn't it be nice if we had lay rectors, so we didn't have to sit here with drawers full of paper, and we could get on with what we are actually trained to do, and I thought this is a fascinating mismatch, because being a manager means doing the admin and all the clergy were saying we don't actually want to do it. We want to teach and preach the faith, we want to administer the sacraments, we want to be a presence in the parish</i></p>	<p><i>*Working out of collaboration rather than competition, instinctively working relationally, and so the whole agenda might be very different. I felt there was some thought and some work that needed to be done about gender issues in leadership which need to be addressed about the course, and how does it fit with Jesus calling us friends?</i></p>
Positive 12 persons	<p><i>*I felt it was more on the management side of it rather than the priestly. But as incumbents you have to be both. But some people are managers rather than priests, or visa versa, and I am judging around in the middle.</i></p> <p><i>*I think residential is good, but I know I am speaking as a single person</i></p> <p><i>*The residential were quite good. I can't really remember much of the detail any more</i></p> <p><i>*I think most of what was given was done in a way that I could take in;</i></p> <p><i>*We all needed to do it because it was effecting a change in what was required of our leadership style.</i></p> <p><i>*There are some quite specific links between what I learned and my ministry – some of the tools I learnt and have since used.</i></p> <p><i>*The teaching input, some stuff was quite familiar from my reading, but there was new input. It would be hard to say, 'I learnt that and applied it there', it wasn't that concrete, its just gradually shaping</i></p> <p><i>*I think there were things in the course that were helpful</i></p> <p><i>*There was a lot in the content that was useful</i></p>	

	<p><i>*Lots of the leadership stuff was great stuff</i></p> <p><i>*There were issues; there were things I needed to deal with. I think there were bits that were helpful</i></p> <p><i>*I appreciated the input sessions. I find it useful to have tools to then be able to use them as a filter, or a tool to apply, say, in this situation, what does this model say?</i></p>	
--	---	--

(ix) Views of the Action Learning set?

View	Comments
<p>Negative</p> <p>3 persons</p>	<p><i>*I didn't find the action learning sets much use- we could have got away with a lot of things, and they went unchallenged-</i></p> <p><i>*It was impacted by a chap in my action learning set who was very negative</i></p> <p><i>*I must admit, I am in the line, which is a different generation, where chalk and talk is still the way I learn. I can't help this, its how I learnt at school, so buzz groups and role-play and all these kinds of things, I find totally alien. So the action learning groups, I thought, I don't want this! The only good thing was I came home, kissed my churchwardens and said thank you</i></p>
<p>Neutral</p> <p>2 persons</p>	<p><i>*The action learning sets were quite useful to talk things through, but I think the thing is, if you have an issue at the time, they are probably brilliant</i></p> <p><i>*The action learning set thing is not right for everyone, and for myself, if you are in a vulnerable place, I am not sure how easy it is to be in a group, and just share things very deep and personal.</i></p>
<p>Positive</p> <p>15 persons</p>	<p><i>*The most useful thing was the action learning set. But you thought, well, actually, I could organise that with people around here-In the action learning set, we each picked one or two difficult scenarios that we were dealing with, and at the time, I was dealing with a tricky issue within my staff team, and that was useful, and it helped me to think that through, and to make some decisions about what to do about it, so yes, that was helpful</i></p> <p><i>*It was a chance to meet people I just wouldn't meet, and hearing their experience of leadership, which was just horrific! hearing from different churches, different backgrounds, was a real eye opener</i></p> <p><i>*The action learning set was good in that it was good to be with people from a wide experience</i></p> <p><i>*But also, having something to talk about meant you didn't have to focus on differences in theology, or sticking points. So from that point of view it was helpful and good. In terms of relating, the ALS were interesting</i></p> <p><i>*I thought the Action Learning Sets were an excellent way of reflecting, peer reflection.</i></p> <p><i>*I enjoyed the action learning sets; the mini accountability for that short space of time was good gradually you are focusing down on the things that are helpful to you as a group</i></p> <p><i>*I think the learning sets were very helpful</i></p> <p><i>*I suppose in the end the ALS were the most valuable thing. That is the area I have pursued. I have always had supervision, but I am now part of a group that meets about once a month, where the facilitator is an expert in organisational dynamics, and so we bring some situation and she runs it very professionally and its tough, but really worth doing.</i></p> <p><i>*Action learning sets very good</i></p> <p><i>*The whole idea of it sounded horrendous to me – an action learning set, and all that group stuff really isn't me, but the one thing that grew out of it for me at that time, the action learning set was very good.</i></p> <p><i>*I felt the action learning sets were, to me, the most valuable thing</i></p> <p><i>*The Action Learning Sets were good, it caused me to think, what am I doing</i></p> <p><i>*and the group work we did, I thought they were really wonderful</i></p> <p><i>*the most helpful aspect was working in groups, and especially our small group was very well liaised, although there were very very different types of churchmanship, it was conducted in a spirit of openness and understanding, there were no tensions</i></p> <p><i>*The action learning sets were good, its good to have that time to put a particular issue on the table and really work it through, and that was helpful, particularly out of context so you have not got people there who have particular axes to grind. But they can listen to what you're saying and help you with the decisions you have to make.</i></p>

Overall the interviewees valued the action learning sets. The three negative comments come from lack of “bite” from others, the negativity of another person and the “alien” nature of the action learning style and processes. The two neutral comments valued the sets as places for conversation but not development, learning or taking problems on. The fifteen positives were about being able to get in among the issues in a non-judgemental and supportive place.

(x) View of being supported by Diocese

View of Support	Comments
Positive	<p><i>*I had not been in the diocese long, and I was trying to find a way into it, so the diocese was offering it, and I like training, so I did it.</i></p> <p><i>*I think it was brilliant from a diocese point of view</i></p> <p><i>*I would say on the whole, Oxford is a supportive diocese</i></p> <p><i>*It put me in contact with the rest of the Diocese</i></p> <p><i>*I think knowing that the diocese recognises that this is a leadership role, and that that carries its own issues, that's really important</i></p> <p><i>*You can tell the parish, I have to go, I've had a letter from the bishop! I have always had a strong sense of being connected to the diocese</i></p> <p><i>*I am very glad that the diocese is trying to address this</i></p> <p><i>*I think the commitment required by it and the seriousness with which it was supported by the dioceses, particularly the bishops, enabled you to make it a priority in a very busy parish life.</i></p> <p><i>*I was pleased to see it offered as a change in the way the diocese was resourcing leadership</i></p>
Other	A number (7) did not comment here; some noted they were already linked in to the Diocese

Overall the DSL initiative from the Bishops was very much appreciated as a signal that the diocese was interested in the needs of clergy.

(xi) Summary of Church Roles held by interviewees.

Roles	Number
Chapter frequent	5
Rarely	3
Never	2
Deanery Synod	6
Diocesan Synod	3
steering committee/advisor	9
Education	13
Special interest	11
School Governor	3
Ecumenical	3
Area Dean	3
Chaplain	2
Training incumbent	1
Mention community	1

It is likely that these responses undercount the roles that clergy have in the wider church. Clearly their scope for exercising leadership is wider than that of the parish. There were 48 roles reported from these 19 people, roughly 2 ½ each, but this probably an underestimate.

(xii) Clergy roles in the wider community

The roles were classified as follows;

- *Pastoral visits and contacts with non-church organisations
- *Chaplaincy to organisations
- *School Governorships; and associated school committees
- *Working roles in social support and community organisations;
e.g. Youth, old folk's homes, day centres
- *Charities' committees
- *Parish Council
- *Economic development organisations

There were approximately 65 roles reported (3 ½ each) which suggests that clergy do exercise substantial leadership in the wider community.

Comment; these clergy interviews gave an “in situ” perspective of the experience of the clergy of the DSL.

Approximately 60% were positive, accepting and glad to have been engaged.

25% were neutral-perhaps because they had already put themselves into leadership development; or considered it all a good idea but had not “taken to it”.

15% were negative; perhaps a perception of priesthood as being and symbolising much more than a view of ministerial or institutional leadership. This may be subsumed in a concept of priestly authority. It is also possible that there was a defensive character to some negatives by identifying DSL as having to do with management/administration and then pushing it away..

The interviews also gave a lot of useful insight from experienced clergy demonstrating that clergy can critically and constructively engage with the challenges presented by DSL. There was an implication that any further development would need to be more tailored to the capability and experience of the individuals and their development needs. That could only be done with good data from an appraisal. It should also be recognised that some clergy are just unavailable for the development of institutional leadership.

D. Discussion

DSL was a structured institution wide course to which all clergy were “invited”. It stood in contrast to the more common voluntary nature of continuing ministerial education. It clearly met a need in an institution undergoing rapid change. The largely positive response to the Action Learning Sets indicates that the mixed learning design was helping members to make the links between structured interventions and processes of natural learning about leadership, although we have no indications of the range of competence in experiential learning of the subjects of this study. There was a strong outcome in the building of social capital among the clergy, both it seems necessary and welcome to most of them.

While this study was not designed to examine theological issues surrounding leadership (to the evident disappointment of a small number of respondents) the question of Servant was raised by women as being a “male” idea. Several women reported that the human experience of women was of being in a servant or service role and that a more inclusive name might be found, possibly along the theme of Friendship.

A number of considerations arose from this study.

7.1. The policy of all clergy inclusion in the programme was received as a very strong signal that the diocesan hierarchy valued the contribution of the clergy as leaders and were prepared to work with the complexity of Distributed Leadership. . It also provided cross-diocese opportunities (in a manner quite different from chapters) for clergy to meet and learn with and from each other.⁹ It served to begin to break down an experience of professional isolation, a sense that is marked by the geographical scale of the diocese. This does raise the question of whether the current configuration of “distributed leadership”, (a direct aspect of diocesan structures), is adequate for the effective accomplishment of the emerging work.

The work of clergy is complex and very demanding. The Grubb Institute distinguished between Person, Role and System as a framework for analysis. A significant dimension of the “leadership” of clergy does inhere in their ordination (perhaps we might see this as the person in role aspect). There is

⁹ Of course para church organisations, diocesan Synods and its boards and councils also provide points of contact within and outside the Diocese.

a strong historical understanding of the collegial and communal relationship of Bishops and priests A further “leadership” inheres in the role¹⁰ and system to which they are instituted and inducted. In the local “system” of the parishes and benefices clergy are expected to take a leadership role in institutional development. This has always been the case, even when the minister was a “gift” to the parish and the stipend was externally funded. But in this new era where the financial resources for stipends comes largely from the parishioners, clergy are bearing an additional burden of demands and expectations. Given that these changes have largely occurred within the ministerial service of the older clergy it would not be surprising to see some variations in insight and understanding of what clergy leadership might be. It might also be the case that clergy who see their ministry as having a focus more nuanced upon the “role and institution” rather than the “person and role” might be more comfortable with the emerging requirements of the institution.

In the simpler language of organisations these difference may be seen as the “professional” leadership of the clergy as compared to the “organisational” leadership required for the parish/benefice. In these new circumstances “organisational” leadership in the parish/benefice is much more essential than it was previously. Whatever the degree of collaborative leadership that is developing it is still the case that organisational leadership (and of course management) is more in focus than hitherto. While clergy might have somewhat different “takes” on how they inhabit the professional role (with relatively little affect on the parish) the requirements of the organisation are less personal, but a sharp change in personal style has much greater significance for how an organisation can work and how individuals can work within it.

Respondents varied in the degree to which they saw a distinction between the office of a (clergy, minister, priest) and the roles of institutional or organisational leadership that were required in the parish or benefice role. There seems to be a systemic difficulty in either wanting to distinguish or distinguishing between leadership in relation to person, office, roles and institution. It may be the case that those respondents who had a ministry focus upon person/role fusion were less likely to report benefits from attendance at DSL.

7.2. Reported Leadership behaviours; The degree of respondents self reported degree of Transformational Leadership did not affect the outcome of the DSL, but the over all scores for Transformational Leadership were quite high and significantly higher than those for Transactional leadership.. However the degree of self reported Transactional Leadership behaviours had a negative effect on the reported outcomes.

It is likely though that the participants with higher degrees of reported Transformational behaviours were more positively oriented to change arising from the DSL, and that a strong underlying thread of the design of DSL was based upon conceptions of transformational leadership and change. Learning preferences, while not specifically measured, may have had some impact upon the perceived benefits of the DSL. From the interviews it was noted that those who were somewhat cognitive in their learning were unhappy with the Action Learning Sets.

7.3. Almost no respondent had revisited their 360 degree evaluation and many spoke of their “shock” at having to go through the 360 degree process. It seems that these clergy had never had structured (constructive?) feedback and review from those to whom and with whom they minister. The SS commented that many clergy do not know themselves well enough. From the interviews it was found that 5 clergy had found the 360Degree evaluation positive, 9 were indifferent to it and 5 were negative to it. Taking indifference as an indicator of unconcern it was interesting to find a group of professionals to be so uninterested (14/19) in feedback from their collaborators and clients. It speaks of a somewhat isolated position. In contrast there was much evidence of a wish to see leadership in the parish as a collaborative process. Certainly there was none of the frisson that occurred in one diocese where a programme of collaborative leadership development with ten parishes (with fifty more wanting to go take part in the programme) was cancelled because of fear; the fear being that the bishop would not be able to nominate a (non collaborating) clergy person to such a parish as the parish would expect the collaborative processes to continue. The bishop took the view that he would not be able to nominate a person who he felt was “right for that parish”.

¹⁰ Some speak of a “calling” and of an “appointment” as different aspects of priesthood and ministry.

7.4. The lack of a prior leadership programme or leadership training was regretted by many respondents. It appears from the data collected that there has been a tradition of voluntary clergy training which has meant that many clergy have not set out to develop the capabilities to enact wider and perhaps more demanding leadership roles in changing circumstances. DSL 2, with its sharper functional focus, appears to be meeting a significant need and is reported to be appreciated.

7.5. It was clear from interviews and questionnaire responses that the leadership role(s) in multi parish benefices are highly complex and are akin to having a set of part time appointments. A variety of approaches were reported in interviews, but no pattern was discerned. It seems that some further work is needed in this area. This is not a new problem, but it is a difficult experience of requiring different leadership in different parishes.

7.6 There was no evidence of leadership succession planning for parishes, benefices or Deaneries. Clergy gave the impression that they were able to enter a place without history. The stories of the individuals gleaned in the interviews provide evidence here. The time periods to find a new post, serve out a resignation period, together with the time period without clergy and the time for a new person to learn enough about the new place meant that as much as four years could pass without any effective future oriented clergy leadership. In a changing environment this may not be the most effective leadership succession process.

7.7 The previous point leads to a question of the significance of the lack of sustained organisational learning and development at the level of the parish or benefice or team. Hence there is a question as to the viability and effectiveness of the past patterns of clergy deployment in the rapidly changing context.

7.8. Among the respondents there were stories of “success” in the gospel-based mission of the church. How can such experience be made available to others? How does such a complex organisation learn (apart from relying upon the migration of clergy and others). The necessity for developing social capital is evident.

7.9 This study was not concerned with lay leadership either in parishes or in the system of synods, boards and councils. There is work to do here to understand how leadership development needs could be met, if the collaborative intent of Sharing Life is to be effectively realised.

7.10. This study was conducted in a period of the last three months in office of the diocesan and the ensuing absence of a diocesan. Some of the interviewees were concerned to have some assurance that these developments would not be turned back.

7.11. There is an ongoing debate in the management literature about the relation of leadership and management. Some (maybe most of the popular authors) insist that there is a clear difference between leaders (who give vision, decide, inspire and shape) and managers who implement the leaders vision.¹¹ But there is also an approach that gives much less emphasis to such a leader–manager split. This comes mainly from those who see leadership as a task of the community, enacted by various people as required. Such people also speak of the task of management being a similar communal process. Much evidence suggests that these opposites are ideal types. Certainly the problems of significant organisational change require some more complex understandings of the role of leading and managing.

From the interviews in the diocese there was some indication that one of the difficult tasks of church leaders at all levels was in managing change, (that is handling the problems of implementation). This problem would repay some more attention in the diocese.

7.12 One of the marks of a successful intervention is that it stimulates clergy to gain new understandings and to see that further education and training are necessary. The interview data may be interpreted (from the standpoint of my experience of more structured institutional development programmes) that some consideration might be given to what life long clergy development has become and what it might become.

¹¹ This was rehearsed by Henry Mintzberg from McGill in Canada and Frank Brown, the American Dean of INSEAD in France in the Financial Times of October 23rd 2006.

This study was limited by conscious choice to a design based upon brief questionnaires complemented by interviews with senior staff and participants of the DSL courses. Hence the analysis and discussion is shaped by the limitations of such data gathering. This is particularly important in such an old, established value centred organisation where nuances may mask very substantial differences of vision and outlook, where there has been a tradition, not so much of distributed leadership, but of a strong central leadership somewhat detached from (stronger?) localised leadership. With all these shortcomings it is hoped that this study will contribute to understanding and development.

E. Conclusions.

The diocesan strategy of “Shaping in future Together” and “Sharing Life” lead to all clergy being invited to attend the DSL. This report was designed to discover some of the effects of the DSL reported by clergy in a postal questionnaire and in face interviews.

The strategy of distributed leadership evidenced in the structures and in the behaviours of respondents was strongly supported by the evidence of the study. There was a clear and positive reported effect of attendance at the DSL upon the increasing intensity of reported leader behaviours. Most of the “following along” initiatives were at the level of person and parish, with fewer initiatives at deanery or diocese. There were a minority of clergy (about 15%) whose evaluation of the DSL was negative. Some of these were already experienced in leadership development and had more sophisticated needs while others objected to the idea.

This intensity of leader behaviour was found to be a positive function of a Positive Evaluation of DSL, (with its correlate of Transformational leadership Style) and a negative function of Transactional leadership Style. There was evidence from the correlations of a strong influence of a Change orientation (to self, to church). The SS were higher in Transformational leadership and lower in Transactional Leadership than the questionnaire sample of clergy.

There were only minor difference in the response based upon gender or church tradition. The DSL had a higher impact upon the transformational leadership of the women than for the men. However a few of the women questioned the use of the term “servant” as only too redolent of the more traditional roles of women as providers of service to men.

Among the implications of the study is the need to build “social capital” among clergy in order to enable more effective development of their ministry.

There will be a further report based upon the interviews. Mrs Stacey will also be writing a dissertation based upon some of the study material.