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ABSTRACT

PASTORAL EFFECTIVENESS: A STUDY OF DIFFERENCES AMONG COMPARISON GROUPS OF SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST CLERGY
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Name of researcher: H. Peter Swanson
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Date completed: July 1999

Problem

Methods of comparison are required to evaluate pastoral effectiveness. This study was an examination of statistically significant differences among contrasted groups of clergy to identify characteristics and performance patterns associated with productivity and effectiveness.

Method

Pastors from Anglo Seventh-day Adventist churches in North America and Canada were assigned to five groups that were evaluated using the Adventist Pastor Inventory,
Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire, Pastoral Tasks Survey, and Pastoral Tasks Questionnaire.

Ministers who baptized 50 or more persons within 3 years were compared with those who baptized 10 or fewer in the same period and clergy rated most effective and least effective by supervisors were compared. Randomly selected pastors were assigned to a reference group.

Results

Statistically significant differences among the groups \((p < .05)\) were identified by means of the four instruments using Chi Square, Analysis of Variance, Multivariate Analysis of Variance, and Discriminant Analysis procedures.

High-baptism pastors were more oriented toward warm relationships with people, were more likely to have achieved scholastic honors, and to have attended the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary. They were likely to have spent more time on seven aspects of their work, and to have been rated as more proficient at 20 of 25 pastoral tasks.

The pastors rated most effective by their ministerial directors were more likely to have received academic honors, involved laity in ministry, had broader career aspirations within ministry, and seen greater numerical growth in their congregations. Characteristically they were evaluated as less submissive, more disciplined, and
more group-oriented than the less-effective pastors. According to lay-leaders' ratings, the more-effective group spent more time on 12 aspects of their work, and their task proficiency was rated superior on 23 of 25 pastoral tasks.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This study was an investigation of the personality profiles, performance characteristics, and demographic data of a stratified sample of Anglo Seventh-day Adventist pastors in North America and Canada. The intent was to identify criteria that would be useful in the evaluation of pastoral effectiveness.

Background of the Problem

It is evident from the apostle Paul's letters to Timothy and Titus that concern about the competence of pastors has existed from the inception of the Christian church (1 Tim 3:1-7, Titus 1:6-9).

These concerns were echoed by Ellen White, one of the founders of Seventh-day Adventism: "God cannot be glorified, or his cause advanced, by unconsecrated workmen, who are entirely deficient in the qualifications necessary to make a gospel minister" (1948, p. 551). She declared: "We stand in great need of competent men who will bring honor instead of disgrace upon the cause which they represent" (1948, p. 407). She also expressed dismay about readiness for ministry: "Some who enter the field are mere novices in the Scriptures. In other things
also they are incompetent and inefficient" (1948, p. 405).

In the first edition of The Ministry, published by the Ministerial Association of Seventh-day Adventists, in 1928, the General Conference President, A. G. Daniels, wrote:

The ardent, pressing desire for a more general and perceptible increase in efficiency has led to the birth of this new periodical--The Ministry... Every minister of the cross should earnestly desire, and pray and strive for, the fullest measure of genuine efficiency. (1928, p. 3)

Paul's exhortations and the testimonies addressed to early Adventist ministers describe the exalted character of the calling to ministry, and leave little doubt about what is unacceptable in a pastor. Educators and administrators face the daunting challenge of attempting to discern which candidates for ministry will measure up to the prescribed standards and which will not.

The task of translating scriptural ideals into what constitutes pastoral effectiveness in contemporary Adventism is complex. This is partly because of the absence of general agreement on the criteria that measure pastoral effectiveness and because of the complicated interplay of multiple influences that impact both the quality and quantity of the fruits of pastoral labor.

To illustrate, the career span of an effective pastor might be characterized as follows:

1. The diverse parishes he pastored presented him with a broad range of challenges and crises which he
handled with distinction.

An administrator in the United Methodist Church alluded to the fact that some congregations can be extremely problematical, and demanding of much greater pastoral expertise than others. "About five or ten percent of our clergy are going to do an excellent job regardless of the place to which they are assigned. The rest aren't that way. How well they perform depends on where we put them" (Clapp, 1982, p. 106).

The level of difficulty of challenges in the ecclesiastical context where a pastor functions is a significant intervening variable when assessing pastoral effectiveness.

2. He met or surpassed the expectations and directives of a succession of church administrators.

Conference administrators are in a unique position to make comparative judgments about the effectiveness of those in ministry. However, the accuracy of their evaluations is influenced by the veracity of the reports they receive, the assessment procedures used, and their personal biases. The pastor's professional reputation may be strongly impacted by the accuracy of effectiveness estimates made by church administrators.

3. He consistently achieved church-growth goals, financial management objectives, and other measurable standards of performance.

The conference administration typically sets and
monitors performance criteria. Local congregational needs also influence how many home visits are made, how many Bible studies are given, and how many evangelistic meetings are held. No matter how the results are obtained, if the numbers look good, the pastor is typically considered effective.

4. A significant percentage of the congregants in all his parishes experienced growth toward spiritual maturity, attributable to his efforts under the blessing of God.

A highly intangible aspect of pastors' effectiveness is the extent to which beneficial changes occur in the lives of their people as a direct result of their ministry. In their study (Lichtman & Malony, 1990), Malony suggests that these include changes in inner preferences, interests, and attitudes, and in observable acts such as tithing, church attendance, and involvement in church-related activities (p. 164).

The process of change is different for each individual. The assortment, relationship, and intensity of factors that motivate change vary from person to person. These realities make it very difficult to assess the actual degree of pastoral influence in the changes, or lack of changes, in parishioners' lives.

5. He inspired and involved the church members in effective expression of their spiritual gifts within the congregation and in the community.
"When we isolate the pastor for evaluation we risk slipping into the mindset that the work of Christ in the world is only accomplished by those called to ordained, professional ministry" (Hudson, 1992, p. 9). Citing Biles (1988), Hudson maintains that better work can be accomplished through concerted action. "In the excellent churches, the laity own, take responsibility for, and are trusted with carrying out the work of the people of God" (Hudson, 1992, p. 3).

6. Periodic peer reviews of his professional skills contained high praise for his superior competency.

Competence is a necessary precondition, but not a guarantee of effectiveness (Rouch, 1974, p. 33). Competence refers to the knowledge, skills, and abilities that are required to do the work of ministry.

Pastors rarely undergo peer reviews unless their competence is in question. In this utopian scenario, an exceptionally effective pastor makes himself accountable by initiating evaluations of his knowledge base and professional skills by peer professionals.

7. The people in the pew loved and respected him as a man well fitted to his calling, and the community recognized him as a man of character and integrity.

A good person-job fit is crucial for effectiveness in ministry. This means more than the match between a pastor and a particular parish. It refers to the extent to which a person is well-suited to the calling and profession of
ministry.

As conceptualized in this study, fitness referred to intellectual ability, emotional stability, a personality conducive to healthy relationships, a conscientious, disciplined approach to responsibilities, an affinity for a deep spiritual experience, and other natural attributes.

8. His loyalty to his church and his fidelity to doctrinal purity were as important to his integrity as was his quest for an understanding of God's will and way in the present moment. Orthodoxy and the conservation of a traditional denominational identity are ecclesiastical values that are often in conflict with desires for ecumenical tolerance and contextual relevance (Clapp, 1982, p. 99). The effective pastor avoids the extremes of closed-mindedly clinging to what properly needs to be changed, and indiscriminately embracing faddish innovations.

9. His detractors were unable to muster any substantive criticisms against him because his life was above reproach. In order to be viewed as effective, pastors must be both able persons and good persons (Douglas, 1957, p. 50). An impeccable record of personal and familial rectitude and a reputation for genuine kindness and helpfulness are viewed as essentials of pastoral effectiveness.

10. He was a man of deep humility, attributing his
success in ministry to the empowerment and blessing of God, rather than to any efficiency of his own.

A curious anomaly in clergy evaluation is the phenomenon of some pastors of modest fitness and competence whose ministry is far more fruitful than some highly talented and educationally advantaged ministers.

The devout affirm the existence of a divine unction that is not subject to empirical analysis. Of all the intervening variables, evaluation of the presence or absence of such empowerment would be most difficult to achieve.

In summary, any attempt to measure comprehensively a pastor's effectiveness must take the following issues into consideration:

1. The complexity of the pastor's ecclesiastical context
2. The goodness-of-fit between the congregation's needs and the pastor's abilities
3. The goodness-of-fit between the church administrators' expectations and the pastor's ability to meet them
4. The presence of personal and material resources to meet numerical performance standards
5. The measurement of the pastor's ability to effect spiritual growth in the lives of church members
6. The ability to lead members to recognize spiritual gifts which are used to fulfill the mission to
members and community

7. The availability of skilled, impartial professionals to provide peer reviews; the reliability and validity of assessment instruments; and the degree of willingness of the pastor to submit to competency evaluation.

8. The ability to address resolutely, yet compassionately, congregational issues of heresy, denominational disloyalty, and sins in the lives of members.

9. The influence of personal and family history on the pastor's ministry and his reputation in church and community.

10. The imponderable of a numinous, supernatural enhancement of the pastor's efforts.

This discussion has focused upon the importance and complexity of evaluating pastoral effectiveness and the need to develop tools for evaluation.

Recognizing the necessity for a sound basis of selection, denominations and their seminaries initially worked independently in their attempts to devise ways of identifying the most promising candidates for ministry. With greater resources at their disposal, collaborative efforts by entities such as The Association of Theological Schools made significant advances in this field of enquiry (Schuller, Strommen, & Brekke, 1980).

Malony's overview (Donaldson, 1976) reveals the
considerable effort of investigators to develop assessment procedures and instruments to identify those who are likely to succeed in ministry (pp. 242-257). These efforts were influenced by what was happening in the broader field of evaluation of the individual's preparedness to practice in helping professions such as medicine, nursing, clinical psychology, teaching, and social work (Menges, 1975).

Within Adventism, Chalmers's (1969) research supported the theory that performance is a function of personality. He showed that "six personality traits differed significantly for those ranked high and those ranked low on the criteria of effectiveness" (1969, p. 24). His pioneering work was instrumental in establishing admission criteria for applicants to the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary.

The seminal work by Hunt, Hinkle, and Malony (1990) examined in depth the theoretical issues and research methodologies currently associated with clergy assessment.

In view of the challenges that face clergy at the dawn of a new millennium and the advances in the field of competency evaluation, it seemed advisable to reexamine the phenomenon of pastoral effectiveness and the ways to identify and measure it with particular application to the SDA Church.
Justification and Purpose of the Study

At the year-end meetings of the 1994 North American Division (NAD) of Seventh-day Adventists, the following action was approved for implementation:

Conduct a study of a cross-section of 100 pastors of Anglo churches in the North American Division who are effective soul-winners to look for any common denominators in education, experience, conference leadership, evangelistic programs, methods, personality profile. Each of these pastors should have baptized at least a total of 50 during the past three-year period. The NAD Office of Information and Research should commission the Institute of Church Ministry to conduct this study. (North American Division of SDA, 1994, p. 23)

This action grew out of a recognition by NAD leadership that church growth in Anglo congregations in North America is lower than in African-American congregations, and much lower than in Hispanic congregations. There are some Anglo pastors, however, who distinguish themselves as effective soul-winners.

The first objective of this study was to discover factors in common among productive pastors, the lack of which might account for the paucity of church growth in Anglo congregations served by less-productive pastors.

The second purpose of the study was an attempt to develop a profile of characteristics and performance patterns that differentiate most-effective from least-effective pastors. It was projected that such a profile could be used to inform decisions about recruitment, remediation, and outplacement, and might be useful in the selection and training of candidates for
Statement of the Problem

Some Anglo SDA pastors are successful in baptizing many new members into their congregations while other Anglo pastors in the NAD are substandard in numbers of baptisms.

Some Anglo SDA pastors are rated exceptional in terms of pastoral effectiveness by conference ministerial directors, while others are rated ineffective.

The study sought to identify criteria that could differentiate high-baptism from low-baptism pastors, and most-effective from least-effective pastors.

Theoretical Perspectives

The focus of this study of pastoral effectiveness was upon aspects of "fitness" and "competence" for ministry.

Fitness refers to the capacities and characteristics needed to acquire the knowledge, practice the skills, and perform the roles that are required in ministry (Hunt et al., 1990, p. 13). The following aspects of fitness for ministry were examined.

1. Intellectual ability: The roles of preacher, writer, and scholar tax the minister's mental acuity. Pastors "with keener memories [and the] capacity for more complex cognitive functioning" (Malony & Hunt, 1991,
p. 126) are believed by some to have greater effectiveness potential than those with lesser intellectual prowess.

2. **Emotional stability:** Tendencies toward depression, anxiety, compulsivity, adjustment impediments, and vulnerability to stress are assumed hindrances to pastoral effectiveness.

"Unhealthy tiredness and lowered energy may signal anxiety, fear, or hopelessness displayed in clinical depression" (Malony & Hunt, 1991, p. 129). Chalmers (1969, p. 15) found that pastors who were more productive had measurably higher levels of energy than those who were less involved. Isolated instances of reactions to stress overload are of lesser concern in evaluating fitness for ministry than a personality structure that is susceptible to emotional distress.

3. **Interpersonal functioning:** "Some pastors maintain professional distance from their parishioners, but they never distinguish themselves as caring and loving ministers. . . . Pastors who fail in their ministries usually do so because of deteriorated relationships" (Means, 1993, pp. 29, 30). A person who is constitutionally shy and retiring may be able to learn interpersonal skills and develop an understanding of relational principles yet will prefer to work in isolation, thus tending to avoid important aspects of ministry.

4. **Self-discipline:** A knowledge of time-management
techniques and efficient work methods will not alter the underlying personality structure of the perpetual procrastinator. Fitness for ministry requires conscientious self-management if efficiency and productivity are to characterize pastors' performance of their duties.

These four aspects of ministerial fitness were studied by comparing the personality profiles of productive and unproductive pastors, and those rated most effective and least effective.

As indicated above, fitness refers to the capacities and characteristics needed to acquire the knowledge, practice the skills, and perform the roles that are required in ministry. Competence refers to the extent to which pastors have acquired the requisite knowledge and skill to adequately perform the functions of their calling, and their demonstrated ability to perform the tasks associated with their pastoral roles. Leaders within congregations were surveyed to evaluate the pastor's competence and effectiveness. And self-reports of time allocated to specified pastoral tasks and self-estimates of task proficiency provided additional indices of competence.

In the conceptualization of this study, it was assumed that in each of the predominantly Anglo conferences in the NAD there were some exceptional pastors and some whose effectiveness was marginal. In
support of this assumption, a survey of church administrators and seminary professors from different denominations by Clapp (1982) revealed that 11% of pastors were considered to be in the excellent category and 15% were classified as incompetent (p. 30).

A second assumption was that ministerial directors would accurately identify the most-effective and the least-effective pastors in their conferences on the basis of baptismal reports and upon their knowledge of the pastors and parishes under their supervision.

The third assumption was that groups of most-effective pastors would share certain distinctive characteristics and practices that would set them apart from other pastors. Similarly, it was assumed that groups of least-effective pastors would have characteristics and performance patterns in common that were different from the average pastor.

It was hypothesized that post hoc studies of the derived personality and performance profiles could demonstrate predictive value. Thus, if an individual's profile were a good match with that of the collective, "most effective" pastor's profile, it would seem reasonable to expect a superior level of pastoral effectiveness from that person.

It was hypothesized that the group profiles of most- and least-effective pastors would differ in intellectual, emotional, relational, and occupational functioning. It
was expected the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire Fifth Edition (Cattell, Cattell & Cattell, 1994) would identify those characteristics.

Differences were also expected in the performance patterns of the two groups. The Pastoral Tasks Survey, developed for this research, was designed to assess the pastors' perspectives of task importance, to obtain self-estimates of the amount of time typically spent performing each of 25 clusters of pastoral tasks, and to elicit self-ratings of the quality of task performance.

The Pastoral Tasks Questionnaire contained the same items as the Pastoral Tasks Survey, but was adapted in order to measure task importance as viewed by leaders in the congregations served by the pastoral respondents.

The Adventist Pastor Inventory (Dudley, 1996) was designed to elicit demographic data which were expected to correlate with high and low levels of pastoral effectiveness.

Study Approach

The first step in this investigation was to survey the ministerial directors in all the Anglo conferences in NAD to obtain four lists of names: Anglo pastors who had 50 or more baptisms during 1993-1995; Anglo pastors who had 10 or fewer baptisms during 1993-1995; three Anglo pastors from each conference who were most effective, and three who were least effective in the performance of their

The second step was to obtain the names of pastors to serve as a reference group. These were randomly selected Anglo pastors not included in the above-mentioned four groups who worked in non-institutional parishes.

The third step was to send the testing materials to the identified and randomly selected pastors. Upon completion, the three test instruments were returned for processing and analysis. Rigorous protocols were implemented to protect the identity of the respondents and to safeguard confidential information.

The fourth step was to send the Pastoral Tasks Questionnaire to three officiating leaders in the largest of the churches served by the pastoral respondents.

The data were then analyzed to identify similarities within groups and differences between groups, and to isolate the particular characteristics and performance factors common to individuals in the different groups.

Delimitations of the Study

1. Due to the limitations imposed by the design of the study, the four main groups of pastors were not randomly selected. Consequently, the generalizability of the findings of this study is circumscribed.

2. The subjects are by definition pastors of Anglo churches, and are therefore not a representative cross section of Seventh-day Adventist pastors in North America,
much less of pastors from other countries. Thus, caution
should be exercised in any use of the findings of this
study outside its primary context.

3. Excluded from the pool from which subjects were
selected for this study were Anglo pastors from
institutional churches such as those at educational or
medical facilities. The professional roles and
expectations in such churches are usually different from
those in other Anglo congregations.

4. Due to the complexities involved in trying to
conduct a comprehensive study of pastoral effectiveness,
no attempt was made to control all the variables described
in the first part of this chapter.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined as used in this
dissertation:

Adventist: "In SDA usage, a short term for
'Seventh-day Adventist'" (Seventh-day Adventist
Encyclopedia, 1976, p. 9).

Andrews University: A Christian institution of
higher education in the Seventh-day Adventist tradition
that prepares its students for service to church and
society. Located in Berrien Springs, Michigan, it is
accredited with the North Central Association of Colleges
and Schools and the Adventist Accrediting Association of
the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists for
programs through the doctoral level.

Anglo: Identifies Seventh-day Adventist pastors (and congregations) in North America who are predominantly English-speaking and Caucasian.

Baptisms: Admission into church membership in the SDA church is normally through the ritual of baptism by immersion. Church-membership growth is typically described in terms of the number of baptisms.

Conference: "The unit of church administration called a local conference, in which a number of local churches are associated for administrative purposes" (Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia, 1976, p. 345).

Division: "The largest geographical and administrative unit next to the General Conference, embracing a number of unions, missions, conferences, sections, et cetera" (Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia, 1976, p. 393).

General Conference: "The central governing organization of the SDA Church. . . . The General Conference conducts its worldwide work through sections called divisions, each operating within a specified territory assigned by General Conference Action" (Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia, 1976, p. 493).

Institute of Church Ministry (ICM):

An official organization of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary [that was] created to share the expertise and resources of Andrews University with the Adventist church in North America, thus aiding denominational decisionmakers and facilitating the
larger church in the accomplishment of its goals. As such the ICM serves the North American Division Strategic Resource Center but also lists the General Conference, local conferences, local churches, and Adventist journals among its clients (Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary Bulletin, 1996, p. 20).

IPAT: Acronym for Institute of Personality and Ability Testing, publisher of Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF).

Ministerial Association: "A branch of the General Conference . . . [that] endeavors through its professional journal, The Ministry, its conventions, institutes, and evangelistic field schools to elevate the spiritual experience of, and increase the efficiency of, its ministerial, evangelistic, and other gospel workers" (Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia, 1976, p. 901).

Ministerial Secretary or Director: Head of the ministerial department of a local conference whose roles include recruitment, supervision, and support of pastors. In smaller conferences this function is usually performed by the conference president.

North American Division (NAD): "A large unit of church organization to which is allotted the territory of the United States, Canada, and Bermuda" (Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia, 1976, p. 981).

SDA: Acronym for Seventh-day Adventist.

Seventh-day Adventist Church:

A conservative Christian body, worldwide in extent, evangelical in doctrine, and professing no creed but the Bible. It places strong emphasis on the Second
Advent, which it believes is near, and observes the Sabbath of the Bible, the seventh day of the week. These two distinguishing points are incorporated into the name Seventh-day Adventist" (Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia, 1976, p. 1325).

Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary:

A post-baccalaureate entity of Andrews University, the Seminary is authorized by the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists to confer doctoral degrees in theology, religion, and ministry, and is the only institution delegated by the denomination's North American Division to provide professional and academic master's degrees for the preparation of ministers. In harmony with its global purview, it is asked to offer extension classes and continuing-education opportunities throughout North America and, by means of extension centers and affiliations, to offer context-sensitive programs world-wide (Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary Bulletin, 1996, p. 15).

Soul-winners: Individuals who lead others to an understanding of salvation and into church membership.

Testimonies: "Communication(s) of counsel and instruction given by Ellen G. White, either orally or in writing, to an individual, to a congregation, or to SDAs in general (a collection of which has been published under the title Testimonies for the Church)" (Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia, 1976, p. 1470).

Outline of the Study

Chapter 2 is a literature review of the field of competency evaluation of ministry.

Chapter 3 describes the methodology, instrumentation, and analysis of the study.

Chapter 4 reports the results and findings of the study.
Chapter 5 presents a summary of the findings and the implications that grow out of the results, and suggests issues for further research.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature review is focused primarily upon effectiveness in pastoral ministry. In broad perspective, two concerns directed the search: (1) issues related to the assessment of requisite characteristics and qualities in persons who aspire to effective ministry, and (2) pastoral roles and tasks, and various methods of evaluating them. The intent of the organization is to provide a perspective of the evolution of thinking about the assessment of clergy performance.

Characteristics and Qualities of Effective Ministers

The issues surrounding the identification and assessment of essential qualities and capacities of effective pastors have been investigated and debated for most of the 20th century. Various systems and categories have been proposed in an attempt to make uncomplicated what continues to be complex. In this overview, a four-dimensional rubric was used to organize the material in a way that corresponds with familiar modes of thought. The talents, aptitudes, and personality qualities described by various authors are
considered in relationship to the intellectual, emotional, relational, and functional domains.

Smith (1950) cited a survey of Disciples of Christ ministers and reported "that in 75 per cent of effective pastorates effectiveness resulted from industriousness rather than from high I.Q. or oratorical power or academic prowess. Equally strong are consecration to the cause of Christ and the ability to get along with people" (p. 346).

Douglas (1957) found five characteristics of ministerial effectiveness identified in ratings by laity and psychological tests. They include

- a genuine love for people as people, regardless of their color, class, economic status, or educational level . . . [and] the ability to sacrifice immediate impulse satisfaction to long range goals, one's own personal desires to the slow working out of group purposes. (p. 164)

Elsewhere (as cited in Bier, 1970), Douglas said that in some studies "pastors' ratings correlated positively with rather withdrawn personalities instead of the outgoing personalities assumed to be requisite for effectiveness" (p. 31). Bier (1970) reported that Douglas "had also discovered that men were often rated as good pastors not because of their concern for people, which might be relatively low, but because they were energetic in the performance of pastoral chores" (p. 31). However, Douglas (1957) also noted that "extra-meticulous attention to detail and over-concern for accuracy are marks of men rated as poor" (p. 152) in the administrative functions of
clergy. These contrasting perspectives reference characteristics that correspond to the relational and functional domains.

The work of Samuel Blizzard laid the foundation for much of the thinking in the field of clergy assessment. While focusing primarily on the functional roles, he also reported respondents' perceptions about their characteristics and how these impacted effectiveness and success. He reported (Blizzard, 1958a) that intelligence was ranked eighth for both effectiveness and success. The range of the rankings was not reported. Emotional functioning was ranked fifth for effectiveness and an outgoing personality was ranked second. Descriptors such as integrity, trustworthiness, and responsibility were subsumed under "character" which was ranked fifth for success (p. 31). This corresponds in some respects with the functional domain in this present study in which conscientiousness, self-management, and productiveness are key concepts. In an earlier study Blizzard (1955) quoted a respondent as saying:

Ministers succeed or fail as local ministers, not on their ability to preach, nor on their knowledge of history, not on their Bible understanding, nor any of the scholarly matters, but on their ability to effectively communicate a Christian concern for people. This is more a matter of personality than training. (p. 389)

This view accords with the relational domain of this present study.

Banks (1966) found that SDA ministers in training who
perceived themselves to have the characteristics of the ideal pastor differ from those who do not on the following 16PF factors: they score higher on Factor H (Enthusiastic), and lower on Factor N (Forthright); these factors are in the relational domain and load in the expected direction. They also scored lower on Factor Q4 (Relaxed), an emotional-domain factor (p. 46).

In his examination of 118 experienced SDA pastors, Chalmers (1969) showed that those identified by their conference presidents as "investing considerably more energy in their ministry than others" (p. 27) and being "more totally involved in their ministerial work" (p. 38) scored higher than men rated "less-involved" on the 16PF Factor C (Emotional Stability), Factor G (Conscientiousness), Factor H (Venturesomeness), and Factor Q3 (Self-Discipline). They also scored lower on Factor M which represents a practical orientation. Not surprisingly, this group also had the higher number of baptisms.

Ashbrook (cited in Bier, 1970) described intellectual ability in two ways. There is "the ability to meet academic requirements," and to achieve "a certain minimum grade-point average that cumulates in the successful completion of course requirements" (pp. 112, 113) leading to graduation. The measures of this ability would include grades, GPA, and the satisfactory meeting of the "implicit and explicit expectations of faculty and administration"
However, in his view, "academic ability is only indirectly related to scholarly capacity" (p. 112). The latter is apparently viewed to be of a higher order that is measured by "personality and intelligence tests, or faculty and peer appraisals of intellectual performance and potential" (p. 112). Ashbrook (cited in Bier, 1970) describes a model developed by Stern, Stein, and Bloom (1956) that characterizes the "ideal" seminary student, and presumably, the effective pastor.

1. Interpersonal Relations. Includes capacity for involvement with others, the ability to interact skillfully with peers, superiors, and subordinates, without arousing hostility or rejection. Such rapport will involve social sensitivity, tact, and confidence in social contact. Aggressive impulses should be well socialized, and the individual should appear as autonomous rather than dependent or dominant.

2. Inner State. Characterized by high energy, consistently purposively directed.

3. Goal Orientation. Will be persistent in attacking problems, although not inflexible. When confronted with possible failure, the individual will counteract, restriving in order to overcome obstacles, rather than withdrawing or otherwise avoiding the issue. Although primarily intraceptive, the student will focus on people and personal relations. (pp. 114, 115)

In these descriptions there is an intermingling of the emotional, interpersonal, and functional domains of this present study. Ashbrook (cited in Bier, 1970) was very critical of misuses of psychological evaluations such as making unwarranted predictions of effectiveness based on test scores. However, testing "is essential for comparative purposes among different populations and for
consensually validated meanings of concepts like minister and ministerial functioning" (p. 119).

Reporting on the proceedings at the seventh symposium of the Academy of Religion and Mental Health, Bier (1970) quotes Coville as saying, "All kinds of personalities may qualify for the ministry and religious life provided they meet the criteria of adequate intelligence, genuine motivation, and relatively stable emotional functioning" (pp. 36, 37). Bier (1970) reported that Steinberg described the intent of their evaluation of students preparing for the rabbinate as follows, "We want to understand their personality structure, their capabilities, their intelligence, their verbal ability, their capacity for conceptualizing" (p. 150). As cited in Bier (1970), Carroll gave insights into the research and development of the Faculty Rating Scale used in the evaluation of likely effectiveness of Catholic clergy-in-training. Of the 19 characteristics described, of first importance was "Industriousness-Perseverance. The effective person wishes and is able to work hard with diligent persistence at tasks assigned to him" (p. 164). This coincides with the functional domain in the present study. Second in importance was "Concern for others. He is outgoing and warm in his dealing with all classes of people so that they know he likes to be with them" (p. 165). This corresponds closely with the interpersonal domain. Third in importance was "Emotional balance and
maturity. He manages himself well—his emotions, his moods, his passions. He is not carried away by feelings, but is self-disciplined, self-controlled" (p. 165). This is similar to the emotional domain. Eleventh in importance was "Intelligence. He should be possessed of an intelligence and memory at least equal to that of the average graduate of a good college" (p. 168).

Fukuyama's (1973) data showed that the measure of ministers' professional authority was in the superiority of their technical competence, principally, their expert knowledge of the Bible and theology (p. 108).

In his careful comparison of various sources, Nauss (1974a) reported that while effective Protestant ministers scored higher on the Weschler verbal intelligence scale, they had more average scores on the performance I.Q. measures. The Graduate Record Examination Aptitude Test revealed normal levels of intelligence. He saw as a more important measure the ability to learn and absorb, and to facilitate learning in others (pp. 45, 46). Emotional stability and the ability to restrain angry responses were, in his view, indices of pastoral effectiveness (p. 41). In the relational domain, he reported that "concern, love and considerateness" are characteristics that were confirmed as highly important by both research and church administrators' ratings (p. 49). In the functional domain he described effective ministers as having "productive energy" and being industrious in their
enthusiastic service of the Lord (p. 42).

Rouch (1974) saw "knowing relevant facts," an accessible "memory bank of ideas and combinations of ideas," and the ability to evaluate emerging "reinterpretations" of data and belief systems, as basic to ministerial competence (pp. 44, 45).

Dower (1980) made an important contribution to Seventh-day Adventist understanding of the abilities required of pastors. He identified 101 characteristics and competencies and had these rank ordered by Seminary faculty, Seminary graduates, conference presidents, and Seminary students. Most of his categories dealt with abilities and skills that can be acquired through academic preparation. "The ability to think clearly, critically, logically, openly" (p. 99) was ranked 14th overall out of 101. The intellectual domain received additional direct and indirect support in his study as important to pastoral effectiveness.

Haight (1980), citing Ham (1960) in her significant work, reported that he found "differences between ministers with effective and ineffective work styles were based on factors of verbal intelligence, degree of emotional distance from others, flexibility of personality structure, other-centeredness, superior marital adjustment, and ego functioning" (p. 60).

In the monumental Association of Theological Schools research project, reported and edited by Schuller et al.,
(1980), 850 items describing specific actions of ministry were subsumed from a larger pool of 1,200 general descriptions of ministry. The wording of items sometimes commingles being and doing, characteristics and functions, and sometimes combines aspects of more than one domain in a single description. The following items coincide with the intellectual domain of this present study:

- Sharpening already keen intelligence through continual theological study and careful attention to clarity of thought and expression (p. 36)
- Evinces and encourages clear, critical thinking, seeks additional information when appropriate, and maintains effective integration of action and reflection (p. 380)
- Explains complex issues in understandable terms (p. 148)
- Expresses complex theological matters in understandable language; can help persons clarify their own theological and ethical thinking (p. 319)
- Quickly grasps the basic issues in complicated matters (p. 148)
- Makes fine, intellectual distinctions when necessary (p. 148)
- Teaches and preaches from a broad base of information (p. 152)
- Demonstrates awareness of current events, history, and other disciplines, and reflects deeply on the theological implications of these (p. 380)
- Maintains an ongoing program of study and research and applies theological and historical knowledge to contemporary religious situations (p. 251)
- Shows intellectual confidence, a wide range of literary interests, and the ability to work with members of other professions (p. 380)
- Intellectual autonomy. Even in the face of adversity, freely expresses own opinions and
maintains stands on issues. (p. 383)

The following items coincide with the emotional domain of the present study:

Handling stressful situations by remaining calm under pressure while continuing to affirm persons (p. 31)

Recognizes own emotional and physical limitations (p. 160)

Can recognize own feelings toward difficult tasks and persons, and is able to handle them so that they do not interfere with the practice of ministry (p. 322)

Acts calmly during times of stress (p. 180)

Bounces back after negative experiences (p. 182)

Worries excessively about what others think of him/her (inverse descriptor) (p. 196)

Becomes moody when pressures increase (inverse descriptor) (p. 201)

Is usually upset by unexpected demands on own time (inverse descriptor) (p. 220)

Seeks constant reassurance that he/she is doing a good job (inverse descriptor) (p. 220)

Uses intellect to avoid dealing with own emotions (inverse descriptor) (p. 220)

Works and sleeps late (inverse descriptor) (p. 222)

Retains a calm, positive orientation under stress and maintains commitments (p. 383)

Actions that demonstrate immaturity, insecurity, insensitivity, and being buffeted by the demands and pressures of the profession (inverse descriptor). (p. 49)

The following items coincide with the relational domain of the present study:

Interpersonal sensitivity. Intuitively senses others' needs and concerns, shows flexibility and openness, and fosters a positive, caring atmosphere (p. 383)
Develops a feeling of trust and confidence between self and members (p. 204)

Relates well to people of varied cultures (p. 178)

Accepts diversity. Encourages valuation of diversity in cultures, lifestyles, ideas, and personal experiences (p. 383)

Tends to be cold and impersonal (inverse descriptor) (p. 198)

Often belittles a person in front of others (inverse descriptor) (p. 201)

Tends to be abrupt and impatient when talking with people (inverse descriptor) (p. 201)

People are afraid to come to him/her for counseling on problems and problem situations (inverse descriptor) (p. 201)

Exercises ministerial authority in ways that are destructive to interpersonal relations, preventing growth in others as well as self (inverse descriptor) (p. 325)

Reaching out to persons under stress with a perception, sensitivity, and warmth that is freeing and supportive (p. 33)

Avoiding intimacy and repelling people by a critical, demeaning, and insensitive attitude (inverse descriptor) (p. 49)

Effectively relates to people, including youth, actively participates in day-by-day activities, and supports innovators (p. 372)

Identifying with all age groupings in the congregation, relating to persons in the midst of their daily activities, and facilitating a sense of belonging, their confidence, and their competence as they share their faith with one another (p. 410)

Self-disclosing style. Openly, but with propriety, admits doubts, struggles, fears, frustrations, disappointments, and battles with temptation (p. 382)

Alienating behaviors. Acts in ways that offend others, such as remaining aloof, fighting congregational structures, working at a secular job, and ignoring people in favor of work (inverse
Harshly judges self and others, and expresses condemnatory attitudes by moodiness, impatience, aloofness, and escapist behaviors (inverse descriptor) (p. 385)

Functions ineffectively in many areas, including socially, emotionally, and behaviorally, all of which signals poor job adjustment, at very least, and possibly psychological disturbance (inverse descriptor) (p. 385)

Becoming overly deferential under pressure, being unable to accept one's mistakes and move on, worrying excessively about what others think, acting impulsively (inverse descriptor) (p. 412)

Shows coldness and immaturity, far more concerned with self than others, violates principles to protect self (inverse descriptor) (p. 451)

Frightens people off with dominating, superior attitude that is compulsive, condemning, sexist, demeaning, and pessimistic (inverse descriptor). (p. 451)

The following items coincide with the functional domain of the present study:

Showing competence and responsibility by completing tasks, relating warmly to persons, handling differences of opinion, and growing in skills (p. 31)

Works independently without prodding or supervision (p. 176)

Does not avoid tasks of ministry that he/she does not enjoy (p. 178)

Generally finishes what he/she starts. (p. 178)

These items were excerpted from the broader study to demonstrate correspondence with the four domains of this present study and without reference to other important considerations such as ratings of relative importance, and variations of item value to different denominations. The
selection of items is broadly representative but not exhaustive.

Clapp (1982) interviewed over a thousand persons, including SDAs, from 22 denominations. These represented clergy, active and inactive church members, Christians who were not members of a local church, denominational executives, and seminary professors. Warmth, concern, patience, and the ability to manage conflict well are relational characteristics of importance that are noted in his summary of 12 competencies (pp. 3, 4). He quoted interviewees as saying:

I know that being intelligent and being a good minister are not identical. But a minimal level of aptitude is important. People can enter the ministry who wouldn't have a chance in another profession. . . . [And] the trouble with most of the clergy that I supervise is that they either are lazy or don't like people. You either have self-discipline and integrity, or you don't. A lot of our people are just plain lazy. (p. 26)

Clapp reports that administrators and seminary professors hold deep concerns about the number of inept clergy, and the large number of "persons who at best are fair or mediocre in their ability" (pp. 26, 27).

Odendaal (1984) examined characteristics associated with ministerial burnout and found that those who scored high on the 16PF Factor O (Apprehensive and Self-Reproaching) and on Factor Q4 (Tense and Driven) were more susceptible to burnout. These factors are included in the emotional domain. Similarly those who scored low on Factor H (Shy and Threat-sensitive) were
more likely to suffer burnout, as were those who scored low on Factor G (Expedient and Unconventional) (p. 108). As burnout is antithetical to pastoral effectiveness, these findings are of practical interest.

Cavanagh (1986) noted that some very competent ministers do not have much formal education while some with the highest degrees are ineffective. He saw intellectual flexibility and creativity as important (pp. 32, 33). The ability of pastors to care for their own emotional and psychological needs was described as central to effectiveness (pp. 10-17). In the relational domain he says that "a minister's effectiveness is in direct proportion to his or her proximity to the people" (p. 34). Furthermore, "approachable ministers are perceived as warm, understanding, and accepting" (p. 35). They also have sufficient strength and assertiveness to resist being misused (p. 35). The effective pastor neither overworks to the point of burnout nor underworks and therefore becomes bored and purposeless (p. 8).

Schaller (1986) showed that the characteristics of effective pastors differed in terms of the kinds of pastorates they served. "Most effective pastors share one common characteristic; each is a remarkably hard worker." However, in the very large congregation "foresight, vision, the ability to conceptualize abstract ideas, and a willingness to lead are far more important than hard work" (p. 29). In the relational domain he emphasized
easily perceived love and concern for people, the ability to inspire trust and confidence, and the security to value competent people rather than to see them as threats (p. 30).

Fishburn (1989) found that effective pastors have "the intelligence to become theologically articulate and enough self-confidence to be able to lead a congregation" (p. 39). In the relational domain they "have good relational skills . . . [and] are very empathic" (p. 40).

Emotional functioning of clergy is addressed cogently by Blackmon and Hart (Hunt et al., 1990) who showed that ministry is an occupation at high risk for depression, stress overload, and burnout. It also places demands on pastors that call for the careful management of anger and assertiveness. Those with robust emotional health are likely to have less down time than pastors with a predisposing vulnerability (pp. 36-44).

Using Holland's (1985) vocational categories, Rieder's study (1991) indicated that United Methodist Superintendents are likely to rate pastors as effective who had personalities described as "a high achiever, status conscious, and self-confident" (p. 112). They were also viewed as imaginative, creative, and expressive. "The older pastors seem to score highest on the self-control scale; indicating that they tend to be responsible, cautious, persistent, insecure, and nonrebellious" (pp. 112, 113).
Means (1993) preferred common sense over genius and gifts. Before intellectual brilliance, he chose sound, practical judgment, depth of insight, and moral discrimination in pastors. Also indispensable were the expertise to exegete Scripture accurately and the informed sensitivity to communicate in culturally relevant terms. "Seldom do pastors rise above the quality of their relationships. . . . Greatly blessed churches have transparent, personable, collegial, spiritual leaders" (pp. 27-30).

Wesemann (1995) examined the predictive value of the Profiles of Ministry Stage I instrument to assess levels of pastoral effectiveness among 92 Lutheran seminarians who were rated during a 1-year, full-time internship and found some limited utility:

It is understandable how an attitude of clericalism and a tendency to be controlling, as reflected by the SELF-C scale, would be a negative indicator of ministerial effectiveness. In the same way, it is clear that a desire to assist people with problems (ICAR-C) and taking an advocacy position toward youth and their needs (YUTH-C) would be positive indicators of ministerial effectiveness. Also, it is understandable how an individual who places ministry as a precedence over family (MNFM-C) would secure a high performance rating due to an extreme commitment to ministry. (p. 42)

These descriptors are similar to the relational and functional domains of this present study.

In his important study of the discontinuance from ministry of Seventh-day Adventist pastors, van Rooyen (1996) examined the influence of marital and emotional...
factors. He concluded that divorce and the attendant emotional turmoil were factors in decisions to leave the ministry for some of the respondents. However, "pastors, as a group, moderately disagreed that their own personal emotional health, and that of their wives was poor" (p. 83).

Lamport (1998) investigated the personality traits of 100 individuals involved in youth ministry in the Greater Boston area. Eighty-five percent perceived Creativity (intellectual domain) to be important for youth ministry, though only 48% rated themselves as creative. In the domain of emotional stability and non-reactivity, Patience was endorsed by 73% of respondents as an ideal characteristic and was self-reported by 50%. In the relational domain the reported traits were: Understanding (ideal 82%, self-report 74%), Enthusiastic (ideal 79%, self-report 59%), Outgoing (ideal 74%, self-report 52%), Personable (ideal 71%, self-report 70%). In the functional domain the characteristics were, Honest (ideal 77%, self-report 73%), Energetic (ideal 75%, self-report 44%), Organized (ideal 70%, self-report 44%), Responsible (ideal 66%, self-report 67%), and Dependable (ideal 64%, self-report 56%).

In his acclaimed work on church development, Schwarz (1998) reported:

Our study demonstrated that while pastors of growing churches are usually not "people-persons" who lose themselves in interaction with individuals, yet on
the average they are somewhat more relationship-, person-, and partnership-oriented than their colleagues in declining churches. (p. 42)

Dudley (1999) surveyed 914 SDA leaders and lay persons and found that 92% believed that pastors should be dependable and emotionally stable, 89% thought that they should be loving towards people, and 62% believed that they should manage time and personal finances well (p. 10).

Summary

This overview of characteristics and qualities thought to be related to pastoral effectiveness focused on the four domains of this present study, intellectual, emotional, relational, and functional. The face validity of these constructs is amply demonstrated by the enduring emphasis placed on them by various authors and researchers. Reviews of attempts to measure aspects of these domains as they relate to pastoral effectiveness have met with mixed outcomes, and Dittes (cited in Bier, 1970) raised appropriate caution about the tendency to misapply the findings of research and the scores of psychological tests. Although the possession of attributes assumed to be necessary for success are not predictors of effectiveness per se (because so many other intervening variables impact performance), it seems obvious that the demands of ministry are likely to be overwhelming to a person of marginal intellectual gifts,
who suffers emotional fragility and relational incapacity, and whose self-management is deficient.

**Role Performance and Task Proficiency**

Interest in the examination of what pastors actually do is pervasive in the research on clergy effectiveness, and various forms of task categorization abound. The present study examines the work of the pastor in terms of five roles, Preaching and Worship Leading, Administration, Pastoral Care and Counseling, Teaching and Equipping, and Evangelism and Church Growth. Each role is subdivided into five tasks or task clusters that describe pastoral responsibilities in behavioral terms. The discussion that follows references these roles and tasks and examines the amount of time required for task performance wherever this is reported.

In Blizzard's study (1956), 690 clergymen were asked to evaluate six pastoral roles in terms of their importance, and with reference to each clergyman's performance effectiveness and enjoyment of the roles. In rank order of importance the roles were Preacher, Pastor, Priest, Teacher, Organizer, and Administrator (p. 508). In rank order of perception of effectiveness the roles were: Preacher, Pastor, Teacher, Priest, Administrator, and Organizer (p. 509). The rank order of role enjoyment was: Pastor, Preacher, Teacher, Priest, Organizer, and Administrator (p. 509). The ranking in terms of the
amount of time spent per role was: Administrator, Pastor, Preacher and Priest, Organizer, and Teacher (p. 509). Of the normal 10-hour work day,

almost two-fifths . . . was spent as administrator. Slightly more than one fourth was devoted to the pastor role. Preaching and priestly activities took up almost one-fifth of the work day. Organizing consumed more than one-tenth of the work day. The residual time (about one-twentieth) was devoted to teaching. This order of priority . . . was the same for both urban and rural ministers. . . . The average time devoted to sermon preparation is 34 minutes for rural men, 38 minutes for urban clergymen. The time taken up by stenographic tasks is one hour and four minutes for both country and city men. (p. 509)

In a later study (1958b) Blizzard identified 14 role categories that emerged from statements made by clergymen about the "essence of what he is really trying to do in his job" (p. 375). Four of these roles were primary for almost two-thirds of the ministers studied: father-shepherd, interpersonal relations specialist, parish promoter, and community problem solver. One-sixth of the respondents saw the believer-saint and evangelist roles as primary. And one-fifth of the ministers saw one of the following roles as primary: scholar, liturgist, educator, specialist in a subculture, representative of the church-at-large, lay minister, church politician, and general practitioner (p. 380).

In his discussion of pastoral roles, Douglas (1957) cited several authors to illustrate different perspectives. Among others, the following role designations were presented: Comrade and Counselor,
Spiritual Sponsor and Social Mediator, Parish Organizer and Leader, Executive Pastor and Priest, Public Relations Director, Student, Priest and Comforter, Religious Educator, Leader of People and Program (p. 24). Besides that of Blizzard, the categorization that Douglas found most adequate was that of May et al. (1934), which he reported in relationship to Blizzard's categories as follows:

1. Ministerial duties (cf. Priest)
2. Homiletical and speaking duties (cf. Preacher)
3. Pastoral and fraternal activities (cf. Pastor, plus some elements of the role of Organizer)
4. Organization, administration, and supervision of the work of the parish (cf. Organizer and Administrator)
5. Educational activities, including teaching, confirmation classes, etc. (cf. Teacher)
6. Civic and community activities
7. Mechanical, routine work--janitorial work, secretarial work, etc. (p. 24)

In his examination of Blizzard's model, Douglas found that his:

six defined practitioner roles possess ambiguities which make securing ratings concerning effectiveness in them more difficult. Some, like Administrator and Organizer, or Preacher and Teacher, blur over into one another, at least for lay people. Moreover Administrator and Pastor are compound roles, the former including policy and detail work, the latter combining calling and counseling. And, in the Protestant Episcopal Church, Priest is too generic a term, and possesses too many connotations beyond the liturgical office itself, to permit 'pure' judgments on the defined responsibilities. (In the Baptist Church the same would probably be true for Preacher, or in the Lutheran Church for Pastor). Blizzard's role division helps greatly in the analysis of the minister's work, but it still requires further refinement, including dividing certain roles and combining others. (pp. 157, 158)

Glock and Roos (1961) examined the responses of 2,729
Lutheran laity to these questions, "As far as you know, what two kinds of work does your pastor spend most of his time on? What two kinds of work does he spend least of his time on?" The follow-up question was, "For each of the activities [listed] check whether you think your pastor spends too much, too little, or about the right amount of time on each?" (p. 171). From most to least, the activities were ranked as follows: sermon preparation, work for church at large, attending church meetings, office work, giving people advice, visiting nonmembers, visiting members, his own recreation (p. 172). Approval from the church members is most likely to come where the minister is perceived as devoting considerable time to visiting members and nonmembers, as not spending much time on office work, and as striking a reasonable balance in the amount of time spent in sermon preparation, work for the church at large, attending church meetings, and giving people advice. (p. 173)

The people are likely to be critical if they perceive that the pastor does not focus his energies on the pastoral and preaching functions.

In an unpublished study of 260 Adventist pastors, Berecz (1974) reported that 40% spent 0-30 minutes per day on private devotions and 37% spent 31-60 minutes per day. A further 15% spent 61-120 minutes per day (p. 3). The kinds of activities that the pastors reported interfering most with their devotional time were: telephone (endorsed by 20%), duty work (14%), and busy work and other miscellaneous activities (12%). The busy work included
committees (endorsed by 33%), travel (28%), and local church work which ought to be done by deacon or laymen (31%) (p. 4).

In his thorough review of methods for the evaluation of professional readiness, Menges (1975) cites Winter, Mills, and Hendrick (1971) who developed a procedure for measuring the distribution of the clergyman's time. Menges suggested that such records could serve as a baseline against which performance could be evaluated (p. 178).

In the process of developing the Ministerial Job Satisfaction Scale, Glass (1976) identified the following traditional functions in the United Methodist Church.

A. Administration. The minister is the manager of the parish. This involves official board and staff meetings, publicity, clerical and stenographic work, financial administration and promotion, physical plant supervision, and general church planning.

B. Preaching. This involves the preparation and delivery of sermons.

C. Priest. The minister is liturgist. He leads people in worship and officiates in the rites of the church (baptisms, weddings, funerals, etc.).

D. Teaching. This involves preparation for and conducting of study courses, new member orientations, teaching training, teaching or substituting in church schools.

E. Counseling. Counseling is usually initiated by the one to be counseled. It means giving advice on religious matters, pre-marital counseling, or simply listening to a person "talk out" his own problems, and acting in a supportive manner by referring him to other professional help if the problem is too involved for the minister's competency.
F. Visiting. Visiting is usually initiated by the minister. It includes both church and nonchurch members. It may be done as a social call or in times of crisis. Hospital and other institutional visiting is also included.

G. Professional and Continuing Study. This involves keeping abreast of contemporary literature in the field of religion and current events, attending conferences or short courses, or—in brief—anything connected with professional improvement. (p. 154)


Huayllara (1979) performed an analysis and evaluation of the field education program of the Inca Union College (SDA) by surveying graduates and their supervisors. The main categories were: Pastoral Functions, Preaching and Evangelistic Functions, Counseling Functions, Leadership Functions, and Personal Improvement functions. The first five rank-ordered sub-functions were:

Maintaining a meaningful devotional life

Understanding his role to love, care for and teach his congregation

Preparing and guiding people to accept Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior through baptism

Keeping close relationship and assisting the local leaders of the church

Organizing his work according to priorities. (p. 142)
There was general agreement about the effectiveness of the program, and several recommendations were made for improvement.

Kruse (1979) developed a process of clergy performance evaluation for pastors in the United Methodist Church. His survey instrument elicited laity estimates of ministers' functions in terms of priority and pastoral performance effectiveness on 6-point scales. His categories were: Pastoral Ministry, Public Worship Ministry, Christian Education Ministry, Organizational and Administrative Ministry, Community and Social Ministry, Personal and Professional Development, and Personal Characteristics. The results provided evidence of benefit to the Pastor-Parish Relations Committee, to the pastor, and to the congregations (pp. 91-95).

The rank-ordered items in the study by Dower (1980) showed obvious similarity to the pastoral tasks in this present study (see Table 2, pp. 99-102). His item descriptions and rank (1-101) are presented below in comparison with task descriptions from this study. The first cluster of tasks is subsumed under the preaching role.

"Ability to properly prepare a Scriptural presentation (6) . . . Ability to properly exegete a Biblical passage (31.5)." These compare with T-1, the tasks directly related to sermon preparation.

"Lead out in meaningful corporate worship services
47

(16) . . . Prepare and conduct a communion service
(48) . . . Prepare and conduct a baptismal service
(52) . . . Prepare and conduct a funeral service
(68) . . . Prepare and conduct a wedding ceremony (90).

These compare with T-11, the tasks of leading out in worship and preaching during the regular services of the church and during special services such as weddings and funerals, and mid-week prayer meetings.

The second cluster of tasks is subsumed under the administrative role.

"Prepare and conduct a church board meeting
(51) . . . Prepare and conduct a church business meeting
(76)." These compare with T-2, the tasks of leading and working with committees and Boards.

"Discover, define, evaluate, and implement church goals (40)." This item compares with T-17, the tasks of visioning, strategic planning, and working with the members to formulate the goals and objectives of the church.

"Ability to manage church finances (62.5) . . . Present philosophy, theology of Christian stewardship
(73) . . . Oversee preparation of the church operating budget (74) . . . Ability to prepare a stewardship plan
(85)." These compare with T-22, the tasks associated with the management of church finances and fund raising.

The third cluster of tasks is subsumed under the pastoral care and counseling role.
"Counsel tactfully when there is marital conflict (58)." This item compares with T-3, the tasks of counseling with church members who have personal or family problems, and giving pre-marital counsel to couples.

"Counsel tactfully when there is an illness (59.5) . . . Counsel tactfully when there is a grief crisis (70)." This item compares with T-8, the tasks of visiting church members who are sick in hospital, those who are bereaved and grieving, the disabled, and elderly shut-ins.

"Prepare and conduct a pastoral visit (4.5)." This item compares with T-13, the task of making regular home visits to members of the congregation.

"Role of church in disciplining its members (53) . . . Counsel tactfully when there is youth unrest (61) . . . Tactfully meeting differing theological positions (66.5) . . . Counsel tactfully when there is church conflict (72)." These compare with T-23, the tasks of confronting members who need pastoral admonition or reproof, and bringing resolution to congregational conflicts.

The fourth cluster of tasks is subsumed under the teaching role.

"Ability to inspire the church to action (24) . . . Prepare and conduct a lay witnessing program (37) . . . Ability to train sabbath school teachers and leaders (79.5) . . . Enlist sabbath school officers and teachers
These correspond with T-4, the tasks of teaching, training, empowering, and supporting church members as they use their spiritual gifts in service as church officers (elders, deaconesses, etc.) and as soul winners.

"Lead young marrieds to growing relationship with Christ (45) . . . Lead working segment to growing relation to Christ (55) . . . Lead professional person to growing relation to Christ (56) . . . Lead elderly person into growing relation to Christ (62.5)." These compare with T-9, the task of conducting small-group ministry to promote the spiritual growth and maturity of church members.

"Reach non-Adventists and lead them to baptism (17)." This item compares with T-14, the tasks of preparing for and teaching the pastor's Bible Class.

"Lead youth to growing relationship with Christ (48) . . . Lead college-age singles to growing relation to Christ (50) . . . Lead children to a growing relationship with Christ (64)." These compare with T-19, the tasks of teaching, instructing, modeling, and ministering to the children and youth of the church.

"Ability to maintain a meaningful devotional life (2)." This item compares with T-24, the tasks of devotional Bible study, personal prayer, and the spiritual exercises that undergird an exemplary life and the modeling of Christian graces and virtues.

The last cluster of tasks is subsumed under the
evangelism and church-growth role.

"Church's outreach through personal witnessing (1) . . . Prepare and conduct a Bible study (7) . . . Evangelistic follow up of those who accept Christ (34)." These compare with T-5, the tasks of following leads, visiting prospective new members, and giving them Bible Studies.

"Counsel tactfully when there is a backslider (48)." This item compares with T-15, the task of reclaiming and reintegrating lost and inactive church members into church fellowship.

"Church's outreach in social/community service centers (71) . . . Counsel tactfully when there is a social problem (82)." These compare with T-20, the tasks of working with community organizations and other churches to provide assistance to the needy, and to address pressing social issues.

"Making an evangelistic appeal to a congregation (30) . . . Selection of relevant evangelistic topics (36) . . . Preparation for evangelistic preaching (46) . . . Church's outreach through health programs (54) . . . Ability to prepare evangelistic advertising (84) . . . Ability to prepare evangelistic meeting schedules (88)." These compare with T-25, the tasks of preparing for and conducting public evangelistic meetings and/or felt-needs evangelism such as stop-smoking clinics.

On the basis of his research Dower recommended that the
SDA Theological Seminary develop a competency-based curriculum, and that incoming students undergo a pre-assessment test to evaluate their levels of competency, the results of which would inform course selection (pp. 147, 148).

Howe (1980) set out to show that ministerial effectiveness might best be measured in terms of changes in the lives of the persons ministered to. The role of the pastor was therefore to enable people to acquire coping and performance skills, to develop their own resources, to make decisions and implement goals, and to develop as persons. Equally important was the healing role in which the minister sought to promote the well-being of the individual and the diminution of dysfunction. Thus, the Preacher/Enabler/Healer paradigm held promise as a construct whereby outcomes in the lives of the parishioners reflect the effectiveness of the pastor (pp. 30-34).

De Paiva (1983) studied issues related to the productivity of the ministry in the South American Division of SDAs and reported:

The most important personal factors for ministerial effectiveness were considered to be a meaningful devotional life, having a sense of calling to the ministry, and having a good marriage. In the areas of leadership and administration, the most important ministerial functions were seen to be the conducting of training courses for winning and establishing new members and instructing church officials and lay members in Christian leadership. Pastoral functions deemed to be of greatest importance were pastoral visitation and youth work. In the area of preaching
and evangelism, the most important functions were reported to be the training of laity for public evangelism and the conducting of public evangelism campaigns. (pp. 95, 96)

Other indices of effectiveness included the number of training seminars conducted, the number of lay-led evangelistic campaigns, the number of people baptized, percentage of membership participating in evangelistic activities, and the keeping of accurate records.

In the study by Nauss (1983), Lutheran pastors were grouped according to their areas of predominant role-effectiveness. The Priest and Preacher role included, "preaching sermons, leading public worship, and working with congregational boards. Participation in community organizations, and giving assistance to victims of social neglect" (p. 335). The Administrator role included "managing the church office and church finances, and planning strategy and program" (p. 335). The Personal and Spiritual Development role "is described by the pastor's maintaining a disciplined life of prayer and personal devotion, following a definite schedule of reading and study, and cultivating home and personal life" (p. 335). The Visitor Counselor role included "visiting members and new residents, counseling with people, fostering fellowship, and recruiting and training lay leaders" (p. 335). The Teacher function included, "teaching and working directly with young people" (p. 335). He found that a unique set of traits was
associated with each of the roles as related to effectiveness (pp. 334-344). In a related study (1994), Nauss concluded that "rather than try to excel in all areas, ministers [should] determine the several areas in which they can become exceptionally good" (p. 66). At the same time "the minister should develop at least a reasonably effective level of performance in the remaining functions" (p. 66).

Guiste (1985) studied the perceptions of 198 SDA pastors concerning their administrative skills and concluded that they recognized the importance of these skills but believed that their academic training was inadequate. In rank order of competence, the respondents rated their administrative skills as follows: decision-making, communicating, planning, managing, and evaluating (see abstract).

Schaller (1986) divided the work of pastors into 12 roles or functions.

Leader. Serving as the leader in the congregation the person to whom members turn for advice and guidance on all aspects of life and work of the congregation, and who initiates new ideas.

Counseling. Counseling with individuals on personal and spiritual problems, with couples planning to be married, with those who are hospitalized, with other people on personal and vocational problems etc.

Community Leader. Serving as a volunteer leader in the community to help make this a better world for all God's children.

Teaching. Teaching the confirmation class, planning or teaching classes for church school teachers or both, teaching in special short-term classes,
teaching evening classes etc.

Denominational and Ecumenical Responsibilities. Carrying a fair share of denominational responsibilities, participating in ecumenical groups and other cooperative bodies. Also enlisting denominational and ecumenical resources to use in the local situation.

Personal and Spiritual Growth. Developing and following a discipline of Bible and other devotional study, participating in programs of continuing education, and helping to plan and lead opportunities for personal and spiritual growth for others.

Visiting. Calling in the homes of members or at their place of work in a systematic program to meet each member on his or her own turf.

Leading Worship and Preaching. Planning and conducting worship services, including sermon preparation, and working with others who will participate in leading corporate worship.

Enabler. Helping others identify their own special call to service and ministry and enabling them to respond to that call.

Evangelism. Calling on the unchurched people in the community, bearing witness to the Good News, calling on prospective new members, and training the laity to be evangelists.

A Leader Among Leaders. Serving with the lay leadership as one of a core of leaders in the congregation—each with his or her own unique gifts and each with his or her own special responsibilities with the expectation that this leadership team will initiate new ideas.

Administration. Serving as "executive secretary" of the congregation, working with committees, helping to plan the financial program of the church, working with committees on planning and implementing program, answering mail, etc. (p. 53)

In the selection of a pastor to serve a particular congregation it is essential for church leadership to prioritize these functions, and for the pastor to have substantial agreement with that prioritization.
Jones (1987) developed evaluative questions for each of the 14 functions of ministry in the United Methodist Church to assist in the supervision process (pp. 149-154). Two of these functions, Preaching Ministry and Worship Leading, are analogous to the single preaching role of this study. Management Skills and Administration Ministries correspond to the single administration role of this study. Pastoral Care, or Home Visitation Ministries, and Counseling are two functions analogous to the pastoral care and counseling role of this study. The teaching role of this study encompasses the following Methodist functions: Christian Education Ministries, Teaching Ministries, and Works With Groups In Ministry. The evangelism and church-growth role corresponds to the Methodist Evangelizing and Community Ministries. Not included in this present study are two Methodist functions: Connectional Ministries, that promote denominational programs, and Ecumenical Ministries. Jones concluded that job satisfaction appears to be less dependent upon the competent performance of roles and tasks than upon general satisfaction about the job and the perceived support and approval of the supervisor (p. 156).

Ryding (1989) observed the work activity of five Nazarene clergymen and found that during an average 6-day work week, they spent 28 hours and 2 minutes on face-to-face contacts, 19 hours on desk work, 8 hours 36 minutes on travel, 3 hours 53 minutes on telephone
contacts, and 3 hours 30 minutes on errands and duties.

Deskwork includes all the noncontact activities that were done in an office environment. Correspondence, record keeping, planning, and study were representative of this medium. Telephone contacts accounted for all the completed incoming and outgoing calls in which the pastor was a participant. Travel measured the time the clergyman spent in his automobile . . . for whatever purpose. Errands and duties was the medium that covered responsibilities the pastor had to do because of the nature of his position, lay expectation, or by default. Such duties included mailing letters, purchasing stamps, making photocopies, collecting checks from the church treasurer, banking church monies, or transporting a parishioner. Face to face contacts featured all of the activities in which the pastor was physically present with another person in a professional capacity. (pp. 56, 57)

Much of what is described in the Deskwork, Telephone, and Errands and Duties categories above, is subsumed under the Administrative role of the present study, and instead of having travel as a separate item, travel time was included with whatever task it was associated.

Juhl (1990) provided an excellent overview of the concept of pastoral roles and describes eight that best fit SDA ministers because of their strong scriptural basis: "Priest" or worship leader, "Prophet" or preacher, "King" or administrator, "Shepherd" or pastoral-care giver and counselor, "Teacher" or equipper, "Evangelist," "Example" or role model, and "General Practitioner," which integrates three or more of the other specialties into a broadly effective ministry. The implementation of his role negotiation with his church district includes information on time allocations of particular functions.
Motschiedler (1990) described the process of developing a pastoral evaluation procedure for the Ohio Conference of SDAs. His evaluation form divided the work of the pastor as follows: Administration and Planning, Church Growth, Leading Worship, Nurture, and Teacher/Trainer/Equipper. Under each heading, descriptive items that tap into both being and doing are rated on a scale from low to high.

In his examination of the task of regular visits in the homes of parishioners, Beukes (1991) noted that if pastors visited in four homes per evening on six evenings per month, they would complete 250 or more home visits per year. If six homes were visited each week with visits lasting 30-60 minutes, the average time investment per week for in-home visits would be about 4-5 hours. Beukes emphasized that the quality of the visits made was of greater importance than the amount of time spent in the homes.

Rieder (1991) used the Inventory of Religious Activities in his study of United Methodist ministers. Referring to Webb's descriptions he listed the following roles and activities:

1. Counselor. Activities which involve bringing comfort and encouragement to lonely, troubled, and sick persons and working with people to help them resolve problems primarily of a personal or family nature.

2. Administrator. Tasks related to planning, promoting, and executing various church-related programs.
3. Teacher. Items related to the administration of and teaching in religious education program of the church.

4. Scholar. Activities involving teaching at the theological school or college level, and engaging in scholarly research or writing.

5. Evangelist. Activities related to evangelism and evangelistic work.

6. Spiritual Guide. Activities directed toward assisting people to develop a deeper and more mature faith.

7. Preacher. Tasks which involve developing speaking skills, preparing and delivering sermons, and making talks and addresses before various groups.

8. Reformer. Activities that involve speaking out against evil and social injustice and participating in programs of community betterment.

9. Priest. Activities concerned with conducting programs or periods of worship and performing sacred rites and rituals.

10. Musician. Activities concerned with conducting a music program for a church. (pp. 44, 45)

He found that "the social, enterprising, conventional, status, and acquiescence scales of the Vocational Preference Inventory were marginally effective in predicting effectiveness ratings done by clergy supervisors for the dimensions of: teaching, worship leading, community involvement, and the mean rating" (pp. 141, 142).

Ten Dutch Reformed ministers in Port Elizabeth, South Africa, were surveyed by van der Merwe (1991) to establish the amount of time spent on various pastoral tasks. He reported that the average work week was 62.5
hours. Preaching and sermon preparation averaged 11 hours. Visiting parishioners, including crisis calls, averaged 9 hours. Two hours per week were spent on scheduling and activity planning, but little time was spent on strategic planning and goal-achievement evaluation. About 6 hours were spent preparing for and leading meetings. Just over 4 hours were spent on administrative work, and just under 4 hours were spent on receiving and making phone calls. He emphasized the importance of prioritizing pastoral time and delegating tasks to laity.

In his careful and thorough examination of scriptural and historical models of pastoral ministry, VanDenburgh (1992) saw the equipping of parishioners for service as the unifying theme most appropriate for SDA ministry. He described the various functions of ministry as:

- Equipping through preaching
- Equipping through teaching
- Equipping through worship (as worship leader)
- Equipping through fellowship (through modeling)
- Equipping through spiritual counseling and direction,
- Equipping through training
- Equipping through creating and managing structures for equipping and managing (as administrator)
- Equipping through visioning, communicating, inspiring, and creating a sense of corporate identity and mission (as leader). (pp. 222-247)

He believed that this perspective can change the prevailing approaches to ministry and mission within Adventism to the benefit of church and community.

Malphurs (1996) showed that the primary role expectation of the pastor is determined by the type of
church and the core values of the congregation. Thus the classroom church whose core value is information needs a teacher as a pastor. The soul-winning church needs an evangelist. The Social-Conscience church that strives for justice needs a reformer. The Experiential church needs a performer. The Family-Reunion church that emphasizes loyalty needs a chaplain. And the Life-Development church that emphasizes character needs a coach (p. 54).

In a brief overview of the historical role of SDA pastors, Hudson (1997) showed that in early Adventism evangelism was the primary focus of effort. Quoting Uriah Smith he indicated the general expectations of the time.

We see no reason why ministers cannot labor, sixty hours at least out of every week . . . He can study with his might five hours, visit from house-to-house with his might four hours each day, and each day preach one hour . . . He has then left him fourteen hours for sleep, recreation, prayer and meditation. (p. 10)

In this reference visits were in the homes of non-members. Lay persons provided pastoral care to members, and for most of the first century of its existence the SDA church did not have settled pastors serving the members of local congregations.

Based on his thoroughly researched history of ministerial functions in the SDA church and on his examination of Scripture, Burrill (1997) concluded that the two primary roles of pastors are those of training and equipping laity for service, and itinerant evangelizer. In his view laity should take the primary
role in pastoral care of the membership using a cell-based model.

Chapter Summary

In this representative but not exhaustive review of literature pertaining to pastoral-effectiveness evaluation, the twofold focus was upon characteristics and qualities of effective pastors, and upon their task performance.

In various ways "adequate intelligence" was described as important to effectiveness, though authorities differ regarding how it should be measured and its importance in terms of predicting effectiveness.

Emotional stability was also emphasized, though the boundaries of satisfactory functioning were difficult to draw. Little disagreement exists over the need to avoid gross pathology in candidates, but "normal" neuroses may not necessarily be counterindicative of effectiveness.

There was broad consensus about the centrality of superior interpersonal relationship ability, though the means of measurement are less than adequate, and a direct causal relationship with effectiveness has not been demonstrated.

Even in the absence of optimum levels of intellectual, emotional, and/or relational functioning, the hard worker who got a lot accomplished was viewed as effective. Thus, apparent productivity seemed closely
linked to perceptions of effectiveness.

In the categorization of the pastor's work, the pie was cut in many ways. A tried and tested approach was to catalog all the imaginable pastoral tasks and to group them by factor analysis or other means into roles and functions. Another approach was to exhaustively explore the scriptural record for examples of and admonition concerning pastoral leadership. In the absence of general agreement about criteria for judging effectiveness, a normative approach to performance evaluation remained an unsettled issue.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses the procedures for the collection of data, the instruments used in the research, a description of the process for subject selection, and the method of the analysis of the data.

Research Description

This study investigated the existence of statistically significant differences between contrasted groups of pastors on demographics, on measures of personality, and on task-performance patterns. Pastors were assigned to comparison groups as follows:

1. The high-baptism group consisted of pastors who personally baptized 50 or more people during 1993-1995.
2. The low-baptism group consisted of pastors who personally baptized 10 or fewer people during 1993-1995.
3. The high-effectiveness group consisted of pastors rated "most effective" by conference ministerial directors.
4. The low-effectiveness group consisted of pastors rated "least effective" by ministerial directors.
5. Randomly selected pastors were assigned to the
reference group.

Groups one and two were mutually exclusive. Groups three and four were mutually exclusive. The members of the reference group were exclusive to those four groups. However, other combinations of the first four groups were not mutually exclusive, and were not examined in this study.

The clusters of characteristics and performance patterns that were investigated were as follows:

1. *Intellectual functioning.* The 16PF scores on Reasoning, Abstractness, Openness to Change, Tough-mindedness, Creative Potential, and Creative Achievement were used to assess this dimension.

2. *Emotional functioning.* The 16PF scores on Emotional Stability, Sensitivity, Apprehension, Tension, Anxiety, Self-Esteem, and Emotional Adjustment were used to measure this aspect of personality.

3. *Interpersonal functioning.* The 16PF scores on Warmth, Dominance, Liveliness, Social Boldness, Vigilance, Privateness, Self-Reliance, Extraversion, Independence, Social Adjustment, Emotional Expressivity, Emotional Control, Social Expressivity, Social Sensitivity, Social Control, Empathy, and Leadership Potential were used to evaluate this domain.

4. *Vocational functioning.* The 16PF scores on Liveliness, Rule-Consciousness, Social Boldness, Perfectionism, and the 16PF-derived Holland Theme scores,
Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising, and Conventional, were used to assess this dimension.

5. Preaching function. The Pastoral Tasks Survey (PTS) was used to assess the degree of importance that the pastors attached to the five tasks associated with the preaching role. It also elicited from the pastors a self-assessment of the quality of their performance of those tasks and time estimates for sermon and liturgy preparation, leading of church services, intercessory prayer, and planning for the sermonic year.

Task importance and quality of task performance were also assessed by means of the Pastoral Tasks Questionnaire described below.

6. Administrative function. The PTS was used to assess the degree of importance that the pastors attached to the five tasks associated with the administrative role. It also elicited from the pastors a self-assessment of the quality of their performance of those tasks and time estimates for strategic planning, phone calls and correspondence, bulletin preparation, committee work, and financial management.

7. Pastoral Care function. The PTS was used to assess the degree of importance that the pastors attached to the five tasks associated with the pastoral care role. It also elicited from the pastors a self-assessment of the quality of their performance of these tasks, and time estimates for pastoral counseling, visiting the sick,
member visitation, conflict resolution, and informal socialization.

8. **Teaching function.** The PTS was used to assess the degree of importance that the pastors attached to the five tasks associated with the teaching role. It also elicited from the pastors a self-assessment of the quality of their performance of these tasks and time estimates for member training, small-group instruction, youth training, teaching classes, and preparation for modeling Christian virtues.

9. **Church Growth function.** The PTS was used to assess the degree of importance that the pastors attached to the five tasks associated with the evangelistic role. It also elicited from the pastors a self-assessment of the quality of their performance of these tasks and time estimates for prospective-member visits, evangelistic meetings, community networking, member involvement, and the re-integration of inactive members.

10. Data such as pastors' education and congregation dynamics were obtained from the Adventist Pastor Inventory (API) and were analyzed to identify characteristics that were common to group members in each of the groups.

In order to obtain a perspective other than the pastor's self-report on the Pastoral Tasks Survey, an adapted version of the same instrument, the Pastoral Tasks Questionnaire (PTQ), was sent to officiating church leaders in the largest congregation served by each
pastoral respondent. The leaders' opinions of task-importance, how well their pastor performed the tasks, and how much time the pastor spent on each task provided added dimensions to the evaluation of the effectiveness of their minister.

Population

The individuals who were evaluated in this study were clergy within the North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists, from dominantly Anglo conferences, who pastored English-speaking churches that were not associated with educational or medical institutions.

Procedures

Subjects for the comparison groups were selected in the following way. Ministerial directors from Anglo conferences were asked to compile and submit four lists of pastors' names.

1. The high-baptism list consisted of pastors who personally baptized 50 or more people during the years 1993-1995.
2. The low-baptism list consisted of pastors who personally baptized 10 or fewer people during 1993-1995.
3. The high-effectiveness list consisted of three pastors from each conference, rated as most effective by their conference ministerial directors.
4. The low-effectiveness list consisted of three pastors from each conference, rated as least effective by
their ministerial directors.

The criteria for selection were overall effectiveness in preaching, spiritual nurture, church administration, community relations, church growth, etc.

Individuals for inclusion in the reference group were selected as follows. Advent Source, the research arm of the North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists, compiled a list of 500 randomly selected pastors from the 50 Anglo conferences. These names were demographically screened, and individuals who were Anglo pastors of English-speaking, non-institutional churches, whose names did not appear on the four lists compiled by ministerial directors, were included.

The package of assessment materials that was sent to each pastor in the five groups contained a letter describing the purpose of the study, the three test instruments, instructions, and return postage.

Each pastor's returned materials were checked for completeness and compliance with instructions. Then the tests were scored, and the data from the three instruments were merged and entered in numerical form into a computer file for analysis.

After the pastors had returned their assessment materials, the Pastoral Tasks Questionnaire was sent to congregational leaders with a letter explaining the research. These data were included in the analysis.
Instrumentation

The instruments used in this study are as follows.

1. The selection of pastors' names for the two pairs of comparison groups was made by conference ministerial directors. The letter requesting their participation appears in Appendix A. The returned lists were checked for compliance with directions, and each name was assigned a numerical identification code that also designated the pastor's group classification. The pastoral respondents were blind to the research design and had no way of knowing about the classifications made by ministerial directors.

2. The Adventist Pastor Inventory (Dudley, 1996) was designed by the senior researcher and Director of the Institute of Church Ministry to survey pastors' education, religious experience and background, record of service to the Church, career aspirations, etc. It also elicited information about the congregations and communities served by each pastoral respondent (see Appendix B). The data were analyzed to identify correlations between items and pastors in the reference and comparison groups. Face validity of the items was rated adequate, and responses showed that the items were clearly understandable.

3. The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire, fifth edition (16PF), was the second of the three instruments that were sent to pastors. The publishers make this test available on computer diskette. The test
diskettes with instructions for self-administration were sent to the pastors with the other assessment materials. The returned data were transferred from the diskette to the computer program that scored the tests and generated the Basic Interpretive Reports. The scores from these reports were used to evaluate personality characteristics thought to be related to effectiveness in ministry.

The 16 Primary Factor scales are: Warmth (A), Reasoning (B), Emotional Stability (C), Dominance (E), Liveliness (F), Rule-Consciousness (G), Social Boldness (H), Sensitivity (I), Vigilance (L), Abstractness (M), Privateness (N), Apprehension (O), Openness to Change (Q1), Self-Reliance (Q2), Perfectionism (Q3), and Tension (Q4). The Global Factor scales are: Extraversion (EX), Anxiety (AX), Tough-Mindedness (TM), Independence (IN), and Self-Control (SC). Response Style Indices are: Impression Management (IM), Infrequency (INF), and Acquiescence (ACQ). Derived Criterion scores are: Self-Esteem, Emotional Adjustment, Social Adjustment, Emotional Expressivity, Emotional Sensitivity, Emotional Control, Social Expressivity, Social Sensitivity, Social Control, Empathy, Leadership Potential, Creative Potential, and Creative Achievement. Derived scores are generated for the following Holland Occupational Codes: Realistic Theme, Investigative Theme, Artistic Theme, Social Theme, Enterprising Theme, and Conventional Theme (Russell & Karol, 1994). Test-retest reliabilities of
the 16PF Fifth Edition Primary scales ranged from .69 to .87 with a mean of .80. Construct validity was demonstrated by correlational studies with the 16PF Fourth Edition and with the Personality Research Form-Form E, the California Psychological Inventory, the NEO Personality Inventory-Revised, and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Factor by Factor correlations are reported in the Technical Manual of the 16PF Fifth Edition (Conn & Reike, 1994).

4. The Pastoral Tasks Survey was the third instrument sent to the pastors, (Appendix B). The five main pastoral roles are Preaching, Administration, Pastoral Care, Teaching, and Evangelism. The task clusters associated with the execution of each of these roles were measured by five task descriptions per role. The PTS was designed to discriminate between most-effective and least effective pastors using three measures: amount of time spent on each of 25 tasks, degree of task importance from the pastor's perspective, and the pastor's self-reported quality of task performance. Prior to its first use in this research, it was submitted to three expert judges who confirmed its face validity. The PTS was also tested in a small pilot and the respondents reported favorably on its utility. The large number of statistically significant differences between comparison groups of pastors that were identified by the PTS in this study provide additional evidence for the validity of the
instrument. Post hoc item analysis and Factor Analysis will doubtless provide a basis for revision and refinement of the PTS.

5. The Pastoral Tasks Questionnaire used the same task descriptions as the Pastoral Tasks Survey and measured essentially the same dimensions from the perspective of the parishioner (Appendix B). The church leaders estimated whether the pastor spent too much time, too little time, or just enough time on each of the 25 tasks. The quality of the pastor's performance of each task was rated as much better, better, about the same, not as good, or much worse than most other pastors. In terms of congregational needs the church leaders rank-ordered the importance of each of the pastoral tasks. Some respondents were hesitant to evaluate their pastors' performance and some found the rank ordering of the tasks challenging, but most had no difficulty completing the questionnaire as directed.

Null Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1. The test scores of the pastors in the high-baptism group, the test scores of those in the reference group, and the test scores of those in the low-baptism group will not differ significantly on the 16PF measures of intellectual functioning.

Hypothesis 2. The test scores of the pastors in the more-effective group, the test scores of those in the
reference group, and the test scores of those in the less-effective group will not differ significantly on the 16PF measures of intellectual functioning.

Hypothesis 3. The test scores of the pastors in the high-baptism group, the test scores of those in the reference group, and the test scores of those in the low-baptism group will not differ significantly on the 16PF measures of emotional functioning.

Hypothesis 4. The test scores of the pastors in the more-effective group, the test scores of those in the reference group, and the test scores of those in the less-effective group will not differ significantly on the 16PF measures of emotional functioning.

Hypothesis 5. The test scores of the pastors in the high-baptism group, the test scores of those in the reference group, and the test scores of those in the low-baptism group will not differ significantly on the 16PF measures of interpersonal functioning.

Hypothesis 6. The test scores of the pastors in the more-effective group, the test scores of those in the reference group, and the test scores of those in the less-effective group will not differ significantly on the 16PF measures of interpersonal functioning.

Hypothesis 7. The test scores of the pastors in the high-baptism group, the test scores of those in the reference group, and the test scores of those in the low-baptism group will not differ significantly on
the 16PF measures of vocational functioning.

Hypothesis 8. The test scores of the pastors in the more-effective group, the test scores of those in the reference group, and the test scores of those in the less-effective group will not differ significantly on the 16PF measures of vocational functioning.

Hypothesis 9. There will be no significant differences in the average amount of time spent on each of the 25 pastoral tasks as reported by pastors in the high-baptism, reference, and low-baptism comparison groups.

Hypothesis 10. There will be no significant differences in the average amount of time spent on each of the 25 pastoral tasks as reported by pastors in the more-effective, reference, and less-effective comparison groups.

Hypothesis 11. There will be no significant differences in the estimates by congregational leaders of the average amount of time spent on each of the 25 pastoral tasks by pastors in the high-baptism, reference, and low-baptism comparison groups.

Hypothesis 12. There will be no significant differences in the estimates by congregational leaders of the average amount of time spent on each of the 25 pastoral tasks by pastors in the more-effective, reference, and less-effective comparison groups.

Hypothesis 13. There will be no significant
differences in the self-ratings of task proficiency on each of the 25 pastoral tasks as reported by pastors in the high-baptism, reference, and low-baptism comparison groups.

Hypothesis 14. There will be no significant differences in the self-ratings of task proficiency on each of the 25 pastoral tasks as reported by pastors in the high-effectiveness, reference, and less-effective comparison groups.

Hypothesis 15. There will be no significant differences in the congregational leaders' ratings of the task proficiency of pastors in the high-baptism, reference, and low-baptism comparison groups.

Hypothesis 16. There will be no significant differences in the congregational leaders' ratings of the task proficiency of pastors in the more-effective, reference, and less-effective comparison groups.

Analyses

In order to test the first eight hypotheses, a Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was performed to establish whether or not the four sets of 16PF measures differentiated among the high-baptism, reference, and low-baptism groups, and among the more-effective, reference, and less-effective groups.

Where significant differences emerged, a Discriminant Analysis (DA) was performed to identify more precisely
which of the measures within each 16PF set contributed most to the differences.

In order to test hypotheses 9-16, a one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was performed to identify significant differences in group means on the 25 pastoral tasks.

Where significant differences emerged, the Student-Newman-Keuls test was performed to identify variance between groups with greater precision.

Summary

This study proposed that pastors who baptized many converts had certain characteristics and performance patterns in common that differentiated them from pastors who had few baptisms. It also postulated that pastors, who were rated as "most effective" by conference ministerial directors, shared characteristics and performance patterns that distinguished them from pastors rated "least effective" by conference ministerial directors.

These within-group similarities and between-group differences were expected to emerge from the data elicited by the Adventist Pastor Inventory, the Pastoral Tasks Survey, the Pastoral Tasks Questionnaire, and the 16PF.

The statistical analyses were intended to verify whether or not the observed differences among the groups were statistically significant.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

This study focused on five groups of Seventh-day Adventist pastors to determine if differences existed among the groups. The intent was to examine how observed differences relate to pastoral effectiveness. Conference ministerial directors provided names of "high-baptism" and "low-baptism" pastors, and identified "high-effectiveness" and "low-effectiveness" clergy. Randomly selected pastors served as a reference group.

This chapter presents demographic information about the respondents and describes the analyses of the data elicited by the Adventist Pastor Inventory (API), the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF) Fifth Edition, the Pastoral Tasks Survey (PTS), and the Pastoral Tasks Questionnaire (PTQ).

Demographic Data

Letters were sent to 58 ministerial directors of conferences in North America and Canada requesting categorized lists of pastors' names. Of the 41 who responded, 21 provided names in all four categories requested, 13 listed names in three categories, 3
listed names in two categories, and 4 listed names in only one category.

Of the 469 pastors to whom surveys were sent, 239 returned one or more of the three survey instruments, a response rate of 51%.

Of the 239 pastors who responded, 44 were listed in two categories as follows:

(1) high-baptism, and more-effective groups (23);
(2) low-baptism, and less-effective groups (17);
(3) low-baptism, and more-effective groups (4).

Respondents who appeared in two classifications--those who returned fewer than three instruments--or who omitted items on the surveys--were included in the tabulations. Consequently the n on different analyses is not constant.

Of the 102 randomly selected pastors, 45 returned one or more of the survey instruments and these were included. Ratings on effectiveness and reports of baptisms by conference ministerial directors were not a design requirement, and were not obtained for pastors in the reference group.

**The Adventist Pastor Inventory**

The Adventist Pastor Inventory (Dudley, 1996) was designed to elicit demographic data from pastors in this study to assist in the process of identifying correlates of pastoral effectiveness.
The respondents returned 236 API surveys, 232 of which were used in the study.

A Chi-Square analysis of the API items and the comparison groups of pastors was performed. This showed significant variance between groups.

The findings in Table 1 show that more high-baptism pastors (76.60%) than low-baptism pastors (53.09%) attended the Seminary at Andrews University.

Among the pastors who had no seminary training, there were more low-baptism pastors (39.51%) than high-baptism pastors (23.40%).

More high-baptism (37.50%) than low baptism

| Table 1 |

| Chi-Square Comparisons of High-Baptism Pastors and Low-Baptism Pastors on Statistically Significant API Items |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>HIGH-BAPTISM</th>
<th>REFERENCE GROUP</th>
<th>LOW-BAPTISM</th>
<th>CHI-SQUARE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 - What seminary did you attend?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.440</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews University</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76.60</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other seminary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No seminary</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 - Received scholastic honors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.072</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62.50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>63.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13 - Had another career before ministry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.973</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
pastors (19.51%) received academic honors in college or university.

More low-baptism pastors (57.32%) reported having had another career prior to entering the ministry than high-baptism pastors (33.33%).

As shown in Table 2, a greater number of more-effective pastors (49.18%) received scholastic honors than those in the reference group (36.73%), and even fewer less-effective pastors (22.22%) received academic honors.

These results taken together suggest that persons with seminary training and academic prowess are more likely to be viewed as effective in ministry, and to see greater church growth than pastors with lesser academic achievements.

Among the more-effective pastors, 59.02% were mentored by a nurturing supervisor as compared with 30.56% of less-effective pastors.

The findings about the largest city in which pastors worked are noteworthy. Only 3.33% of more-effective pastors worked in cities of less than 25,000 population, whereas 33.33% of less-effective pastors did so. Conversely, 43.33% of the more-effective pastors served in cities of a million or more inhabitants whereas the same was true for only 13.89% of the less-effective ministers.

It appears that effective pastors may gravitate to larger population areas whereas less-effective clergy seem
Table 2

Chi-Square Comparisons of More-Effective Pastors, Reference-Group Pastors, and Less-Effective Pastors on Statistically Significant API Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>MORE-EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>REFERENCE GROUP</th>
<th>LESS-EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>CHI-SQUARE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q7 - Received scholastic honors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10 49.18</td>
<td>18 36.73</td>
<td>8 22.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31 50.82</td>
<td>31 63.27</td>
<td>28 77.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30 - Mentor was a Nurturer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36 59.02</td>
<td>21 42.86</td>
<td>11 30.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25 40.98</td>
<td>28 57.14</td>
<td>25 69.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34 - Largest city worked in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 24.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 25,000</td>
<td>2 3.33</td>
<td>5 10.10</td>
<td>12 33.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000 - 100,000</td>
<td>9 15.00</td>
<td>10 20.41</td>
<td>9 25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 - 1,000,000</td>
<td>23 38.33</td>
<td>15 30.61</td>
<td>10 27.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000+</td>
<td>26 43.33</td>
<td>19 38.78</td>
<td>5 13.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q41 - Conducted comprehensive lay-training program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 15.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the last year</td>
<td>33 55.93</td>
<td>15 32.61</td>
<td>8 23.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the last 3 years</td>
<td>16 27.12</td>
<td>16 34.78</td>
<td>9 26.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not recently</td>
<td>10 16.95</td>
<td>15 32.61</td>
<td>17 50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q45 - Involved lay members in evangelism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 12.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the last year</td>
<td>55 93.22</td>
<td>44 91.67</td>
<td>29 82.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the last 3 years</td>
<td>3 5.08</td>
<td>4 8.33</td>
<td>1 2.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not recently</td>
<td>1 1.69</td>
<td>0 0.00</td>
<td>5 14.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q51 - Long-term goal - conference administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 7.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16 26.23</td>
<td>6 12.24</td>
<td>2 5.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>45 73.77</td>
<td>43 87.76</td>
<td>34 94.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q55 - Long-term goal - full-time evangelist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 7.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11 18.03</td>
<td>3 6.12</td>
<td>1 2.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>50 81.97</td>
<td>46 93.88</td>
<td>35 97.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2--Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>MORE-EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>REFERENCE GROUP</th>
<th>LESS-EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>CHI-SQUARE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>PROB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q56 - Long-term goal - ministering in radio or TV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19 31.15</td>
<td>4 8.16</td>
<td>3 8.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>42 68.85</td>
<td>45 91.84</td>
<td>33 91.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q81 - Operates a church school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57 93.44</td>
<td>36 73.47</td>
<td>24 66.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4 6.56</td>
<td>13 66.67</td>
<td>12 33.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q82 - Operates a community services center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>49 80.33</td>
<td>31 63.27</td>
<td>21 58.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12 19.67</td>
<td>18 36.73</td>
<td>15 41.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q83 - Operates a Pathfinder Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>54 88.52</td>
<td>36 73.47</td>
<td>22 61.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7 11.48</td>
<td>13 26.53</td>
<td>14 38.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q84 - Operates an Adventist Youth Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25 40.98</td>
<td>5 38.78</td>
<td>5 13.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>36 59.02</td>
<td>11 61.22</td>
<td>31 86.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q85 - Operates a women's organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50 81.97</td>
<td>31 63.27</td>
<td>19 52.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11 18.03</td>
<td>18 36.73</td>
<td>17 47.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q86 - Operates a men's organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23 37.70</td>
<td>10 20.41</td>
<td>5 13.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>38 62.30</td>
<td>39 79.59</td>
<td>31 86.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q87 - Operates a divorce recovery group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6 9.84</td>
<td>10 20.41</td>
<td>0 0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>55 90.16</td>
<td>39 79.59</td>
<td>36 100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2--Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>MORG-EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>REFERENCE GROUP</th>
<th>LESS-EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>CHI-SQUARE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q93 - Atmosphere of main congregation is supportive</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>93.44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>95.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.938</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

less likely to do so. Alternatively, pastors may be viewed as effective because they are in large city districts, and less effective if they are in smaller population centers.

A greater number of more-effective pastors (55.93%) than less-effective pastors (23.53%) conducted comprehensive lay-training programs in the year before they completed the survey.

Fewer more-effective pastors (16.95%) than less-effective pastors (50.0%) indicated that they had not conducted lay-training programs recently.

Most more-effective pastors (93.22%) involved lay members in evangelism whereas fewer of the less-effective pastors 82.86% did so. Of those who did not involve laity in evangelism, there were fewer more-effective pastors.
(1.69%) than less-effective pastors (14.29%).

The more-effective pastors were more likely than their colleagues to train and involve laity in the mission of the church. This finding affirms the interrelationship between the volunteer service of laity and perceptions of clergy effectiveness.

Fewer less-effective (5.56%) than more-effective pastors (26.23%) had long-term goals of getting into conference administration.

Fewer less-effective (2.78%) than more-effective pastors (18.03%) had long-term goals of becoming full-time evangelists.

Fewer less-effective (8.33%) than more-effective pastors (31.15%) had long-term goals of ministering in radio or TV.

A spread of 15%-23% separates the less-effective pastors from the more-effective pastors on these measures. This suggests that less-effective pastors may be more limited in their career aspirations than more-effective pastors.

In all of the following cases, more-effective pastors were more likely to have had specialized ministries in their church districts than was true for less-effective pastors:

1. Church school, 93.44% : 66.67%
2. Community services center, 80.33% : 58.33%
3. Pathfinder Club, 88.52% : 61.11%
4. Adventist Youth Association, 40.98% : 13.89%
5. Women's organization, 81.97% : 52.78%
6. Men's organization, 37.70% : 13.89%
7. Divorce recovery group, 9.84% : 0%.

Reference-group pastors had fewer specialized ministries in their church districts than more-effective pastors and more specialized ministries than less-effective pastors in all cases except the last. More reference-group pastors (20.41%) than more-effective pastors (9.84%) had divorce-recovery ministries in their church districts.

The presence or absence of these specialized ministries in a congregation is apparently related to perceptions of pastoral effectiveness. Other questions grow out of this finding. Was the pastor instrumental in establishing these ministries, or were they functioning prior to his/her arrival? And how does the degree of success of the ministries relate to perceptions of pastoral effectiveness?

A greater number of pastors from the more-effective group (93.44%) than from the less-effective group (80.56%) reported that their church climate was supportive rather than conflictual.

Finally, the age categories of church membership differed according to the effectiveness ratings of the pastors with more-effective pastors having more members under 30 (3.28%), and fewer members over 65 (1.64%) than less-effective pastors who had 0% and 8.33% respectively.
More-effective pastors reported that 62.3% of their members were 45 years old or younger while less-effective pastors reported that 63.89% of their members were 45 years or older.

Confounding the evaluation of any individual's pastoral effectiveness were these findings that pastors who were rated less-effective generally served in smaller population centers and in congregations that may have had fewer active members to support specialized ministries and member evangelism. It is not clear from the data how the sociological context in which pastors served influenced perceptions about their effectiveness.

Additional Adventist Pastor Inventory Analyses

Several of the items on the API were used in combination to produce four additional criteria that differentiated among the comparison groups of pastors. The statistics are reported in Table 3.

API Questions 63 and 64 asked pastors to report their church membership totals at the end of 1992 and 1995 respectively. From these data the percentage of membership growth during that 3-year period was calculated.

The mean membership increases were: high-baptism pastors 49.85%, reference-group 32.74%, low-baptism pastors 1.40%, more-effective pastors 41.48%. The less-effective pastors saw a membership decline (-4.27%).
Table 3

Analysis of Variance Among Pastors in Designated Groups by Categories of Membership Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>HIGH-BAPTISM</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>LOW-BAPTISM</th>
<th>ANOVA RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>ST DBV</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Membership Growth</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49.8522</td>
<td>138.0744</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptisms as % of Membership</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26.3122</td>
<td>21.2174</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach Baptisms % of Members</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16.1002</td>
<td>14.4548</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Baptisms % of Membership</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.4104</td>
<td>4.2613</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>MORR-EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>LESS-EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>ANOVA RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>ST DBV</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Membership Growth</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>41.4775</td>
<td>73.3257</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptisms as % of Membership</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20.0060</td>
<td>20.1597</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach Baptisms % of Members</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11.3094</td>
<td>13.6129</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Baptisms % of Membership</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5.5036</td>
<td>4.8146</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More than 45 percentage points separated the high-baptism and more-effective pastors from the low-baptism and less-effective pastors on membership growth. Percentage of membership growth emerged from these findings as an important correlate of pastoral effectiveness. This is consistent with the assumptions that a higher level of performance could reasonably have been expected from pastors in these categories, and that less-effective pastors were likely to have had substandard church-growth performance.

Using the 1992 membership totals and the number of baptisms reported 1993-1995 (API Q63 and Q65), baptisms as a percentage of membership were shown to be: high-baptism pastors 26.33%, reference-group pastors 12.68%, low-baptism pastors 8.67%, more-effective pastors 20.01%, and less-effective pastors 9.48%.

This performance measure also showed high-baptism and more-effective pastors to have been more productive, though the degree of separation between comparison groups was less striking.

Using church membership totals from 1992 (API Q63) and responses to the question, How many people baptized during the years 1993-1995 were from a non-Adventist background? (API Q66), the numbers of outreach baptisms as a percentage of membership were calculated: high-baptism pastors 16.1%, reference-group 6.74%, low-baptism pastors 4.42%, more-effective pastors 11.31%,
less-effective pastors 5.36%.

On this measure the performance of the low-baptism and less-effective pastors was similar to that of the reference-group pastors. By contrast, the higher percentages for both high-baptism and more-effective pastors indicated that their outreach efforts towards non-Adventists were very successful. The comparative data did not reveal whether the more-productive pastors used different methods, or whether they did more or better quality work using the same methods.

Using the data from API questions 63 and 67, the calculations of youth baptisms as percentage of membership produced these results: high-baptism pastors 6.41%, reference-group pastors 4.05%, low-baptism pastors 3.52%, more-effective pastors 5.5%, and less-effective pastors 3.34%.

From these modest percentage differences among comparison groups, it may be inferred that the more-productive pastors gave more attention to the spiritual nurture of the youth in their congregations.

In summary: responses elicited by the Adventist Pastor Inventory revealed many statistically significant differences that existed among the comparison groups of clergy in this study, some of which are reported here. When compared with low-baptism pastors, the high-baptism pastors were more likely to have had seminary training and to have received academic honors. They were also less
likely to have entered ministry from another career.

In comparison with those rated less-effective by their ministerial directors, more-effective pastors were more likely to have received academic honors, had a nurturing mentor, worked in large population centers, conducted lay-training programs, and involved laity in evangelism. They were more likely to have reported as professional goals: conference administration, full-time evangelism, and radio or TV ministry. Their congregations were more likely to have engaged in one or more of the following specialized ministries: church school, community services center, Pathfinder Club, Adventist Youth Association, men's organization, women's organization, and/or divorce recovery program.

Four measures of membership growth distinguished high-baptism from low-baptism pastors, and more-effective from less-effective pastors: percentage of membership increase, baptisms as percentage of membership, outreach baptisms as percentage of membership, and youth baptisms as percentage of membership. On all measures, the high-baptism and more-effective pastors were shown to have been more productive in soul winning.

The API successfully identified statistically significant differences among comparison groups of pastors in this study. Some important implications that emerged from the API findings were as follows:

1. The relationships among seminary training,
the ability to achieve academic honors, and pastoral effectiveness

2. The influence upon pastoral effectiveness of nurturant mentors

3. The importance of lay-training programs and the involvement of laity in evangelism, in relationship to pastoral effectiveness

4. The influence upon perceptions of pastoral effectiveness of contextual factors such as membership composition and geographic location of congregations

5. Reported career aspirations as an indicator of pastoral-effectiveness potential.

Analyses of 16PF Findings

The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire, Fifth Edition, was used to determine the extent to which aspects of personality were correlated with group designations of respondents.

Intellectual Functioning

The first area of interest was intellectual functioning. The following six measures were used to evaluate the five groups of pastors.

Factor B assesses verbal, numerical, and logical reasoning ability.

High scorers on Factor M focus on the inner world of ideas, imagination, and fantasy. Low scorers focus on sensory experiences, observable data, and external
realities.

People with high scores on Factor Q1 welcome new ideas and experiences while those with lower scores value constancy, and prefer what is familiar and predictable to the new and innovative.

Tough-Mindedness is a Second-order measure, based upon primary-factor scores, that assesses the individual's leaning towards functioning in a dispassionate, objective, resolute manner. Low scorers are more attuned to intuition and feelings, and are more sensitive to interpersonal concerns than are high scorers.

Individuals with high Creative-Potential scores are resourceful, self-expressive, and open-minded. They are eager to try out new ways of doing things, and exhibit elevated levels of curiosity and imagination.

People with higher scores on Creative Achievement may have many qualities in common with those who score high on Creative Potential, but they are also likely to be more productive and to have greater creative output than individuals with lower scores.

Question 1

Do the mean test scores of the pastors in the high-baptism group, the reference group, and the low-baptism group differ significantly on the 16PF measures of intellectual functioning? Table 4 presents means and standard deviations for each of the measures.
Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations of 16PF Measures of Intellectual Functioning of Pastors in High-Baptism, Reference, and Low-Baptism Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16PF MEASURES</th>
<th>HIGH-BAPTISM</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>LOW-BAPTISM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( N = 50 )</td>
<td>( N = 72 )</td>
<td>( N = 44 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>STD DBV</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR B</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>6.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR M</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR Q1</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>6.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOUGH MINDENESS</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREATIVE POTENTIAL</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREATIVE ACHIEVEMENT</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No statistically significant differences emerged in the Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) among the high-baptism, reference, and low-baptism groups of pastors on the 16PF measures of intellectual functioning (Wilks' Lambda = 0.895, \( df = 12.000 \), \( F = 1.501 \), Probability = 0.122.) Consequently Null Hypothesis 1 was retained.

Question 2

Do the mean test scores of pastors in the more-effective, reference, and less-effective groups differ significantly on the 16PF measures of intellectual functioning? Tables 5-7 present the statistics.
Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations of 16PF Measures of Intellectual Functioning of Pastors in More-Effective, Reference, and Less-Effective Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16PF MEASURES</th>
<th>MORE EFFECTIVE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>LESS EFFECTIVE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 61</td>
<td>N = 44</td>
<td>N = 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEAN STD DEV</td>
<td>MEAN STD DEV</td>
<td>MEAN STD DEV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR B</td>
<td>6.70 1.52</td>
<td>6.39 1.71</td>
<td>6.90 1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR M</td>
<td>5.23 1.80</td>
<td>4.66 1.51</td>
<td>5.40 2.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR Q1</td>
<td>6.46 1.84</td>
<td>5.75 2.05</td>
<td>5.77 2.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOUGH MINDEDNESS</td>
<td>5.13 1.94</td>
<td>5.55 1.96</td>
<td>5.57 2.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREATIVE POTENTIAL</td>
<td>5.94 1.96</td>
<td>5.60 1.59</td>
<td>4.68 2.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREATIVE ACHIEVEMENT</td>
<td>5.20 1.80</td>
<td>4.28 1.80</td>
<td>4.88 2.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

Statistics for Canonical Discriminant Function (n = 135)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>EIGENVALUE</th>
<th>CANONICAL CORRELATION</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CHISQUARE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>24.782</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>7.167</td>
<td>.208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

Structure Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16 PF MEASURES</th>
<th>FUNCTION 1</th>
<th>FUNCTION 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR B</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR M</td>
<td>.387*</td>
<td>.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR Q1</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOUGH MINDEDNESS</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREATIVE POTENTIAL</td>
<td>-.484*</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREATIVE ACHIEVEMENT</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.621</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) confirmed differences among the groups (at 0.05 level of significance). (Wilks' Lambda = 0.826, df = 12.000, F = 2.125, Probability = 0.016.)

A Discriminant Analysis (DA) was then performed to identify the areas of significant difference. The values for the canonical discriminant function evaluated at group means were: ME = -0.03, RG = -0.394, and LE = 0.641.

The discriminant function separated the reference and more-effective groups from the less-effective group on Abstractness (Factor M) and Creative Potential (Figure 1).

When the mean scores on Factor M were higher for the more-effective and less-effective groups than for the reference group, the mean scores on Creative Potential were higher for the more-effective and reference groups than for the less-effective group. Put another way, the
Figure 1. Relationships between 16PF scales loading .3 and above on the significant discriminant function and pastoral groups; and the relative positions of group means on Creative Potential and Abstractness (Factor M).
less-effective pastors scored lower on Creative Potential and higher on Abstractness than pastors in the more-effective and reference groups.

This is a counter-intuitive finding because the scores of the less-effective pastors on Factor M were expected to have been lower than those of the more-effective group. The more important reason why this seems counter-intuitive is that Abstractness (Factor M) is normally correlated with creativity. Instead the less-effective pastors who scored highest on Factor M scored lowest on Creative Potential. Dominance (Factor E) and Perfectionism (Factor Q3) are included in the Creative Potential specification equation, and on these factors the less-effective pastors scored significantly lower than the more-effective pastors. The less-effective group's lower scores on Creative Potential were attributed to these differentials. It seems reasonable that creativity was correlated with effectiveness in ministry because sermon preparation and problem solving benefit from creativity.

The answer to Question 2 is that significant differences did exist among groups on Creative Potential and Abstractness (Factor M), therefore Null Hypothesis 2 was rejected on these measures.

Emotional Functioning

The following 16PF measures were used to determine whether or not significant differences existed among the
high-baptism, reference, and low-baptism groups of pastors, and among the more-effective, reference, and less-effective groups of pastors.

Factor C (Emotional Stability) measures emotional reactivity at the low end of the scale and emotional resilience at the upper end.

Higher scores on Factor I (Sensitivity) indicate a subjective sensitivity and refinement whereas lower scores point to an unsentimental utilitarian approach to life.

High scores on Factor O (Apprehension) are indicative of worry, self-reproach, and insecurity whereas low scores denote self-assurance and self-confidence.

High scorers on Factor Q4 (Tension) tend to be restless and driven, whereas low scorers tend to be patient and relaxed.

The Second-order measure of Anxiety indicates a vulnerability to perceived threat and fear of realistic danger whereas lower scores are characteristic of people who are unperturbed and unmotivated by similar stimuli.

High scores on Self-Esteem indicate that the individual's self-perception is one of positive self-worth and favorable self-concept.

Adjustment is a broad psychological measure of balance and stability in social, emotional, and occupational domains.
Question 3

Do the mean test scores of the pastors in the high-baptism, reference, and low-baptism groups differ significantly on the 16PF measures of emotional functioning? The means and standard deviations are presented in Table 8.

No statistically significant differences emerged in the Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) among the high-baptism, reference, and low-baptism groups of pastors on the 16PF measures of Emotional Functioning (Wilks' Lambda = 0.884, df = 14.000, F = 1.425, Probability = 0.140.) Consequently Null Hypothesis 3 was retained.

Question 4

Do the mean test scores of the more-effective, reference, and the less-effective groups differ significantly on the 16PF measures of emotional functioning? Tables 9-11 present the statistics.

A Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) confirmed differences among the groups (at the 0.05 level of significance). (Wilks' Lambda = 0.765 df = 14.000, F = 2.577, Probability = 0.002.)

A Discriminant Analysis was then performed to identify the areas of significant difference.

The values for the first canonical discriminant function evaluated at group means were: ME = -0.376,
Table 8

Means and Standard Deviations of 16PF Measures of Emotional Functioning of Pastors in High-Baptism, Reference, and Low-Baptism Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16 PF MEASURES</th>
<th>HIGH-BAPTISM</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>LOW-BAPTISM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 50</td>
<td>N = 72</td>
<td>N = 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>STD DEV</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR C</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>6.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR I</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR O</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR Q4</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANXIETY</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-ESTEEM</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMOTIONAL ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16PF MEASURES</th>
<th>MORE EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>LESS EFFECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEAN STD DEV</td>
<td>MEAN STD DEV</td>
<td>MEAN STD DEV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR C</td>
<td>7.23 1.49</td>
<td>6.52 1.56</td>
<td>6.90 1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR I</td>
<td>4.87 2.09</td>
<td>5.30 2.15</td>
<td>4.83 2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR O</td>
<td>4.85 2.00</td>
<td>4.41 1.74</td>
<td>4.37 1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR Q4</td>
<td>4.62 1.60</td>
<td>4.50 1.65</td>
<td>4.03 1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANXIETY</td>
<td>3.84 1.67</td>
<td>3.98 1.61</td>
<td>3.80 1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-ESTEEM</td>
<td>7.13 1.59</td>
<td>7.05 1.45</td>
<td>6.79 1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMOTIONAL ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>6.75 1.56</td>
<td>6.73 1.47</td>
<td>6.89 1.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10
Statistics for Canonical Discriminant Function (n = 135)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>EIGENVALUE</th>
<th>CANONICAL CORRELATION</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CHISQUARE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>34.515</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>13.099</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 11
Structure Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16PF MEASURES</th>
<th>FUNCTION 1</th>
<th>FUNCTION 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR C</td>
<td>-.470*</td>
<td>-.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR I</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>-.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR O</td>
<td>-.229</td>
<td>-.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR Q4</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>-.435*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANXIETY</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>-.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-ESTEEM</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMOTIONAL ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RG = 0.583, and LE = -0.902. The values for the second canonical discriminant function group centroids were: ME = -0.208, RG = -0.121, and LE = 0.601.

Figures 2 and 3 present a visual representation of the three groups and the factors that differentiate them.

On the first significant function Factor C (Emotional Stability), differentiated between the reference group and the more-effective and less-effective groups, both of which scored significantly higher than the reference group.

Conventional wisdom would lead one to believe that the more-effective group would have been more emotionally mature than the reference group, as was the case here. What was unexpected was the degree of similarity on emotional stability of the more-effective and the
Figure 2. The relationship between the 16PF scale that loads above .3 on the first significant discriminant function and pastoral groups; and the relative positions of group means on Emotional Stability (Factor C).
Legend: Positions of:

RG = Reference-Group Pastors
LE = Less-Effective Pastors
ME = More-Effective Pastors

Figure 3. The relationship between the 16PF scale that loads above .3 on the second significant discriminant function and pastoral groups; and the relative positions of group means on Tension (Factor Q4).
less-effective groups. Instead of being significantly less stable than the more-effective pastors, the less-effective group scored only one third of a sten lower, and still within the high-average range of emotional resilience. (A sten is 1 point on a scale of 1-10.) It seems, therefore, that the poor professional performance of the less-effective group of pastors was not directly attributable to emotional problems as measured by this 16PF Factor. Although individual pastors may have had diminished performance because of emotional difficulties, the analyses do not support the notion that emotional problems lay at the root of poor pastoral performance.

On the second significant function, the less-effective group scored significantly lower on Factor Q4 than the reference and more-effective groups. This indicates that less-effective pastors tended to be more relaxed than the other pastors. Although this difference is statistically significant, the actual difference between group means on Factor Q4 is modest (.59 on a scale of 1-10).

The emergence of statistically significant differences among groups on Factors C and Q4 of the 16PF leads to the rejection of Null Hypothesis 4.

Interpersonal Functioning

The following 16PF measures were used to determine
whether or not significant differences existed among the high-baptism, reference, and low-baptism pastors, and among more-effective, reference, and less-effective pastors.

Persons who score high on Factor A tend to be warmly involved in their interpersonal interactions and those with lower scores tend to be reserved and distant.

Factor E is the familiar dominance-submissiveness scale with higher scores indicating assertiveness and competitiveness, and lower scores pointing towards deference and conflict-avoidance.

People who score high on Factor F tend to be lively, spontaneous, and attention-seeking whereas those who score low tend to be serious, cautious, and prudent.

Low scorers on Factor H tend to be shy and timid when among strangers whereas high scorers tend to be socially bold and adventurous.

Persons with high scores on Factor L tend to be distrustful of others and may be oppositional or obstructive at times. Low scorers tend to expect that they will be treated equitably and trust others accordingly, sometimes to their detriment.

Those with high scores on Factor N are private and astute in their social interactions, not revealing more than is appropriate about themselves. Low scorers are very genuine, open, and inclined to self-disclose readily, so much so that they may be perceived as naive at times.
High Factor Q2 scores reveal the degree of self-reliance and level of comfort a person has with solitude, whereas lower scores indicate the test-taker's need for group support and social contact.

Second-order Extraversion-Introversion scores are derived from a cluster of primary scores to give insights into this dimension of personality with high scores indicating Extraversion.

The second of the global scores is Independence with accommodating people scoring low on this scale.

The remaining measures in this section are criterion scores derived from the primaries, the first of which is Social Adjustment, with high scorers being audacious, forceful, and aggressive in their social interactions.

Emotional Expressivity is a measure of the person's ability to communicate effectively in non-verbal ways.

Emotional Control indicates the ability to regulate non-verbal communication with high scorers able to display or conceal their emotions according to what they want to accomplish.

High-scorers on Social Expressivity are talkative and readily engage others in conversation.

Those who score high on Social Sensitivity are adept at receiving and interpreting verbal communication.

People with high scores on Social Control are tactful and confident in their verbal communication.

High scorers on Empathy are able to identify with
the feelings and experiences of others and to readily convey their understanding of the person's situation.

Leadership Potential refers to a cluster of qualities including good coping skills, tolerance, extraversion, and low anxiety that have been demonstrated to be present in the personalities of those who do well as leaders.

Question 5

Do the mean test scores of pastors in the high-baptism, reference, and low-baptism groups differ significantly on the 16PF measures of interpersonal functioning? The means and standard deviations are presented in Table 12.

No statistically significant differences emerged in the Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) among the high-baptism, reference, and low-baptism groups of pastors on the 16PF measures of Interpersonal Functioning (Wilks' Lambda = 0.808, df = 34.000, F = 0.975, Probability = 0.512.) Consequently Null Hypothesis 5 was retained.

Question 6

Do the mean test scores of more-effective, reference-group, and the less-effective pastors differ significantly on the 16PF measures of interpersonal functioning? See Table 13 for means and standard deviations.

No statistically significant differences emerged in
Table 12

Means and Standard Deviations of 16PF Measures of Interpersonal Functioning of Pastors in High-Baptism, Reference, and Low-Baptism Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16PF Measures</th>
<th>HIGH-BAPTISM</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>LOW-BAPTISM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 50</td>
<td>N = 72</td>
<td>N = 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEAN STD DEV</td>
<td>MEAN STD DEV</td>
<td>MEAN STD DEV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR A</td>
<td>6.84 1.79</td>
<td>6.25 2.05</td>
<td>6.64 1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR E</td>
<td>4.94 2.27</td>
<td>4.72 1.91</td>
<td>4.59 1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR F</td>
<td>4.84 1.96</td>
<td>4.03 1.74</td>
<td>4.23 2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR H</td>
<td>6.66 1.84</td>
<td>6.42 1.73</td>
<td>7.14 1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR L</td>
<td>4.54 1.49</td>
<td>4.79 1.71</td>
<td>4.25 1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR N</td>
<td>4.80 1.90</td>
<td>5.56 1.55</td>
<td>5.25 1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR Q2</td>
<td>5.18 2.33</td>
<td>5.63 1.83</td>
<td>5.23 1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTRAVERSION</td>
<td>6.28 2.05</td>
<td>5.46 1.70</td>
<td>5.98 1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEPENDENCE</td>
<td>5.52 1.95</td>
<td>5.33 1.77</td>
<td>5.34 1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>6.51 1.98</td>
<td>6.19 1.74</td>
<td>6.85 1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMOTIONAL EXPRESSIVITY</td>
<td>5.45 2.26</td>
<td>4.93 2.02</td>
<td>5.28 2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMOTIONAL CONTROL</td>
<td>5.99 2.02</td>
<td>6.42 1.76</td>
<td>6.38 1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL EXPRESSIVITY</td>
<td>5.97 2.17</td>
<td>5.25 1.85</td>
<td>5.80 1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SENSITIVITY</td>
<td>4.45 2.00</td>
<td>4.64 1.81</td>
<td>4.55 1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL CONTROL</td>
<td>6.57 1.92</td>
<td>6.36 1.77</td>
<td>6.93 1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPATHY</td>
<td>7.01 1.76</td>
<td>6.31 1.63</td>
<td>6.77 1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEADERSHIP POTENTIAL</td>
<td>6.26 1.88</td>
<td>5.73 1.54</td>
<td>6.26 1.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 13
Means and Standard Deviations of 16PF Measures of Interpersonal Functioning of Pastors in More-Effective, Reference, and Less-Effective Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16PF MEASURES</th>
<th>MORE EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>LESS EFFECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEAN STD DBV</td>
<td>MEAN STD DBV</td>
<td>MEAN STD DBV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR A</td>
<td>6.90 1.77</td>
<td>6.64 1.83</td>
<td>6.20 2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR B</td>
<td>4.92 2.06</td>
<td>4.59 1.66</td>
<td>3.63 2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR C</td>
<td>4.84 1.78</td>
<td>4.23 2.07</td>
<td>4.63 1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR D</td>
<td>6.79 1.82</td>
<td>7.14 1.50</td>
<td>6.47 1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR E</td>
<td>4.08 1.53</td>
<td>4.25 1.57</td>
<td>4.63 1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR F</td>
<td>4.95 1.58</td>
<td>5.25 1.74</td>
<td>5.33 2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR G</td>
<td>5.03 1.87</td>
<td>5.23 1.72</td>
<td>6.13 2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTRAVERSION</td>
<td>6.34 1.70</td>
<td>5.98 1.65</td>
<td>5.57 2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEPENDENCE</td>
<td>5.61 1.71</td>
<td>5.34 1.38</td>
<td>4.60 1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>6.69 1.85</td>
<td>6.85 1.50</td>
<td>6.04 1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMOTIONAL EXPRESSIVITY</td>
<td>5.47 2.00</td>
<td>5.28 2.01</td>
<td>4.61 2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMOTIONAL CONTROL</td>
<td>5.98 1.84</td>
<td>6.38 1.93</td>
<td>6.62 1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL EXPRESSIVITY</td>
<td>6.03 1.95</td>
<td>5.80 1.90</td>
<td>5.60 2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SENSITIVITY</td>
<td>4.60 1.85</td>
<td>4.55 1.81</td>
<td>4.25 1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL CONTROL</td>
<td>7.02 1.62</td>
<td>6.93 1.48</td>
<td>6.08 1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPATHY</td>
<td>7.24 1.64</td>
<td>6.77 1.54</td>
<td>6.68 1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEADERSHIP POTENTIAL</td>
<td>6.50 1.69</td>
<td>6.26 1.63</td>
<td>5.72 1.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) among the groups on the 16PF measures of Interpersonal Functioning (Wilks' Lambda = 0.679, df = 34.000, F = 1.457, Probability = 0.057.) Consequently Null Hypothesis 6 was retained. (Note that Probability approached significance.)

Vocational Functioning

The following 16PF measures were used to determine whether or not significant differences exist among high-baptism, reference, and low-baptism groups of pastors, and among more-effective, reference, and less-effective pastors.

High scores on Factor F indicate an exuberance that points to high energy and changeableness whereas lower scores describe people who are prudent, serious, and mature in their approach to responsibilities.

Persons who score high on Factor G are conscientious and persevering whereas those who score low tend to disregard rules and policies that do not fit with their somewhat unconventional perspectives.

High scorers on Factor H tend to be more energetic and adventurous than low scorers, who tend to feel discomfort in unfamiliar situations and when interacting with strangers.

Factor Q3 is a measure of self-discipline and goal-directedness with low-scorers tending towards
procrastination and disorganization.

Self-Control is a Second-order measure that includes self-restraint, self-imposed performance-expectations, and a need for order and structure.

The remaining scores in this set refer to the Holland Occupational Themes, Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising, and Conventional that are derived from the 16PF Primary- and Second-order scores.

Question 7

Do the mean test scores of the pastors in the high-baptism, reference, and the low-baptism groups differ significantly on the 16PF measures of vocational functioning? See Table 14 for means and standard deviations.

No statistically significant differences emerged in the Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) among the groups on the 16PF measures of vocational functioning (Wilks' Lambda = 0.819, df = 22.000, F = 1.438, Probability = 0.095.) Consequently Null Hypothesis 7 was retained.

Question 8

Do the mean test scores of more-effective, reference-group, and less-effective pastors differ significantly on the 16PF measures of vocational functioning? See Table 15 for means and standard deviations.
Table 14

Means and Standard Deviations of 16PF Measures of Vocational Functioning of Pastors in High-Baptism, Reference, and Low-Baptism Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16PF MEASURES</th>
<th>HIGH-BAPTISM N = 50</th>
<th>REFERENCE N = 71</th>
<th>LOW-BAPTISM N = 43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEAN   STD DEV</td>
<td>MEAN   STD DEV</td>
<td>MEAN   STD DEV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR P</td>
<td>4.84    1.96</td>
<td>3.97    1.68</td>
<td>4.28    2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR G</td>
<td>6.56    1.54</td>
<td>6.46    1.52</td>
<td>6.56    1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR H</td>
<td>6.66    1.84</td>
<td>6.38    1.72</td>
<td>7.14    1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR Q3</td>
<td>4.78    1.98</td>
<td>5.06    2.05</td>
<td>5.16    1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-CONTROL</td>
<td>5.94    1.57</td>
<td>5.97    1.72</td>
<td>6.23    1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REALISTIC</td>
<td>6.24    2.01</td>
<td>6.01    1.84</td>
<td>5.84    2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVESTIGATIVE</td>
<td>5.80    1.63</td>
<td>6.17    1.63</td>
<td>5.51    1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTISTIC</td>
<td>5.66    1.85</td>
<td>5.96    2.07</td>
<td>5.65    1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL</td>
<td>6.90    1.71</td>
<td>6.39    1.88</td>
<td>6.88    1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTERPRISING</td>
<td>6.14    1.84</td>
<td>5.76    1.63</td>
<td>6.23    1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONVENTIONAL</td>
<td>5.90    1.67</td>
<td>5.51    2.03</td>
<td>6.00    2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 15

Means and Standard Deviations of 16PF Measures of Vocational Functioning of Pastors in More-Effective, Reference, and Less-Effective Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16PF MEASURES</th>
<th>MORE EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>LESS EFFECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 61</td>
<td>N = 44</td>
<td>N = 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEAN STD DBV</td>
<td>MEAN STD DBV</td>
<td>MEAN STD DBV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR F</td>
<td>4.84 1.78</td>
<td>4.23 2.07</td>
<td>4.63 1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR G</td>
<td>6.59 1.28</td>
<td>6.59 1.63</td>
<td>6.43 1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR H</td>
<td>6.79 1.82</td>
<td>7.14 1.50</td>
<td>6.47 1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR Q3</td>
<td>5.10 1.96</td>
<td>5.14 1.85</td>
<td>4.20 1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-CONTROL</td>
<td>6.00 1.54</td>
<td>6.23 1.49</td>
<td>5.63 1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REALISTIC</td>
<td>5.95 2.10</td>
<td>5.89 2.00</td>
<td>6.43 1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVESTIGATIVE</td>
<td>5.95 1.83</td>
<td>5.57 1.85</td>
<td>6.53 1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTISTIC</td>
<td>5.80 2.07</td>
<td>5.68 1.90</td>
<td>5.60 2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL</td>
<td>6.82 1.98</td>
<td>6.91 1.55</td>
<td>6.33 2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTERPRISING</td>
<td>6.28 2.12</td>
<td>6.20 1.44</td>
<td>5.50 1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONVENTIONAL</td>
<td>5.85 2.05</td>
<td>5.95 2.00</td>
<td>5.47 2.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No statistically significant differences emerged in the Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) among the groups on the 16PF measures of Vocational Functioning (Wilks' Lambda = 0.806, df = 22.000, F = 1.265, Probability = 0.196.) Consequently Null Hypothesis 8 was retained.

Additional Analyses

After reflecting on the counter-intuitive findings from the 16PF analyses reported above, it was decided to perform a further analysis of the 16PF primary scores as a set to establish whether significant differences emerged between the high-baptism and low-baptism groups and between the more-effective and less-effective groups. This seemed advisable because the previous analyses had been performed on sets of scores that included primary factors, second-order factors, and derived criterion scores. This approach had introduced the possibility of confoundability that would be eliminated if the analysis was confined to the primaries.

Second, the analyses of the more-effective and less-effective groups were also confounded by the scores of the reference group. It seemed apparent that the reference group may have contained more-effective and less-effective pastors in addition to moderately effective pastors, and this may have obscured significant differences.
A Discriminant Analysis (DA) was performed on the 16PF primary scores from the high-baptism and low-baptism groups. Table 16 displays the means and standard deviations and Tables 17 and 18 report the associated statistics.

The values for the first canonical discriminant function evaluated at group means were: HB = -0.263, and LB = 0.182 (see Figure 4.)

According to these data, the high-baptism pastors, on average, were more warm, lively, socially bold, and open to change, whereas the low-baptism pastors were more private and self-sufficient. All but one of these 16PF factors fall within the relational domain of this study and suggest that high-baptism pastors are more oriented towards social interaction than the low-baptism pastors. The higher Factor Q1 score also seems consistent with the profile of soul-winners who adapt easily to change as they pursue their objectives. Figure 4 gives a visual representation of the relative positions of the scores which fall on a scale of 1-10, and the values for the Discriminant Function.

A Discriminant Analysis (DA) was also performed on the 16PF Primary scores from the more-effective and less-effective groups.

Table 19 displays the means and standard deviations and Tables 20 and 21 report associated statistics. Figure 5 presents a visual representation of the two
Table 16

Means and Standard Deviations of 16PF Primary Factor Scores of Pastors in High-Baptism and Low-Baptism Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16PF MEASURES</th>
<th>HIGH BAPTISMS</th>
<th>LOW BAPTISMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M = 50</td>
<td>N = 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEAN  STD DBV</td>
<td>MEAN  STD DBV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR A</td>
<td>6.84  1.79</td>
<td>6.25  2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR B</td>
<td>6.22  1.33</td>
<td>6.68  1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR C</td>
<td>7.08  1.50</td>
<td>6.68  1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR E</td>
<td>4.94  2.27</td>
<td>4.72  1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR F</td>
<td>4.84  1.96</td>
<td>4.03  1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR G</td>
<td>6.56  1.54</td>
<td>6.44  1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR H</td>
<td>6.66  1.84</td>
<td>6.42  1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR I</td>
<td>4.88  1.98</td>
<td>5.35  1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR L</td>
<td>4.54  1.49</td>
<td>4.79  1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR M</td>
<td>4.98  1.91</td>
<td>5.50  2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR N</td>
<td>4.80  1.90</td>
<td>5.56  1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR O</td>
<td>4.44  1.94</td>
<td>4.78  1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR Q1</td>
<td>6.26  1.91</td>
<td>6.08  2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR Q2</td>
<td>5.18  2.23</td>
<td>5.63  1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR Q3</td>
<td>4.78  1.98</td>
<td>5.04  2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR Q4</td>
<td>4.52  1.66</td>
<td>4.53  1.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17

Statistics for Canonical Discriminant Function (n = 122)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>EIGENVALUE</th>
<th>CANONICAL CORRELATION</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CHISQUARE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5.684</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18

Structure Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16PF MEASURES</th>
<th>FUNCTION 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR N</td>
<td>1.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR F</td>
<td>-.396*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR H</td>
<td>-.393*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR A</td>
<td>-.365*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR Q2</td>
<td>.355*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR Q1</td>
<td>-.343*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR E</td>
<td>-.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR L</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR Q3</td>
<td>.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR M</td>
<td>-.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR C</td>
<td>-.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR I</td>
<td>-.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR G</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR O</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR Q4</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR B</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4. The relationship between the 16PF scales that load .3 and above on the only significant discriminant function and pastoral groups; and the relative positions of group means on Warmth (Factor A), Liveliness (Factor F), Social Boldness (Factor H), Privateness, (Factor N), Openness to Change (Factor Q1), and Self-Reliance (Factor Q2).
Table 19

Means and Standard Deviations of 16PF Primary Factor Scores of Pastors in More-Effective and Less-Effective Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16PF MEASURES</th>
<th>MORE EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>LESS EFFECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 50</td>
<td>N = 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEAN STD DEV</td>
<td>MEAN STD DEV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR A</td>
<td>6.90 1.77</td>
<td>6.20 2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR B</td>
<td>6.70 1.52</td>
<td>6.90 1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR C</td>
<td>7.23 1.49</td>
<td>6.90 1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR D</td>
<td>4.92 2.06</td>
<td>3.63 2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR E</td>
<td>4.84 1.78</td>
<td>4.63 1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR F</td>
<td>6.59 1.29</td>
<td>6.43 1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR G</td>
<td>6.79 1.82</td>
<td>6.47 1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR H</td>
<td>4.87 2.09</td>
<td>4.83 2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR I</td>
<td>4.08 1.33</td>
<td>4.63 1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR J</td>
<td>5.23 1.30</td>
<td>5.40 2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR K</td>
<td>4.95 1.58</td>
<td>5.33 2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR L</td>
<td>4.85 2.00</td>
<td>4.37 1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR M</td>
<td>6.46 1.84</td>
<td>5.77 2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR N</td>
<td>5.01 1.87</td>
<td>6.13 2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR O</td>
<td>5.10 1.96</td>
<td>4.20 1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR P</td>
<td>4.62 1.60</td>
<td>4.03 1.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20

*Statistics for Canonical Discriminant Function (n = 122)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>EIGENVALUE</th>
<th>CANONICAL CORRELATION</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CHISQUARE</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>15.108</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21

*Structure Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16PF MEASURES</th>
<th>FUNCTION 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR E</td>
<td>.683*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR Q2</td>
<td>-.612*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR Q3</td>
<td>.506*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR H</td>
<td>.418*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR A</td>
<td>.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR N</td>
<td>-.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR F</td>
<td>.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR Q1</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR Q4</td>
<td>.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR C</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR I</td>
<td>-.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR M</td>
<td>-.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR G</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR L</td>
<td>-.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR B</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR O</td>
<td>-.010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5. The relationship between the 16PF scales that load .3 and above on the only significant discriminant function and pastoral groups; and the relative positions of group means on Dominance (Factor E), Social Boldness (Factor H), Self-Reliance (Factor Q2), and Perfectionism (Factor Q3).
groups and the factors that differentiate them.

The values for the canonical discriminant function evaluated at group means were: \( ME = 0.301 \) and \( LE = -0.612 \).

These data reveal that the less-effective pastors were significantly more submissive and conflict-avoidant than the more-effective pastors who were about as assertive as persons in the general population. The difference in mean scores of 1.29 stens is not only statistically significant, but also of practical importance because it suggests that below-average levels of assertiveness are correlated with lower effectiveness. The more-effective pastors scored marginally higher on Social Boldness (Factor H) than the less-effective pastors and this was in the expected direction.

More-effective pastors scored close to average in terms of maintaining contact and proximity with others whereas less-effective pastors scored 1.1 stens higher in the direction of self-sufficiency and preference for solitude (Factor Q2). Although still within the average range, this finding about less-effective pastors is of practical interest because much of the pastor's work requires group involvement which can be wearing on the person who does not enjoy a lot of social interaction.

Less-effective pastors scored almost a full sten lower on self-discipline than the group of more-effective pastors, and 1.3 stens below the average for men in the general population. Factor Q3 is termed Perfectionism
because higher scores indicate the ability to accomplish one's objectives in a timely and precise manner. People with lower scores tend to procrastinate and to be more content with disorganization and lack of structure.

Taken together, the findings of these analyses suggest that less-effective pastors tend to be more submissive, less socially bold, less group-oriented, and less disciplined than more-effective pastors. And high-baptism pastors tend to reveal more personal openness, and to be more sociable, genuine, and approachable than low-baptism pastors.

In summary, it was hypothesized that the groups of high-baptism pastors, low-baptism pastors, more-effective pastors, less-effective pastors, and reference-group pastors would be differentiated from each other on four domains of functioning as measured by clusters of 16PF scores: intellectual, emotional, relational, and vocational/functional. The findings provide support for these ideas in the following instances.

The less-effective pastors scored lower on Creative Potential and higher on Abstractness (Factor M) than reference-group and more-effective pastors, thus confirming differences in intellectual functioning.

The reference-group pastors scored lower on Emotional Stability (Factor C) than more-effective and less-effective pastors. The less-effective pastors scored lower on Tension (Factor Q4) than reference-group and
more-effective pastors. These two findings provide support for the idea that there are differences in emotional functioning among the groups.

No significant differences among groups were shown in the domain clusters measuring relational functioning and vocational functioning.

There were fewer differences in the four domains than expected and the magnitude of the differences was smaller than anticipated. This may be partially explained by the smallness of group size (n=30 for the less-effective group) and by the degree of homogeneity of the scores within the average range. Had greater precision been employed in the identification of pastors in the four comparison groups, greater personality variability may have emerged. It is also possible that other means of measurement might have identified differences between groups in the four theoretical domains of this model.

A competing view might seek support in these results affirming that we should not expect to find important differences among contrasted groups of pastors because they are all likely to be very similar to the average person in the general population in these domains of functioning.

However, this theory was challenged by the findings when direct comparisons were made on the 16PF primary factors. Six of the 16 factors differentiated high-baptism from low-baptism pastors (Factors A, F, H,
N, Q1, and Q2), and four factors differentiated more-effective from less-effective pastors (Factors E, H, Q2, and Q3). These statistically significant differences lend support to the idea (confirmed by other research) that personality dynamics are correlated with pastoral performance.

Analyses of PTS and PTQ Findings

The Pastoral Tasks Survey and the Pastoral Tasks Questionnaire were used to elicit information about pastoral roles and tasks. As conceptualized in this study, the work of the pastor can be divided into five distinct roles: Preaching, Administration, Pastoral Care, Teaching, and Evangelism. Each of these roles was further subdivided into five tasks or task clusters, yielding 25 pastoral tasks that describe in behavioral terms what the pastor does.

Three dimensions of task performance were assessed: the average amount of time spent per week by the pastors on each of the 25 tasks, an estimate of the quality of their performance on each of the 25 tasks, and perceptions of task importance. The PTS elicited this information from the perspective of the pastor, and the PTQ provided time estimates, task-quality estimates, and rankings of task importance from the perspective of the lay leaders in the congregations served by the pastors who were surveyed.
Question 9

Are there any significant differences in the amount of time spent on the 25 pastoral tasks as reported by pastors in the high-baptism, reference, and low-baptism comparison groups? Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 22.

An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) confirmed statistically significant differences among the groups on tasks 2, 4, and 6. Consequently Null Hypothesis 9 was rejected on these tasks.

Task 2 is the Administrative function of leading and working with committees and boards. The mean self-reports of hours spent on this task per week by pastors were: high-baptism group 4.08, reference group 3.88, low-baptism group 2.89 hours. At the 0.05 level (0.1 when measured by the more conservative Student-Newman-Keuls test), the low-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the other two groups. This means that, according to their self-reports, the low-baptism pastors spent less time on committee work than the high-baptism and reference-group pastors.

Task 4 is the Teaching function of training, empowering, and supporting church members as they use their spiritual gifts in service as church officers (elders, deaconesses, etc.) and as soul winners. The mean self-reports of hours spent on this task per week were: high-baptism group 5.91, reference group 4.03,
Table 22

Means and Standard Deviations of Reported Time Spent by Pastors in High-Baptism, Reference, and Low-Baptism Groups on 25 Pastoral Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASTORAL TASKS</th>
<th>HIGH-BAPTISM</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>LOW-BAPTISM</th>
<th>ANOVA RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.88</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 11</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 16</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 18</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 19</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 21</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 23</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 24</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates statistically significant differences.
low-baptism group 3.70. At the .05 level, the high-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the reference and low-baptism groups. This means that, according to their self-reports, the high-baptism pastors spent more time on training laity than the reference-group and low-baptism pastors.

Task 6 is the Preaching function of planning the details for regular worship services and for special services such as weddings and funerals, and working with worship participants in preparation for their roles. The mean self-reports of hours spent on this task per week were: high-baptism group 2.43, reference group 2.01, low-baptism group 1.46. At the 0.05 level, the high-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the low-baptism group. This means that, according to their self-reports, high-baptism pastors spent more time on worship preparation than low-baptism pastors.

In summary, according to their self-reports, low-baptism pastors spent less time on committee work than high-baptism and reference-group pastors; high-baptism pastors spent more time on training laity than low-baptism and reference-group pastors; and high-baptism pastors spent more time on worship preparation than low-baptism pastors.

Question 10

Are there any significant differences in the amount
of time spent on the 25 pastoral tasks as reported by pastors in the more-effective, reference, and less-effective comparison groups? Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 23.

No statistically significant differences were found in the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) of the amount of time spent on the 25 pastoral tasks as reported by the pastors in the more-effective, the reference, and the less-effective groups. Consequently, Null Hypothesis 10 was retained.

The finding that all three groups spent roughly the same amount of time on each of the 25 tasks is not without some practical value. Apparently the range of hours for each of the tasks is representative of how long it typically takes pastors to perform the tasks.

Question 11

Are there significant differences in the estimates by lay leaders of the amount of time spent on the 25 tasks by pastors in the high-baptism, reference, and low-baptism groups? Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 24.

An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) confirmed statistically significant differences among the groups on tasks 3, 5, 12, 18, 22, and 25. Consequently, Null Hypothesis 11 was rejected on these tasks.

Lay leaders were asked to indicate whether they
Table 23
Means and Standard Deviations of Reported Time Spent by Pastors in More-Effective, Reference, and Less-Effective Groups on 25 Pastoral Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASTORAL TASKS</th>
<th>MORE-EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>LESS-EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>ANOVA RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>ST DEV</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 10</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 11</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 12</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 13</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 15</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 16</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 17</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 18</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 19</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 21</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 22</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 23</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 24</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 25</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 24

Means and Standard Deviations of Lay leaders' estimates of Time Spent by Pastors in High-Baptism, Reference, and Low-Baptism Groups on 25 Pastoral Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASTORAL TASKS</th>
<th>HIGH-BAPTISM</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>LOW-BAPTISM</th>
<th>ANOVA RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>ST DEV</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 6</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 7</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 8</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 9</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 10</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 11</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 12</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 13</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 14</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 15</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 16</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 17</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 18</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 19</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 20</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 21</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 22</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 23</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 24</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 25</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.

* Indicates statistically significant differences.

Scale: 1 = spends too little time; 2 = spends just enough time; 3 = spends too much time.
thought their pastor spends too little time, just enough time, or too much time on each of the 25 tasks.

Task 3 is the Pastoral Care function of counseling with church members who have personal or family problems, and giving pre-marital counseling to couples. The mean time estimates by lay leaders were: high-baptism group 1.81, reference group 1.80, low-baptism group 1.65. At the 0.05 level (0.1, Student-Newman-Keuls test), the low-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the other two groups. This means that, by the lay leaders' estimates, pastors in the low-baptism group spent less time on task 3 than pastors in the high-baptism and reference groups.

Task 5 is the Evangelism function of following those who have shown an interest in the church, visiting prospective new church members, and giving Bible studies. The mean time estimates by lay leaders were: high-baptism group 1.49, reference group 1.64, low-baptism group 1.52. At the 0.05 level, the low-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the high-baptism group. This means that, by the lay leaders' estimates, pastors in the low-baptism group spent less time on task 5 than pastors in the high-baptism group.

Task 12 is the Administrative function of making church-related phone calls, writing church-related letters, and following up on parishioner requests. The mean time estimates by lay leaders were: high-baptism
At the 0.05 level, the low-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the high-baptism group. This means that, by the lay leaders' estimates, pastors in the low-baptism group spent less time on task 12 than pastors in the high-baptism group.

Task 18 is the Pastoral Care function of attending church-related social events, and spending informal time associating with church members. The mean time estimates by lay leaders were: high-baptism group 1.97, reference group 1.90, low-baptism group 1.77. At the 0.05 level, the low-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the high-baptism and reference groups. This means that, by lay leaders' estimates, pastors in the low-baptism group spent less time on task 18 than pastors in the high-baptism and reference groups.

Task 22 is the Administrative function associated with the management of church finances and fund raising. The mean time estimates by lay leaders were: high-baptism group 1.95, reference group 1.95, low-baptism group 1.78. At the 0.05 level, the low-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the high-baptism and reference groups. This means that, by the lay leaders' estimates, pastors in the low-baptism group spent less time on task 22 than pastors in the high-baptism and reference groups.

Task 25 is the Evangelism function of preparing for
and conducting public evangelistic meetings and/or felt-needs evangelism such as stop-smoking clinics. The mean time estimates by lay leaders were: high-baptism group 1.86, reference group 1.64, low-baptism group 1.67. At the 0.05 level, the high-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the low-baptism and reference groups. This means that by lay leaders' estimates, pastors in the high-baptism group spent more time on task 22 than pastors in the low-baptism and reference groups.

In summary, in the ratings of lay leaders, low-baptism pastors spent less time than high-baptism pastors on tasks 3 (counseling), 12 (phone calls), 18 (socializing), 22 (finances), and 25 (evangelistic meetings).

Question 12

Are there significant differences in the estimates by lay leaders of the amount of time spent on the 25 tasks by pastors in the more-effective, reference, and less-effective groups? Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 25.

An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) confirmed statistically significant differences among the groups on tasks 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 12, 13, 17, 21, 22, 23, and 25. Consequently Null Hypothesis 12 was rejected on these tasks.
Table 25

Means and Standard Deviations of Lay leaders' Estimates of Time Spent by Pastors in More-Effective, Reference, and Less-Effective Groups on 25 Pastoral Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASTORAL TASKS</th>
<th>MORE-EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>LESS-EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>ANOVA RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N MEAN ST DEV</td>
<td>N MEAN ST DEV</td>
<td>N MEAN ST DEV</td>
<td>P  DF PROB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>121  1.98 0.33</td>
<td>79  1.91 0.37</td>
<td>57  1.98 0.35</td>
<td>1.01 2 0.3649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>123  2.07 0.52</td>
<td>80  2.06 0.51</td>
<td>57  1.79 0.53</td>
<td>6.53 2 0.0017*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3</td>
<td>118  1.81 0.51</td>
<td>80  1.80 0.46</td>
<td>56  1.52 0.57</td>
<td>6.83 2 0.0013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4</td>
<td>122  1.53 0.53</td>
<td>80  1.64 0.58</td>
<td>57  1.33 0.58</td>
<td>4.97 2 0.0076*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5</td>
<td>122  1.84 0.56</td>
<td>80  1.65 0.53</td>
<td>57  1.51 0.54</td>
<td>8.02 2 0.004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 6</td>
<td>120  1.91 0.43</td>
<td>80  1.90 0.38</td>
<td>56  1.86 0.40</td>
<td>0.31 2 0.7326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 7</td>
<td>119  2.03 0.47</td>
<td>79  1.81 0.48</td>
<td>57  1.84 0.41</td>
<td>1.18 2 0.3084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 8</td>
<td>122  1.79 0.41</td>
<td>79  1.85 0.40</td>
<td>57  1.74 0.48</td>
<td>1.99 2 0.1387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 9</td>
<td>118  1.53 0.53</td>
<td>79  1.48 0.51</td>
<td>57  1.37 0.49</td>
<td>2.76 2 0.0651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 10</td>
<td>117  1.62 0.52</td>
<td>80  1.53 0.53</td>
<td>57  1.42 0.50</td>
<td>0.05 2 0.9520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 11</td>
<td>120  2.03 0.24</td>
<td>79  2.01 0.20</td>
<td>55  2.02 0.41</td>
<td>8.07 2 0.0004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 12</td>
<td>117  2.03 0.41</td>
<td>78  1.86 0.58</td>
<td>55  1.71 0.60</td>
<td>4.63 2 0.0107*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 13</td>
<td>119  1.47 0.52</td>
<td>79  1.53 0.50</td>
<td>55  1.27 0.45</td>
<td>2.96 2 0.0535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 14</td>
<td>112  1.78 0.42</td>
<td>72  1.69 0.46</td>
<td>49  1.59 0.50</td>
<td>1.77 2 0.1721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 15</td>
<td>117  1.50 0.54</td>
<td>79  1.51 0.53</td>
<td>54  1.35 0.52</td>
<td>0.00 2 0.9325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 16</td>
<td>117  1.84 0.39</td>
<td>75  1.84 0.37</td>
<td>54  1.82 0.39</td>
<td>5.41 2 0.0050*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 17</td>
<td>119  1.86 0.56</td>
<td>78  1.86 0.53</td>
<td>55  1.58 0.57</td>
<td>2.17 2 0.1165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 18</td>
<td>119  1.96 0.35</td>
<td>77  1.90 0.35</td>
<td>55  1.84 0.42</td>
<td>1.21 2 0.3014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 19</td>
<td>119  1.73 0.46</td>
<td>79  1.71 0.46</td>
<td>54  1.61 0.53</td>
<td>5.50 2 0.0046*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 20</td>
<td>119  1.68 0.49</td>
<td>76  1.75 0.47</td>
<td>55  1.73 0.53</td>
<td>6.66 2 0.0066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 21</td>
<td>116  1.88 0.35</td>
<td>75  1.88 0.37</td>
<td>56  1.70 0.50</td>
<td>4.66 2 0.0014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 22</td>
<td>118  1.97 0.45</td>
<td>76  1.95 0.36</td>
<td>56  1.66 0.51</td>
<td>9.93 2 0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 23</td>
<td>116  1.77 0.48</td>
<td>75  1.77 0.48</td>
<td>56  1.52 0.57</td>
<td>5.42 2 0.0050*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 24</td>
<td>112  1.96 0.28</td>
<td>75  1.91 0.34</td>
<td>54  1.89 0.37</td>
<td>0.97 2 0.3816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 25</td>
<td>116  1.83 0.50</td>
<td>75  1.64 0.51</td>
<td>56  1.57 0.60</td>
<td>5.50 2 0.0046*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.

* Indicates statistically significant differences.

Scale: 1 = spends too little time; 2 = spends just enough time; 3 = spends too much time.
Task 2 is the Administrative function of leading and working with committees and boards. The mean time estimates by lay leaders were: more-effective group 2.07, reference group 2.06, less-effective group 1.79. At the 0.05 level, the less-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the more-effective and reference groups. This means that, by the lay leaders' estimates, pastors in the less-effective group spent less time on task 2 than pastors in the more-effective and reference groups.

Task 3 is the Pastoral-Care function of counseling with church members who have personal or family problems, and giving pre-marital counsel to couples. The mean time estimates for lay leaders were: more-effective group 1.81, reference group 1.80, less-effective group 1.52. At the 0.05 level, the less-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the more-effective and reference groups. This means that, by the lay leaders' estimates, pastors in the less-effective group spent less time on task 3 than pastors in the more-effective and reference groups.

Task 4 is the Teaching function of training, empowering, and supporting church members as they use their spiritual gifts in service as church officers (elders, deaconesses, etc.) and as soul winners. The mean time estimates by lay leaders were: more-effective group 1.52, reference group 1.64, less-effective
group 1.33. At the 0.05 level, the less-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the more-effective and reference groups. This means that, by the lay leaders' estimates, pastors in the less-effective group spent less time on task 4 than pastors in the more-effective and reference groups.

Task 5 is the Evangelism function of following those who have shown an interest in the church, visiting prospective church members, and giving Bible studies. The mean time estimates by lay leaders were: more-effective group 1.84, reference group 1.65, less-effective group 1.51. At the 0.05 level, the more-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the less-effective and reference groups. This means that, by the lay leaders' estimates, pastors in the more-effective group spent more time on task 5 than pastors in the less-effective and reference groups.

Task 7 is the Administrative function of preparing the announcement bulletin and the church newsletter. The mean time estimates by lay leaders were: more-effective group 2.03, reference group 1.81, less-effective group 1.84. At the 0.05 level, the more-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the less-effective and reference groups. This means that, by the lay leaders' estimates, pastors in the more-effective group spent more time on task 7 than pastors in the less-effective and reference groups.
Task 12 is the Administrative function of making church-related phone calls, writing church-related letters, and following up on parishioner requests. The mean time estimates by lay leaders were: more-effective group 2.03, reference group 1.86, less-effective group 1.71. At the 0.05 level, the more-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the less-effective and reference groups. This means that, by the lay leaders' estimates, pastors in the more-effective group spent more time on task 12 than pastors in the less-effective and reference groups.

Task 13 is the Pastoral-Care function of making regular home visits to members of the congregation. The mean time estimates by lay leaders were: more-effective group 1.47, reference group 1.53, less-effective group 1.27. At the 0.05 level, the less-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the more-effective and reference groups. This means that, by the lay leaders' estimates, pastors in the less-effective group spent less time on task 13 than pastors in the more-effective and reference groups.

Task 17 is the Administrative function of visioning, strategic planning, and working with members to formulate goals and objectives for the church. The mean time estimates by lay leaders were: more-effective group 1.86, reference group 1.86, less-effective group 1.58. At the 0.05 level, the less-effective group was shown to be
significantly different from the more-effective and reference groups. This means that, by the lay leaders' estimates, pastors in the less-effective group spent less time on task 17 than pastors in the more-effective and reference groups.

Task 21 is the Preaching function of planning the sermonic year, arranging for guest preachers, and choosing sermon topics to meet members' needs. The mean time estimates by lay leaders were: more-effective group 1.88, reference group 1.88, less-effective group 1.70. At the 0.05 level, the less-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the more-effective and the reference groups. This means that, by the lay leaders' estimates, pastors in the less-effective group spent less time on task 21 than pastors in the more-effective and reference groups.

Task 22 is the Administrative function associated with the management of church finances and fund raising. The mean time estimates by lay leaders were: more-effective group 1.97, reference group 1.95, less-effective group 1.66. At the 0.05 level, the less-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the more-effective and reference groups. This means that, by the lay leaders' estimates, pastors in the less-effective group spent less time on task 22 than pastors in the more-effective and reference groups.

Task 23 is the Pastoral-Care function of confronting
members who need pastoral admonition or reproof, and bringing resolution to congregational conflicts. The mean time estimates by lay leaders were: more-effective group 1.77, reference group 1.77, less-effective group 1.52. At the 0.05 level, the less-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the more-effective and the reference groups. This means that, by the lay leaders' estimates, pastors in the less-effective group spent less time on task 23 than pastors in the more-effective and reference groups.

Task 25 is the Evangelism function of preparing for and conducting public evangelistic meetings and/or felt-needs evangelism such as stop-smoking clinics. The mean time estimates by lay leaders were: more-effective group 1.83, reference group 1.64, less-effective group 1.57. At the 0.05 level, the more-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the less-effective and reference groups. This means that, by the lay leaders' estimates, pastors in the more-effective group spent more time on task 25 than pastors in the less-effective and reference groups.

In summary, in the ratings of lay leaders, less-effective pastors were more likely to be viewed as spending less time than the more-effective and reference-group pastors on tasks 2 (committees), 3 (counseling), 4 (training), 13 (home visits), 17 (visioning), 21 (sermonic year), 22 (finances), and 23
(reproof). More-effective pastors were viewed as spending more time than less-effective and reference-group pastors on tasks 5 (Bible studies), 7 (bulletin), 12 (phone calls), and 25 (evangelistic meetings).

Question 13

Are there significant differences in the self-ratings of task proficiency on each of the 25 pastoral tasks as reported by pastors in the high-baptism, reference, and low-baptism groups? Means and standard deviations are displayed in Table 26. An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) confirmed statistically significant differences among the groups on tasks 1, 2, 5, 6, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, on 22, and 25. Consequently Null Hypothesis 13 was rejected on these tasks.

The proficiency ratings of their task performance by pastors are on the following scale: much better than most other pastors, better than average pastors, about the same as most other pastors, not as good as most other pastors, and much worse than most other pastors.

Task 1 is the preaching function of sermon preparation. The mean self-ratings of task proficiency were: high-baptism pastors 1.98, reference-group pastors 2.47, low-baptism pastors 2.39. At the 0.05 level, the high-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the low-baptism and reference groups. This means that, according to the
Table 26
Means and Standard Deviations of Pastors’ Self-Ratings of Task Proficiency by Pastors in High-Baptism, Reference, and Low-Baptism Groups on 25 Pastoral Tasks

| PASTORAL TASKS | HIGH-BAPTISM | | REFERENCE | | LOW-BAPTISM | | STATISTICS |
|----------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                | N | MEAN | ST | N | MEAN | ST | N | MEAN | ST | N | MEAN | ST | Z | DF | PROB |
| Task 1         | 49 | 1.98 | 0.92 | 47 | 2.47 | 0.86 | 77 | 2.39 | 0.80 | 4.82 | 2 | 0.0092* |
| Task 2         | 49 | 2.20 | 0.79 | 47 | 2.40 | 0.97 | 77 | 2.74 | 0.66 | 7.34 | 2 | 0.0009* |
| Task 3         | 49 | 2.71 | 1.04 | 47 | 2.81 | 0.85 | 77 | 2.66 | 0.79 | 0.40 | 2 | 0.6707 |
| Task 4         | 49 | 2.69 | 0.85 | 47 | 2.89 | 0.91 | 77 | 2.94 | 0.78 | 1.31 | 2 | 0.2738 |
| Task 5         | 49 | 2.04 | 0.96 | 47 | 2.64 | 0.79 | 77 | 2.91 | 0.92 | 14.09 | 2 | 0.0001* |
| Task 6         | 47 | 2.30 | 0.86 | 44 | 2.64 | 0.69 | 74 | 2.70 | 0.70 | 4.51 | 2 | 0.0125* |
| Task 7         | 46 | 2.61 | 0.98 | 44 | 2.77 | 0.64 | 74 | 2.81 | 0.81 | 0.90 | 2 | 0.0303 |
| Task 8         | 47 | 2.38 | 0.82 | 44 | 2.39 | 0.81 | 74 | 2.53 | 0.73 | 0.68 | 2 | 0.0505 |
| Task 9         | 46 | 3.04 | 0.97 | 43 | 3.16 | 0.87 | 73 | 3.07 | 0.84 | 0.23 | 2 | 0.1195 |
| Task 10        | 46 | 2.37 | 0.83 | 44 | 2.89 | 0.84 | 74 | 3.10 | 0.69 | 12.70 | 2 | 0.0001* |
| Task 11        | 47 | 1.94 | 0.70 | 46 | 2.24 | 0.71 | 73 | 2.47 | 0.65 | 8.69 | 2 | 0.0003* |
| Task 12        | 47 | 2.45 | 0.88 | 46 | 2.74 | 0.65 | 73 | 2.77 | 2.74 | 2.83 | 2 | 0.0618 |
| Task 13        | 47 | 2.75 | 0.79 | 46 | 2.61 | 0.98 | 72 | 2.82 | 0.98 | 0.72 | 2 | 0.4885 |
| Task 14        | 44 | 2.71 | 0.82 | 42 | 3.21 | 1.02 | 65 | 3.17 | 1.07 | 3.72 | 2 | 0.0565* |
| Task 15        | 45 | 2.67 | 0.77 | 46 | 3.04 | 0.94 | 73 | 3.22 | 0.73 | 6.58 | 2 | 0.0018* |
| Task 16        | 45 | 2.82 | 0.86 | 43 | 3.09 | 0.84 | 72 | 2.92 | 0.76 | 1.36 | 2 | 0.2655 |
| Task 17        | 46 | 2.30 | 0.92 | 43 | 2.84 | 1.02 | 73 | 3.07 | 0.90 | 9.23 | 2 | 0.0002* |
| Task 18        | 46 | 2.37 | 0.83 | 43 | 2.54 | 0.77 | 77 | 2.77 | 0.61 | 4.49 | 2 | 0.0127* |
| Task 19        | 46 | 2.59 | 0.78 | 43 | 2.58 | 0.86 | 72 | 3.04 | 0.94 | 5.12 | 2 | 0.0070* |
| Task 20        | 46 | 3.24 | 0.87 | 43 | 3.26 | 1.14 | 73 | 3.22 | 0.89 | 0.02 | 2 | 0.9796 |
| Task 21        | 47 | 2.62 | 0.85 | 43 | 2.86 | 0.97 | 71 | 2.65 | 0.90 | 1.00 | 2 | 0.3714 |
| Task 22        | 47 | 2.45 | 0.83 | 43 | 2.67 | 0.99 | 71 | 2.87 | 0.79 | 3.49 | 2 | 0.0328* |
| Task 23        | 47 | 2.72 | 0.80 | 45 | 2.82 | 0.96 | 69 | 2.81 | 0.69 | 0.22 | 2 | 0.8018 |
| Task 24        | 46 | 2.67 | 0.90 | 45 | 2.67 | 0.94 | 71 | 2.78 | 0.87 | 0.25 | 2 | 0.7768 |
| Task 25        | 47 | 2.36 | 0.92 | 45 | 3.00 | 0.74 | 73 | 3.00 | 0.89 | 8.59 | 2 | 0.0003* |

Note.

* Indicates statistically significant differences.

Scale: 1 = much better than most other pastors; 2 = better than average pastors; 3 = about the same as most other pastors; 4 = not as good as most other pastors; 5 = much worse than most other pastors.
pastors' self-ratings of task proficiency those in the high-baptism group were more proficient on task 1 than pastors in the low-baptism and reference groups.

Task 2 is the Administrative function of leading and working with committees and boards. The mean self-ratings of task proficiency were: high-baptism pastors 2.20, reference-group pastors 2.40, low-baptism pastors 2.74. At the 0.05 level, the low-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the high-baptism and reference groups. This means that, according to the pastors' self-ratings of task proficiency, those in the low-baptism group were less proficient on task 2 than pastors in the high-baptism and reference groups.

Task 5 is the Evangelism function of following those who have shown an interest in the church, visiting prospective new church members, and giving Bible studies. The mean self-ratings of task proficiency were: high-baptism pastors 2.04, reference-group pastors 2.64, low-baptism pastors 2.91. At the 0.05 level, the high-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the low-baptism and reference groups. This means that, according to the pastors' self-ratings of task proficiency, those in the high-baptism group were more proficient on task 5 than pastors in the low-baptism and reference groups.

Task 6 is the Preaching function of planning the details for regular worship services and for special
services such as weddings and funerals, and working with worship participants in preparation for their roles. The mean self-ratings of task proficiency were: high-baptism pastors 2.30, reference-group pastors 2.64, low-baptism pastors 2.70. At the 0.05 level, the high-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the low-baptism and reference groups. This means that, according to the pastors' self-ratings of task proficiency, those in the high-baptism group were more proficient on task 6 than pastors in the low-baptism and reference groups.

Task 10 is the Evangelistic function of involving and supporting members in soul-winning and church-growth activities. The mean self-ratings of task proficiency were: high-baptism pastors 2.37, reference-group pastors 2.89, low-baptism pastors 3.10. At the 0.05 level, the high-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the low-baptism and reference groups. This means that, according to the pastors' self-ratings of task proficiency, those in the high-baptism group were more proficient on task 10 than pastors in the low-baptism and reference groups.

Task 11 is the Preaching function of leading out in worship and preaching during regular services of the church and during special services such as weddings and funerals, and at mid-week prayer meetings. The mean self-ratings of task proficiency were: high-baptism
pastors 1.94, reference-group pastors 2.24, low-baptism pastors 2.47. At the 0.05 level (0.1, Student-Newman-Keuls test), all three groups were shown to be significantly different from each other. This means that, according to the pastors' self-ratings of task proficiency, those in the high-baptism group were more proficient on task 11 than pastors in the reference group, and low-baptism pastors were less proficient than reference-group pastors.

Task 14 is the Teaching function of preparing for and teaching the Pastor's Bible class. The mean self-ratings of task proficiency were: high-baptism pastors 2.71, reference-group pastors 3.21, low-baptism pastors 3.17. At the 0.05 level, the high-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the low-baptism and reference groups. This means that, according to the pastors' self-ratings of task proficiency, those in the high-baptism group were more proficient on task 14 than pastors in the low-baptism and reference groups.

Task 15 is the Evangelistic function of reclaiming and reintegrating lost and inactive church members into church fellowship. The mean self-ratings of task proficiency were: high-baptism pastors 2.67, reference-group pastors 3.04, low-baptism pastors 3.22. At the 0.05 level, the high-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the low-baptism and
reference groups. This means that, according to the pastors' self-ratings of task proficiency, those in the high-baptism group were more proficient on task 15 than pastors in the low-baptism and reference groups.

Task 17 is the Administrative function of visioning, strategic planning, and working with the members to formulate the goals and objectives of the church. The mean self-ratings of task proficiency were: high-baptism pastors 2.30, reference-group pastors 2.84, low-baptism pastors 3.07. At the 0.05 level, the high-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the low-baptism and reference groups. This means that, according to the pastors' self-ratings of task proficiency, those in the high-baptism group were more proficient on task 17 than pastors in the low-baptism and reference groups.

Task 18 is the Pastoral-Care function of attending church-related social events and spending informal time associating with church members. The mean self-ratings of task proficiency were: high-baptism pastors 2.37, reference-group pastors 2.54, low-baptism pastors 2.77. At the 0.05 level, the high-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the low-baptism group. This means that, according to the pastors' self-ratings of task proficiency, those in the high-baptism group were more proficient on task 18 than pastors in the low-baptism group.
Task 19 is the Teaching function of instructing, modeling, and ministering to the children and youth of the church. The mean self-ratings of task proficiency were: high-baptism pastors 2.59, reference-group pastors 2.58, low-baptism pastors 3.04. At the 0.05 level, the low-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the high-baptism and reference groups. This means that, according to the pastors' self-ratings of task proficiency, those in the low-baptism group were less proficient on task 19 than pastors in the high-baptism and reference groups.

Task 22 is the Administrative function of management of church finances and fund raising. The mean self-ratings of task proficiency were: high-baptism pastors 2.45, reference-group pastors 2.67, low-baptism pastors 2.87. At the 0.05 level, the high-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the low-baptism group. This means that, according to the pastors' self-ratings of task proficiency, those in the high-baptism group were more proficient on task 22 than pastors in the low-baptism group.

Task 25 is the Evangelism function of preparing for and conducting public evangelistic meetings and/or felt-needs evangelism such as stop-smoking clinics. The mean self-ratings of task proficiency were: high-baptism pastors 2.36, reference-group pastors 3.00, low-baptism pastors 3.00. At the 0.05 level, the high-baptism group
was shown to be significantly different from the low-baptism and the reference groups. This means that, according to the pastors' self-ratings of task proficiency, those in the high-baptism group were more proficient on task 25 than pastors in the low-baptism and reference groups.

In summary, according to their self-reports, the quality of their task-performance was higher for the high-baptism pastors than for low-baptism and reference-group pastors on tasks 1 (sermon preparation), 5 (Bible studies), 6 (worship planning), 10 (member evangelism), 14 (Bible Class), 15 (reclaiming missing members), 17 (visioning), and 25 (evangelistic meetings). On tasks 18 (socializing) and 22 (finances), the quality of their task-performance was higher for the high-baptism pastors than for the low-baptism pastors. On task 11 (preaching), the quality of their task-performance was higher for the high-baptism pastors than for the reference-group pastors, whose performance was higher than that of the low-baptism pastors. And on tasks 2 (committees) and 19 (youth ministry), the quality of their task-performance was shown to be lower for the low-baptism pastors than for the high-baptism and reference-group pastors.

Question 14

Are there significant differences in the self-ratings
of task-proficiency on each of the 25 pastoral tasks as reported by pastors in the more-effective, reference, and less-effective groups? Means and standard deviations are displayed in Table 27. An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) confirmed statistically significant differences among the groups on tasks 1, 4, 10, 11, 12, 17, 21, 22, and 25. Consequently Null Hypothesis 14 was rejected on these tasks.

The proficiency ratings of their task performance by pastors are on the following scale: much better than most other pastors, better than average pastors, about the same as most other pastors, not as good as most other pastors, and much worse than most other pastors.

Task 1 is the Preaching function of tasks directly related to sermon preparation. The mean self-ratings of task proficiency were: more-effective pastors 1.86, reference-group pastors 2.47, less-effective pastors 2.22. At the 0.05 level, the more-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the less-effective and reference groups. This means that, according to the pastors' self-ratings of task proficiency, those in the more-effective group were more proficient on task 1 than pastors in the less-effective and reference groups.

Task 4 is the Teaching function of training and empowering members as they use their spiritual gifts in ministry in church and as soul winners. The mean self-ratings of task proficiency were: more-effective
Table 27

Means and Standard Deviations of Pastors' Self-Ratings of Task-Proficiency by Pastors in More-Effective, Reference, and Less-Effective Groups on 25 Pastoral Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASTORAL TASKS</th>
<th>MORE-EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>LESS-EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>STATISTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  MEAN ST DEV</td>
<td>N  MEAN ST DEV</td>
<td>N  MEAN ST DEV</td>
<td>Z  DF  PROB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>62  1.86 0.83</td>
<td>47  2.47 0.86</td>
<td>32  2.22 0.83</td>
<td>7.34 2 0.0009*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>61  2.30 0.76</td>
<td>47  2.40 0.97</td>
<td>32  2.63 0.79</td>
<td>1.61 2 0.2046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3</td>
<td>62  2.69 0.76</td>
<td>47  2.81 0.85</td>
<td>32  2.78 0.71</td>
<td>0.32 2 0.7266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4</td>
<td>62  2.60 0.80</td>
<td>47  2.89 0.91</td>
<td>32  3.03 0.69</td>
<td>3.50 2 0.0330*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5</td>
<td>62  2.37 1.04</td>
<td>47  2.64 0.79</td>
<td>32  2.84 1.03</td>
<td>2.45 2 0.0904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 6</td>
<td>62  2.40 0.78</td>
<td>44  2.64 0.69</td>
<td>32  2.66 0.70</td>
<td>1.87 2 0.1588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 7</td>
<td>62  2.50 0.84</td>
<td>44  2.77 0.64</td>
<td>32  2.59 0.71</td>
<td>1.69 2 0.1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 8</td>
<td>62  2.35 0.83</td>
<td>44  2.39 0.81</td>
<td>32  2.59 0.67</td>
<td>1.02 2 0.3621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 9</td>
<td>60  3.33 0.96</td>
<td>43  3.16 0.87</td>
<td>31  3.10 1.10</td>
<td>0.07 2 0.9315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 10</td>
<td>62  2.53 1.00</td>
<td>44  2.89 0.84</td>
<td>32  3.04 0.59</td>
<td>4.12 2 0.0184*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 11</td>
<td>61  2.00 0.66</td>
<td>46  2.24 0.71</td>
<td>31  2.48 0.63</td>
<td>5.60 2 0.0046*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 12</td>
<td>61  2.44 0.72</td>
<td>46  2.74 0.65</td>
<td>31  2.71 0.53</td>
<td>3.21 2 0.0434*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 13</td>
<td>61  2.72 0.88</td>
<td>46  2.61 0.98</td>
<td>31  2.84 0.30</td>
<td>0.59 2 0.5551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 14</td>
<td>57  2.84 1.08</td>
<td>42  3.21 1.02</td>
<td>31  3.00 0.93</td>
<td>1.58 2 0.2101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 15</td>
<td>61  2.90 0.91</td>
<td>46  3.04 0.94</td>
<td>31  3.23 0.69</td>
<td>2.25 2 0.1092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 16</td>
<td>59  2.78 0.93</td>
<td>43  3.09 0.84</td>
<td>32  3.09 0.69</td>
<td>2.25 2 0.1092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 17</td>
<td>59  2.48 0.84</td>
<td>43  2.84 1.02</td>
<td>32  3.28 0.68</td>
<td>9.05 2 0.0002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 18</td>
<td>59  2.58 0.67</td>
<td>43  2.53 0.77</td>
<td>32  2.78 0.66</td>
<td>1.27 2 0.2555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 19</td>
<td>59  2.69 0.86</td>
<td>43  2.58 0.96</td>
<td>32  2.84 0.85</td>
<td>0.80 2 0.4508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 20</td>
<td>59  3.29 0.79</td>
<td>43  3.26 1.14</td>
<td>32  3.19 1.12</td>
<td>0.11 2 0.8989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 21</td>
<td>60  2.45 0.98</td>
<td>43  2.86 0.97</td>
<td>33  2.97 0.85</td>
<td>4.05 2 0.0195*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 22</td>
<td>60  2.47 0.87</td>
<td>43  2.67 0.99</td>
<td>33  2.94 0.66</td>
<td>3.19 2 0.0445*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 23</td>
<td>59  2.75 0.63</td>
<td>43  2.82 0.96</td>
<td>32  3.03 0.78</td>
<td>1.37 2 0.2569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 24</td>
<td>60  2.63 0.97</td>
<td>46  2.67 0.94</td>
<td>33  2.76 0.83</td>
<td>0.19 2 0.8276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 25</td>
<td>60  2.62 0.87</td>
<td>45  3.00 0.74</td>
<td>33  2.97 0.81</td>
<td>3.54 2 0.0318*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.

* Indicates statistically significant differences.

Scale: 1 = much better than most other pastors; 2 = better than average pastors; 3 = about the same as most other pastors; 4 = not as good as most other pastors; 5 = much worse than most other pastors.
pastors 2.60, reference-group pastors 2.89, less-effective pastors 3.03. At the 0.05 level, the more-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the less-effective group. This means that, according to the pastors' self-ratings of task proficiency, those in the more-effective group were more proficient on task 4 than pastors in the less-effective group.

Task 10 is the Evangelistic function of involving and supporting members in soul-winning and church-growth activities. The mean self-ratings of task proficiency were: more-effective pastors 2.53, reference-group pastors 2.89, less-effective pastors 3.03. At the 0.05 level, the more-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the less-effective group. This means that, according to the pastors' self-ratings of task proficiency, those in the more-effective group were more proficient on task 10 than pastors in the less-effective group.

Task 11 is the Preaching function of leading out in worship and preaching during regular and special services. The mean self-ratings of task proficiency were: more-effective pastors 2.00, reference-group pastors 2.24, less-effective pastors 2.48. At the 0.05 level, the more-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the less-effective group. This means that, according to the pastors' self-ratings of task proficiency, those in the more-effective group were more
proficient on task 11 than pastors in the less-effective group.

Task 12 is the Administrative function of making phone calls and writing letters for the church. The mean self-ratings of task proficiency were: more-effective pastors 2.44, reference-group pastors 2.74, less-effective pastors 2.71. At the 0.5 level (0.1, Student-Newman-Keuls test), the more-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the less-effective and reference groups. This means that, according to the pastors' self-ratings of task proficiency, those in the more-effective group were more proficient on task 12 than pastors in the less-effective and reference groups.

Task 17 is the Administrative task of visioning and strategic planning, and formulating goals for the church. The mean self-ratings of task proficiency were: more-effective pastors 2.48, reference-group pastors 2.84, less-effective pastors 3.28. At the 0.5 level (0.1, Student-Newman-Keuls test), all three groups were shown to be significantly different from each other. This means that, according to the pastors' self-ratings of task proficiency, those in the more-effective group were more proficient on task 17 than pastors in the reference group, who were more proficient on task 17 than those in the less-effective group.

Task 21 is the Preaching function of planning the sermonic year and arranging for guest preachers. The
mean self-ratings of task proficiency were: more-effective pastors 2.45, reference-group pastors 2.86, less-effective pastors 2.97. At the 0.5 level (0.1, Student-Newman-Keuls test), the more-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the less-effective and the reference groups. This means that, according to the pastors' self-ratings of task proficiency, those in the more-effective group were more proficient on task 21 than pastors in the less-effective and reference groups.

Task 22 is the Administrative function of managing the church finances and promoting fund raising. The mean self-ratings of task proficiency were: more-effective pastors 2.47, reference-group pastors 2.67, less-effective pastors 3.94. At the 0.05 level (0.1, Student-Newman-Keuls test), the more-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the less-effective group. This means that, according to the pastors' self-ratings of task proficiency, those in the more-effective group were more proficient on task 22 than pastors in the less-effective group.

Task 25 is the Evangelistic function of holding public meetings and conducting felt-needs evangelism. The mean self-ratings of task proficiency were: more-effective pastors 2.62, reference-group pastors 3.00, less-effective pastors 2.97. At the 0.05 level (0.1, Student-Newman-Keuls test), the more-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the...
less-effective and reference groups. This means that, according to the pastors' self-ratings of task proficiency, those in the more-effective group were more proficient on task 25 than pastors in the less-effective and reference groups.

In summary, on tasks 1 (sermon preparation), 4 (training), 10 (member evangelism), 11 (preaching), 12 (phone calls), 21 (sermonic year), 22 (finances), and 25 (evangelistic meetings), less-effective pastors rated the quality of their task-performance lower than did the more-effective pastors, and on task 17 (visioning) the more-effective pastors rated the quality of their task-performance higher than that of the reference-group pastors, who rated their performance higher than that of the less-effective pastors.

Question 15

Are there significant differences in the ratings by lay leaders of the task-proficiency of pastors in the high-baptism, reference, and low-baptism groups on each of the 25 pastoral tasks? Means and standard deviations are displayed in Table 28. An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) confirmed statistically significant differences among the groups on tasks 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 24, and 25. Consequently Null Hypothesis 15 was rejected on these tasks.

The proficiency ratings by lay leaders of the
Table 28

Means and Standard Deviations of Lay Leaders' Ratings of Task Proficiency by Pastors in High-Baptism, Reference, and Low-Baptism Groups on 25 Pastoral Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASTORAL TASKS</th>
<th>HIGH-BAPTISM</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>LOW-BAPTISM</th>
<th>STATISTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>ST DEV</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 6</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 7</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 8</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 9</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 10</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 11</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 12</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 13</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 14</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 15</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 16</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 17</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 18</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 19</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 20</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 21</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 22</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 23</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 24</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 25</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.

* Indicates statistically significant differences.

Scale: 1 = much better than most other pastors; 2 = better than average pastors; 3 = about the same as most other pastors; 4 = not as good as most other pastors; 5 = much worse than most other pastors
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pastors' task performance were on the following scale: much better than most other pastors, better than average pastors, about the same as most other pastors, not as good as most other pastors, and much worse than most other pastors.

Task 1 is the Preaching function of tasks directly related to sermon preparation. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: high-baptism pastors 1.98, reference-group pastors 2.44, low-baptism pastors 2.46. At the 0.05 level, the high-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the low-baptism and reference groups. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, the pastors in the high-baptism group were more proficient on task 1 than pastors in the low-baptism and reference groups.

Task 3 is the Pastoral-Care function of counseling with members who have personal or family problems, and giving pre-marital counseling to couples. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: high-baptism pastors 2.62, reference-group pastors 2.59, low-baptism pastors 2.92. At the 0.05 level (0.1, Student-Newman-Keuls test), the low-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the high-baptism and reference groups. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, the pastors in the low-baptism group were less proficient on task 3 than
pastors in the more-effective and reference groups.

Task 5 is the Evangelistic function of following leads, visiting prospective church members, and giving Bible studies. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: high-baptism pastors 2.34, reference-group pastors 2.52, low-baptism pastors 2.77. At the 0.05 level, the high-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the low-baptism group. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, the pastors in the high-baptism group were more proficient on task 5 than pastors in the low-baptism group.

Task 6 is the Preaching function of planning the details for regular worship services, and for special services such as weddings and funerals, and working with participants in preparation for their roles. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: high-baptism pastors 2.18, reference-group pastors 2.46, low-baptism pastors 2.66. At the 0.05 level, the high-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the low-baptism and reference groups. This means that according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, the pastors in the high-baptism group were more proficient on task 6 than pastors in the low-baptism and reference groups.

Task 8 is the Pastoral-Care function of visiting members who are sick in hospital, those who are bereaved
and grieving, the disabled, and elderly shut-ins. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: high-baptism pastors 2.21, reference-group pastors 2.24, low-baptism pastors 2.63. At the 0.05 level, the low-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the high-baptism and the reference groups. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, the pastors in the low-baptism group were less proficient on task 8 than pastors in the high-baptism and reference groups.

Task 10 is the Evangelistic function of motivating, involving, and supporting church members in soul-winning and other church-growth activities. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: high-baptism pastors 2.53, reference-group pastors 2.84, low-baptism pastors 3.02. At the 0.05 level, the high-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the low-baptism and reference groups. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, the pastors in the high-baptism group were more proficient on task 10 than pastors in the low-baptism and reference groups.

Task 11 is the Preaching function of leading in worship and preaching during the regular services of the church and during special services such as weddings and funerals, and mid-week prayer meetings. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: high-baptism
pastors 1.94, reference-group pastors 2.30, low-baptism pastors 2.47. At the 0.05 level, the high-baptism group was shown as significantly different from the low-baptism and reference groups. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, the pastors in the high-baptism group were more proficient on task 11 than pastors in the low-baptism and reference groups.

Task 12 is the Administrative function of making phone calls and writing letters, and following up on parishioner requests. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: high-baptism pastors 2.41, reference-group pastors 2.49, low-baptism pastors 2.91. At the 0.05 level, the low-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the high-baptism and reference groups. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, the pastors in the low-baptism group were less proficient on task 12 than pastors in the high-baptism and reference groups.

Task 13 is the Pastoral-Care function of making regular home visits to members of the congregation. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: high-baptism pastors 2.84, reference-group pastors 2.94, low-baptism pastors 3.33. At the 0.05 level, the low-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the high-baptism and reference groups. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, the pastors in the low-baptism group were less proficient on task 13 than pastors in the high-baptism and reference groups.
proficiency, the pastors in the low-baptism group were less proficient on task 13 than pastors in the high-baptism and reference groups.

Task 15 is the Evangelistic function of reclaiming and reintegrating lost and inactive church members into church fellowship. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: high-baptism pastors 2.76, reference-group pastors 2.91, low-baptism pastors 3.17. At the 0.05 level, the high-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the low-baptism group. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, the pastors in the high-baptism group were more proficient on task 15 than pastors in the low-baptism group.

Task 16 is the Preaching function of public and private intercessory prayer on behalf of church members, the needs of the congregation, and lost sinners. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: high-baptism pastors 2.21, reference-group pastors 2.30, low-baptism pastors 2.58. At the 0.05 level, the low-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the high-baptism and reference groups. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, the pastors in the low-baptism group were less proficient on task 16 than pastors in the high-baptism and reference groups.

Task 17 is the Administrative function of visioning,
strategic planning, and working with the members to formulate the goals and objectives of the church. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: high-baptism pastors 2.38, reference-group pastors 2.47, low-baptism pastors 2.79. At the 0.05 level, the low-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the high-baptism and reference groups. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, the pastors in the low-baptism group were less proficient on task 17 than pastors in the high-baptism and reference groups.

Task 18 is the Pastoral-Care function of attending church-related social events, and spending informal time associating with church members. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: high-baptism pastors 2.35, reference-group pastors 2.47, low-baptism pastors 2.68. At the 0.05 level, the high-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the low-baptism group. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, the pastors in the high-baptism group were more proficient on task 18 than pastors in the low-baptism group.

Task 19 is the Teaching function of instructing, modeling, and ministering to the children and youth of the church. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: high-baptism pastors is 2.49, reference-group pastors 2.64, low-baptism pastors 2.88.
At the 0.05 level, the high-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the low-baptism group. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, the pastors in the high-baptism group were more proficient on task 19 than pastors in the low-baptism group.

Task 21 is the Preaching function of planning the sermonic year, arranging for guest preachers, and choosing sermon topics to meet members' needs. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: high-baptism pastors 2.27, reference-group pastors 2.43, low-baptism pastors 2.72. At the 0.05 level, the high-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the low-baptism group. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, the pastors in the high-baptism group were more proficient on task 21 than pastors in the low-baptism group.

Task 24 is the Teaching function of devotional Bible study, personal prayer, and the spiritual exercises that undergird an exemplary life and the modeling of Christian graces and virtues. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: high-baptism pastors 2.07, reference-group pastors 2.32, low-baptism pastors 2.43. At the 0.05 level, the high-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the low-baptism group. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, the pastors in the
The high-baptism group were more proficient on task 24 than pastors in the low-baptism group.

Task 25 is the Evangelistic function of preparing for and conducting public evangelistic meetings and/or felt-need evangelism such as stop-smoking clinics. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: high-baptism pastors 2.32, reference-group pastors 2.88, low-baptism pastors 2.92. At the 0.05 level, the high-baptism group was shown to be significantly different from the low-baptism and reference groups. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, the pastors in the high-baptism group were more proficient on task 25 than pastors in the low-baptism and reference groups.

In summary, on tasks 1 (sermon preparation), 6 (worship planning), 10 (member evangelism), 11 (preaching), and 25 (evangelistic meetings), lay leaders rated the quality of task performance higher for high-baptism pastors than for reference-group and low-baptism pastors. On tasks 5 (Bible studies), 15 (reclaiming missing members), 18 (socializing), 19 (youth ministry), 21 (sermonic year), and 24 (devotions), lay leaders rated the quality of task performance higher for high-baptism pastors than for low-baptism pastors. And on tasks 3 (counseling), 8 (hospital visits), 12 (phone calls), 13 (home visits), 16 (intercessory prayer), and 17 (visioning), lay leaders rated the quality of
task performance lower for low-baptism pastors than for pastors in the high baptism and reference groups.

**Question 16**

Are there significant differences in the ratings by lay leaders of the task proficiency of pastors in the more-effective, reference, and less-effective groups on each of the 25 pastoral tasks? Means and standard deviations are displayed in Table 29. An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) confirmed statistically significant differences among the groups on tasks 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25. Consequently Null Hypothesis 16 was rejected for these tasks.

The proficiency ratings by lay leaders of the pastors' task performance were on the following scale: much better than most other pastors, better than average pastors, about the same as most other pastors, not as good as most other pastors, and much worse than most other pastors.

Task 1 is the Preaching function of tasks related to sermon preparation. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: more-effective pastors 1.87, reference-group pastors 2.44, less-effective pastors 2.46. At the 0.05 level, the more-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the less-effective and reference groups. This means that, according to the lay
Table 29
Means and Standard Deviations of Lay Leaders' Ratings of Task Proficiency by Pastors in More-Effective, Reference, and Less-Effective Groups on 25 Pastoral Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASTORAL TASKS</th>
<th>MORE-EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>LESS-EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>STATISTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN ST DEV</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN ST DEV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1.87 0.87</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.44 0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.40 0.95</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.61 0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.68 0.87</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.59 0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.50 1.02</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.74 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.43 1.06</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.52 1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 6</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.19 0.85</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.46 0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 7</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.40 0.84</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.72 0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 8</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.25 1.00</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.24 1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 9</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2.74 1.02</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.86 1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 10</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>2.50 1.11</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.84 0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 11</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1.88 0.84</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.30 0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 12</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2.35 0.84</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2.49 0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 13</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>2.98 1.09</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2.94 1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 14</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.75 0.95</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.76 1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 15</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>2.90 1.03</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.91 0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 16</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2.22 0.97</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.30 0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 17</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2.30 1.04</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.47 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 18</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>2.45 0.83</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.47 0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 19</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>2.45 0.98</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.64 1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 20</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2.58 0.90</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2.87 0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 21</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>2.06 0.86</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.43 0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 22</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2.39 0.97</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.54 0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 23</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>2.72 1.12</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.73 1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 24</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>2.04 0.91</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.22 0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 25</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2.44 1.16</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.88 1.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.

* Indicates statistically significant differences

Scale: 1 = much better than most other pastors; 2 = better than average pastors; 3 = about the same as most other pastors; 4 = not as good as most other pastors; 5 = much worse than most other pastors.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
leaders' ratings of task proficiency, the pastors in the more-effective group were more proficient on task 1 than pastors in the less-effective and reference groups.

Task 2 is the Administrative function of leading and working with committees. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: more-effective pastors 2.40, reference-group pastors 2.61, less-effective pastors 2.98. At the 0.05 level, the less-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the more-effective and reference groups. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, pastors in the less-effective group were less proficient on task 2 than pastors in the more-effective and reference groups.

Task 3 is the Pastoral-Care function of counseling with members who have personal or family problems, and giving pre-marital counseling to couples. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: more-effective pastors 2.68, reference-group pastors 2.59, less-effective pastors 3.20. At the 0.05 level, the less-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the more-effective and reference groups. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, the pastors in the less-effective group were less proficient on task 3 than pastors in the more-effective and reference groups.

Task 4 is the Teaching function of training,
empowering, and supporting members as they use their spiritual gifts in the church and as soul winners. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: more-effective pastors 2.50, reference-group pastors 2.74, less-effective pastors 3.29. At the 0.05 level, the less-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the more-effective and reference groups. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, the pastors in the less-effective group were less proficient on task 4 than pastors in the more-effective and reference groups.

Task 5 is the Evangelistic function of visiting prospective new church members, and giving Bible studies. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: more-effective pastors 2.43, reference-group pastors 2.52, less-effective pastors 2.98. At the 0.05 level, the less-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the more-effective and reference groups. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, the pastors in the less-effective group were less proficient on task 5 than pastors in the more-effective and reference groups.

Task 6 is the Preaching function of planning the details for regular worship services and for special services such as weddings and funerals, and working with participants in preparation for their roles. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were:
more-effective pastors 2.19, reference-group pastors 2.46, less-effective pastors 2.66. At the 0.05 level, the less-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the more-effective group. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, the pastors in the less-effective group were less proficient on task 6 than pastors in the more-effective group.

Task 7 is the Administrative function of preparing the announcement bulletin and church newsletter. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: more-effective pastors 2.40, reference-group pastors 2.72, less-effective pastors 2.71. At the 0.05 level (0.1, Student-Newman-Keuls test), the more-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the less-effective and reference groups. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, pastors in the more-effective group were more proficient on task 7 than pastors in the less-effective and reference groups.

Task 8 is the Pastoral-Care function of visiting the sick in hospital, those who are bereaved and grieving, the disabled, and elderly shut-ins. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: more-effective pastors 2.25, reference-group pastors 2.24, less-effective pastors 2.64. At the 0.05 level, the less-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the
more-effective and reference groups. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, pastors in the less-effective group were less proficient on task 8 than pastors in the more-effective and reference groups.

Task 9 is the Teaching function of conducting small groups to promote spiritual growth and maturity of members. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: more-effective pastors 2.74, reference-group pastors 2.86, less-effective pastors 3.29. At the 0.05 level, the less-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the more-effective and reference groups. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, pastors in the less-effective group were less proficient on task 9 than pastors in the more-effective and reference groups.

Task 10 is the Evangelistic function of motivating, involving, and supporting church members in soul-winning and other church-growth activities. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: more-effective pastors 2.50, reference-group pastors 2.84, less-effective pastors 3.27. At the 0.05 level, the less-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the more-effective and reference groups. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, pastors in the less-effective group were less proficient on task 10 than pastors in the more-effective and
reference groups.

Task 11 is the Preaching function of leading out and preaching during regular worship services, and during special services such as weddings and funerals, and at mid-week prayer meetings. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: more-effective pastors 1.88, reference-group pastors 2.30, less-effective pastors 2.49. At the 0.05 level, the more-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the less-effective and reference groups. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, pastors in the more-effective group were more proficient on task 11 than pastors in the less-effective and reference groups.

Task 12 is the Administrative function of making phone calls, writing letters, and following up on parishioner requests. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: more-effective pastors 2.35, reference-group pastors 2.49, less-effective pastors 3.15. At the 0.05 level, the less-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the more-effective and reference groups. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, pastors in the less-effective group were less proficient on task 12 than pastors in the more-effective and reference groups.

Task 13 is the Pastoral-Care function of making
regular home visits to members of the congregation.
The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were:
more-effective pastors 2.98, reference-group pastors 2.94,
less-effective pastors 3.50. At the 0.05 level, the
less-effective group was shown to be significantly
different from the more-effective and reference groups.
This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of
task proficiency, pastors in the less-effective group
were less proficient on task 13 than pastors in the
more-effective and reference groups.

Task 15 is the Evangelistic function of reclaiming
and reintegrating lost and inactive church members into
church fellowship. The mean ratings of task proficiency
by lay leaders were: more-effective pastors 2.90,
reference-group pastors 2.91, less-effective pastors 3.36.
At the 0.05 level, the less-effective group was shown to
be significantly different from the more-effective and
reference groups. This means that, according to the lay
leaders' ratings of task proficiency, pastors in the
less-effective group were less proficient on task 15 than
pastors in the more-effective and reference groups.

Task 16 is the Preaching function of public and
private intercessory prayer on behalf of church members,
the needs of the congregation, and lost sinners. The
mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were:
more-effective pastors 2.22, reference-group pastors 2.30,
less-effective pastors 2.64. At the 0.05 level, the
less-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the more-effective and reference groups. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, pastors in the less-effective group were less proficient on task 16 than pastors in the more-effective and reference groups.

Task 17 is the Administrative function of visioning, strategic planning, and working with the members to formulate the goals and objectives of the church. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: more-effective pastors 2.30, reference-group pastors 2.47, less-effective pastors 3.15. At the 0.05 level, the less-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the more-effective and reference groups. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, the pastors in the less-effective group were less proficient on task 17 than pastors in the more-effective and reference groups.

Task 19 is the Teaching function of instructing, modeling, and ministering to the children and youth of the church. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: more-effective pastors 2.45, reference-group pastors 2.64, less-effective pastors 2.93. At the 0.05 level, the less-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the more-effective group. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, the pastors in the less-effective group
were less proficient on task 19 than pastors in the more-effective group.

Task 20 is the Evangelistic function of working with community organizations and other churches to provide assistance to the needy, and to address pressing social issues. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: more-effective pastors 2.58, reference-group pastors 2.87, less-effective pastors 2.89. At the 0.05 level (0.1, Student-Newman-Keuls test), the more-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the less-effective group. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, pastors in the more-effective group were more proficient on task 20 than pastors in the less-effective group.

Task 21 is the Preaching function of planning the sermonic year, arranging for guest preachers, and choosing sermon topics to meet members' needs. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: more-effective pastors 2.06, reference-group pastors 2.43, less-effective pastors 2.89. At the 0.05 level, all three groups were shown to be significantly different from each other. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, pastors in the more-effective group were more proficient on task 21 than pastors in the reference group, and those in the less-effective group were less proficient than pastors in the reference group.

Task 22 is the Administrative function of managing
the church finances and fund raising. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: more-effective pastors 2.39, reference-group pastors 2.54, and less-effective pastors 3.13. At the 0.05 level, the less-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the more-effective and the reference groups. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, the pastors in the less-effective group were less proficient on task 22 than pastors in the more-effective and reference groups.

Task 23 is the Pastoral-Care function of confronting members who need pastoral admonition or reproof, and bringing resolution to congregational conflicts. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: more-effective pastors 2.72, reference-group pastors 2.73, less-effective pastors 3.41. At the 0.05 level, the less-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the more-effective and reference groups. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, pastors in the less-effective group were less proficient on task 23 than pastors in the more-effective and reference groups.

Task 24 is the Teaching function of devotional Bible study, personal prayer, and the spiritual exercises that undergird an exemplary life and the modeling of Christian graces and virtues. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: more-effective pastors 2.04, 
reference-group pastors 2.32, less-effective pastors 2.59. At the 0.05 level, the less-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the more-effective group. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, the pastors in the less-effective group were less proficient on task 24 than pastors in the more-effective group.

Task 25 is the Evangelistic function of preparing for and conducting public evangelistic meetings and/or felt-needs evangelism such as stop-smoking clinics. The mean ratings of task proficiency by lay leaders were: more-effective pastors 2.44, reference-group pastors 2.88, less-effective pastors 3.07. At the 0.05 level, the more-effective group was shown to be significantly different from the less-effective and reference groups. This means that, according to the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency, the pastors in the more-effective group were more proficient on task 25 than pastors in the less-effective and reference groups.

In summary, on all of the following tasks the less-effective pastors were rated by lay leaders with lower quality of task performance than pastors in the more-effective and reference groups: 2 (committees), 3 (counseling), 4 (training), 5 (Bible studies), 8 (hospital visits), 9 (small groups), 10 (member evangelism), 12 (phone calls), 13 (home visits), 15 (reclaiming missing members), 16 (intercessory prayer), 17 (visioning), 22
(finances), and 23 (reproof).

On tasks 1 (sermon preparation), 7 (bulletin), 11 (preaching), 20 (indigent assistance), and 25 (evangelistic meetings), the more-effective pastors were rated with higher task proficiency than the other two groups, and on tasks 6 (worship planning), 19 (youth ministry), and 24 (devotions) the more-effective pastors were rated higher than the less-effective pastors.

On task 21 (sermonic year) all three groups were significantly different from each other with more-effective pastors rated most proficient, and less-effective pastors rated least proficient.

This first section of the report on the PTS and PTQ findings has shown that the comparison groups of pastors were differentiated from each other by self-reports of time spent on pastoral tasks and by self-ratings of task proficiency. The comparison groups were also differentiated from each other by lay leaders' estimates of time spent on pastoral tasks and proficiency ratings.

The Issues of Time and Importance Ranking

Research questions 9-12 focused upon determining whether or not statistically significant differences existed among the five comparison groups of pastors, with respect to time spent on 25 pastoral tasks.

Beyond the theoretical importance of significance testing, the accumulated data about time spent by pastors...
on various tasks have considerable practical importance.

There are upper limits to the amount of time clergy can spend each week in pastoral ministry. How that time is divided among the competing demands for pastoral attention depends upon a variety of factors including conference directives, conditions in the local congregation, and on the sense of importance that the pastor attaches to various activities. In the tables that follow, the amount of time spent on each of the 25 pastoral tasks by each of the five comparison groups of pastors is presented showing ranges and frequencies.

Also on a task-by-task basis, the ratings of task importance are displayed as reported by pastors in the five comparison groups. The design of the instrument did not allow for a strict rank ordering of all 25 tasks, but respondents were asked to rank-order the five most important tasks and the five least important tasks. The arrangement of the data is designed to facilitate an understanding of the relationship of each role to the five tasks associated with it.

The Preaching Role

The following pastoral tasks are included in the Preaching role:

1. Task 1: tasks directly related to sermon preparation

2. Task 6: planning details and preparing
participants for their roles in worship services

3. Task 11: leading out and preaching at worship services, weddings, and funerals

4. Task 16: intercessory prayer for church members, congregational needs, and lost sinners

5. Task 21: planning the sermonic year and arranging for guest preachers.

The amount of time spent per week on task 1 by all pastors in the comparison groups ranged from 1 to 45 hours.

The amount of time spent per week on task 6 by all pastors in the five comparison groups ranged from 15 minutes to 22 hours.

The amount of time spent per week on task 11 by all pastors in the five comparison groups ranged from 15 minutes to 25 hours.

The amount of time spent per week on task 16 by all pastors in the five comparison groups ranged from 15 minutes to 15 hours.

The amount of time spent per week on task 21 by all pastors in the five comparison groups ranged from 15 minutes to 20 hours.

Of the pastors in this study, 50.4% ranked task 1 in the top five of the 25 pastoral tasks in terms of importance, whereas 1.6% ranked task 1 as among the lowest five of the 25 tasks in terms of importance. The rankings by lay leaders were 19% and 4% respectively. Of the
pastors in this study, 9% ranked task 6 in the top five of the 25 pastoral tasks in terms of importance, whereas 22% ranked task 6 as among the lowest five of the 25 tasks in terms of importance. The rankings by lay leaders were 7% and 26% respectively. Of the pastors in this study, 32.2% ranked task 11 in the top five of the 25 pastoral tasks in terms of importance, whereas 1.6% ranked task 11 as among the lowest five of the 25 tasks in terms of importance. The rankings by lay leaders were 28% and 3% respectively. Of the pastors in this study, 35.2% ranked task 16 in the top five of the 25 pastoral tasks in terms of importance, whereas 2.2% ranked task 16 as among the lowest five of the 25 tasks in terms of importance. The rankings by lay leaders were 30% and 3% respectively. Of the pastors in this study, 3.8% ranked task 21 in the top five of the 25 pastoral tasks in terms of importance, whereas 19.8% ranked task 21 as among the lowest five of the 25 tasks in terms of importance. The rankings by lay leaders were 7% and 23% respectively.

In summary, sermon preparation normally took 8-10 hours per week and was considered to be in the most-important range by 50% of the pastors and by 19% of the lay leaders.

Planning worship services normally took 1.5-2.5 hours per week and was considered to be in the least-important range by 22% of pastors and 26% of lay leaders.

Leading worship and preaching normally took 3-4.5
hours per week and were considered to be in the most-important range by 32.2% of the pastors and by 28% of the lay leaders.

Intercessory prayer normally took 2.5-3 hours per week and was considered to be in the most-important range by 35.2% of the pastors and by 30% of the lay leaders.

Planning the sermonic year normally took 1-1.5 hours per week and was considered to be in the least-important range by 19.8% of pastors and 23% of lay leaders.

The pastoral respondents spent approximately 19 hours per week on the five tasks associated with the Preaching role. Tables 30-39 present the data for this role.

The Administrative Role

The following pastoral tasks are included in the Administrative role:

1. Task 2: leading, and working with committees and boards
2. Task 7: preparation of announcement bulletin and church newsletter
3. Task 12: phone calls, letters, and following up on parishioner requests
4. Task 17: visioning, planning, and working with members to formulate congregational goals
5. Task 22: management of church finances and fund raising.
Table 30

Comparison of Hours Spent on Task 1 by Pastors in the High-Baptism, Low-Baptism, Reference, More-Effective, and Less-Effective Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HI BAP N=50</th>
<th>LO BAP N=78</th>
<th>REFERENCE N=45</th>
<th>MORE EFFECT N=63</th>
<th>LESS EFFECT N=33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>FREQ %</td>
<td>HOURS FREQ %</td>
<td>HOURS FREQ %</td>
<td>HOURS FREQ %</td>
<td>HOURS FREQ %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1 3.0</td>
<td>2.0 2 1.6</td>
<td>2.0 2 4.4</td>
<td>2.0 1 1.6</td>
<td>1.0 1 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3 3.8</td>
<td>3.0 4 8.9</td>
<td>3.5 1 2.2</td>
<td>3.5 1 1.6</td>
<td>3.5 1 1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3 3.8</td>
<td>3.5 1 2.2</td>
<td>4.0 2 4.4</td>
<td>4.0 4 6.3</td>
<td>4.0 4 12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4 8.9</td>
<td>4.0 5 6.4</td>
<td>4.0 2 4.4</td>
<td>4.0 4 6.3</td>
<td>4.0 4 12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3 3.8</td>
<td>4.5 3 3.8</td>
<td>4.5 1 2.2</td>
<td>4.5 2 6.1</td>
<td>4.5 2 6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3 6.0</td>
<td>5.0 8 10.3</td>
<td>5.0 4 8.9</td>
<td>5.0 4 6.3</td>
<td>5.0 4 12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3 6.0</td>
<td>6.0 2 2.6</td>
<td>6.0 4 8.9</td>
<td>6.0 5 7.9</td>
<td>6.0 1 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4 8.0</td>
<td>7.0 5 6.4</td>
<td>7.0 2 4.4</td>
<td>7.0 3 4.8</td>
<td>7.0 3 4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.0 2 2.6</td>
<td>7.5 1 1.3</td>
<td>7.5 1 2.2</td>
<td>7.5 2 3.2</td>
<td>7.5 2 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1 2.0</td>
<td>8.0 7 9.0</td>
<td>8.0 4 8.9</td>
<td>8.0 8 12.7</td>
<td>8.0 8 12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>9.0 3 3.8</td>
<td>9.0 2 4.4</td>
<td>9.0 2 3.2</td>
<td>9.0 1 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>2 4.0</td>
<td>10.0 13 16.7</td>
<td>10.0 9 20.0</td>
<td>10.0 15 23.8</td>
<td>10.0 7 21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11 22.0</td>
<td>10.0 13 16.7</td>
<td>10.0 9 20.0</td>
<td>10.0 15 23.8</td>
<td>10.0 7 21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>2 4.0</td>
<td>11.0 1 1.3</td>
<td>11.0 3 4.8</td>
<td>11.0 3 4.8</td>
<td>11.0 3 4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1 2.0</td>
<td>12.0 1 1.3</td>
<td>12.0 4 8.9</td>
<td>12.0 1 1.6</td>
<td>12.0 2 6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 30--Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Table 31

*Importance Ranking of Pastoral Task 1 (Sermon Preparation) by Groups (In Percentages)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>High Importance Ranking</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>Low Importance Ranking</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 32

Comparison of Hours Spent on Task 6 by Pastors in the High-Baptism, Low-Baptism, Reference, More-Effective, and Less-Effective Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HI BAP N=49</th>
<th></th>
<th>LO BAP N=77</th>
<th></th>
<th>REFERENCE N=47</th>
<th></th>
<th>MORE EFFECT N=67</th>
<th></th>
<th>LESS EFFECT N=33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>PRBQ</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>PRBQ</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>PRBQ</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4286</td>
<td>1.6771</td>
<td>1.4610</td>
<td>1.1123</td>
<td>2.0085</td>
<td>2.3063</td>
<td>2.1079</td>
<td>1.7368</td>
<td>2.2697</td>
<td>3.9993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 33

*Importance Ranking of Pastoral Task 6 (Worship Planning) by Groups (In Percentages)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>High Importance Ranking</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>Low Importance Ranking</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 34

Comparison of Hours Spent on Task 11 by Pastors in the High-Baptism, Low-Baptism, Reference, More-Effective, and Less-Effective Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>HI BAP N=50</th>
<th>LO BAP N=78</th>
<th>REFERENCE N=47</th>
<th>MORE EFFECT N=63</th>
<th>LESS EFFECT N=33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 34--Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HI BAP N=50</th>
<th>LO BAP N=78</th>
<th>REFERENCE N=47</th>
<th>MORE EFFECT N=63</th>
<th>LESS EFFECT N=13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5340</td>
<td>3.8069</td>
<td>4.2383</td>
<td>4.1857</td>
<td>2.9758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5654</td>
<td>1.9988</td>
<td>2.1532</td>
<td>3.4862</td>
<td>1.2452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 35

**Importance Ranking of Pastoral Task 11 (Preaching and Leading Worship) by Groups (In Percentages)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>High Importance Ranking</th>
<th>Low Importance Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 36

Comparison of Hours Spent on Task 16 by Pastors in the High-Baptism, Low-Baptism, Reference, More-Effective, and Less-Effective Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 36--Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HI BAP N=50</th>
<th>LO BAP N=58</th>
<th>REFERENCE N=47</th>
<th>MORE EFFECT N=63</th>
<th>LESS EFFECT N=33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.9957</td>
<td>2.6787</td>
<td>2.8487</td>
<td>2.3404</td>
<td>2.5702</td>
<td>2.1633</td>
<td>3.1871</td>
<td>2.9282</td>
<td>2.9121</td>
<td>3.4156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 37

Importance Ranking of Pastoral Task 16 (Intercessory Prayer) by Groups (In Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>High Importance Ranking</th>
<th>Low Importance Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  Total</td>
<td>21 22 23 24 25 Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>2 10 0 6 0 18%</td>
<td>0 0 2 0 0 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>11 16 5 3 7 42%</td>
<td>0 2 0 0 0 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>3 13 8 3 2 30%</td>
<td>0 0 0 2 0 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>6 18 15 6 3 49%</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>11 15 4 4 2 37%</td>
<td>0 2 0 2 0 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>3 10 5 7 5 30%</td>
<td>1 0 0 1 0 3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 38

Comparison of Hours Spent on Task 21 by Pastors in the High-Baptism, Low-Baptism, Reference, More-Effective, and Less-Effective Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Prq</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Prq</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Prq</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Prq</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Prq</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean ST Dev</th>
<th>Mean ST Dev</th>
<th>Mean ST Dev</th>
<th>Mean ST Dev</th>
<th>Mean ST Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1817</td>
<td>0.9404</td>
<td>1.4407</td>
<td>2.4442</td>
<td>1.0775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 39

Importance Ranking of Pastoral Task 21 (Planning Sermonic Year) by Groups (In Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>High Importance Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>Low Importance Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The amount of time spent per week on task 2 by all pastors in the five comparison groups ranged from 15 minutes to 15 hours.

The amount of time spent per week on task 7 by all pastors in the five comparison groups ranged from 15 minutes to 10 hours.

The amount of time spent per week on task 12 by all pastors in the five comparison groups ranged from 30 minutes to 15 hours.

The amount of time spent per week on task 17 by all pastors in the five comparison groups ranged from 15 minutes to 15 hours.

The amount of time spent per week on task 22 by all pastors in the five comparison groups ranged from 15 minutes to 8 hours.

Of the pastors in this study, 8.4% ranked task 2 in the top five of the 25 pastoral tasks in terms of importance, whereas 28% ranked task 2 as among the lowest of five the 25 tasks in terms of importance. The rankings by lay leaders were 6% and 34% respectively. Of the pastors in this study, 0.6% ranked task 7 in the top five of the 25 pastoral tasks in terms of importance, whereas 86% ranked task 7 as among the lowest five of the 25 tasks in terms of importance. The rankings by lay leaders were 0% and 93% respectively. Of the pastors in this study, 3.2% ranked task 12 in the top five of the 25 pastoral tasks in terms of importance, whereas 37.4%
ranked task 12 as among the lowest five of the 25 tasks in terms of importance. The rankings by lay leaders were 1% and 54% respectively. Of the pastors in this study, 38.2% ranked task 17 in the top five of the 25 pastoral tasks in terms of importance, whereas 4.2% ranked task 17 as among the lowest five of the 25 tasks in terms of importance. The rankings by lay leaders were 29% and 9% respectively. Of the pastors in this study, 2.2% ranked task 22 in the top five of the 25 pastoral tasks in terms of importance, whereas 58.6% ranked task 22 as among the lowest five of the 25 tasks in terms of importance. The rankings by lay leaders were 5% and 56% respectively.

In summary, Committee work normally took 3-4 hours per week and was considered to be in the least-important range by 28% of the pastors, and by 34% of the lay leaders.

The church bulletin and newsletter normally took 0.5-1.5 hours per week and were considered to be in the least-important range by 86% of the pastors and by 93% of the lay leaders.

Phone calls and letters normally took 3.5-5.5 hours per week and this task was considered to be in the least-important range by 37.4% of the pastors and by 54% of the lay leaders.

Visioning and strategic planning normally took 1.5-2 hours per week and was considered to be in the most-important range by 38.2% of the pastors and by 29% of
the lay leaders.

Financial management normally took 1-1.5 hours per week and was considered to be in the least-important range by 58.6% of pastors and 56% of lay leaders.

Pastoral respondents spent approximately 12 hours per week on the five tasks associated with the Administrative role. Tables 40-49 present the data for this role.

The Pastoral-Care Role

The following pastoral tasks are included in the Pastoral-Care role:

1. Task 3: counseling members with personal or family problems and pre-marital counseling
2. Task 8: visiting members who are sick, bereaved, disabled, infirm, and shut-in
3. Task 13: making regular home visits to members of the congregation
4. Task 18: attending church social events and associating informally with church members
5. Task 23: giving admonition and reproof, and resolving congregational conflicts.

The amount of time spent per week on task 3 by all pastors in the five comparison groups ranged from 15 minutes to 18 hours.

The amount of time spent per week on task 8 by all pastors in the five comparison groups ranged from 15
Table 40

Comparison of Hours Spent on Task 2 by Pastors in the High-Baptism, Low-Baptism, Reference, More-Effective, and Less-Effective Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HI BAP N=50</th>
<th>LO BAP N=76</th>
<th>REFERENCE N=46</th>
<th>MORE EFFECT N=63</th>
<th>LESS EFFECT N=33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 40--Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HI BAP N=50</th>
<th>LO BAP N=76</th>
<th>REFERENCE N=46</th>
<th>MORE EFFECT N=63</th>
<th>LESS EFFECT N=33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0840</td>
<td>2.4340</td>
<td>2.8908</td>
<td>2.5137</td>
<td>3.8783</td>
<td>3.2359</td>
<td>3.8603</td>
<td>2.3620</td>
<td>2.7700</td>
<td>1.8585</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 41

*Importance Ranking of Pastoral Task 2 (Committees) by Groups (In Percentages)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>High Importance Ranking</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>Low Importance Ranking</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 42

Comparison of Hours Spent on Task 7 by Pastors in the High-Baptism, Low-Baptism, Reference, More-Effective, and Less-Effective Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.6191</td>
<td>1.5698</td>
<td>1.2427</td>
<td>1.0288</td>
<td>0.5348</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 43

Importance Ranking of Pastoral Task 7 (Announcement Bulletin) by Groups (In Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>High Importance Ranking</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>Low Importance Ranking</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 44  

Comparison of Hours Spent on Task 12 by Pastors in the High-Baptism, Low-Baptism, Reference, More-Effective, and Less-Effective Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 44--Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HI BAP N=48</th>
<th>LO BAP N=78</th>
<th>REFERENCE N=47</th>
<th>MORE EFFECT N=62</th>
<th>LESS EFFECT N=33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEAN ST DEV</td>
<td>MEAN ST DEV</td>
<td>MEAN ST DEV</td>
<td>MEAN ST DEV</td>
<td>MEAN ST DEV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5521</td>
<td>4.3269</td>
<td>4.3766</td>
<td>4.6935</td>
<td>3.4091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1118</td>
<td>3.4120</td>
<td>3.5990</td>
<td>3.2710</td>
<td>2.1918</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 45

Importance Ranking of Pastoral Task 12 (Phone Calls) by Groups (In Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>High Importance Ranking</th>
<th>Low Importance Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 46

Comparison of Hours Spent on Task 17 by Pastors in the High-Baptism, Low-Baptism, Reference, More-Effective, and Less-Effective Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HI BAP N=43</th>
<th></th>
<th>REFERENCE N=47</th>
<th></th>
<th>MORE EFFECT N=59</th>
<th></th>
<th>LESS EFFECT N=33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 46—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HI BAP N=43</th>
<th>LO BAP N=66</th>
<th>Reference N=47</th>
<th>More Effect N=59</th>
<th>Less Effect N=33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2814</td>
<td>2.8451</td>
<td>1.6970</td>
<td>2.0044</td>
<td>1.9444</td>
<td>2.1090</td>
<td>1.8051</td>
<td>2.1075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3143</td>
<td>1.2880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 47

Importance Ranking of Pastoral Task 17 (Visioning and Strategic Planning) by Groups (In Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>High Importance Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>Low Importance Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 48

Comparison of Hours Spent on Task 22 by Pastors in the High-Baptism, Low-Baptism, Reference, More-Effective, and Less-Effective Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HI BAP N=43</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|        | MORE EFFECT N=58 |        |        |        |        |        |        |
|        |                  |        |        |        |        |        |        |
|        |                  |        |        |        |        |        |        |
|        |                  |        |        |        |        |        |        |
|        |                  |        |        |        |        |        |        |
|        |                  |        |        |        |        |        |        |

|        | LESS EFFECT N=29 |        |        |        |        |        |        |
|        |                  |        |        |        |        |        |        |
|        |                  |        |        |        |        |        |        |
|        |                  |        |        |        |        |        |        |
|        |                  |        |        |        |        |        |        |
|        |                  |        |        |        |        |        |        |
Table 49

*Importance Ranking of Pastoral Task 22 (Church Finances) by Groups (In Percentages)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>High Importance Ranking</th>
<th>Low Importance Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  Total</td>
<td>21 22 23 24 25 Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0  0  0  0  0  0%</td>
<td>9  11 17 10 6  54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0  0  1  0  1  3%</td>
<td>12  8 14 17 9  59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0  0  0  0  0  0%</td>
<td>9  12 20 8 3  52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0  0  3  0  0  3%</td>
<td>12  8 39 17 8  59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>0  0  2  0  2  5%</td>
<td>7  14 14 18 16  69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>0  0  1  1  3  5%</td>
<td>11 10 12 13 10  56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
minutes to 20 hours.

The amount of time spent per week on task 13 by all pastors in the five comparison groups ranged from 15 minutes to 20 hours.

The amount of time spent per week on task 18 by all pastors in the five comparison groups ranged from 15 minutes to 15 hours.

The amount of time spent per week on task 23 by all pastors in the five comparison groups ranged from 15 minutes to 6 hours.

Of the pastors in this study, 5.4% ranked task 3 in the top five of the 25 pastoral tasks in terms of importance, whereas 18.4% ranked task 3 as among the lowest five of the 25 tasks in terms of importance. The rankings by lay leaders were 11% and 6% respectively. Of the pastors in this study, 25.8% ranked task 8 in the top five of the 25 pastoral tasks in terms of importance, whereas 4.8% ranked task 8 as among the lowest five of the 25 tasks in terms of importance. The rankings by lay leaders were 31% and 1% respectively. Of the pastors in this study, 31.2% ranked task 13 in the top five of the 25 pastoral tasks in terms of importance, whereas 11.2% ranked task 13 as among the lowest five of the 25 tasks in terms of importance. The rankings by lay leaders were 22% and 13% respectively. Of the pastors in this study, 5.4% ranked task 18 in the top five of the 25 pastoral tasks in terms of importance, whereas 34.4% ranked task 17 as among
the lowest five of the 25 tasks in terms of importance. The rankings by lay leaders were 3% and 35% respectively. Of the pastors in this study, 1% ranked task 23 in the top five of the 25 pastoral tasks in terms of importance, whereas 31.6% ranked task 22 as among the lowest five of the 25 tasks in terms of importance. The rankings by lay leaders were 9% and 20% respectively.

In summary, pastoral counseling normally took 3-4.5 hours per week and this task was considered to be in the least-important range by 18.4% of the pastors and 6% of the lay leaders.

Visiting the sick normally took 3.5-4 hours per week and this task was considered to be in the most-important range by 25.8% of the pastors and by 31% of the lay leaders.

Home visits normally took 4-5 hours per week and this task was considered to be in the most-important range by 31.2% of the pastors and by 22% of the lay leaders.

Attending social events normally took 2-3 hours per week and this task was considered to be in the least-important range by 34.4% of the pastors and by 35% of the lay leaders.

Conflict management normally took about 1 hour per week and this task was considered to be in the least-important range by 31.6% of the pastors and by 20% of the lay leaders.

Pastoral respondents spent approximately 15 hours
per week on the five tasks associated with the Pastoral-Care role. Tables 50-59 present the data for this role.

The Teaching Role

The following pastoral tasks are included in the teaching role:

1. Task 4: teaching members how to serve as church officers, and how to win souls for Christ
2. Task 9: conducting small-group ministry to promote the spiritual growth of members
3. Task 14: preparing for and teaching the pastor's Bible class
4. Task 19: teaching, modeling, and ministering to the children and youth of the church
5. Task 24: devotional Bible study and prayer that undergird an exemplary life.

The amount of time spent per week on task 4 by all pastors in the five comparison groups ranged from 15 minutes to 20 hours.

The amount of time spent per week on task 9 by all pastors in the five comparison groups ranged from 15 minutes to 10 hours.

The amount of time spent per week on task 14 by all pastors in the five comparison groups ranged from 15 minutes to 11 hours.

The amount of time spent per week on task 19 by all
Table 50

Comparison of Hours Spent on Task 3 by Pastors in the High-Baptism, Low-Baptism, Reference, More-Effective, and Less-Effective Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HI BAP N=49</th>
<th>LO BAP N=74</th>
<th>REFERENCE N=47</th>
<th>MORE EFFECT N=62</th>
<th>LESS EFFECT N=32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>FREQ %</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>FREQ %</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 50--Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>PRQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>PRQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>PRQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>PRQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>PRQ</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Table 51
Importance Ranking of Pastoral Task 3 (Counseling) by Groups (In Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>High Importance Ranking</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>Low Importance Ranking</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 52
Comparison of Hours Spent on Task 8 by Pastors in the High-Baptism, Low-Baptism, Reference, More-Effective, and Less-Effective Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HI BAP N=50</th>
<th>LO BAP N=79</th>
<th>REFERENCE N=47</th>
<th>MORE EFFECT N=63</th>
<th>LESS EFFECT N=33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 52--Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HI BAP N=50</th>
<th>LO BAP N=79</th>
<th>REFERENCE N=47</th>
<th>MORE EFFECT N=62</th>
<th>LESS EFFECT N=33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Table 53

Importance Ranking of Pastoral Task 8 (Hospital Visits) by Groups (In Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>High Importance Ranking</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>Low Importance Ranking</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 54

Comparison of Hours Spent on Task 13 by Pastors in the High-Baptism, Low-Baptism, Reference, More-Effective, and Less-Effective Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>PRBQP</th>
<th>N=46</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>PRBQP</th>
<th>N=77</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>PRBQP</th>
<th>N=46</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>PRBQP</th>
<th>N=62</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>PRBQP</th>
<th>N=32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 54--Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>PREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>PREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>PREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>PREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.4688</td>
<td>3.6253</td>
<td>4.9441</td>
<td>4.5845</td>
<td>4.8131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 55

Importance Ranking of Pastoral Task 13 (Home Visits) by Groups (In Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>High Importance Rankings</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>Low Importance Rankings</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 56

Comparison of Hours Spent on Task 18 by Pastors in the High-Baptism, Low-Baptism, Reference, More-Effective, and Less-Effective Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>PREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>PREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>PREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>PREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>PREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.0426</td>
<td>2.7422</td>
<td>2.2110</td>
<td>1.5163</td>
<td>2.0469</td>
<td>8.1734</td>
<td>2.0967</td>
<td>1.3812</td>
<td>2.0438</td>
<td>1.4714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 57

Importance Ranking of Pastoral Task 18 (Social Events) by Groups (In Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>High Importance Rankings</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>Low Importance Rankings</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 58

Comparison of Hours Spent on Task 23 by Pastors in the High-Baptism, Low-Baptism, Reference, More-Effective, and Less-Effective Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HI BAP N=42</th>
<th>LO BAP N=68</th>
<th>REFERENCE N=43</th>
<th>MORE EFFECT N=60</th>
<th>LESS EFFECT N=28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEAN ST DBV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DBV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DBV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DBV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DBV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2571</td>
<td>1.3747</td>
<td>1.1544</td>
<td>1.0526</td>
<td>1.1070</td>
<td>0.9714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0167</td>
<td>0.7522</td>
<td>0.9214</td>
<td>0.7015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 59

Importance Ranking of Pastoral Task 23 (Conflict Management) by Groups (In Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>High Importance Rankings</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>Low Importance Rankings</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
pastors in the five comparison groups ranged from 15 minutes to 10 hours.

The amount of time spent per week on task 24 by all pastors in the five comparison groups ranged from 15 minutes to 20 hours.

Of the pastors in this study, 52.8% ranked task 4 in the top five of the 25 pastoral tasks in terms of importance, whereas 0% ranked task 4 as among the lowest five of the 25 tasks in terms of importance. The rankings by lay leaders were 51% and 1% respectively. Of the pastors in this study, 12% ranked task 9 in the top five of the 25 pastoral tasks in terms of importance, whereas 13.2% ranked task 9 as among the lowest five of the 25 tasks in terms of importance. The rankings by lay leaders were 20% and 7% respectively. Of the pastors in this study, 2.2% ranked task 14 in the top five of the 25 pastoral tasks in terms of importance, whereas 21.4% ranked task 14 as among the lowest five of the 25 tasks in terms of importance. The rankings by lay leaders were 2% and 27% respectively. Of the pastors in this study, 13.6% ranked task 19 in the top five of the 25 pastoral tasks in terms of importance, whereas 5.2% ranked task 19 as among the lowest five of the 25 tasks in terms of importance. The rankings by lay leaders were 37% and 3% respectively. Of the pastors in this study, 77.4% ranked task 24 in the top five of the 25 pastoral tasks in terms of importance, whereas 0.4% ranked task 24 as among the
lowest five of the 25 tasks in terms of importance. The rankings by lay leaders were 57% and 2% respectively.

Training members for service normally took 2-6 hours per week and this task was considered to be in the most-important range by 52.8% of the pastors and by 51% of the lay leaders.

Small-group ministry normally took 1.5-3 hours per week and this task was considered to be in the most-important range by 12% of the pastors and by 20% of the lay leaders.

The pastors' Bible class normally took about 2 hours per week and this task was considered to be in the least-important range by 21.4% of the pastors and by 27% of the lay leaders.

Youth ministry normally took 1.5-2 hours per week and this task was considered to be in the most-important range by 13.6% of the pastors and by 37% of the lay leaders.

The pastor's devotional life normally took 2.5-6.5 hours per week and this task was considered to be in the most-important range by 77.4% of the pastors and by 57% of the lay leaders.

Pastoral respondents spent approximately 14 hours per week on the five tasks associated with the Teaching role. Tables 60-69 present the data for this role.

The Evangelism Role

The following pastoral tasks are included in the
Table 60

Comparison of Hours Spent on Task 4 by Pastors in the High-Baptism, Low-Baptism, Reference, More-Effective, and Less-Effective Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>HI BAP N=46</th>
<th>LO BAP N=75</th>
<th>REFERENCE N=46</th>
<th>MORE EFFECT N=60</th>
<th>LESS EFFECT N=32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1 2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5 6.7</td>
<td>0.5 2 4.3</td>
<td>0.5 3 5.0</td>
<td>0.5 2 6.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5 10.9</td>
<td>1.0 18 24.0</td>
<td>1.0 9 19.6</td>
<td>1.0 9 15.0</td>
<td>1.0 9 28.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1 2.2</td>
<td>1.5 5 6.7</td>
<td>1.5 1 1.7</td>
<td>1.5 1 3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>9 19.6</td>
<td>2.0 14 18.7</td>
<td>2.0 10 21.7</td>
<td>2.0 9 15.0</td>
<td>2.0 10 31.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2 2.7</td>
<td>2.5 2 4.3</td>
<td>2.5 1 1.7</td>
<td>2.5 1 3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3 6.5</td>
<td>3.0 7 9.3</td>
<td>3.0 5 10.9</td>
<td>3.0 7 11.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1 2.2</td>
<td>3.5 1 2.2</td>
<td>3.5 2 3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3 6.5</td>
<td>4.0 3 4.0</td>
<td>4.0 2 4.3</td>
<td>4.0 4 6.7</td>
<td>4.0 2 6.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1 1.3</td>
<td>4.5 1 2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>9 19.6</td>
<td>5.0 5 6.7</td>
<td>5.0 2 4.3</td>
<td>5.0 7 11.7</td>
<td>5.0 2 6.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7 9.3</td>
<td>6.0 1 2.2</td>
<td>6.0 1 5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1 1.3</td>
<td>7.0 1 2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1 1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1 2.2</td>
<td>8.0 4 8.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.0 2 6.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1 1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.0 1 1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6 13.0</td>
<td>10.0 1 1.3</td>
<td>10.0 3 6.5</td>
<td>10.0 8 13.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 60--Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.9130</td>
<td>5.1200</td>
<td>3.7000</td>
<td>4.1785</td>
<td>4.0261</td>
<td>3.9803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6200</td>
<td>4.0747</td>
<td>2.8500</td>
<td>3.0575</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 61

*Importance Ranking of Pastoral Task 4 (Training Laity) by Groups (In Percentages)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>High Importance Rankings</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>Low Importance Rankings</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 62
Comparison of Hours Spent on Task 9 by Pastors in the High-Baptism, Low-Baptism, Reference, More-Effective, and Less-Effective Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>HI BAP N=36</th>
<th>LO BAP N=52</th>
<th>REFERENCE N=34</th>
<th>MORE EFFECT N=40</th>
<th>LESS EFFECT N=26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean ± std dev

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HI BAP</th>
<th>LO BAP</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
<th>MORE EFFECT</th>
<th>LESS EFFECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.7361 ± 2.1563</td>
<td>2.1363 ± 1.8910</td>
<td>2.1824 ± 1.5336</td>
<td>2.2550 ± 1.8546</td>
<td>1.5923 ± 1.3169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 63

*Importance Ranking of Pastoral Task 9 (Small-Group Ministry) by Groups (In Percentages)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>High Importance Rankings</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>Low Importance Rankings</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 64
Comparison of Hours Spent on Task 14 by Pastors in the High-Baptism, Low-Baptism, Reference, More-Effective, and Less-Effective Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.9235</td>
<td>1.6731</td>
<td>2.2886</td>
<td>2.1099</td>
<td>2.2500</td>
<td>1.6805</td>
<td>1.9825</td>
<td>1.4798</td>
<td>2.0500</td>
<td>1.3268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>High Importance Rankings</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>Low Importance Rankings</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 66

Comparison of Hours Spent on Task 19 by Pastors in the High-Baptism, Low-Baptism, Reference, More-Effective, and Less-Effective Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HI BAP N=46</th>
<th>LOW BAP N=64</th>
<th>REFERENCE N=44</th>
<th>MORE EFFECT N=56</th>
<th>LESS EFFECT N=10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 66--Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HI BAP N=46</th>
<th>LO BAP N=64</th>
<th>REFERENCE N=44</th>
<th>MORE EFFECT N=56</th>
<th>LESS EFFECT N=30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|          |          |          |          |          |          |
| MEAN     | ST DEV   | MEAN     | ST DEV   | MEAN     | ST DEV   |
|          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 1.9652   | 1.9069   | 1.5813   | 1.4233   | 2.2864   | 1.9619   |
|          |          |          |          |          |          |
| 1.8719   | 1.3833   | 1.4645   | 1.4011   |          |          |
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Table 67

*Importance Ranking of Pastoral Task 19 (Youth Ministry) by Groups (In Percentages)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>High Importance Rankings</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>Low Importance Rankings</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 68
Comparison of Hours Spent on Task 24 by Pastors in the High-Baptism, Low-Baptism, Reference, More-Effective, and Less-Effective Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HI BAP N=49</th>
<th>LO BAP N=76</th>
<th>REFERENCE N=46</th>
<th>MORE EFFECT N=61</th>
<th>LESS EFFECT N=30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRQ</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>PRQ</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 68--Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>ST DEV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Table 69

*Importance Ranking of Pastoral Task 24 (Devotional Exercises) by Groups (In Percentages)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>High Importance Rankings</th>
<th>Low Importance Rankings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>21 22 23 24 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>61 8 2 0 4</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>54 7 4 1 3</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>65 7 3 2 5</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>53 12 3 6 9</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>50 13 4 7 2</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>36 6 3 6 5</td>
<td>1 0 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total:
- High Importance Rankings: 76%, 69%, 82%, 84%, 76%, 57%
- Low Importance Rankings: 0%, 0%, 0%, 0%, 2%, 2%
Evangelism role:

1. Task 5: following leads, visiting prospective church members, and giving Bible studies

2. Task 10: motivating and supporting members in soul-winning and church-growth activities

3. Task 15: reclaiming and reintegrating lost and inactive members into church fellowship

4. Task 20: providing assistance to the needy and networking to address social issues

5. Task 25: conducting public evangelistic meetings or felt-needs evangelistic programs.

The amount of time spent per week on task 5 by all pastors in the five comparison groups ranged from 15 minutes to 39 hours.

The amount of time spent per week on task 10 by all pastors in the five comparison groups ranged from 15 minutes to 16 hours.

The amount of time spent per week on task 15 by all pastors in the five comparison groups ranged from 15 minutes to 15 hours.

The amount of time spent per week on task 20 by all pastors in the five comparison groups ranged from 15 minutes to five hours.

The amount of time spent per week on task 25 by all pastors in the five comparison groups ranged from 15 minutes to 30 hours.

Of the pastors in this study, 25.2% ranked task 5 in
the top five of the 25 pastoral tasks in terms of importance, whereas 4.8% ranked task 5 as among the lowest five of the 25 tasks in terms of importance. The rankings by lay leaders were 20% and 5% respectively.

Of the pastors in this study, 43.2% ranked task 10 in the top five of the 25 pastoral tasks in terms of importance, whereas 1.8% ranked task 10 as among the lowest five of the 25 tasks in terms of importance. The rankings by lay leaders were 56% and 1% respectively. Of the pastors in this study, 6.8% ranked task 15 in the top five of the 25 pastoral tasks in terms of importance, whereas 11.2% ranked task 15 as among the lowest five of the 25 tasks in terms of importance. The rankings by lay leaders were 27% and 6% respectively. Of the pastors in this study, 0.8% ranked task 20 in the top five of the 25 pastoral tasks in terms of importance, whereas 72.6% ranked task 19 as among the lowest five of the 25 tasks in terms of importance. The rankings by lay leaders were 6% and 55% respectively. Of the pastors in this study, 14.6% ranked task 25 in the top five of the 25 pastoral tasks in terms of importance, whereas 7.8% ranked task 19 as among the lowest five of the 25 tasks in terms of importance. The rankings by lay leaders were 18% and 15% respectively.

Visiting persons interested in church membership and giving Bible studies normally took 2-8 hours per week and this task was considered to be in the most-important range by 25.2% of the pastors and by 20% of the lay leaders.
Involving laity in church-growth activities normally took 2-3 hours per week and this task was considered to be in the most-important range by 43.2% of the pastors and by 56% of the lay leaders.

Reclaiming lost members normally took 1.5-2.5 hours per week and this task was considered to be in the most-important range by 6.8% of the pastors and by 27% of the lay leaders.

Ministry to the needy normally took about 1 hour per week and this task was considered to be in the least-important range by 72.6% of the pastors and by 55% of the lay leaders.

Evangelistic meetings normally took 2-3 hours per week and this task was considered to be in the most-important range by 14.6% of the pastors and by 18% of the lay leaders.

Pastoral respondents spent approximately 14 hours per week on the five tasks associated with the Evangelism role. Tables 70-79 present the data for this role.

In summary, this section examined the issues of time and task importance. The purpose was not significance testing of the differences among groups, but a presentation of the data in a manner that facilitates an understanding of the ranges and frequencies of time spent per task by the five groups of pastors, combined with importance rankings of the tasks by pastors and lay leaders.
Table 70
Comparison of Hours Spent on Task 5 by Pastors in the High-Baptism, Low-Baptism, Reference, More-Effective, and Less-Effective Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HI BAP N=47</th>
<th>LO BAP N=75</th>
<th>REFERENCE N=47</th>
<th>MORE EFFECT N=61</th>
<th>LESS EFFECT N=32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 70--Continued.

| Hours | FREQ | %   | Hours | FREQ | %   | Hours | FREQ | %   | Hours | FREQ | %   | Hours | FREQ | %   |
|-------|------|-----|-------|------|-----|-------|------|-----|-------|------|-----|-------|------|-----|-----|
| 11.0  | 3    | 4.0 | 11.0  | 1    | 2.1 | 11.0  | 1    | 1.6 | 11.0  | 3    | 4.9 | 11.0  | 1    | 3.1 |
| 12.0  | 2    | 4.3 | 12.0  | 2    | 2.7 | 12.0  | 1    | 2.1 | 12.0  | 3    | 4.9 | 12.0  | 1    | 3.1 |
| 12.5  | 2    | 4.3 | 12.5  | 1    | 1.6 | 12.5  | 1    | 1.6 | 12.5  | 1    | 1.6 | 12.5  | 1    | 1.6 |
| 14.0  | 1    | 2.1 | 14.0  | 1    | 2.1 | 14.0  | 1    | 1.6 | 14.0  | 1    | 1.6 | 14.0  | 1    | 1.6 |
| 15.0  | 2    | 4.3 | 15.0  | 1    | 1.3 | 15.0  | 3    | 6.4 | 15.0  | 3    | 4.9 | 15.0  | 3    | 4.9 |
| 17.5  | 1    | 2.1 | 17.5  | 1    | 1.6 | 17.5  | 1    | 1.6 | 17.5  | 1    | 1.6 | 17.5  | 1    | 1.6 |
| 18.0  | 1    | 3.1 |                  |                  |     |                  |                  |     |                  |                  |     |                  |
| 19.0  | 1    | 2.1 |                  |                  |     |                  |                  |     |                  |                  |     |                  |
| 20.0  | 1    | 2.1 | 20.0  | 3    | 4.0 | 20.0  | 1    | 2.1 | 20.0  | 3    | 4.9 | 20.0  | 1    | 3.1 |
| 22.0  | 1    | 1.3 |                  |                  |     |                  |                  |     |                  |                  |     |                  |
| 23.0  | 1    | 1.3 |                  |                  |     |                  |                  |     |                  |                  |     |                  |
| 25.0  | 1    | 1.3 |                  |                  |     |                  |                  |     |                  |                  |     |                  |
| 30.0  | 1    | 2.1 |                  |                  |     |                  |                  |     |                  |                  |     |                  |
| 35.0  | 1    | 3.1 |                  |                  |     |                  |                  |     |                  |                  |     |                  |
| 39.0  | 1    | 1.6 |                  |                  |     |                  |                  |     |                  |                  |     |                  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St Dev</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St Dev</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St Dev</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2697</td>
<td>3.9993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups of Respondents</td>
<td>High Importance Rankings</td>
<td>Low Importance Rankings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 72

Comparison of Hours Spent on Task 10 by Pastors in the High-Baptism, Low-Baptism, Reference, More-Effective, and Less-Effective Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FRQ</th>
<th></th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FRQ</th>
<th></th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FRQ</th>
<th></th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FRQ</th>
<th></th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FRQ</th>
<th></th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FRQ</th>
<th></th>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FRQ</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 72---Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HI BAP N=43</th>
<th>LO BAP N=71</th>
<th>REFERENCE N=44</th>
<th>MORE EFFECT N=58</th>
<th>LESS EFFECT N=31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>PRQ %</td>
<td>HOURS PRQ %</td>
<td>HOURS PRQ %</td>
<td>HOURS PRQ %</td>
<td>HOURS PRQ %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1 2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0 2 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1.4</td>
<td>15.0 1 2.3</td>
<td>15.0 3 5.2</td>
<td>16.0 1 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3651</td>
<td>2.3496</td>
<td>2.3183</td>
<td>2.0341</td>
<td>2.5750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 73

Importance Ranking of Pastoral Task 10 (Involving Laity in Church Growth) by Groups (In Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>High Importance Rankings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>Low Importance Rankings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 74
Comparison of Hours Spent on Task 15 by Pastors in the High-Baptism, Low-Baptism, Reference, More-Effective, and Less-Effective Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOURS</th>
<th>FREQ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HI BAP N=36</th>
<th>LO BAP N=52</th>
<th>REFERENCE N=34</th>
<th>MORE EFFECT N=40</th>
<th>LESS EFFECT N=26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
<th>MEAN ST DEV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3119</td>
<td>2.4214</td>
<td>1.6137</td>
<td>1.3772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7400</td>
<td>1.7225</td>
<td>1.9870</td>
<td>2.4220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 75

Importance Ranking of Pastoral Task 15 (Reintegrating Inactive Members) by Groups (In Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>High Importance Rankings</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>Low Importance Rankings</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 76

Comparison of Hours Spent on Task 20 by Pastors in the High-Baptism, Low-Baptism, Reference, More-Effective, and Less-Effective Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>HI BAP N=43</th>
<th>LO BAP N=45</th>
<th>REFERENCE N=29</th>
<th>MORE EFFECT N=43</th>
<th>LESS EFFECT N=19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.9222</td>
<td>0.5509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0756</td>
<td>1.1533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1862</td>
<td>0.7855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1605</td>
<td>0.9210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4424</td>
<td>1.6594</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 77  
Importance Ranking of Pastoral Task 20 (Indigent Assistance) by Groups (In Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>High Importance Rankings</th>
<th>Low Importance Rankings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5      Total</td>
<td>21 22 23 24 25  Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0%</td>
<td>5 9 7 25 37 81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 1%</td>
<td>11 6 21 14 21 73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0%</td>
<td>11 5 10 16 33 75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0 0 0 3 0 3%</td>
<td>3 0 19 9 28 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0%</td>
<td>14 14 9 25 11 74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>0 0 1 3 3 6%</td>
<td>11 12 11 12 9 55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 78

Comparison of Hours Spent on Task 25 by Pastors in the High-Baptism, Low-Baptism, Reference, More-Effective, and Less-Effective Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HI BAP N=43</th>
<th>LO BAP N=63</th>
<th>REFERENCE N=38</th>
<th>MORE EFFECT N=53</th>
<th>LESS EFFECT N=23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
<td>HOURS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
<td>FREQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 78—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hi Bap N=43</th>
<th>Lo Bap N=63</th>
<th>Reference N=38</th>
<th>More Effect N=53</th>
<th>Less Effect N=28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St Dev</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St Dev</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St Dev</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St Dev</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1651</td>
<td>.6175</td>
<td>2.7111</td>
<td>4.6217</td>
<td>1.9947</td>
<td>2.2718</td>
<td>2.2962</td>
<td>2.3445</td>
<td>2.7679</td>
<td>4.6929</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 79

*Importance Ranking of Pastoral Task 25 (Evangelistic Meetings) by Groups (In Percentages)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of Respondents</th>
<th>High Importance Rankings</th>
<th>Low Importance Rankings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Baptism Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less-Effective Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference-Group Pastors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Leaders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The tasks associated with the Preaching role accounted for approximately 26% of the time of all pastoral respondents, and these tasks received positive importance rankings by the following percentages of pastors: sermon preparation 50.4%, worship planning 9%, preaching 32.2%, intercessory prayer 35.2%, and sermonic-year planning 3.8%.

The tasks associated with the Administrative role accounted for approximately 12% of the time of all pastoral respondents, and these tasks received positive importance rankings by the following percentages of pastors: committees 8.2%, bulletin preparation 0.6%, phone calls 3.2%, visioning 38.2%, church finances 2.2%.

The tasks associated with the Pastoral-Care role accounted for approximately 20% of the time of all pastoral respondents, and these tasks received positive importance rankings by the following percentages of pastors: counseling 5.4%, hospital visits 25.8%, home visits 31.2%, socializing 5.4%, confronting error 1%.

The tasks associated with the Teaching role accounted for approximately 19% of the time of all pastoral respondents, and these tasks received positive importance rankings by the following percentages of pastors: training laity 52.8%, small-group ministry 12%, Bible class 2.2%, youth ministry 13.6%, personal devotions 77.4%.

The tasks associated with the Evangelistic role
accounted for approximately 19% of the time of all pastoral respondents, and these tasks received positive importance rankings by the following percentages of pastors: Bible studies 25.2%, lay evangelism support 43.2%, reclaiming lost members 6.8%, indigent assistance 0.8%, evangelistic meetings 14.6%.

The amount of time spent on the five pastoral roles by the high-baptism, low-baptism, more-effective, less-effective, and reference-group pastors is summarized in Table 80.

Chapter Summary

In this study of 239 Anglo Seventh-day Adventist pastors, the intent was to identify differences among five comparison groups of clergy and to examine these differences in relationship to pastoral effectiveness. High-baptism pastors were compared with low-baptism pastors, and more-effective with less-effective pastors. These contrasting groups were also compared with a randomly selected reference group.

Significant differences were identified among the groups by the demographic data elicited by the Adventist Pastor Inventory. In contrast to low-baptism pastors, more of the high-baptism pastors attended the SDA Seminary at Andrews University, received scholastic honors, and did not have another career before ministry. Their baptismal statistics were higher in terms of percentage of
Table 80

Summary of Hours per Week Spent on Five Pastoral Roles by Clergy in the High-Baptism, Low-Baptism, More-Effective, Less-Effective, and Reference Groups of Pastors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pastoral Roles</th>
<th>High-Baptism</th>
<th>Low-Baptism</th>
<th>More-Effective</th>
<th>Less-Effective</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=50</td>
<td>n=78</td>
<td>n=63</td>
<td>n=33</td>
<td>n=47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preaching and Leading Worship</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and Visioning</td>
<td>14.0*</td>
<td>10.7*</td>
<td>12.6*</td>
<td>9.4*</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral Care and Counseling</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Equipping</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Growth and Evangelism</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hours Per Week</td>
<td>82.7*</td>
<td>70.2*</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.

* Statistically significant differences

PRACHING = sermon preparation, worship planning, preaching, intercessory prayer, sermonic-year planning
ADMINISTRATION = committees, bulletin, phone calls, visioning, church finances
PASTORAL CARE = counseling, hospital visits, home visits, socializing, conflict management
TEACHING = training, small groups, Bible class, youth ministry, personal devotions
EVANGELISM = Bible studies, member evangelism, reclaiming missing members, indigent assistance, evangelistic meetings.
membership growth, baptisms as a percentage of membership, outreach baptisms as a percentage of membership, and youth baptisms as a percentage of membership.

In contrast to the less-effective pastors, the more-effective pastors were more likely to have received scholastic honors, had nurturant mentors, worked in large population centers, conducted comprehensive lay-training programs, and involved lay members in evangelism. They were more likely to have had long-term goals of being involved in conference administration, full-time evangelism, and radio or TV ministry. Their congregations were more likely to have conducted the following specialized ministries: church school, community services center, Pathfinder club, Adventist Youth Association, women's organization, men's organization, and divorce support group. They reported the atmosphere in their churches to be more supportive than conflictual, and they had a higher percentage of younger members. Their baptismal statistics were higher in terms of percentage of membership growth, baptisms as a percentage of membership, outreach baptisms as a percentage of membership, and youth baptisms as a percentage of membership.

The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire was used to identify personality differences among the five groups of pastors. No significant differences emerged among the high-baptism, the reference, and low-baptism groups on the 16PF measures of intellectual functioning.
The less-effective group scored lower on Creative Potential and higher on Abstractness (Factor M) than the more-effective and reference groups, thereby confirming the research hypothesis that there are differences in intellectual functioning among these groups.

No significant differences emerged among the high-baptism, reference, and low-baptism groups on the 16PF measures of emotional functioning.

The more-effective and less-effective groups scored significantly higher on Emotional Stability (Factor C) than the reference group. The less-effective group scored significantly lower on Tension (Factor Q4) than the reference and more-effective groups. These findings confirm the research hypothesis that there are differences in emotional functioning among these groups.

No significant differences emerged among the high-baptism, reference, and low-baptism groups on the 16PF measures of interpersonal functioning.

No significant differences emerged among the more-effective, reference, and less-effective groups on the 16PF measures of interpersonal functioning.

No significant differences emerged among the high-baptism, reference, and low-baptism groups on the 16PF measures of vocational functioning.

No significant differences emerged among the more-effective, reference, and less-effective groups on the 16PF measures of vocational functioning.
Additional analyses comparing only the high-baptism pastors with the low-baptism pastors showed that as a group the high-baptism pastors scored higher on relational warmth (Factor A), enthusiasm (Factor F), social boldness (Factor H), and openness to change (Factor Q1) than the low-baptism pastors who tended to be more private (Factor N) and self-reliant (Factor Q2).

Additional analyses comparing only the more-effective with the less-effective pastors showed that the less-effective group's scores on Dominance (Factor E) showed them to be significantly more submissive and conflict avoidant than the more-effective pastors. The less-effective pastors scored significantly lower on Liveliness (Factor F) than the more-effective pastors. The less-effective pastors scored significantly higher on Self-sufficiency (Factor Q2) than the more-effective pastors, indicating a preference for solitude over group interaction. The less-effective pastors scored significantly lower on Perfectionism (Factor Q3) than the more-effective pastors, indicating that they were less disciplined and more content with disorganization and lack of structure. These findings lend support to the idea that personality differences influence pastoral performance.

The Pastoral Tasks Inventory and the Pastoral Tasks Questionnaire (see pp. 302-313) effectively differentiated among the five groups of pastors. There were significant
differences in the self-reports of time spent on three pastoral tasks by the high-baptism, reference, and low-baptism groups. There were no significant differences in the self-reports of time spent on the 25 pastoral tasks among the more-effective, reference, and less-effective groups. There were significant differences in the lay leaders' estimates of time spent on six pastoral tasks among the high-baptism, reference, and low-baptism groups. There were significant differences in the lay leaders' estimates of time spent on 12 pastoral tasks among the more-effective, reference, and less-effective groups. There were significant differences in the self-ratings of task proficiency on 12 pastoral tasks among the high-baptism, reference, and low-baptism groups. There were significant differences in the self-ratings of task proficiency on nine pastoral tasks among the more-effective, reference, and less-effective groups. There were significant differences in the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency on 15 pastoral tasks among the high-baptism, reference, and low-baptism groups. There were significant differences in the lay leaders' ratings of task proficiency on 23 pastoral tasks among the more-effective, reference, and less-effective groups.

These findings give support to the idea that the high-baptism pastors differ significantly in their use of time and in their task proficiency when compared with low-baptism pastors. The same holds true for the
more-effective and less-effective pastors in this study.

In conclusion, this research set out to investigate whether there were statistically significant differences among five groups of Anglo Seventh-day Adventist pastors. The results confirm that measurable differences did exist, and that these differences were identifiable by the Adventist Pastor Inventory, the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire, the Pastoral Tasks Survey, and the Pastoral Tasks Questionnaire.

The direction of the observed differences between contrasting groups of pastors was generally consistent with the expectation that pastors identified as productive soul winners and as task-proficient were indeed more effective than those identified by their supervisors as unproductive and ineffective.

The research also showed that the effectiveness ratings of pastors by ministerial directors were confirmed by the self-reports of the clergy and by the ratings of their ministers by lay leaders in the churches served by the pastoral respondents. This evidence supported the idea that in the surveyed conferences extremes in pastoral effectiveness did exist.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter defines the problem that was investigated, presents a summary of the literature review, describes the methodology and findings, offers recommendations, and makes suggestions for further study.

The Problem

This study sought to identify statistically significant differences between contrasted groups of Anglo Seventh-day Adventist clergy. Specifically, pastors who baptized 50 or more persons within 3 years were compared with pastors who baptized 10 or fewer during the same period. In addition, pastors rated "most effective" by their conference ministerial directors were compared with those rated "least effective." Randomly selected pastors served as a reference group.

The purpose of the investigation was to use the analysis of identified differences to inform decisions about ministerial recruitment, theological preparation, professional development, and the remediation of ineffective ministers.
**Review of Literature**

In the overview of literature dealing with pastoral effectiveness, various approaches to appraisal were identified, but mainly with a focus on personal characteristics and role performance of clergy.

Authors generally stressed the importance of aspects of intellectual functioning. Some were concerned about academic measures such as grades, GPA, exegetical ability, biblical and theological knowledge, and scholarly ability. Others considered as more important such factors as memory, creativity, the ability to readily learn and absorb new information, to think logically, and to evaluate new interpretations critically. Another group valued sound common sense, good judgment, and depth of insight. No single instrument measures all of these capacities, though the Weschler Verbal Intelligence scale and the 16PF Factor B scale measuring abstract conceptualization have both proved useful. Prediction of effectiveness based on such measures has generally met with marginal success.

The emotional domain was referenced by many as important to pastoral success. Here the emphasis was most often on the absence of pathology. Lack of moodiness, anger management, patience, emotional balance, stability, and maturity were cited as important. The MMPI has been widely used for screening, and certain 16PF scores were reported to be common with pastors vulnerable to
stress and burn-out.

There was wide agreement that pastoral effectiveness was closely related to interpersonal relationships. Descriptors include: warmth, concern, considerateness, approachableness, understanding, empathetic, outgoing, personable, enthusiastic, others-centeredness, open, transparent, not dominant but assertive, not emotionally distant, inspires trust, and manages conflict well. Comprehensive reviews of many assessment instruments and studies were cited.

Authorities referenced the functional domain with descriptors such as conscientiousness, persistence, industriousness, perseverance, productivity, efficiency, being energetic, responsible, organized, dependable, persevering, not lazy, self-controlled, and having a capacity for sustained hard work.

There is no certainty that possessors of such desirable qualities will be effective in ministry because many other factors external to the individual also influence success. However, the importance of these characteristics is widely accepted.

The second area of focus was upon performance appraisal. Pastoral roles and tasks have been studied from many theoretical perspectives. One line of reasoning led to the identification of biblical examples and models of ecclesiastical leadership that were then applied to modern roles. Differences in interpretation and emphasis
by authors led to varying conclusions. Another approach was to observe the tasks and functions of pastors in situ and to build models based on typical patterns of behavior. However, no inter-rater reliability was reported, and replicability could be problematic. The survey approach has been used by many, and hundreds of aspects of ministry have been identified and categorized.

The model developed for the present research has five roles and five tasks or task-clusters per role. The Preaching and Worship-Leading role was referenced in most of the literature. The Administrative, Pastoral Care, Teaching, and Evangelism roles were also broadly represented in the work of other investigators.

The method of rank-ordering tasks based on perceived importance was used in different studies, and several investigators reported the amount of time spent on various tasks and functions. Such findings were comparable with this present study.

In the field of clergy-performance appraisal, the problem of the lack of agreement about criteria of measurement endures. Authorities are pessimistic about a resolution because ecclesiastical leaders and pastors often differ over what is most important, and because conditions vary considerably from region to region. Given the limited agreement over norm-based and criterion-based measures of pastoral effectiveness, one possible solution, and the one suggested in this study, is to custom design
clergy-performance evaluation to the specific expectations of the congregation, pastor, and ministerial director.

**Methodology**

Ministerial directors from 41 conferences in North America and Canada submitted lists of pastors' names grouped as high baptism, low baptism, most effective, and least effective. Three instruments were sent to these pastors and to those in the randomly selected reference group.

The Adventist Pastor Inventory (API) elicited demographic information about the pastors and their professional experience. A Chi-Square analysis of the data was performed to identify differences between groups.

The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF) Fifth Edition was used to measure characteristics in the hypothesized Intellectual, Emotional, Relational, and Functional domains. A Multivariate Analysis of Variance was performed to investigate differences between groups, and where differences emerged, a Discriminate Analysis was performed to achieve greater precision.

The Pastoral Tasks Survey (PTS) examined five pastoral roles and 25 corresponding pastoral tasks at three levels: pastors' self-reports of time spent per task, self-ratings of task-proficiency, and rankings of task-importance. An Analysis of Variance was performed to identify statistically significant differences.
The Pastoral Tasks Questionnaire (PTQ) is a parallel instrument to the Pastoral Tasks Survey. It was sent to lay leaders in the congregations served by pastoral respondents. These leaders were asked to judge whether their pastors were spending too much, too little, or just enough time on each of the 25 tasks, to rate their pastor's task proficiency, and to rank the tasks in terms of importance to their congregation. An Analysis of Variance was performed to identify differences between comparison groups of pastors.

Findings

Of the 58 ministerial directors of conferences in the North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists who were approached, 71% responded with names of pastors categorized as high baptism, low baptism, most effective, and least effective. From 469 pastors surveyed there was a 51% response rate.

High-Baptism and Low-Baptism Pastors Compared

As demonstrated by selected API responses, fewer low-baptism pastors attended the Theological Seminary at Andrews University, and more of them had attended some other seminary or had not attended seminary at all. More high-baptism pastors had received scholastic honors, and fewer had had previous careers. In addition to the baptismal differential that categorized the clergy, the high-baptism pastors were superior on the percentage of
membership growth, baptisms as a percentage of membership, outreach baptisms as a percentage of membership, and youth baptisms as a percentage of membership.

No statistically significant differences were found between the high-baptism and low-baptism groups as measured by the 16PF in the hypothesized Intellectual, Emotional, Relational, and Functional domains. When high-baptism and low-baptism pastors were directly compared on the 16PF primary factors, high-baptism pastors were shown to be more warm relationally (Factor A), more enthusiastic (Factor F), more bold in social settings (Factor H), and more open to new experiences (Factor Q1). The low-baptism pastors were shown to be more private and guarded (Factor N), and more self-sufficient (Factor Q2).

According to their self-reports on the PTS, low-baptism pastors spent less time on committee work, training laity, and worship preparation than the high-baptism pastors. According to PTQ estimates by lay leaders of their pastors' time usage, the low-baptism group spent less time than high-baptism pastors on counseling, phone calls, church finances, and evangelistic meetings.

According to their self-reports on the PTS, the quality of their task performance was higher for the high-baptism pastors than for the low-baptism group on sermon preparation, committees, Bible studies, worship planning, member evangelism, preaching, Bible class,
reclaiming missing members, visioning, socializing, youth ministry, church finances, and evangelistic meetings. According to PTQ ratings by lay leaders of the quality of their pastors' task performance, high-baptism pastors were superior to low-baptism pastors on sermon preparation, Bible studies, counseling, hospital visits, worship planning, member evangelism, preaching, phone calls, home visits, reclaiming missing members, intercessory prayer, visioning, socializing, youth ministry, sermonic-year planning, personal devotions, and evangelistic meetings.

In brief, high-baptism pastors were more likely to have achieved scholastic honors, attended the SDA Seminary, and have seen growth in membership. By their own self-ratings and by the estimates of lay leaders from their congregations, the high-baptism group of pastors spent more time on seven aspects of their work, and the quality of their task performance was rated superior to that of the low-baptism pastors on 20 of the 25 pastoral tasks.

More-Effective and Less-Effective Pastors Compared

As demonstrated by selected API responses, a greater number of the more-effective pastors received academic honors, had a nurturant mentor, worked in large population centers, conducted lay-training programs, and involved laity in evangelism. Fewer less-effective pastors had
long-term goals of being in conference administration, doing full-time evangelism, or engaging in TV or radio ministry. More-effective pastors were more likely to serve churches having the following specialized ministries: church school, Community Services Center, Pathfinder Club, Adventist Youth Association, women's organization, men's organization, and divorce-recovery group. There were significantly more parishioners 45 years and younger in churches served by more-effective pastors, and significantly more members 45 years and older in congregations served by less-effective pastors. The congregational atmosphere was more likely to be supportive than conflictual for more-effective pastors. The more-effective group was superior on a percentage of membership growth, baptisms as a percentage of membership, outreach baptisms as a percentage of membership, and youth baptisms as a percentage of membership.

In the Intellectual domain cluster of 16PF measures, the less-effective pastors scored lower on Creative Potential and higher on Abstractness than pastors in the more-effective and reference groups. In the Emotional domain cluster, the less-effective pastors scored lower on Tension (Factor Q4) than the other two groups. In direct comparison with the more-effective group, the less-effective pastors were shown to be more submissive (Factor E), less socially bold (Factor H), and less group-oriented (Factor Q2) in their interpersonal
interactions. And in the Functional domain they scored lower on self-discipline (Factor Q3) than the more-effective pastors.

Although there were no significant differences in the two groups' self-ratings of time spent on the 25 tasks, according to PTQ estimates by lay leaders of their pastors' time usage, the less-effective group spent less time than more-effective pastors on committees, counseling, training laity, Bible studies, bulletin, phone calls, home visits, visioning, sermonic-year planning, church finances, conflict resolution, and evangelistic meetings.

Comparing the PTS self-ratings of task performance of the two groups, the less-effective pastors rated the quality of their work lower on sermon preparation, training laity, member evangelism, preaching, phone calls, visioning, sermonic-year planning, church finances, and evangelistic meetings.

Comparing the PTQ ratings by lay leaders of the quality of their pastors' task performance, the more-effective group did superior work on sermon preparation, committees, counseling, training laity, Bible studies, worship planning, bulletin, hospital visits, small-group ministry, member evangelism, preaching, phone calls, home visits, reclaiming missing members, intercessory prayer, visioning, youth ministry, indigent assistance, sermonic-year planning, church
finances, conflict resolution, personal devotions, and evangelistic meetings.

In summary, more-effective pastors were more likely to have received academic honors, conducted lay training programs and involved laity in evangelism, had broader career aspirations, and had seen their membership grow. The estimates of time usage by lay leaders differentiated the more-effective from the less-effective pastors on 12 aspects of their work. The quality of more-effective pastors' work was rated superior according to their self-reports on 9 pastoral tasks, and by the ratings of lay leaders on 23 of the 25 pastoral tasks.

**Importance Ranking of Pastoral Tasks**

Due to complexities of design, analyses of differences between comparison groups on task-importance ranking were not performed; however, ranges and means were tabulated and reported.

As ranked by all pastors surveyed, the most important of the 25 tasks were personal devotions, training laity, sermon preparation, involving laity in evangelism, and strategic planning/visioning.

As ranked by lay leaders, the most important tasks were personal devotions, involving laity in evangelism, training laity, child and youth ministry, and visiting sick and infirm members.

As ranked by all pastors surveyed, the least
important tasks were preparing the church bulletin and newsletter, supporting efforts for the needy, church finances, letters and phone calls, and attending church social events.

As ranked by lay leaders, the least important tasks for the pastor to perform were preparing the church bulletin and newsletter, church finances, supporting efforts for the needy, letters and phone calls, and attending church social events.

**Reported Time for Pastoral Tasks**

A comparison of the amount of time reported per task by all pastors in the study was tabulated (see p. 260). About 19 hours per week were spent on the tasks associated with the Preaching role. Approximately 12 hours per week were spent on Administration. Pastoral Care required about 15 hours per week. About 14 hours per week were spent on Teaching and Equipping laity, and close to 14 hours per week were spent on Evangelism and church growth.

**Discussion of Findings**

As expected, differences were found between the high-baptism and low-baptism groups of pastors. The identifying criterion was contrasted baptismal records, and therefore a close link to measures of membership increase was not surprising. Less predictable were the findings that attendance at the SDA Seminary and a record of academic honors were related to higher numbers of
baptisms. Although a causal relationship cannot be inferred, it seems reasonable that brighter and better-trained evangelists are likely to be more successful at soul-winning. Conventional wisdom would also lead one to predict that the pastor who spends more time on the job and who works at a higher level of task proficiency is likely to see better results. The findings give support to these ideas.

Like the high-baptism pastors, the more-effective pastors were more likely to have received academic honors, enjoyed greater membership growth, worked longer hours, and performed their tasks with greater proficiency. More intriguing were the findings that many of the more-effective pastors worked in large population centers and many of the less-effective pastors were in smaller population centers. Similarly, the more-effective pastors had younger-aged parishioners and the less-effective had older-aged congregants. In retrospect, more-effective and less-effective pastors should have been matched more carefully with respect to these demographic differences in order to preclude confounding variables from skewing the results.

The finding that more-effective pastors were more likely to have had broader career aspirations in ministry seems consistent with what might be expected of effective persons, as does the finding that they placed greater emphasis on sharing responsibility by training laity and
involving them in evangelism.

Of considerable practical value are the findings concerning task importance and time spent on task performance. Though appropriate caution should be exercised in generalizing the results, there is some clarity about what clergy and congregants consider most-important and least-important pastoral tasks. Time and effort should be apportioned accordingly, adjusted to the particular needs of the local church and conference.

Ineffective pastors can be coached to align their priorities and time allocations more closely to those of the effective pastors, and in the areas where they lack proficiency on particular tasks, in-service training or other remedial interventions may produce desirable outcomes.

The results of this investigation support the theory that pastoral effectiveness is related to both being and doing, characteristics and performance. The model of appraisal that measures intellectual ability, emotional stability, relational capability, and functional capacity, and assesses task priorities, time allocation and task proficiency as correlates of effectiveness, shows promise as a method of clergy performance evaluation.

Recommendations

A number of important issues emerge from this research with possible implications for educators,
conferences, pastors, and congregations.

Added to the evidence in the review of literature are the findings of this study that underscore the importance of intellectual functioning to productivity and effectiveness in pastoral ministry. In simple terms, those who did superior work academically were more likely to do superior work professionally, and those with Seminary training were likely to be more productive soul-winners than those without it.

At a time when the brightest young minds are eagerly sought after by other academic disciplines, serious efforts should be made to recruit such individuals to ministerial training assuming that they feel a call from God to ministry. Scholarships and grants should be made available to those who show greatest promise so that financial obstacles will not deter them from obtaining the necessary preparation for ministry.

The design of this study brought into focus the significant number of those classified as nonproductive and ineffective pastors in the surveyed conferences. Educators doubtless share part of the responsibility for this state of affairs when lenient admission policies and inadequate in-training evaluation procedures fail to identify those who will likely perform poorly in ministry. Guided towards careers better suited to their abilities, such individuals would probably perform better and achieve greater job satisfaction from doing what they are able to
do well.

This research has provided evidence to support what one believes intuitively, namely, pastors who are most productive and effective invest more time in what they do and do it better than substandard pastors. Naturally occurring diligence and dedication to the task, when observed in ministerial students, may prove useful in predicting superior pastoral performance because past behavior is often the best predictor of future behavior. Efforts to develop these characteristics in all candidates for ministry should be a part of their theological training.

There was a gratifying degree of agreement among pastors and lay leaders concerning most-important, and least-important pastoral tasks. Educators may need to make changes in curriculum in order to develop in students superior levels of competence in the performance of the pastoral tasks of highest ranking:

1. Practicing the spiritual disciplines of personal prayer and devotional Bible study
2. Training members for service within the congregation and for participation in its outreach program
3. Involving members in church-growth activities
4. Sermon preparation
5. Strategic planning and visioning
6. Ministry to children and youth
7. Pastoral care of sick and infirm members. Students obviously also need to develop competency in the performance of other pastoral tasks ranked important to pastoral effectiveness.

The ministerial directors who participated in this research are to be commended for their courage to identify nonproductive and ineffective pastors in their employment and thereby to acknowledge that the SDA church, like many other denominations, has pastors on its payroll who are unfruitful and poorly suited to ministry. The existence of this problem was confirmed by the pastoral respondents' own self-evaluations and by the lay leaders' evaluations of their pastors' performance.

This study provides a basis for applying a remedy to this problem. The first step would be to reevaluate hiring procedures to ensure that candidates for employment meet basic fitness, readiness, and competence standards as described in this research and in the literature on clergy assessment. If conferences refuse to hire candidates who do not meet employment criteria, educators will find good reason to ensure that their students are more carefully selected and that their graduates are adequately prepared for ministerial service. Second, ministerial directors could use the instruments designed for this research to reach agreement with clergy upon task priorities, apportionment of time per task, and task objectives at the start of a year, and then perform an annual review based
on that performance agreement. Clarified objectives and programmed accountability will likely motivate most pastors toward improvement in productivity and effectiveness. The instruments can also highlight areas of substandard proficiency which can be addressed by in-service training or other remedial efforts. In the event that a pastor is unwilling or unable to meet basic professional expectations, a compassionate process toward outplacement should be implemented. Appropriate caution should be exercised to preclude the misuse of the instruments and the misapplication of the findings of this research.

The research also revealed demographic factors that influence perceptions of pastoral effectiveness. Clergy who served in large population centers in congregations with many specialized ministries that were supported by younger church members were more likely to be viewed as effective. It would obviously be unfair to label the seed sower as ineffective and unproductive if the fault lies with infertile soil. Similarly, conference effectiveness expectations must be adjusted to correspond with the realities of the congregation and community where the pastor serves. Thus, as demonstrated by this research, pastoral effectiveness must be more broadly defined than by the single criterion of numbers of accessions to church membership.

Ideally, pastors would achieve distinction in all
five pastoral roles and excel at all 25 pastoral tasks identified in this research. In reality, pastors are more likely to do well in a few professional areas and adequately in many others. This being so, conferences are well-advised to align the strengths of pastors with the specific needs of congregations. The instruments from this study can facilitate the identification of pastoral strengths and limitations and congregational needs and aspirations so that a good match can be achieved between pastor and parish.

Some of the surveyed pastors wrote in unsolicited comments that the process of self-evaluation prompted by this research was very beneficial to them. It seems likely that when pastors, ministerial directors, and congregational leaders agree upon performance expectations that much of the anxiety and confusion produced by role ambiguity will be dissipated. Reluctance to submit to annual performance reviews should give way to enthusiasm when it becomes clear that the process of goal setting and progress assessment is not intended to be an inquisitorial exercise but rather a means of demonstrating one's competence and productivity within the realistic limits of the congregational context.

Sometimes pastors feel that conference administration has an inaccurate understanding of what they actually do and that misperceptions concerning pastoral effectiveness are the result. This model allows for pastors to initiate
a process of evaluation of their own professional practice that can serve as the basis for discussion with administration. If the record shows that performance objectives agreed by pastor and congregation were actually achieved, this evidence can be used to resolve differences. Pastors can also use the annual performance reviews to build a portfolio of their service attainments that will prove useful when opportunities for transfer or advancement are presented.

Lay leaders who evaluated their pastors' performance in this study were generally candid in their responses, due in part no doubt to the assurances of confidentiality that were given them. In order for laity to participate freely in ongoing discussions of pastoral performance objectives and evaluations of pastoral effectiveness, they will need to receive permission and encouragement from their ministers to do so. When the pitfalls that are clearly identified in the literature are avoided and the guidelines carefully followed, pastors and people may expect a new and higher level of cooperation as they team up to accomplish the purposes of the church in their community.

Many smaller congregations have no pastor or must share the services of a pastor with one or more other churches. The pastoral tasks identified in this research need to be performed whether or not there is a paid professional available. Congregations can therefore use
the instruments developed for this research to identify 
the relative importance of the 25 pastoral tasks to their 
congregation, determine how much time per week needs to 
be expended to adequately perform the needed tasks, and 
assign the tasks to laity in harmony with their gifts and 
abilities. In larger congregations, lay leaders may 
perform some or most of the pastoral tasks in order to 
free up the pastor's time so that he or she can focus on 
tasks and objectives of greatest importance to the church. 

The initiative may come from the pastor, the 
congregation, or from conference leadership to achieve 
agreement on pastoral roles, tasks, and objectives. Once 
the performance criteria are defined, the pastor will be 
clear about the basis for evaluation and can apportion 
time and effort accordingly. 

In view of the potential usefulness of the 
application of the results of this study, it seems 
advisable to commit resources to follow-up research and 
the experimental application of the results in selected 
conferences. 

For Further Study 

In the light of the findings of this study, 
researchers could formulate and perform additional 
analyses of the data accumulated by this research. 

Researchers could use other methods to measure 
different aspects of the intellectual, emotional,
relational, and functional domains in order to broaden the utility of this approach to the evaluation of Pastoral effectiveness.

Investigators could replicate this evaluative model in African-American, Hispanic, Asian, and other minority Adventist communities in North America.

Researchers could adapt this evaluation model to the needs of other Divisions of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, and for use with clergy of other denominations.
APPENDIX A

LETTERS
May 23, 1996

Ministerial Secretaries
Local Conferences

Dear Colleagues:

You are certainly aware that there is strong interest in finding a way to renew church growth and evangelism in the white, Anglo congregations. During the “evangelism think tank” process that Elder McClure set in motion about two years ago, one of the ideas that came to the surface was to study a sample of white, Anglo pastors who have demonstrated success in soul-winning to identify the elements that are part of their success.

We are working with Dr. Roger Dudley and his team at the Institute of Church Ministry in conducting this study. We need your cooperation in order to make it successful.

Please share with Roger the information that he needs to build a list for this specialized survey and please pray that the Lord will help to open our eyes through this research and see more clearly the things that will bring greater effectiveness to our mission.

If you have any questions, please don’t hesitate to phone either Roger at Andrews University or myself at the division office.

Sincerely,

Monte Sahlin
Assistant to the President
Ministerial Directors in NAD

Dear Colleagues:

The North American Division (NAD) has commissioned the Institute of Church Ministry (ICM) at Andrews University to conduct a significant study that will point to a more effective ministry in the white, Anglo churches. This project was voted at the 1994 Year-End Meeting. The goal voted was to study a cross-section of white, Anglo pastors who are effective soul-winners to look for any common denominators in education, experience, conference leadership, evangelistic programs, methods, personality profile, etc.

We have been planning the design of this study for several months now and have enlisted the service of Peter Swanson, who heads up the pastor counseling area at the Andrews University Seminary, to assist with the assessment and evaluation. In order to proceed we need your help to identify pastors from your conference who fall into four categories. On the enclosed list would you please give us:

1. The names of pastors in your conference who have baptized 50 or more people during the three-year period, 1993-1995.
2. The names of pastors in your conference who have baptized fewer than 10 people during the three-year period, 1993-1995.
3. The names of your three most effective pastors overall--preaching, spiritual nurture, church administration, community relations, church growth, etc.
4. The names of your three least effective pastors overall--preaching, spiritual nurture, church administration, community relations, church growth, etc.

Since the concern of this study is for the Anglo pastor, please exclude all pastors who are Black, Hispanic, Asian, or other language groups. Focus on White, English-speaking pastors. Also do not include those pastors of churches that are connected with major institutions such as colleges and hospitals since they represent a different dynamic.

Obviously, we are asking for very sensitive material, especially list 4. We pledge complete confidentiality to your responses. The identity and classification of the pastors will be known only to the researchers and will never be disclosed to anyone else.

Your best estimates, in response to this request, are essential to the outcome of the research, and your quick reply will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely your fellow worker,

Roger L. Dudley
PASTORAL EFFECTIVENESS - CATEGORY 1

Please list the names of Anglo pastors in your conference who had **fifty or more baptisms** during 1993-1995.

Do not include pastors who work in institutional congregations where ministers have specialized pastoral functions.

1. ________________________________
2. ________________________________
3. ________________________________
4. ________________________________
5. ________________________________
6. ________________________________

PASTORAL EFFECTIVENESS - CATEGORY 2

Please list the names of Anglo pastors in your conference who had **ten or fewer baptisms** during 1993-1995.

Do not include pastors who work in institutional congregations where ministers have specialized pastoral functions.

1. ________________________________
2. ________________________________
3. ________________________________
4. ________________________________
5. ________________________________
6. ________________________________
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PASTORAL EFFECTIVENESS - CATEGORY 3

In rank order, please list the names of three Anglo pastors in your conference who you consider to have been most effective in the performance of their pastoral responsibilities during 1993-1995.

Do not include pastors who work in institutional congregations where ministers have specialized pastoral functions.

1. ________________________________  
2. ________________________________  
3. ________________________________  

PASTORAL EFFECTIVENESS - CATEGORY 4

In rank order, please list the names of three Anglo pastors in your conference who you consider to have been least effective in the performance of their pastoral responsibilities during 1993-1995.

Do not include pastors who work in institutional congregations where ministers have specialized pastoral functions.

1. ________________________________  
2. ________________________________  
3. ________________________________  
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December 15, 1996

Dear Pastor:

You have been selected to participate in a very important study of pastoral ministry commissioned by a vote of the NAD Executive Committee. Please take the time to share with us the insights you have gained through your professional experience.

I have asked Dr. Roger Dudley and his associates at the Theological Seminary at Andrews University to implement this study through the Institute of Church Ministry. They have prepared three instruments to gather crucial information about effective pastoral ministry.

1. The ADVENTIST PASTOR INVENTORY asks for information about you and the congregation(s) you serve. Your candid responses will be most helpful.

2. The PASTORAL TASKS SURVEY describes 25 tasks that pastors typically perform. We need your help in ranking these tasks in the order of importance to your congregation(s).

3. A standard PERSONALITY PROFILE is included on a disk that you can slip into any IBM-compatible computer. Please arrange with a church member or friend for the use of a machine if you don't own one. You don't need to know anything about computers to complete this task.

In order to give careful and uninterrupted attention to the completion of these three items, I recommend that you plan to spend about two hours working on them in a place where you will not be disturbed.

I have asked that the information that you provide will be treated with the highest degree of respect and will be strictly confidential. In the processing of the data, your identity will be carefully protected and all response numerically coded prior to analysis to ensure complete privacy for all the participating pastors.

The NAD officers are strongly committed to the advancement and support of pastoral ministry in North America. We need your input from "the front line."

Sincerely,

Monte Sahlin, Assistant to the President

12501 Old Columbia Pike, Silver Spring, MD 20904-6600. Telephone (301) 680-6400, Fax (301) 680-6464
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INSTRUCTIONS FOR RETURNING MATERIALS

This material has been sent to you under the direction and authority of the North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists (NAD). The officers of NAD have asked that it be returned directly to the Institute of Church Ministry (ICM) at Andrews University which will be processing it for NAD.

Please reuse the envelope in which you received the material. Enclosed in the packet is a label addressed to ICM. Fasten that label over the one addressed to you, tape the envelope shut, and return it.

Inside your packet you will find sufficient postage to affix to the return envelope so you can send it first class without cost to you.

Remember to enclose the ADVENTIST PASTOR INVENTORY, the PASTORAL TASKS SURVEY, and the COMPUTER DISK. It is very important to return the materials to us.

Even if you decide not to participate, PLEASE SEND EVERYTHING BACK.

The leaders of NAD realize that they are asking for a sizable chunk of your valuable time. Your major reward is the satisfaction in knowing that you are contributing to the strengthening of pastoral ministry in this Division. In addition, in appreciation for the effort you are putting into this task, we will send you a CERTIFICATE WORTH $20.00 at AdventSource, the NAD supply center, if you return the packet completed so that it is postmarked within two weeks of your receiving it.

The few dollars that we are able to send you cannot begin to express how important your participation in this study is, or how much we appreciate your time and effort.

THANKS AGAIN!
Dear Pastor,

We are most thankful to you for returning the research materials to us. Please use the enclosed gift certificate to purchase something of value to you from Adventsource. We really do appreciate your participation!

In order to round out our research we need to get the perspective of pastoral roles and tasks from people in the pew. Several studies have shown that pastors and parishioners typically see the needs of the local congregation very differently. In fact, in some churches it is difficult to get any agreement at all from the members about how ministers should spend their time and what the pastoral priorities should be. In spite of these potential difficulties we would like to survey members in our Division in order to look at two areas of inquiry. The first is to assess the degree of agreement between laity and pastors about the needs and priorities of specific congregations; and the second is to get a general sense of what parishioners across North America perceive the pastoral roles and tasks to be.

We respect your understanding of the climate in your congregation and if in your judgment a survey of the opinions of about three of your church members would be disruptive or detrimental in any way, we need to hear from you immediately. If we do not hear from you within two weeks we will assume that we have your consent to proceed with the survey in your church.

In order to protect their privacy, and to ensure their freedom to be candid in their responses, the identity of participating lay members will not be divulged to pastors or anyone else. Everything that you told us about your congregations and your ministry, and all the survey responses from the lay members will be kept strictly confidential. The identity of all who respond will be known only to the researchers, and the report of the research findings will provide no possible link between the data and particular individuals or congregations.

It is our hope and prayer that the results of this study will be of great blessing to pastors and people as we work together to become more effective in fulfilling the commission of our Lord.

Sincerely yours,

Roger L. Dudley, Ed.D., Director
Institute of Church Ministry

North American Division Strategic Resource Center
BERRIEN SPRINGS, MICHIGAN 49104 • 616-471-3575
Dear Lay Leader:

You have been selected to participate in a very important study of pastoral roles and tasks commissioned by the North American Division Office of Information and Research. I invite and urge you to share with us your perspective, as a church leader, about what constitutes effective pastoral ministry in the local congregation. Your pastor has agreed that a number of his church members may be surveyed, however in order to allow you the freedom to give candid responses, he has not been told who will be invited to participate.

At our request, Dr. Roger Dudley of the Institute of church Ministry, and Professor Peter Swanson of the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary have agreed to conduct this research. They have assured me that the information you provide will be treated with the highest degree of respect and will be kept strictly confidential.

The numerical code on your questionnaire identifies your congregation while carefully protecting your privacy. Only the researchers will have access to the information you provide. Neither your pastor, nor Conference officers, nor anyone else will be able to link your responses to you or to your pastor.

In order to give careful and uninterrupted attention to the completion of the Pastoral Tasks questionnaire, I recommend that you plan to spend about thirty minutes working on it in a place where you will not be disturbed. It is not a timed test, so take your time and be sure to respond to all the questions. Remember that we need you own personal perspective as you respond to the questions. Try your best to be candid and as accurate as possible, avoiding any tendency to be overly generous or overly critical in your evaluation.

Please return the questionnaire as soon as possible in the enclosed envelope. It is very important to return the materials to us. Even if you decide not to participate, please send everything back.

I want to thank you very much for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Your participation will provide crucial information which we will use to enrich the work of our pastors.

Sincerely,

Monte Sahlin
Assistant to the President

12501 Old Columbia Pike, Silver Spring, MD 20904-6600, Telephone (301) 680-6400, Fax (301) 680-6464
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APPENDIX B

SURVEY INSTRUMENTS
THE ADVENTIST PASTOR INVENTORY

Please either circle the number of your choice or write the correct number in the blank.

How many years did you attend Adventist schools at each of the following levels
1. Grades 1 - 8 ........................................................................................................  years
2. Grades 9 - 12 ......................................................................................................  years
3. College ................................................................................................................  years

4. What was your major in college?

5. What seminary did you attend?
   1 Andrews University
   2 other seminary
   3 no seminary

6. What is the highest degree you have received?
   1 B.A. or B.S.
   2 M.A. or M.S.
   3 M.Div
   4 D.Min
   5 Ph.D., Th.D., or Ed.D.

7. In your college or university experience, have you ever received any scholastic honors?
   1 yes  2 no

8. Which best describes the pathway that you followed into the ministry?
   1 college to seminary to field
   2 college to field to seminary to field
   3 college to field

Did you have specific training in evangelism during college or seminary by any of the following means?
9. Public evangelism class/field school
   1 yes  2 no
10. Personal evangelism class/lab experience
    1 yes  2 no
11. Small group class/lab experience
    1 yes  2 no

12. In connection with the seminary, did you attend a ninth-quarter training program in evangelism?
    1 at N.A.D.E.I.
    2 some other program
    3 none

13. Did you have some other career before you decided to prepare for the ministry?
    1 yes  2 no
    If so, what? ________________________________________________________________

Are you presently engaged in any of these continuing-education programs?
14. Pursuing an advanced degree
    1 yes  2 no
15. Attending seminars
    1 yes  2 no
16. Home study course
    1 yes  2 no

17. Were you raised in an Adventist home?
    1 yes  2 no
18. If yes, were any one of your grandparents Adventist?
    1 yes  2 no

19. How old were you when you were baptized into the Adventist Church?
    ______ years
20. Did you ever drop out of the church for a period of time?  
   Yes  No
21. If you were an Adventist as a young person, were you 
active in faith-sharing?  
   Yes  No  not Adventist as a youth

22. Have you ever served a term as a student missionary? 
   Yes  No
23. Have you ever served as a Taskforce volunteer here in NAD? 
   Yes  No
24. Have you ever gone on a short-term mission project? 
   Yes  No
25. Have you ever worked as a literature evangelist? 
   Yes  No
26. Have you held evangelistic meetings as a pastor? 
   Yes  No
27. Did you work in full-time evangelism as an intern? 
   Yes  No
28. Have you ever worked as a full-time evangelist? 
   Yes  No

What kind of mentors or supervisors have you worked with in ministry?
29. Evangelist  
   Yes  No
30. Nurturer  
   Yes  No
31. Outstanding preacher  
   Yes  No
32. Trainer  
   Yes  No
33. Administrator  
   Yes  No

34. What is the largest city you have worked in? 
   1 up to 25,000  
   2 25,000 to 100,000  
   3 100,000 to 1,000,000  
   4 over 1,000,000

35. How many years have you been in the ministry?  
   ________ years
36. How many years have you been in your present pastoral position?  
   ________ years

Which of the following evangelistic methods have you employed?  
   1 = in the last year; 2 = in the last three years; 
   3 = not recently.
37. Held public meetings myself  
   last year 3 years longer
38. Hosted a visiting evangelist  
   last year 3 years longer
39. Held prophecy seminars (e.g., Revelation)  
   last year 3 years longer
40. Held felt-need seminars (e.g., stop-smoking)  
   last year 3 years longer
41. Conducted comprehensive lay training programs  
   last year 3 years longer
42. Used small-group method  
   last year 3 years longer
43. Program on local radio/TV  
   last year 3 years longer
44. Followed leads from media contacts  
   last year 3 years longer
45. Involved lay members in evangelism  
   last year 3 years longer
46. Sabbath services geared to non-members  
   last year 3 years longer
47. Other  

48. Approximately how many personal Bible studies with non-members 
do you hold in an average month?  
   ________ studies
49. Approximately how much time do you spend in 
prayer and personal Bible study each day?  
   ________ hours
Have you set long term goals for your ministry in the following categories? Yes No

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Earning an advanced degree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Moving into conference administration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Going into teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Finding a career in writing/editing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Working in chaplaincy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Becoming a full-time evangelist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Ministering in radio or television</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Pastoring a &quot;mega&quot; size church</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Moving into a specialized ministry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Planting and growing a new congregation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

60. What is your favorite hobby? _______________________________________________________

61. What do you consider to be your most outstanding talent? _____________________________

62. How many churches do you pastor at the present time? ________ churches

63. What was the membership of your church or district (if more than one church) at the end of 1992? ________ members

64. What was the membership of your church or district at the end of 1995? ________ members

65. How many were baptized into your church or district during the three-year period 1993 - 1995? ________ members

66. How many of these baptisms came from a non-Adventist background? ________ members

67. How many of these baptisms came from youth (19 years and under)? ________ youth

68. What is your average Sabbath worship attendance? ________ people

69. What is your average Sabbath school attendance? ________ people

Do you have any of the following conference employees assist you in your church district? Yes No

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>Youth pastor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>Associate pastor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>Ministerial intern</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

73. What was the total tithe for your district in 1993? $ __________________________

74. What was the total tithe for your district in 1995? $ __________________________

75. What percentage of your membership is actively involved in church activities (not just attending)? ________ %

76. How many years ago was your church organized? ________ years
77. In what kind of community is your main church located?
   1 urban
   2 suburban
   3 rural

78. Is your community more ...
   1 new and growing
   2 old and established

79. How many children and youth Sabbath school departments does your main church operate? _______ departments

80. Would you describe your worship services as more ...
   1 traditional
   2 a mixture
   3 contemporary

Which of these ministries does your church or district operate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ministry</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81. A church school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. A Community Services Center, inner city project, or homeless ministry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. A Pathfinder Club</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. An Adventist Youth Association</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. A women's organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. A men's organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. A divorce recovery group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. A grief recovery group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. A singles ministry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. A marriage support group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. A prison ministry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

92. Would you describe your main church building as ...
   1 very attractive
   2 quite attractive
   3 not very attractive

93. Is the atmosphere of your main congregation more ...
   1 supportive
   2 conflictual

94. What is the average age of your church membership?
   1 under 30 years
   2 30 - 45 years
   3 45 - 65 years
   4 over 65 years

How well does the conference support your local congregation in outreach programs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financially</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By furnishing personnel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By providing programs and materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

98. Does the conference have a helpful and functioning accountability structure for local pastors and congregations?
   1 yes
   2 no

**PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS.** All information is strictly confidential. **THANK YOU VERY MUCH.**
Rank the 5 tasks described on this page in order of importance to your largest congregation, from your own pastoral perspective.

First in importance is task # [ ]
Second in importance is task # [ ]
Third in importance is task # [ ]
Fourth in importance is task # [ ]
Fifth in importance is task # [ ]

In this column please give your best estimate of the average amount of time you normally spend in the performance of the numbered tasks. Try to be accurate to the nearest quarter hour, and include the time spent in ministry to all your congregations.

How many hours do you normally spend per week on Task # 1?
How many hours do you normally spend per week on Task # 2?
How many hours do you normally spend per week on Task # 3?
How many hours do you normally spend per week on Task # 4?
How many hours do you normally spend per week on Task # 5?

Please give your best estimate of the rating an impartial panel of pastors would give to the quality of your task-performance of the tasks described on this page by writing a letter in the space provided below.

The likely peer rating of my performance of task # 1 is [ ]
  a. much better than most other pastors.
The likely peer rating of my performance of task # 2 is [ ]
  b. better than the average pastor.
The likely peer rating of my performance of task # 3 is [ ]
  c. about the same as most other pastors.
The likely peer rating of my performance of task # 4 is [ ]
  d. not as good as most other pastors.
The likely peer rating of my performance of task # 5 is [ ]
  e. much worse than most other pastors.
Rank the 5 tasks described on this page in order of importance to your largest congregation, from your own pastoral perspective.

First in importance is task # | 
Second in importance is task # | 
Third in importance is task # | 
Fourth in importance is task # | 
Pifth in importance is task # | 

In this column please give your best estimate of the average amount of time you normally spend in the performance of the numbered tasks. Try to be accurate to the nearest quarter hour, and include the time spent in ministry to all your congregations.

How many hours do you normally spend per week on Task # 6?

How many hours do you normally spend per week on Task # 7?

How many hours do you normally spend per week on Task # 8?

How many hours do you normally spend per week on Task # 9?

How many hours do you normally spend per week on Task # 10?

Please give your best estimate of the rating an impartial panel of pastors would give to the quality of your task-performance of the tasks described on this page by writing a letter in the space provided below.

The likely peer rating of my performance of task # 6 is [ ]
    a. much better than most other pastors.
    b. better than the average pastor.
    c. about the same as most other pastors.
    d. not as good as most other pastors.
    e. much worse than most other pastors.

The likely peer rating of my performance of task # 7 is [ ]

The likely peer rating of my performance of task # 8 is [ ]

The likely peer rating of my performance of task # 9 is [ ]

The likely peer rating of my performance of task # 10 is [ ]
Rank the 5 tasks described on this page in order of importance to your largest congregation, from your own pastoral perspective.

- First in importance is task # 11.
- Second in importance is task # 12.
- Third in importance is task # 13.
- Fourth in importance is task # 14.
- Fifth in importance is task # 15.

In this column please give your best estimate of the average amount of time you normally spend in the performance of the numbered tasks. Try to be accurate to the nearest quarter hour, and include the time spent in ministry to all your congregations.

**TASK # 11**
The tasks of leading out in worship and preaching during the regular services of the church and during special services such as weddings and funerals, and mid-week prayer meetings.

**TASK # 12**
The tasks of making church-related phone calls, writing church-related letters, and following up on parishioner requests.

**TASK # 13**
The tasks of making regular home visits to members of the congregation.

**TASK # 14**
The tasks of preparing for, and teaching the pastor's Bible class.

**TASK # 15**
The tasks of reclaiming and reintegrating lost and inactive church members into church fellowship.

How many hours do you normally spend per week on Task # 11?

How many hours do you normally spend per week on Task # 12?

How many hours do you normally spend per week on Task # 13?

How many hours do you normally spend per week on Task # 14?

How many hours do you normally spend per week on Task # 15?

Please give your best estimate of the rating an impartial panel of pastors would give to the quality of your task-performance of the tasks described on this page by writing a letter in the space provided below.

| The likely peer rating of my performance of task # 11 is | a. much better than most other pastors. |
| The likely peer rating of my performance of task # 12 is | b. better than the average pastor. |
| The likely peer rating of my performance of task # 13 is | c. about the same as most other pastors. |
| The likely peer rating of my performance of task # 14 is | d. not as good as most other pastors. |
| The likely peer rating of my performance of task # 15 is | e. much worse than most other pastors. |
Rank the 5 tasks described on this page in order of importance to your largest congregation, from your own pastoral perspective.

| First in importance is task # |  |
| Second in importance is task # |  |
| Third in importance is task # |  |
| Fourth in importance is task # |  |
| Fifth in importance is task # |  |

In this column please give your best estimate of the average amount of time you normally spend in the performance of the numbered tasks. Try to be accurate to the nearest quarter hour, and include the time spent in ministry to all your congregations.

| TASK # 16 | How many hours do you normally spend per week on Task # 16? |
| Task # 16 | The tasks of public and private intercessory prayer on behalf of church members, the needs of the congregation, and lost sinners. |

| TASK # 17 | How many hours do you normally spend per week on Task # 17? |
| Task # 17 | The tasks of visioning, strategic planning, and working with the members to formulate the goals and objectives of the church. |

| TASK # 18 | How many hours do you normally spend per week on Task # 18? |
| Task # 18 | The tasks of attending church-related social events, and spending informal time associating with church members. |

| TASK # 19 | How many hours do you normally spend per week on Task # 19? |
| Task # 19 | The tasks of teaching, instructing, modeling, and ministering to the children and youth of the church. |

| TASK # 20 | How many hours do you normally spend per week on Task # 20? |
| Task # 20 | The tasks of working with community organizations and other churches to provide assistance to the needy, and to address pressing social issues. |

Please give your best estimate of the rating an impartial panel of pastors would give to the quality of your task-performance of the tasks described on this page by writing a letter in the space provided below.

The likely peer rating of my performance of task # 16 is [ ]
- a. much better than most other pastors.
- b. better than the average pastor.
- c. about the same as most other pastors.
- d. not as good as most other pastors.
- e. much worse than most other pastors.

The likely peer rating of my performance of task # 17 is [ ]

The likely peer rating of my performance of task # 18 is [ ]

The likely peer rating of my performance of task # 19 is [ ]

The likely peer rating of my performance of task # 20 is [ ]
Rank the 5 tasks described on this page in order of importance to your largest congregation, from your own pastoral perspective:

- First in importance is task # [ ]
- Second in importance is task # [ ]
- Third in importance is task # [ ]
- Fourth in importance is task # [ ]
- Fifth in importance is task # [ ]

In this column please give your best estimate of the average amount of time you normally spend in performance of the numbered tasks. Try to be accurate to the nearest quarter hour, and include the time spent in ministry to all your congregations.

| TASK # 21 | How many hours do you normally spend per week on Task # 21? |
| Task # 21 | The tasks of planning the sermonic year, arranging for guest preachers, and choosing sermon topics to meet members' needs. |
| TASK # 22 | How many hours do you normally spend per week on Task # 22? |
| Task # 22 | The tasks associated with the management of church finances and fund raising. |
| TASK # 23 | How many hours do you normally spend per week on Task # 23? |
| Task # 23 | The tasks of confronting members who need pastoral admonition or reproof, and bringing resolution to congregational conflicts. |
| TASK # 24 | How many hours do you normally spend per week on Task # 24? |
| Task # 24 | The tasks of devotional Bible study, personal prayer, and the spiritual exercises that undergird an exemplary life and the modeling of Christian graces and virtues. |
| TASK # 25 | How many hours do you normally spend per week on Task # 25? |
| Task # 25 | The tasks of preparing for, and conducting public evangelistic meetings and/or felt-needs evangelism such as stop-smoking clinics. |

Please give your best estimate of the rating an impartial panel of pastors would give to the quality of your task-performance of the tasks described on this page by writing a letter in the space provided below.

| The likely peer rating of my performance of task # 21 is | a. much better than most other pastors. |
| The likely peer rating of my performance of task # 22 is | b. better than the average pastor. |
| The likely peer rating of my performance of task # 23 is | c. about the same as most other pastors. |
| The likely peer rating of my performance of task # 24 is | d. not as good as most other pastors. |
| The likely peer rating of my performance of task # 25 is | e. much worse than most other pastors. |
From the 25 tasks described in this survey please rank order the 5 tasks MOST essential to pastoral effectiveness for Adventist pastors.

The most important task for pastors to perform well is task #
The second most important task for pastors to perform well is task #
The third most important task for pastors to perform well is task #
The fourth most important task for pastors to perform well is task #
The fifth most important task for pastors to perform well is task #

From the 25 tasks described in this survey please rank order the 5 tasks LEAST essential to pastoral effectiveness for Adventist pastors.

The least important task for pastors to perform well is task #
The second least important task for pastors to perform well is task #
The third least important task for pastors to perform well is task #
The fourth least important task for pastors to perform well is task #
The fifth least important task for pastors to perform well is task #

In the space below please describe any significant task that you perform as part of your regular pastoral responsibilities that was NOT included among the 25 tasks described in this survey.

An impartial panel of pastors would probably rate my performance of this task as:

a. much better than most other pastors.
b. better than the average pastor.
c. about the same as most other pastors.
d. not as good as most other pastors.
e. much worse than most other pastors.

How many hours do you normally spend per week on this task?

The Pastoral Tasks Survey is protected by Copyright (C) 1996 Peter Swanson.
There are five pastoral tasks described on this page. Please rank them in order of importance to your congregation.

First in importance is task A | | |
Second in importance is task B | | |
Third in importance is task C | | |
Fourth in importance is task D | | |
Fifth in importance is task E | | |

Please circle a letter in each of the boxes in this column to indicate the amount of time you think your pastor is spending at present on the different tasks described on this page.

I THINK OUR PASTOR SPENDS
a. too much time on Task A
b. too little time on Task A
c. just enough time on Task A

I THINK OUR PASTOR SPENDS
a. too much time on Task B
b. too little time on Task B
c. just enough time on Task B

I THINK OUR PASTOR SPENDS
a. too much time on Task C
b. too little time on Task C
c. just enough time on Task C

I THINK OUR PASTOR SPENDS
a. too much time on Task D
b. too little time on Task D
c. just enough time on Task D

I THINK OUR PASTOR SPENDS
a. too much time on Task E
b. too little time on Task E
c. just enough time on Task E

Please give your best estimate of the quality of your pastor's performance of the tasks described on this page by writing a letter in the space provided below.

The quality of our pastor's performance of task A is [ | | ]
   a. much better than most other pastors.
   b. better than the average pastor.
   c. about the same as most other pastors.
   d. not as good as most other pastors.
   e. much worse than most other pastors.

The quality of our pastor's performance of task B is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task C is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task D is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task E is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task F is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task G is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task H is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task I is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task J is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task K is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task L is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task M is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task N is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task O is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task P is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task Q is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task R is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task S is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task T is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task U is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task V is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task W is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task X is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task Y is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task Z is [ | | ]

Please give your best estimate of the quality of your pastor's performance of the tasks described on this page by writing a letter in the space provided below.

The quality of our pastor's performance of task A is [ | | ]
   a. much better than most other pastors.
   b. better than the average pastor.
   c. about the same as most other pastors.
   d. not as good as most other pastors.
   e. much worse than most other pastors.

The quality of our pastor's performance of task B is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task C is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task D is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task E is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task F is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task G is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task H is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task I is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task J is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task K is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task L is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task M is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task N is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task O is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task P is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task Q is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task R is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task S is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task T is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task U is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task V is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task W is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task X is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task Y is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task Z is [ | | ]

Please give your best estimate of the quality of your pastor's performance of the tasks described on this page by writing a letter in the space provided below.

The quality of our pastor's performance of task A is [ | | ]
   a. much better than most other pastors.
   b. better than the average pastor.
   c. about the same as most other pastors.
   d. not as good as most other pastors.
   e. much worse than most other pastors.

The quality of our pastor's performance of task B is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task C is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task D is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task E is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task F is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task G is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task H is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task I is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task J is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task K is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task L is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task M is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task N is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task O is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task P is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task Q is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task R is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task S is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task T is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task U is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task V is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task W is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task X is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task Y is [ | | ]

The quality of our pastor's performance of task Z is [ | | ]

Please give your best estimate of the quality of your pastor's performance of the tasks described on this page by writing a letter in the space provided below.

The quality of our pastor's performance of task A is [ | | ]
   a. much better than most other pastors.
   b. better than the average pastor.
   c. about the same as most other pastors.
   d. not as good as most other pastors.
   e. much worse than most other pastors.
**Pastoral Tasks Questionnaire - Page 2**

There are five pastoral tasks described on this page. Please indicate how important they are to your congregation.

**First in importance is task #** [ ]

**Second in importance is task #** [ ]

**Third in importance is task #** [ ]

**Fourth in importance is task #** [ ]

**Fifth in importance is task #** [ ]

Please circle a letter in each of the boxes in this column to indicate the amount of time you think your pastor is spending at present on the different tasks described on this page.

**I THINK OUR PASTOR SPENDS**

a. too much time on Task # 6
b. too little time on Task # 6
c. just enough time on Task # 6

**I THINK OUR PASTOR SPENDS**

a. too much time on Task # 7
b. too little time on Task # 7
c. just enough time on Task # 7

**I THINK OUR PASTOR SPENDS**

a. too much time on Task # 8
b. too little time on Task # 8
c. just enough time on Task # 8

**I THINK OUR PASTOR SPENDS**

a. too much time on Task # 9
b. too little time on Task # 9
c. just enough time on Task # 9

**I THINK OUR PASTOR SPENDS**

a. too much time on Task # 10
b. too little time on Task # 10
c. just enough time on Task # 10

---

**Task # 6**

The tasks of planning the details for regular worship services and for special services such as weddings and funerals, and working with worship participants in preparation for their roles.

**I THINK OUR PASTOR SPENDS**

a. too much time on Task # 6
b. too little time on Task # 6
c. just enough time on Task # 6

**Task # 7**

The tasks associated with the preparation of the announcement bulletin, and the church newsletter.

**I THINK OUR PASTOR SPENDS**

a. too much time on Task # 7
b. too little time on Task # 7
c. just enough time on Task # 7

**Task # 8**

The tasks of visiting church members who are sick in hospital, those who are bereaved and grieving, the disabled, and elderly shut-ins.

**I THINK OUR PASTOR SPENDS**

a. too much time on Task # 8
b. too little time on Task # 8
c. just enough time on Task # 8

**Task # 9**

The task of conducting small-group ministry to promote the spiritual growth and maturity of church members.

**I THINK OUR PASTOR SPENDS**

a. too much time on Task # 9
b. too little time on Task # 9
c. just enough time on Task # 9

**Task # 10**

The tasks of motivating, involving, and supporting church members in soul-winning, and church-growth activities.

**I THINK OUR PASTOR SPENDS**

a. too much time on Task # 10
b. too little time on Task # 10
c. just enough time on Task # 10

---

Please give your best estimate of the quality of your pastor's performance of the tasks described on this page by writing a letter in the space provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The quality of our pastor's performance of task # 6 is</th>
<th>a. much better than most other pastors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The quality of our pastor's performance of task # 7 is</td>
<td>b. better than the average pastor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of our pastor's performance of task # 8 is</td>
<td>c. about the same as most other pastors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of our pastor's performance of task # 9 is</td>
<td>d. not as good as most other pastors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of our pastor's performance of task # 10 is</td>
<td>e. much worse than most other pastors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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There are five pastoral tasks described on this page. Please indicate how important they are to your congregation.

First in importance is task # 1
Second in importance is task # 2
Third in importance is task # 3
Fourth in importance is task # 4
Fifth in importance is task # 5

Please circle a letter in each of the boxes in this column to indicate the amount of time you think your pastor is spending at present on the different tasks described on this page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK # 11</th>
<th>I THINK OUR PASTOR SPENDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The tasks of leading out in worship and preaching during the regular services of the church and during special services such as weddings and funerals, and mid-week prayer meetings. | a. too much time on Task # 11  
b. too little time on Task # 11  
c. just enough time on Task # 11 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK # 12</th>
<th>I THINK OUR PASTOR SPENDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The tasks of making church-related phone calls, writing church-related letters, and following up on parisioner requests. | a. too much time on Task # 12  
b. too little time on Task # 12  
c. just enough time on Task # 12 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK # 13</th>
<th>I THINK OUR PASTOR SPENDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The task of making regular home visits to members of the congregation. | a. too much time on Task # 13  
b. too little time on Task # 13  
c. just enough time on Task # 13 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK # 14</th>
<th>I THINK OUR PASTOR SPENDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The tasks of preparing for and teaching the pastor's Bible class. | a. too much time on Task # 14  
b. too little time on Task # 14  
c. just enough time on Task # 14 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK # 15</th>
<th>I THINK OUR PASTOR SPENDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The tasks of reclaiming and reintegrating lost and inactive church members into church fellowship. | a. too much time on Task # 15  
b. too little time on Task # 15  
c. just enough time on Task # 15 |

Please give your best estimate of the quality of your pastor's performance of the tasks described on this page by writing a letter in the space provided below.

| The quality of our pastor's performance of task # 11 is | a. much better than most other pastors.  
b. better than the average pastor.  
c. about the same as most other pastors.  
d. not as good as most other pastors.  
e. much worse than most other pastors. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The quality of our pastor's performance of task # 12 is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of our pastor's performance of task # 13 is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of our pastor's performance of task # 14 is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of our pastor's performance of task # 15 is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are five pastoral tasks described on this page. Please indicate how important they are to your congregation.

First in importance is task
Second in importance is task
Third in importance is task
Fourth in importance is task
Fifth in importance is task

Please circle a letter in each of the boxes in this column to indicate the amount of time you think your pastor is spending at present on the different tasks described on this page.

TASK # 16
The tasks of public and private intercessory prayer on behalf of church members, the needs of the congregation, and lost sinners.

I THINK OUR PASTOR SPENDS
a. too much time on Task # 16
b. too little time on Task # 16
c. just enough time on Task # 16

TASK # 17
The tasks of visioning, strategic planning, and working with the members to formulate the goals and objectives of the church.

I THINK OUR PASTOR SPENDS
a. too much time on Task # 17
b. too little time on Task # 17
c. just enough time on Task # 17

TASK # 18
The tasks of attending church-related social events, and spending informal time associating with church members.

I THINK OUR PASTOR SPENDS
a. too much time on Task # 18
b. too little time on Task # 18
c. just enough time on Task # 18

TASK # 20
The tasks of working with community organizations and other churches to provide assistance to the needy, and to address pressing social issues.

I THINK OUR PASTOR SPENDS
a. too much time on Task # 20
b. too little time on Task # 20
c. just enough time on Task # 20

Please give your best estimate of the quality of your pastor’s performance of the tasks described on this page by writing a letter in the space provided below.

The quality of our pastor’s performance of task # 16 is
a. much better than most other pastors.
b. better than the average pastor.
c. about the same as most other pastors.
d. not as good as most other pastors.
e. much worse than most other pastors.

The quality of our pastor’s performance of task # 17 is
The quality of our pastor’s performance of task # 18 is
The quality of our pastor’s performance of task # 19 is
The quality of our pastor’s performance of task # 20 is
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There are five pastoral tasks described on this page. Please indicate how important they are to your congregation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>First in importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle a letter in each of the boxes in this column to indicate the amount of time you think your pastor is spending at present on the different tasks described on this page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>I think our pastor spends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>a. too much time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>b. too little time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>c. just enough time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>a. too much time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>b. too little time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. just enough time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please give your best estimate of the quality of your pastor's performance of the tasks described on this page by writing a letter in the space provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>The quality of our pastor's performance is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>a. much better than most other pastors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>b. better than the average pastor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>c. about the same as most other pastors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>d. not as good as most other pastors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>e. much worse than most other pastors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the 25 tasks described in this survey please rank order the 5 tasks that you think are MOST essential to pastoral effectiveness for Adventist Pastors in North America.

The most important task for pastors to perform well is task #
The second most important task for pastors to perform well is task #
The third most important task for pastors to perform well is task #
The fourth most important task for pastors to perform well is task #
The fifth most important task for pastors to perform well is task #

From the 25 tasks described in this survey please rank order the 5 tasks that you think are LEAST essential to pastoral effectiveness for Adventist Pastors in North America.

The least important task for pastors to perform well is task #
The second least important task for pastors to perform well is task #
The third least important task for pastors to perform well is task #
The fourth least important task for pastors to perform well is task #
The fifth least important task for pastors to perform well is task #

In the space below please describe any significant task that your pastor performs as part of his/her regular pastoral responsibilities that was NOT included among the 25 tasks described in this survey.


Please give your best estimate of the quality of your pastor's performance of this task:

a. much better than most other pastors.
b. better than the average pastor.
c. about the same as most other pastors.
d. not as good as most other pastors.
e. much worse than most other pastors.

My pastor spends (a) too much (b) too little (c) just enough time on this task.

The Pastoral Tasks Questionnaire is protected by Copyright (C) 1996 Peter Swanson.
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