

# **Leadership Style of UMC Racial-Ethnic Lead Pastors Who Are Serving Cross-Racial and Cross-Cultural Appointments**

**HiRho Park, D. Min., Ph.D.  
Director, Clergy Lifelong Learning  
General Board of Higher Education and Ministry  
September 24, 2014**

When the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry (GBHEM) conducted a survey on the leadership style of lead pastors<sup>1</sup> who were serving churches with a membership of 1,000 or more in The United Methodist Church in 2008, one of the findings that we noticed was that there were very few racial-ethnic pastors in this category.<sup>2</sup>

The questions were, “How many racial-ethnic<sup>3</sup> cross-racial and cross-cultural pastors are serving large white-majority congregations? What kind of leadership challenges do they experience compared to white lead pastors? What kind of support are they getting from the denomination?”

The Clergy Lifelong Learning Office at GBHEM (HiRho Park, Director) discovered that there were only 20 racial-ethnic pastors out of 1,070 lead pastors who were serving large white-

---

<sup>1</sup> The term “lead pastor” was defined by the General Council on Finance and Administration (GCFA) as clergy who are serving churches with 1,000 or more members within The United Methodist Church.

<sup>2</sup> Only one Asian-American and two African-American lead pastors responded among a sample of 200 lead pastors. Thirty percent (61) of female pastors and 70 percent (139) of male pastors responded to the survey among the 394 sample of lead pastors (94 female pastors and 300 randomly selected male pastors). There were 1,154 lead pastors in this category, according to the GCFA in the General Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the UMC in 2005.

<sup>3</sup> *Racial-ethnic* is a general term to describe people who are Asian, black or African-American, Hispanic/Latino, Native American, Pacific Islanders, and white. However, the term is often used to abbreviate ‘racial and ethnic minority,’ in which case it generally describes all these groups except white people. (The General Commission on Religion and Race of the United Methodist Church, Glossary of Terms, <http://gcorr.org/resources/glossary-terms-new-conversations> , accessed September, 2014.

majority congregations in 2011.<sup>4</sup> GBHEM hosted its first gathering of racial-ethnic cross-racial and cross-cultural lead pastors (RE CR-CC lead pastors) in the summer of 2012. The group decided to form a network of support and shared their own wisdom and advice with each other in relation to unique challenges they face in addition to being in a large church, such as racial and cultural issues.<sup>5</sup>

One of the suggestions that RE CR-CC lead pastors made to GBHEM was to conduct a survey about the demographics of these pastors and their leadership styles. So as a follow-up to the 2008 Lead Pastors Survey,<sup>6</sup> the Clergy Lifelong Learning Office in collaboration with the GBHEM's Research Office (Mark McCormack, director) sought to measure leadership patterns among RE CR-CC lead pastors this year, 2014.

We identified 75 racial-ethnic pastors serving in churches with a membership of 500 or more, based on the General Council on Finance and Administration (GCFA)'s data. We had to expand the sample to make a survey relevant for comparison since we identified only 20 RE CR-CC lead pastors. An online survey was distributed by email to RE CR-CC lead pastors, and we received a 51 percent response rate (38 complete responses) after initial and three follow-up contacts.

The survey was an adaptation of the earlier survey disseminated in 2008, with the addition of several items related to racial-ethnic and cultural issues, as well as challenges they face at their current appointments.

### **Why This Study Now?**

---

<sup>4</sup> That is, there were 984 male clergy (89.2 percent) and 116 female clergy (10.8 percent), according to the GCFA, in 2013.

<sup>5</sup> Unfortunately, there was only one female racial-ethnic lead pastor in this category in 2011.

<sup>6</sup> HiRho Park and Susan Willhauck, *Lead Pastors Survey*, GBHEM, 2011.

According to the 2010 census, Non-Hispanic White Americans are 63.7 percent of the U.S. population. The Census Bureau in December 2012 predicted that no single racial-ethnic group would constitute a majority of children under 18 by the end of this decade; in 30 years no single group will constitute a majority of the country and non-Hispanic Whites will fall below 50 percent. In Washington, D.C.; Hawaii; New Mexico; California; and Texas, racial-ethnic people are the majority at the present time. Racial-ethnic people account for 91.7 percent of the nation's population growth for the last 10 years. The Hispanic/Latino population is expected to more than double by 2060, from 53.3 million (16.3 percent) in 2010 to 128.8 million; African-Americans are expected to move to 61.8 million from 41.2 million (12.6 percent), and Asian/Pacific Islanders should rise to 34.4 million from 15.9 million (8.1 percent from 4.9 percent).<sup>7</sup>

But what about the demographics of the UMC? We have 46 episcopal areas in the U.S. and 20 episcopal areas in the Central Conferences. There are 125 annual conferences (51 in the U.S., 74 outside of the U.S.), 7 Central Conferences,<sup>8</sup> and 68 active bishops (of the 50 in the U.S., 15 are active women bishops, including 2 racial-ethnic women bishops, 16 racial-ethnic male bishops (10 African-Americans and 6 Asian-Americans)).<sup>9</sup> The membership of The United Methodist Church is 14.2 million as of 2012 (7.4 million in the U.S. and 6.8 million in the Central Conferences).<sup>10</sup> Compare that number to the 2009 number—7.7 million in the U.S. and 4.4 million in the Central Conferences—and we see the trend is that U.S. membership is declining; therefore, U.S. Jurisdictions have fewer and fewer delegates to the General Conference. One interesting phenomenon is that while the number of Central Conference

---

<sup>7</sup> United States Census 2010, <http://www.census.gov/2010census/>.

<sup>8</sup> Africa, Central and Southern Europe, Congo, Germany, Northern Europe and Eurasia, the Philippines, and West Africa.

<sup>9</sup> The information was provided by GCFA, 2014.

<sup>10</sup> The figures were 7.7 million in the U.S. and 4.4 million in the Central Conference in 2009.

delegates is increasing, the number of racial-ethnic delegates from the U.S. is declining further, from 25 percent in 2008 to 22 percent in 2012, while the U.S. is rapidly becoming more racially and culturally diverse.

However, the membership in the U.S. shows that the UMC is a majority white denomination: 91.2 percent white in 2009 and 90 percent in 2013. African-Americans make up 6 percent of the UMC, while Asians, Hispanic/Latino, and multi-racial groups each constitutes 1 percent of the entire membership in the U.S. According to GCFA 2013 data, there are a total of 44,926 clergy, with 11,302 (25 percent) being clergywomen and 5,108 (11.4 percent) racial-ethnic clergy in the U.S. By the way, the number of racial-ethnic clergy has increased from 9.2 percent in 2010 to 11.4 percent in 2013.<sup>11</sup>

The above data shows that the general demographics of people in the U.S. are becoming extremely diverse for the next three decades. However, the UMC membership does not reflect this trend, and hasn't for the last four years. Meanwhile, clergy leadership of the UMC is becoming more diverse. This is a pertinent indicator that the UMC needs to strategically plan to nurture clergy who are called to serve the church cross-racially and culturally with needed leadership skills.

One of the denomination's intentional strategies to develop clergy leadership that are able to minister to all people is the cross-racial and cross-cultural (CR-CC) appointment. The United Methodist Church promotes and holds in high esteem the opportunity of an inclusive church (§4. Article IV, *The Book of Discipline (BOD)*, 2012), with the formation of "open itinerancy" (§425.3, *BOD*, 2012). The CR-CC appointment is a unique ministry of the UMC that represents

---

<sup>11</sup> GCFA, 2013.

our theological and denominational commitment to an inclusive church by strategically appointing clergy who are equipped to serve such a ministry setting:

Cross-racial and cross-cultural appointments are made as a creative response to increasing racial and ethnic diversity in the church and in its leadership. Cross-racial and cross-cultural appointments are appointments of clergypersons to congregations in which the majority of their constituencies are different from the clergyperson's own racial/ethnic and cultural background. (§425.4, *BOD*, 2012)<sup>12</sup>

### **A Brief History of Cross-Racial and Cross-Cultural Appointments in the UMC**

In 1982 the task force on “open itinerancy” was formed in the Baltimore-Washington Annual Conference under the leadership of Bishop D. Frederick Wertz. They produced policies and a strategic plan to intentionally support cross-racial and cross-cultural appointments. This document was submitted to the Bishop’s Task Force on “Open Itinerancy” under the General Commission on Religion and Race (GCORR). In 1982, GCORR came up with a document entitled: “Eight Principles to Undergird Serious Reflection and Action on ‘Open Itinerancy.’” In 1983, the Council of Bishops established the Center for United Methodist Pastoral Exchange, which was located at the Gammon Theological Seminary in Atlanta, Ga. Bishop L. Scott Allen, who was the first African-American bishop in the Southeastern Jurisdiction, became the director. In 1985, The National Seminar on “Open Itinerancy” was held in Atlanta. In 1988, the National Seminar for Annual Conference Leadership on Racial Inclusiveness and Ministerial Deployment was held. The Center for United Methodist Pastoral Exchange sponsored three national seminars to raise the conscience of the church to actualize and concretize the concern for inclusiveness

---

<sup>12</sup> This paragraph was adopted in 2008 during the General Conference. The paragraph 425.4 also requires annual conferences to prepare and train clergy and congregations for cross-racial and cross-cultural appointments.

and “open itinerancy.” Unfortunately, the Center closed in 1988 as Bishop Allen left the office. After 1988, there was not much discussion about “open itinerancy” in the denomination until 1997 when GBHEM started to work with Korean-American UM clergy who had been serving cross-racial and cross-cultural appointments. As a result, the Association of Korean American Clergy Serving Cross-Racial Appointments was established in 1997, sponsored by GBHEM. This was the first official network of pastors who are serving cross-racial and cross-cultural appointments supported by a denomination. Now there are more than 300 Korean-American UM clergy who are serving cross-racial and cross-cultural appointments in the UMC.

GBHEM published the first book about cross-racial and cross-cultural appointments in 1999, *Witness from the Middle: Korean-American Pastors in Non-Korean Local Churches in The United Methodist Church*. GBHEM also published *Meeting God at the Boundaries* in 2003 and *Meeting God at the Boundaries: A Manual for Church Leaders* in 2006. In 2008, GBHEM submitted legislation about the definition and the need of education for clergy and congregations for cross-racial and cross-cultural appointments, and the General Conference adopted the legislation (§425.4, BOD). The Association of Korean American Clergy Serving Cross-Racial Appointments published *The Manual of Cross-Racial & Cross-Cultural Ministries for Korean-American Pastors in the United Methodist Church* in 2009, sponsored by GBHEM. GBHEM also came up with a PowerPoint resource that district superintendents can use when they introduce a cross-racial and cross-cultural appointment to local congregations in the same year. In 2011, GBHEM, in collaboration with GCORR, sponsored a training event, *Facing the Future: Cross-Racial and Cross-Cultural Appointments in a Global Church*. GBHEM has been supporting RE CR-CC lead pastors by providing an annual meeting and mentoring since 2012.

### **Theological Reflections on RE CR-CC Lead Pastors’ Leadership Styles**

## **Breaking Stereotypes** (Romans 12:2)

According to our study, racial-ethnic cross-racial and cross-cultural lead pastors are breaking stereotypes not only by their presence but also by their skills, based on transnational and intercultural experiences that contribute to the church and that change the traditional understanding of white, male-oriented “senior pastors.”

When asked about the leadership styles they felt their congregation values, RE CR-CC lead pastors were more likely to identify as “always” when it came to the leadership styles designated as *Nurturing* (White (W) 23.9 percent vs. Racial-Ethnic (RE) 48.6 percent), *Servant Leader* (W 25.6 percent vs. RE 35.1 percent), and *Democratic* (W 10.5 percent vs. RE 25 percent). When asked how often they utilize certain leadership styles, RE CR-CC lead pastors reported that they are more “often” and “always”:

- collaborative (W 84.5 percent vs. RE 94.6 percent)
- equipping (W 77 percent vs. RE 97.3 percent)
- directive (W 24.3 percent vs. RE 40.5 percent)
- confident (W 83.3 percent vs. RE 86.1 percent)
- creative (W 58.4 percent vs. RE 80.6 percent)
- nurturing (W 58.6 percent vs. RE 83.3 percent)
- energetic (W 78.4 percent vs. RE 83.3 percent)
- adaptive (W 74.6 percent vs. RE 94.4 percent)
- charismatic (W 32 percent vs. RE 55.9 percent)
- delegatory (W 63.7 percent vs. RE 66.7 percent)
- servant leader (W 70.5 percent vs. RE 94.4 percent)
- persuasive (W 6.3 percent vs. RE 72.2 percent)

- democratic (W 55.5 percent vs. RE 61.1 percent)
- compassionate (W 77.7 percent vs. RE 91.1 percent)
- prophetic (W 32.1 percent vs. RE 52.8 percent).

They are less (“never” or “rarely”) authoritarian (W 78.2 percent vs. RE 85.3 percent) and more “always” decisive (W 8.3 percent vs. RE 17.1 percent). When asked how they would respond if a parishioner verbally attacked them in a meeting, 69.4 percent of RE CR-CC lead pastors said that they would “calmly address” the matter, compared to 31.1 percent of white lead pastors. And 25 percent of RE CR-CC lead pastors who responded said that they would pray about it, compared to 8.3 percent of white lead pastors. These findings are breaking stereotypes about racial-ethnic leaders, such as African-American males are loud and rough, Asian-American leaders are too authoritative and rigid, and racial-ethnic leaders are less effective in administration. For example, according to my research for the 2000 thesis *Creating Christian Community Through the Cross-Racial Appointment*, the stereotype about racial-ethnic pastors being less effective was then more evident among respondents, with some of them at that time saying, “Yes, the church should be a racially inclusive community, but the appointment of pastors is a different matter,” and “Ability is more important than being an inclusive community. We should accept pastors by ability not by their color.”<sup>13</sup>

### **Adaptive & Skillful** (1 Corinthians 9: 19-23)

Adaptive leaders are fluent and versatile, willing to take a risk and start new things. They are socially and contextually conscientious about enabling their faith, which is a living faith, therefore bringing diverse people together and closer to God as disciples of Christ. They practice a dialectical relationship between the Word of God and Christian practice, which is John

---

<sup>13</sup> HiRho Park, *Creating Christian Community Through the Cross-Racial Appointment: Problems and Challenges* (Washington, D.C.: Wesley Theological Seminary, 2000), 82.

Wesley's formula for discipleship formation. They continue to learn and develop their leadership skills and participate in the formation of a self within the spirit of God. The survey witnesses that RE CR-CC lead pastors are adaptive leaders with the skills necessary to serve cross-racial and cross-cultural appointments.

Racial-ethnic cross-racial and cross-cultural lead pastors reported roughly the same mean age as white lead pastors (53.8 and 54.4, respectively), though more RE CR-CC lead pastors indicated being clergy as a second career (47.4 percent), reported more recent ordination dates, and reported fewer appointments prior to their current appointment. Of RE CR-CC lead pastors, 59.5 percent reported that their leadership style has changed or shifted emphasis since they moved into a large membership church. If we look at their career trajectories, it makes sense that these pastors are very adaptive leaders. More RE CR-CC lead pastors have served as Board of Ordained Ministry chairpersons (W 7 percent vs. RE 10.5 percent), extension ministries (W 4 percent vs. RE 7.9 percent), and associate pastors (W 10.9 percent vs. RE 23.3 percent), even though 13.2 percent of RE CR-CC lead pastors served as district superintendents, compared to 17 percent of white lead pastors. As we have seen above, almost half of RE CR-CC lead pastors are second-career pastors. This may explain why RE CR-CC lead pastors served fewer appointments prior to the current appointment. They bring to their ministry the skills to lead multi-staff congregations with stronger financial management skills and adapt themselves according to different contexts. Only one-third of white lead pastors came into ministry as a second career. The UMC needs to pay more attention to how to more effectively utilize the expertise and skills that these pastors are bringing to the church.

More RE CR-CC lead pastors "always" lead change by equipping others (W 10.9 percent vs. RE 32.4 percent), and 28.6 percent of RE CR-CC lead pastors "often and always" make

decisions by taking a vote, compared to 1.1 percent of white lead pastors. This sounds like RE CR-CC lead pastors skillfully use inclusiveness to leave little room for argument or conflicts.

According to our study, more RE CR-CC lead pastors (67 percent) responded that their confidence level on financial management has improved since they became large church lead pastors. Even though they responded that they enjoy working on church finances (42.9 percent), they showed less confidence in financial management (65.8 percent) when compared to white lead pastors (87.2 percent). This finding correlates with white lead women pastors' responses that they enjoy working on finances but express less confidence than white male lead pastors. One RE CR-CC lead pastor mentioned that he relies on the expertise of laity who are financial professionals.

McCormack pointed out that these findings may indicate a more intentional, gentle style of leadership (by congregations and clergy, or both) among racial-ethnic clergy that emphasizes relationships and community over stronger, more authoritative approaches to leadership, as well as an awareness that their leadership could be misinterpreted by members of the church.<sup>14</sup>

### **Vulnerable Trailblazers** (Isaiah 43:18-19)

RE CR-CC lead pastors practice their faith of bringing together the majority and minority perspectives of society in their ministry. By doing so, they create an inclusive leadership style with cross-cultural competency and sensitivity that represents being bridge builders who not only bring diverse people together based on Christian faith, but also connect people to God.

When asked whether “the call to pastor a large membership church is distinct from the call to other kinds of pastoral ministries,” 57.9 percent of RE CR-CC lead pastors said, “Yes.”

---

<sup>14</sup> Mark McCormack, *Cross-Racial, Cross-Cultural Leadership Survey Descriptive and Correlational Analysis*, September 2014.

The majority of these pastors consider their call as a special call that requires a distinct set of skills.

RE CR-CC lead pastors are more conscientious about developing leadership skills compared to white lead pastors. Of RE CR-CC lead pastors, 68 percent developed their leadership skills through a formal leadership training program, compared to 50.5 percent of white lead pastors who responded to the same question. However, fewer RE CR-CC lead pastors indicated that they learned from a role model (65.8 percent), compared to 67 percent of white lead pastors. This makes sense when there are only 75 RE CR-CC lead pastors who serve churches with a membership of 500 or more. Furthermore, their ordination history is shorter; for example, racial-ethnic women started to be ordained only in the late 1970s. Therefore, RE CR-CC lead pastors are trailblazers who are self-learners as they practice their leadership in large church settings. This is why the network of RE CR-CC lead pastors who are serving large churches is crucial for their leadership development.

RE CR-CC lead pastors are called to a ministry of vulnerability; their presence and leadership style shatters ethnocentrism and opens up a new possibility of God's revelation. Their vulnerability challenges the congregation and many times leads them to a spiritual transformation towards a new and different future for the church.

### **Progressive & Spiritual Wounded Healers (Philippians 2:5-8)**

Racial-ethnic cross-racial and cross-cultural lead pastors practice intentional openness to otherness because of their experiences as racial-ethnic people in the U.S. context. This shows in their willingness to seek outside support whenever needed (RE 29.7 percent vs. W 8 percent), and they are more open to seek feedback, as well (RE 27 percent vs. W 15.9 percent). They consider themselves as more empathetic, and they believe they have the ability to move and

inspire people. Two-thirds of them also believe that they can guide people towards discernment. Their leadership self-construction is established by embracing the “both-and” fluidity of a pluralistic culture, while maintaining a strong sense of self at the same time. RE CR-CC lead pastors are very confident about themselves; more of them expressed that they can “connect with all ages,” remain “steady in crisis,” and “sing their own tune.”

RE CR-CC lead pastors spend significantly more time to prepare for preaching, with 21.6 percent of them spending 16-20 hours for sermon preparation, while only 8.9 percent of white lead pastors spend the same amount of time. As it relates to the need of spirituality of the church, 15.8 percent of RE CR-CC lead pastors consider that meeting the spiritual need of the church is the most important task for their leadership, compared to 9.5 percent of white lead pastors. RE CR-CC lead pastors spend more time for pastoral care (RE 19.6 percent vs. W 15.2 percent) and social or community work (RE 7.8 percent vs. W 5.5 percent). They call for cultural and racial inclusiveness in their preaching whenever needed; on average, they say, 10 percent of their sermon contains these issues.

RE CR-CC lead pastors also demonstrate that they are first and foremost spiritual leaders. For example, more of the RE CR-CC lead pastors responding “always” “pray or ask for prayer” if they are verbally attacked by a parishioner (RE 25 percent vs. W 8.3 percent), “always” pray about small and large decisions (RE 62.2 percent vs. W 35.9 percent), and “always” lead change by “praying for divine intervention” (RE 61.1 percent vs. W 37.7 percent). They utilize Bible study in making decisions, also. According to McCormack, these outcomes may suggest a greater appreciation for and utilization of spiritual disciplines as leadership tools among these pastors.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> McCormack, September 2014.

RE CR-CC lead pastors demonstrate different attitudes toward and awareness of conflict than do white lead pastors. When asked about their views on conflict, they were significantly more likely to say conflict should never be avoided. The majority of them perceive that conflicts are healthy and manageable (70.3 percent). RE CR-CC lead pastors reported that they have fewer conflicts about worship and music styles, staff relations, and trustee issues. Even though they had experienced fewer “major” conflicts for the preceding two years (27 percent) than White lead pastors reported (32.4 percent), they had significantly more conflicts about racial and cultural issues, issues regarding homosexuality, and lay leadership styles. It was interesting to find out that RE CR-CC lead pastors reported a much higher percentage of conflicts related to homosexual issues in their congregations, which is more a political denominational issue, than white lead pastors did (RE 13.2 percent vs. W 4.5 percent).

Both white lead pastors and RE CR-CC pastors reported that the two most challenging issues that they face in their current appointments are church finances and staffing. However, RE CR-CC pastors deal with more conflicts within the congregation related to theological issues and cultural diversity.

When asked about the two most challenging issues for women/racial-ethnic minority clergy today, 42.1 percent of RE CR-CC lead pastors said “acceptance of leadership,” while 23.7 percent responded that we as a church need more education about cross-racial and cross-cultural appointments.

It appears that RE CR-CC lead pastors understand that they are called to restore peace and wholeness in a Christian community in partnership with God. These pastors become historical agents of the radical struggle for building a harmonious Christian community through their vulnerable ministry.

## **Covenant In Spite Of (2 Corinthians 4:8-9)**

An inclusive church is a community of covenant—the covenant of faithfulness, which is initiated by God’s grace. RE CR-CC lead pastors are leaders of perseverance under the covenant of faithfulness. As God is faithful toward God’s people, RE CR-CC lead pastors have responded to a special call to cross-racial and cross-cultural ministry depending on God’s grace. RE CR-CC lead pastors carry triple burdens—being a large church pastor, being a racial-ethnic pastor, and being a pioneer in a large church setting.

An inclusive church understands that it is called to take an active role in promoting social equity and harmony through the ministry of reconciliation. The survey found out that more RE CR-CC lead pastors graduated from UMC seminaries than did white lead pastors, with 10 percent having graduated from the Gammon Theological Seminary, the historical African-American UM seminary. This suggests that denominational efforts to recruit racial-ethnic leaders have been successful. Among RE CR-CC lead pastors, 40.9 percent have a doctoral degree and 15.4 percent have a Ph.D. degree. Only 9.1 percent of white lead pastors have a Ph.D. degree. However, despite their education and experience, the 2008 survey showed that no RE CR-CC lead pastors received over \$150,000 annual salary, while 5.2 percent of white lead pastors received a salary of over \$150,000.

Here, the important point is that the majority of respondents for the 2008 study were serving the middle and bottom third of the large churches. According to the Center for Church Renewal report, large churches have three levels in the UMC: small (1,000-1,272 members), medium (1,272-1,809 members), and large (1,810 or more members). Among the small large churches, women and men made comparable salaries, with women paid about 2 percent more. Among the medium large churches, men are paid about 4 percent more. Among the large-sized

large churches, men receive 27 percent higher pay than women.<sup>16</sup> In our survey, 12 respondents indicated that they were serving 1,000 or more membership churches; 7 of them were serving over 1,300 or more membership churches (one respondent was serving a 2,000 membership church), which is the second tier of large churches (1,272-1,809). However, none of them were receiving \$150,000 or higher salary level, compared to 5.2 percent of white lead pastors who were receiving salary within that level in 2008. Actually, only 6 of them are receiving the \$100,000-150,000 salary level among 7 who are serving 1,300 or membership churches. This finding is consistent with the Study for Salaries for United Methodist Clergy from GBHEM in 2008 that found racial-ethnic clergy receive 9-15 percent less pay than white clergy in general.<sup>17</sup> This calls The United Methodist Church to pursue equity of clergy salary regardless of race and gender. But in spite of all their experience of inequities, RE CR-CC lead pastors are faithful to their call to serve this special ministry.

## **Conclusion**

The study of leadership style of racial-ethnic cross-racial and cross-cultural lead pastors demonstrates that their ministry is a living response to the grace of God. The racial-ethnically and culturally different faith community in a large setting became a radical space for RE CR-CC lead pastors to testify to God's prevenient, justifying and sanctifying grace upon them in spite of inequities. They are wounded healers in the midst of their experiences of injustice in society and the church, trusting the covenant of God's faithfulness. These are leaders who are willing to take a risk and be confident about their decisions to do so. For Wesley, "practical divinity" meant pushing the boundaries and taking a risk rather than being content with a conventional paradigm.

---

<sup>16</sup> Lovett H. Weems, Jr., Ann A. Michel, Joseph E. Arnold, and Tana Brown, *Report on Lead Pastor Survey Conducted by the General Board of Higher Education and Ministry*, Fall 2009.

<sup>17</sup> Eric B. Johnson, *Study for Salaries for United Methodist Clergy*, GBHEM, 2010.

Racial-ethnic cross-racial and cross-cultural lead pastors are creating their own authentic leadership styles by synthesizing their distinctive cluster of cultural ideas and theological understandings. Perhaps the most salient personal, historical, cultural, and theological determinant of the ministries of RE CR-CC lead pastors is their contribution of disrupting marginality in society and the church by skillfully navigating racial-ethnic and cultural challenges in their ministries. Further study is needed about gender disparity among RE CR-CC lead pastors, especially those who are serving 1,000 or more membership churches. It will also be interesting to know why more RE CR-CC lead pastors (36.1 percent) are single while 89.5 percent of white lead pastors are married. After all, The United Methodist Church should be commended for striving to witness God's love for all people through cross-racial and cross-cultural appointments.

## **Racial-Ethnic Minority Clergy Serving Large, Cross-Racial and Cross-Cultural Appointments: Research Summary**

Mark M. McCormack  
Director of Research, GBHEM  
October 2, 2014

In 2008, the General Board of Higher Education & Ministry's Office of Clergy Lifelong Learning, under the leadership of Director HiRho Park and with the assistance of the Lewis Center for Church Leadership, conducted a survey of lead pastors of large churches in The United Methodist Church. The survey provided fresh insights into clergy leadership styles and practices and subsequently led to a study on the leadership practices of clergywomen among these pastors (Park, 2013).

One limitation of this earlier research was the lack of racial-ethnic diversity in its sample—a full 98% percent of the lead pastor respondents were white. Given the UMC's ongoing commitment to engage diverse populations, and particular interests in the GBHEM Office of Clergy Lifelong Learning in developing programming and services relevant to diverse populations, a second wave of surveys was conducted more specifically targeting racial-ethnic minority lead pastors serving large Caucasian majority churches.

Given the unique challenges faced by clergy serving in cross-racial, cross-cultural appointments, the UMC would benefit from better understanding the leadership challenges and practices of these clergy in order to provide better resourcing and support.

### **Methods**

Using local church data from the General Council on Finance & Administration, and excluding persons who received the 2008 survey or who were incorrectly labeled as lead pastor, we were able to identify 75 racial-ethnic minority lead pastors serving in predominantly white churches with a membership of 500 or more.<sup>1</sup>

We disseminated an online survey to each of these clergy through personalized emails, including an initial invitation to participate, three follow-up contacts (for those not responding), and a \$10

---

<sup>1</sup> Though the criteria for the 2008 Lead Pastor study included "church membership of 1,000 or more", it was determined that similar criteria for this study would significantly limit our population size. To increase our population size, we changed the criteria to include "church membership of 500 or more", still considered to be large churches by most standards. While this potentially explains some differences between samples—such as salary and staff size—we do not feel it necessarily explains our main analyses below.

incentive to participate. These efforts yielded 44 survey responses for a 59% response rate, 38 (51%) of which were fully completed.

The survey was an adaptation of the leadership survey disseminated in 2008, including a range of questions related to the pastor's current appointment (e.g. church size, salary), their leadership styles, and issues and challenges they face at their church appointment. Given the focus of this second round of surveys, we also included survey items on behaviors related to racial-ethnic concerns and conflict. More specifically, survey themes included:

- Pastor and congregation preferred leadership styles
- Leadership behaviors related to organizational management and decision-making
- Responses to hypothetical church scenarios
- Approaches to church-related tasks (e.g. preaching)
- Perceptions of and responses to church conflict

Where possible, the wording and placement of survey questions were identical to the 2008 study, to allow for direct comparison of the responses of these racial-ethnic minority clergy to their white counterparts.

Analyses of these survey data began with a descriptive summary of the participants and their survey responses, noting in particular their demographic and church appointment profiles. Analysis then proceeded to a correlational comparison, summarized below, of the racial-ethnic minority clergy to the 2008 survey group (with group membership serving as a binary variable.) It is proposed that such an analysis will be helpful in uncovering the unique leadership styles and behaviors of racial-ethnic minority clergy serving large, predominantly white churches and in instructing the UMC in better resourcing and supporting these clergy.

## **Results**

Looking first at the demographic distributions of our racial-ethnic minority clergy sample, more than half of our sample (54.3%) self-reported as African American and a quarter (25.7%) self-reported as Asian. Five (14.3%) respondents reported as Hispanic, and one each reported as Pacific Islander and Multi-Racial. Just over a third (39%) of respondents were female, and roughly two-thirds (63.9%) reported being married. The median age of the sample was 54, consistent with the median age of the larger UMC clergy population.

Our correlational analysis highlighted four distinct thematic areas where we may be able to identify unique challenges and characteristic represented by our racial-ethnic minority clergy serving in cross-racial and cross-cultural appointments: (1) previous pastoral experience; (2) preferred leadership styles; (3) spiritual disciplines; (4) and church conflict.

### *Previous Pastoral Experience*

Compared to their white counterparts, racial-ethnic minority clergy respondents indicated entry

into parish ministry later in life and less experience in parish ministry in some regards. Though racial-ethnic minority clergy reported close to the same median age as non-minority clergy (54 and 55, respectively), more racial-ethnic minority clergy indicated that being a clergy member is a second career (nearly half, compared to a third of their white counterparts), reported more recent ordination dates on average, and reported moderately fewer appointments prior to their current appointment ( $r=-.144, p=.023$ ).

Given the later entry into clergy work among racial-ethnic minorities and their reports of moderately less pastoral experience prior to larger church appointments, these clergy may require leadership adjustments moving into larger church appointments. Interestingly, racial-ethnic minority clergy were more likely to report that their leadership style had changed or shifted emphasis since moving into a large membership church ( $r=.166, p=.009$ ). This trend may reveal a resourcing opportunity for denominational institutions to support these clergy as they transition into new and larger appointments.

### *Leadership Styles*

The majority of the survey questions focused on the respondents' preferred leadership styles and their responses as leaders to certain management- and conflict-based scenarios. Our analysis showed some potentially important differences in these items between clergy groups, with what appear to be more collaborative and relationship-focused leadership preferences and behaviors among racial-ethnic minority clergy.

When asked about the leadership styles they felt their congregation values, racial-ethnic minority clergy were significantly more likely than their white counterparts to identify the Nurturing ( $r=.193, p=.003$ ), Servant Leader ( $r=.146, p=.027$ ), and Democratic ( $r=.220, p=.001$ ) leadership styles. Similarly, when asked how often they utilize certain leadership styles, these clergy reported the Collaborative ( $r=.147, p=.025$ ), Equipping ( $r=.254, p<.001$ ), Nurturing ( $r=.200, p=.002$ ), Adaptive/flexible ( $r=.134, p=.041$ ), Servant Leader ( $r=.249, p<.001$ ), Democratic ( $r=.143, p=.030$ ), and Compassionate ( $r=.200, p=.003$ ) leadership styles significantly more frequently than their counterparts.

Importantly, these reported leadership style preferences translated into related behaviors associated with church management. When asked about how they lead change in their church, racial-ethnic minority clergy were significantly more likely to report equipping others to make changes ( $p=.180, r=.006$ ), and when asked about how they make decisions, they were significantly more likely to report taking a vote ( $r=.193, p=.003$ ) from their congregation.

These findings, taken together, may indicate a more collaborative and relational preferred style of leadership (by congregations and/or clergy) among racial-ethnic minority clergy, in contrast to more authoritative and detached approaches to leadership. Perhaps not surprisingly, then, racial-ethnic minority clergy reported a significantly greater percentage of their time taken up by pastoral care ( $r=.167, p=.011$ ) and social or community work ( $r=.199, p=.003$ ).

### *Spiritual Disciplines*

Several of the survey items focused on behaviors related to spirituality or religious practice and, again, our analysis showed here several important differences between clergy groups. Among the most significant differences were the reported prayer habits of these clergy.

When asked what they would do if a parishioner verbally attacked them, racial-ethnic minority clergy were significantly more likely to report that they would “pray or ask for prayer” ( $r=.270$ ,  $p<.001$ ), and when asked how they lead change in their church these clergy were significantly more likely to report “praying for divine intervention” ( $r=.221$ ,  $p=.001$ ). Finally, when asked about how they make decisions, these clergy were significantly more likely to report praying about small and large decisions ( $r=.174$ ,  $p=.007$ ). These clergy were also more likely to use Bible study in making decisions, suggesting greater utilization of spiritual disciplines as leadership tools and indicating potential opportunities for denominational leaders and institutions to connect with and resource these clergy.

### **Conclusions**

It is our hope that the above analyses begin to highlight some of the potential issues and dynamics faced by racial-ethnic minority clergy as they move into larger cross-racial appointments. Certainly these clergy face both opportunities and challenges not encountered by their white counterparts, and the denomination would benefit from understanding more about these clergy and their unique appointments. In particular, it appears these clergy utilize leadership styles and spiritual disciplines in ways that differ from their white counterparts, and such differences may help inform more culturally relevant leadership resources and support.

As with most studies of this nature, ours is not without limitations. One of the primary limitations of the current study is the relatively small sample size for analysis, with 44 respondents out of 75 identified clergy. Given the targeted nature of this study there was a very small pool of clergy from which to choose. It is our hope that the UMC would continue to recruit and promote more racial-ethnic minority clergy into parish ministry, and that such research will only become easier in the future!

This study also leaves open opportunities for digging deeper into the organizational and interpersonal dynamics facing these clergy. For example, what more might the church learn about specific spiritual practices these clergy utilize in their leadership, or exactly how are these more collaborative and relational leadership styles and behaviors embodied by individual clergy and how are they perceived by their congregations? A follow-up qualitative study that allows us to dig deeper into individual cases of cross-racial appointment in large churches would certainly help in further elucidating these trends.

As the UMC continues to live into its commitment to understanding and working with diverse churches and leadership, further research in these areas will prove to be an essential tool for important efforts in denominational resourcing and decision-making.

Year of ordination as an elder:

Year	2008 Leader Survey (175)	2014 CR-CC Survey (36)
Prior to 1969	2.9% (5)	0
1970 to 1979	31.4% (55)	5.6% (2)
1980 to 1989	38.3% (67)	25.0% (9)
1990 to 1999	23.4% (41)	38.9% (14)
2000 to present	4% (7)	28.9% (11)

Is being a clergy member a second career?

Response	2008 Leader Survey	2014 CR-CC Survey
Yes	32% (63)	47.4% (18)
No	68% (134)	52.6% (20)

Number of appointments prior to current appointment:

Response	2008 Leader Survey (159)	2014 CR-CC Survey
1	5% (8)	7.9% (3)
2	10.7% (17)	21.1% (8)
3	17.6% (28)	18.4% (7)
4	28.9% (46)	15.8% (6)
5	37.7% (60)	36.8% (14)

Was your appointment prior to current appointment in:

Response	2008 Leader Survey	2014 CR-CC Survey
The local church	87.5% (154)	78.9% (30)
Beyond the local church	12.5% (22)	21.1% (8)

Were you a:

Response	2008 Leader Survey	2014 CR-CC Survey
Lead pastor	83.7% (123)	73.3% (22)
Associate pastor	10.9% (16)	23.3% (7)
Special ministry	5.4% (8)	3.3% (1)

Were you a:

Response	2008 Leader Survey (200)	2014 CR-CC Survey (38)
District Superintendent	17% (34)	13.2% (5)
Extension Ministry	4% (8)	7.9% (3)

Do you think your leadership style changed or shifted emphasis when you moved into a large membership church lead pastor role?

Response	2008 Leader Survey (193)	2014 CR-CC Survey
Yes	79.8% (154)	59.5% (22)
No	18.1% (35)	37.8% (14)
Unsure	2.1% (4)	2.7% (1)

Are you now or have you ever been:

Response	2008 Leader Survey (200)	2014 CR-CC Survey
Candidate for Episcopacy	8% (16)	5.3% (2)
Bd of Ordained Ministry Chair	7% (14)	10.5% (4)
District Superintendent	23% (46)	18.4% (7)
Extension Ministry	16% (32)	26.3% (10)

If you received a M.Div. degree, from what institution?

Response	2008 Leader Survey (189)	2014 CR-CC Survey (38)
<b>UM Schools</b>	<b>65.6% (124)</b>	<b>65.8% (25)</b>
Boston SoT	2.1% (4)	2.6% (1)
Candler SoT	19.6% (37)	7.9% (3)
Claremont SoT	1.1% (2)	0
Drew TS	1.1% (2)	0
Duke DS	11.1% (21)	5.3% (2)
Gammon TS	0	10.5% (4)
Garrett-Evang	1.6% (3)	7.9% (3)
Iliff SoT	3.2% (6)	2.6% (1)
Methodist TS	2.6% (5)	7.9% (3)
Perkins SoT	12.7% (24)	7.9% (3)
St Paul SoT	0	2.6% (1)
United TS	4.2% (8)	5.3% (2)
Wesley TS	3.2% (6)	5.3% (2)
<b>Non UM School</b>	<b>34.4% (65)</b>	<b>28.9% (11)</b>

Have you received a doctoral degree?

Response	2008 Leader Survey (191)	2014 CR-CC Survey (37)
Yes	40.3% (77)	40.5% (15)
No	59.7% (114)	59.5% (22)

What type of doctoral degree have you received?

Response	2008 Leader Survey (77)	2014 CR-CC Survey (13)
D.Min.	85.7% (66)	84.6% (11)
Th.D.	0	0
Ph.D.	9.1% (7)	15.4% (2)
D.Phil.	5.2% (4)	0
Other	0	0

Location of current appointment:

Response	2008 Leader Survey (186)	2014 CR-CC Survey (35)
Large City	17.2% (32)	20.0% (7)
Suburb of Large City	39.8% (74)	42.9% (15)
Mid-size City	33.3% (62)	20.0% (7)
Small Town	9.7% (18)	11.4% (4)
Rural	0	5.7% (2)

What is the total number of professing members in your current appointment?

Response	2008 Leader Survey	2014 CR-CC Survey
Average	1764.07	814.90
Median	1398.50	683.00

Average attendance at the principal weekly worship service(s):

Response	2008 Leader Survey	2014 CR-CC Survey
Average	605.88	283.86
Median	527.50	247.00

Number of weekly worship services:

Response	2008 Leader Survey (175)	2014 CR-CC Survey (37)
1	1.7% (3)	15.8% (6)
2	25.1% (44)	42.1% (16)
3	51.4% (90)	28.9% (3)
4	21.7% (38)	5.3% (4)
5	0	2.6% (1)

How many staff are at your current appointment?

Response	2008 Leader Survey (191)	2014 CR-CC Survey
Full-Time		
0	0	2.6% (1)
1 to 3	11.5% (22)	44.7% (17)
4 to 6	36.6% (70)	23.7% (9)
7 to 10	29.3% (56)	7.9% (3)
10+	22.5% (43)	7.9% (3)
Part-Time		
1 to 3	4.2% (8)	13.2% (5)
4 to 6	26.7% (51)	44.7% (17)
7 to 10	25.7% (49)	21.1% (8)
10+	28.3% (54)	10.5% (4)
Volunteer		
1 to 3	15.7% (30)	15.8% (6)
4 to 6	13.6% (26)	21.1% (8)
7 to 10	3.1% (6)	10.5% (4)
10+	29.8% (57)	23.7% (9)

The gross annual salary range, including housing allowance, for your current appointment:

Response	2008 Leader Survey (194)	2014 CR-CC Survey
Over \$150,000	5.2% (10)	0
\$100,000- \$150,000	25.8% (50)	16.7% (6)
\$99,999- \$65,000	62.4% (121)	55.6% (20)
\$64,999- \$50,000	6.2% (12)	19.4% (7)
\$49,000 or below	0.5% (1)	8.3% (3)

In your view, how highly does your congregation value the following leadership styles?

	Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	Highly	Very highly
Collaborative – 2008	0	2.7% (5)	25.4% (47)	46.5% (86)	25.4% (47)
Collaborative – 2014	0	5.4% (2)	10.8% (4)	51.4% (19)	32.4% (12)
Equipping – 2008	0	2.5% (5)	30.2% (60)	35.7% (71)	31.7% (63)
Equipping – 2014	0	2.7% (1)	24.3% (9)	45.9% (17)	27.0% (10)
Directive – 2008	0.6% (1)	6.0% (11)	42.1% (77)	37.2% (68)	14.2% (26)
Directive – 2014	5.7% (2)	17.1% (6)	31.4% (11)	22.9% (8)	22.9% (8)
Confident – 2008	0	1.1% (2)	8.7% (16)	44.6% (82)	45.7% (84)
Confident - 2014	0	0	8.1% (3)	43.2% (16)	48.6% (18)
Decisive – 2008	0.6% (1)	1.7% (3)	17.7% (32)	54.1% (98)	26.0% (47)
Decisive – 2014	2.7% (1)	0	29.7% (11)	29.7% (11)	37.8% (14)
Creative – 2008	0.6% (1)	4.4% (8)	31.3% (57)	39.0% (71)	24.7% (45)
Creative – 2014	5.3% (2)	2.7% (1)	13.5% (5)	51.4% (19)	27.0% (10)
Nurturing – 2008	0	3.3% (6)	29.4% (53)	43.3% (78)	23.9% (43)
Nurturing - 2014	0	2.7% (1)	13.5% (5)	35.1% (13)	48.6% (18)
Energetic – 2008	0	0.6% (1)	13.7% (25)	46.2% (84)	39.6% (72)
Energetic – 2014	0	2.7% (1)	16.2% (6)	21.6% (8)	59.5% (22)
Adaptive – 2008	0	4.3% (8)	30.4% (56)	44.0% (81)	21.2% (39)
Adaptive – 2014	0	5.7% (2)	25.7% (9)	42.9% (15)	25.7% (9)

Charismatic – 2008	1.7% (3)	10.5% (19)	37.6% (68)	30.9% (56)	19.3% (35)
Charismatic – 2014	0	16.7% (6)	27.8% (10)	25.0% (9)	30.6% (11)
Delegatory – 2008	0.6% (1)	7.7% (14)	40.1% (73)	41.2% (75)	10.4% (19)
Delegatory – 2014	0	5.7% (2)	34.3% (12)	40.0% (14)	20.0% (7)
Servant Leader – 2008	1.1% (2)	5.6% (10)	32.8% (59)	35.0% (63)	25.6% (46)
Servant Leader – 2014	0	5.4% (2)	13.5% (5)	45.9% (17)	35.1% (13)
Persuasive – 2008	0	4.7% (8)	39.6% (67)	41.4% (70)	14.2% (24)
Persuasive – 2014	0	13.9% (5)	30.6% (11)	38.9% (14)	16.7% (6)
Democratic – 2008	0.6% (1)	9.9% (18)	34.8% (63)	44.2% (80)	10.5% (19)
Democratic – 2014	0	5.6% (2)	13.9% (5)	55.6% (20)	25.0% (9)
Authoritarian – 2008	24.4% (44)	45.6% (82)	19.4% (35)	7.8% (14)	2.8% (5)
Authoritarian – 2014	26.5% (9)	50.0% (17)	8.8% (3)	8.8% (3)	5.9% (2)
Compassionate – 2008	0	0.6% (1)	18.1% (32)	45.8% (81)	35.6% (63)
Compassionate – 2014	0	5.6% (2)	8.3% (3)	33.3% (12)	52.8% (19)
Prophetic – 2008	1.8% (3)	21.2% (36)	42.9% (73)	22.9% (39)	11.2% (19)
Prophetic – 2014	5.6% (2)	16.7% (6)	38.9% (14)	19.4% (7)	19.4% (7)

A parishioner verbally attacks you in a meeting. What do you do?

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Ignore – 2008	34.1% (59)	32.9% (57)	25.4% (44)	7.5% (13)	0
Ignore – 2014	43.3% (13)	30.0% (9)	16.7% (5)	10.0% (3)	0
Calmly Address – 2008	0	1.6% (3)	10.4% (20)	57.0% (110)	31.1% (60)
Calmly Address – 2014	0	0	5.6% (2)	25.0% (9)	69.4% (25)
Leave Room – 2008	89.8% (158)	7.4% (13)	2.8% (5)	0	0
Leave Room – 2014	93.9% (31)	3.0 (1)	3.0% (1)	0	0
Pray – 2008	15.8% (19)	30.8% (37)	22.5% (27)	22.5% (27)	8.3% (10)
Pray – 2014	3.1% (1)	6.3% (2)	37.5% (12)	28.1% (9)	25.0% (8)
Defend Actions – 2008	2.9% (5)	18.3% (32)	61.1% (107)	15.4% (27)	2.3% (4)
Defend Actions – 2014	9.1% (3)	24.2% (8)	48.5% (16)	15.2% (5)	3.0% (1)
Make a joke – 2008	43.8% (74)	33.1% (56)	18.9% (32)	3.6% (6)	0.6% (1)
Make a joke – 2014	63.6% (21)	18.2% (6)	15.2% (5)	3.0% (1)	0

Rate your ability:

	Not	Somewhat	Highly
Connect w/ all ages – 2008	0	18.4% (35)	81.6% (155)
Connect w/ all ages – 2014	0	2.7% (1)	97.3% (36)
Steady in crisis – 2008	0	14.8% (28)	85.2% (161)
Steady in crisis – 2014	0	8.1% (3)	91.9% (34)
Sing your own tune – 2008	6.9% (13)	55.3% (104)	37.8% (71)
Sing your own tune – 2014	8.6% (3)	48.6% (17)	42.9% (15)
Empathy & Presence – 2008	0	17.0% (32)	83.0% (156)
Empathy & Presence – 2014	0	5.4% (2)	94.6% (35)
Move and inspire – 2008	0	32.4% (61)	67.6% (127)
Move and inspire – 2014	0	10.8% (4)	89.2% (33)
Help laity discern – 2008	1.1% (2)	45.7% (86)	53.2% (100)
Help laity discern – 2014	0	24.3% (9)	75.7% (28)

In your view, conflict is:

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Something to avoid – 2008	4.0% (7)	37.0% (64)	50.3% (87)	7.5% (13)	1.2% (2)
Something to avoid – 2014	42.9% (15)	37.1% (13)	20.0% (7)	0	0
Inevitable – 2008	0	0	20.9% (39)	47.6% (89)	31.6% (59)
Inevitable – 2014	8.1% (3)	0	32.4% (12)	29.7% (11)	29.7% (11)
Healthy – 2008	0	0	47.1% (88)	47.1% (88)	5.9% (11)
Healthy – 2014	2.6% (1)	0	43.2% (16)	40.5% (15)	13.5% (5)
Manageable – 2008	0	0	22.2% (42)	67.2% (127)	10.6% (20)
Manageable – 2014	2.7% (1)	0	27.0% (10)	54.1% (20)	16.2% (6)
A test of my leadership – 2008	1.1% (2)	21.2% (40)	39.2% (74)	24.9% (47)	13.8% (26)
A test of my leadership – 2014	2.9% (1)	8.6% (3)	57.1% (20)	17.1% (6)	14.3% (5)

On average, what percent of your time is spent on each of these ministerial activities?

Response	2008 Leader Survey	2014 CR-CC Survey
Pastoral Care	15.2%	19.6%
Administration	22.7%	21.9%
Meetings	14.6%	16.4%
Social or Community Work	5.5%	7.8%
Teaching	9.6%	10.7%
Worship Planning	20.0%	17.9%
Denominational Responsibilities	6.0%	6.0%
Weddings/Funerals	5.4%	5.4%
Other	9.8%	6.2%

What is the average length of time you spend weekly in sermon preparation?

Response	2008 Leader Survey (192)	2014 CR-CC Survey
1 to 4 hours	7.8% (15)	5.4% (2)
5 to 10 hours	43.2% (83)	35.1% (13)
11 to 15 hours	34.3% (66)	35.1% (13)
16 to 20 hours	8.9% (17)	21.6% (8)
> 20 hours	5.7% (11)	2.7% (1)

On average, what percentage of your sermons contains each of the following?

Response	2008 Leader Survey	2014 CR-CC Survey
Biblical Exegesis	27.8%	32.4%
Personal Experience	16.5%	13.3%
Stories/Illustrations	22.7%	13.0%
Teaching Moral Issues	13.4%	11.2%
Art or Drama	5.0%	4.7%
Call to Action	15.1%	16.8%
Call for racial & cultural inclusive	-	10.5%
Other	11.8%	7.5%

Your phone rings at 2 a.m., what do you do? Check all that apply.

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Answer the phone – 2008	0	2.2% (4)	4.3% (8)	14.7% (27)	78.8% (145)
Answer the phone – 2014	0	12.1% (4)	15.2% (5)	21.2% (7)	51.5% (17)
Screen call – 2008	43.7% (76)	9.8% (17)	13.2% (23)	12.6% (22)	20.7% (36)
Screen call – 2014	24.2% (8)	9.1% (3)	30.3% (10)	3.0% (1)	33.3% (11)
Voice mail check in AM – 2008	70.6% (125)	22.0% (39)	6.2% (11)	0.6% (1)	0.6% (1)
Voice mail check in AM – 2014	32.4% (11)	32.4% (11)	20.6% (7)	5.9% (2)	8.8% (3)

Over the past two years of your church ministry service, was there any conflict in the congregation?

Response	2008 Leader Survey	2014 CR-CC Survey
No Conflict I am Aware of	6.9% (13)	10.8% (4)
Some minor conflict	60.6% (114)	62.2% (23)
Major conflict	32.4% (61)	27.0% (10)

What was the conflict about? Check all that apply.

Response	2008 Leader Survey (200)	2014 CR-CC Survey
Pastoral leadership styles	30.5% (61)	18.4% (7)
Finances	33.0% (66)	26.3% (10)
Changes in worship style	36.5% (73)	21.1% (8)
Conflict between staff & clergy	45.0% (90)	26.3% (10)
Issues about new building or renovation	29.5% (59)	13.2% (5)
Changes in music style	23.0% (46)	7.9% (3)
Lay leadership styles	10.5% (21)	13.2% (5)
Changes in congregational programs	14.0% (28)	13.2% (5)
Doctrine	4.0% (8)	2.6% (1)
Sexual misconduct	6.0% (12)	2.6% (1)
Issues regarding homosexuality	4.5% (9)	13.2% (5)
Racial issues	1.5% (3)	10.5% (4)
Cultural issues	-	10.5% (4)
Local outreach groups	6.5% (13)	5.3% (2)
Church growth issues	27.0% (54)	23.7% (9)

Have you ever felt physically threatened or felt afraid for your safety because of your role as a pastor?

Response	2008 Leader Survey	2014 CR-CC Survey
Yes	33.3% (63)	27.8% (10)
No	66.7% (126)	72.2% (26)

How often do you do the following? Check all that apply.

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Second guess yourself – 2008	0	12.3% (23)	62.0% (116)	24.1% (45)	1.6% (3)
Second guess yourself – 2014	2.8% (1)	22.2% (8)	58.3% (21)	11.1% (4)	5.6% (2)
Seek outside support – 2008	0.5% (1)	8.6% (16)	39.6% (74)	43.3% (81)	8.0% (15)
Seek outside support – 2014	0	0	32.4% (12)	37.8% (14)	29.7% (11)
Lead change – 2008	0	0	23.2% (43)	59.5% (110)	17.3% (32)
Lead change – 2014	0	0	16.2% (6)	64.9% (24)	18.9% (7)
Openly display emotion – 2008	2.7% (5)	48.1% (90)	40.1% (75)	9.1% (17)	0
Openly display emotion – 2014	11.4% (4)	54.3% (19)	25.7% (9)	5.7% (2)	2.9% (1)
Talk about inclusiveness – 2008	-	-	-	-	-
Talk about racial and cultural inclusiveness – 2014	0	5.6% (2)	36.1% (13)	41.7% (15)	16.7% (6)
Take all of your vacation – 2008	5.4% (10)	26.3% (49)	17.2% (32)	18.8% (35)	32.3% (60)
Take all of your vacation – 2014	8.1% (3)	32.4% (12)	16.2% (6)	16.2% (6)	27.0% (10)
Seek feedback from others – 2008	0	2.2% (4)	23.1% (42)	58.8% (107)	15.9% (29)
Seek feedback from others – 2014	0	0	21.6% (8)	51.4% (19)	27.0% (10)

How do you lead change?

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
I intentionally recruit support – 2008	0	2.1% (4)	10.2% (19)	51.9% (97)	35.8% (67)
I intentionally recruit support – 2014	0	2.7% (1)	16.2% (6)	43.2% (16)	37.8% (14)
I pray for divine intervention – 2008	4.4% (8)	13.1% (24)	22.4% (41)	22.4% (41)	37.7% (69)
I pray for divine intervention – 2014	0	2.8% (1)	8.3% (3)	27.8% (10)	61.1% (22)
I informally plant seeds – 2008	0.5% (1)	9.8% (18)	40.2% (74)	34.2% (63)	15.2% (28)
I informally plant seeds – 2014	2.9% (1)	17.6% (5)	20.6% (7)	44.1% (15)	17.6% (6)
I don't make changes, but equip others – 2008	3.8% (7)	19.0% (35)	56.0% (103)	18.5% (34)	2.7% (5)
I don't make changes, but equip others – 2014	2.9% (1)	11.4% (4)	42.9% (15)	25.7% (9)	17.1% (6)
I create a plan with steps – 2008	0	5.4% (10)	25.8% (48)	51.6% (96)	17.2% (32)
I create a plan with steps – 2014	0	2.7% (1)	32.4% (12)	40.5% (15)	24.3% (9)
I look for win/win solutions – 2008	0	1.1% (2)	17.7% (33)	46.2% (86)	34.9% (65)
I look for	0	2.8% (1)	19.4% (7)	41.7% (15)	36.1% (13)

win/win solutions – 2014					
I persuade through preaching and teaching – 2008	0	2.2% (4)	29.5% (54)	38.3% (70)	30.1% (55)
I persuade through preaching and teaching – 2014	2.7% (1)	2.7% (1)	13.5% (5)	51.4% (19)	29.7% (11)

Which two of the following do you consider to be the most important for your leadership?

Response	2008 Leader Survey (190)	2014 CR-CC Survey
To be personally well grounded spiritually	53.7% (102)	57.9% (22)
To connect with my congregation/relationships	32.6% (62)	26.3% (10)
To exercise solid theology	9.0% (17)	0
To shepherd the mission & ministry of the congregation	32.6% (62)	31.6% (12)
To be available & present for those hurting	10.0% (19)	2.6% (1)
To prophetically challenge the Church	6.3% (12)	7.9% (3)
To meet the spiritual needs of the congregation	9.5% (18)	15.8% (6)
To equip and empower others for leadership	44.2% (84)	52.6% (20)
Other	1.6% (3)	0

What are the two most challenging issues for you personally in your current appointment?

Response	2008 Leader Survey (182)	2014 CR-CC Survey
Cultural Diversity	6.0% (11)	13.2% (5)
Theological Diversity	13.2% (24)	15.8% (6)
Sexism	2.7% (5)	2.6% (1)
Racism	1.1% (2)	13.2% (5)
Ageism	1.1% (2)	10.5% (4)
Time Management	24.7% (45)	13.2% (5)
Perceptions of Women	4.9% (9)	0
Conflict within Congregation	14.8% (27)	21.1% (8)
Church Finances	42.3% (77)	36.8% (14)
Work Load	29.7% (54)	15.8% (6)
Staffing	47.8% (87)	31.6% (12)
Family	2.7% (5)	5.3% (2)
Burn Out	8.2% (15)	5.3% (2)
Homosexuality	0	5.3% (2)
Other	3.3% (6)	18.4% (7)

Which do you consider to be the two most challenging issues for women/racial-ethnic minority clergy today?

Response	2008 Leader Survey	2014 CR-CC Survey
Leadership in denominational agency	2.2% (4)	15.8% (6)
More clergywomen/racial-ethnic minorities serving large churches	37.2% (68)	21.1% (8)
Approval from one's own racial-cultural community	-	13.2% (5)
Salary equity	21.3% (39)	10.5% (4)
Need more education about cross-racial and cross-cultural appointments	-	23.7% (9)
Loneliness	-	21.1% (8)
Acceptance of leadership styles	44.3% (81)	42.1% (16)
Balancing ministry & family responsibilities	39.9% (73)	-
Racial or cultural conflict or equality	-	13.2% (5)
Appointment process	32.8% (60)	2.6% (1)
Retention	18.6% (34)	7.9% (3)
Other	2.7% (5)	10.5% (4)

How do you make decisions?

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
I pray about small and large decisions – 2008	0	2.2% (4)	20.1% (37)	41.8% (77)	35.9% (66)
I pray about small and large decisions – 2014	0	0	5.4% (2)	32.4% (12)	62.2% (23)
I talk with one or two key trusted people – 2008	0.5% (1)	1.1% (2)	14.8% (27)	53.3% (97)	30.2% (55)
I talk with one or two key trusted people – 2014	0	0	11.1% (4)	58.3% (21)	30.6% (11)
I work through committees – 2008	0.5% (1)	4.8% (9)	26.7% (50)	56.1% (105)	11.8% (22)
I work through committees – 2014	0	0	27.0% (10)	54.1% (20)	18.9% (7)
I analyze the issues involved – 2008	0	0.5% (1)	6.6% (12)	38.3% (70)	54.6% (100)
I analyze the issues involved – 2014	0	0	18.9% (7)	40.5% (15)	40.5% (15)
I go with my gut – 2008	-	-	-	-	-
I go with my gut – 2014	2.6% (1)	22.2% (8)	52.8% (19)	19.4% (7)	2.8% (1)
I take a vote – 2008	3.5% (7)	40.7% (81)	49.2% (98)	6.0% (12)	0.5% (1)
I take a vote – 2014	5.7% (2)	25.7% (9)	40.0% (14)	20.0% (7)	8.6% (3)
I study the Bible and	1.1% (2)	8.7% (16)	42.1% (77)	38.8% (71)	9.3% (17)

engage in theological reflection – 2008					
I study the Bible and engage in theological reflection – 2014	2.9% (1)	5.7% (2)	25.7% (9)	42.9% (15)	22.9% (8)
I try to build on consensus – 2008	0	3.0% (6)	11.7% (23)	57.4% (113)	27.9% (55)
I try to build on consensus – 2014	0	0	20.0% (7)	51.4% (18)	28.6% (10)
I consider the political ramifications of every decision – 2008	3.1% (6)	26.9% (52)	39.4% (76)	19.2% (37)	11.4% (22)
I consider the political ramifications of every decision – 2014	8.8% (3)	14.7% (5)	38.2% (13)	23.5% (8)	14.7% (5)

How often do you use the following leadership styles? Rate each leadership style.

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always
Collaborative – 2008	0	1.0% (2)	14.5% (28)	67.4% (130)	17.1% (33)
Collaborative – 2014	0	0	5.4% (2)	64.9% (24)	29.7% (11)
Equipping – 2008	0	1.6% (3)	21.4% (41)	66.1% (127)	10.9% (21)
Equipping – 2014	0	0	2.6% (1)	64.9% (24)	32.4% (12)
Directive – 2008	0.5% (1)	18.0% (35)	57.2% (111)	22.2% (43)	2.1% (4)
Directive – 2014	0	13.5% (5)	45.9% (17)	29.7% (11)	10.8% (4)
Confident – 2008	0	1.0% (2)	15.7% (30)	63.9% (122)	19.4% (37)
Confident – 2014	0	0	13.9% (5)	50.0% (18)	36.1% (13)
Decisive – 2008	0	3.6% (7)	34.9% (67)	53.1% (102)	8.3% (16)
Decisive – 2014	0	11.4% (4)	22.9% (8)	48.6% (17)	17.1% (6)
Creative – 2008	0.5% (1)	5.7% (11)	35.4% (68)	46.4% (89)	12.0% (23)
Creative – 2014	0	0	19.4% (7)	55.6% (20)	25.0% (9)
Nurturing – 2008	0.5% (1)	5.7% (11)	35.2% (68)	48.2% (93)	10.4% (20)
Nurturing – 2014	0	2.8% (1)	13.9% (5)	58.3% (21)	25.0% (9)
Energetic – 2008	0	2.1% (4)	22.5% (43)	51.3% (98)	24.1% (46)
Energetic – 2014	0	0	5.7% (2)	57.1% (20)	37.1% (13)
Adaptive – 2008	0	1.0% (2)	24.4% (47)	53.9% (104)	20.7% (40)
Adaptive – 2014	0	0	5.6% (2)	69.4% (25)	25.0% (9)

Charismatic – 2008	2.6% (5)	25.3% (49)	40.2% (78)	26.3% (51)	5.7% (11)
Charismatic – 2014	0	8.8% (3)	35.3% (12)	35.3% (12)	20.6% (7)
Delegatory – 2008	0	4.1% (8)	32.1% (62)	58.5% (113)	5.2% (10)
Delegatory – 2014	0	5.6% (2)	27.8% (10)	52.8% (19)	13.9% (5)
Servant Leader – 2008	0.5% (1)	4.3% (8)	25.0% (47)	45.2% (85)	25.0% (47)
Servant Leader – 2014	0	0	5.6% (2)	47.2% (17)	47.2% (17)
Persuasive – 2008	0	4.5% (8)	26.3% (47)	52.0% (93)	17.3% (31)
Persuasive – 2014	0	0	27.8% (10)	47.2% (17)	25.0% (9)
Democratic – 2008	0	8.9% (16)	35.6% (64)	49.4% (89)	6.1% (11)
Democratic – 2014	0	2.8% (1)	36.1% (13)	41.7% (15)	19.4% (7)
Authoritarian – 2008	17.1% (33)	61.1% (118)	16.6% (32)	4.1% (8)	1.0% (2)
Authoritarian – 2014	38.2% (13)	47.1% (16)	8.8% (3)	2.9% (1)	2.9% (1)
Compassionate – 2008	0	1.1% (2)	21.2% (38)	49.2% (88)	28.5% (51)
Compassionate – 2014	0	0	8.8% (3)	38.2% (13)	52.9% (18)
Prophetic – 2008	1.6% (3)	16.3% (30)	50.0% (92)	28.8% (53)	3.3% (6)
Prophetic – 2014	0	11.1% (4)	36.1% (13)	38.9% (14)	13.9% (5)

How did you develop your leadership style?

Response	2008 Leader Survey (200)	2014 CR-CC Survey
From role models	67.0% (134)	65.8% (25)
From mistakes, learning, experience	87.5% (175)	76.3% (29)
Formal leadership training	50.5% (101)	68.4% (26)

Have you ever taken a course(s) related to leadership development?

Response	2008 Leader Survey	2014 CR-CC Survey
In seminary	34.0% (68)	55.3% (21)
Through online learning/blackboard	7.5% (15)	7.9% (3)
Through personal mentoring/coaching	43.0% (86)	52.6% (20)
Through UMC continuing education events	68.5% (137)	71.1% (27)
Especially about cross-racial cross-cultural ministry	-	28.9% (11)
None	3.5% (7)	7.9% (3)
Other	4.0% (8)	18.4% (7)

What do you consider to be your top three gifts for the ministry?

2008 Leader Survey	2014 CR-CC Survey
Preaching	Preaching
Teaching	Administration
Administration	Teaching
Leadership	Pastoral Care

How do you feel about your leadership in managing?

	Confident	Somewhat Confident	Not Confident
Church Finances - 2008	50.3% (99)	45.7% (90)	4.1% (8)
Church Finances - 2014	51.4% (19)	45.9% (17)	2.7% (1)
Fundraising - 2008	39.0% (76)	49.2% (96)	11.8% (23)
Fundraising - 2014	32.4% (12)	54.1% (20)	13.5% (5)
Budget Management - 2008	54.1% (105)	43.3% (84)	2.6% (5)
Budget Management - 2014	45.9% (17)	48.6% (18)	5.4% (2)

Has your confidence level with financial management changed since you became the lead pastor?

Response	2008 Leader Survey	2014 CR-CC Survey
Yes	57.4% (112)	67.6% (25)
No	42.6% (83)	32.4% (12)

Do you feel you have the qualities needed to manage church finances?

Response	2008 Leader Survey	2014 CR-CC Survey
Yes	87.2% (170)	65.8% (25)
No	10.3% (20)	13.2% (5)
Don't know	2.6% (5)	15.8% (6)

Do you enjoy the tasks of church finances?

Response	2008 Leader Survey	2014 CR-CC Survey
Never	2.5% (5)	2.9% (1)
Rarely	23.2% (46)	11.4% (4)
Sometimes	44.4% (88)	42.9% (15)
Often	24.2% (48)	28.6% (10)
Always	5.6% (11)	14.3% (5)

Do you think that the call to pastor a large membership church is distinct from the call to other kinds of pastoral ministries such as pastoring a small membership church; DS; BOOM Chair?

Response	2008 Leader Survey	2014 CR-CC Survey
Yes	77.8% (147)	57.9% (22)
No	17.5% (33)	18.4% (7)
Unsure	4.8% (9)	18.4% (7)

Are you married?

Response	2008 Leader Survey	2014 CR-CC Survey
Yes	89.5% (179)	63.9% (23)
No	10.5% (21)	36.1% (13)

Age

Response	2008 Leader Survey	2014 CR-CC Survey
Average	54.4	53.8
Median	55.0	54.0
Mode	55	59.0

## Ethnicity

Response	2008 Leader Survey	2014 CR-CC Survey
Asian	0.5% (1)	25.7% (9)
African American	1.0% (2)	54.3% (19)
Hispanic	0	14.3% (5)
Native American	0	0
Pacific Islander	0	2.9% (1)
White	98.5% (194)	0
Multi-Racial	0	2.9% (1)