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Abstract

This thesis develops a questionnaire Ministry Today to examine the leadership predispositions and characteristics of 100 clergy in the Chester Diocese and to explore the relationship between leadership and church growth. The data were collected using a paper copy of the questionnaire mailed to all clergy in leadership roles in the Diocese. The majority of the data collected were quantitative, but a free format section was provided for clergy to add comments. The main element of the survey was the commercial psychometric instrument Glowinkowski Predispositions Indicator (GPI); this has been used widely as part of consultancy interventions, in business, education and not-for-profit organisations, but had not been used previously with clergy. The clergy also completed Francis Psychological Type Scale (FPTS), and the Francis Burnout Inventory (FBI).

The primary research question is the examination of the GPI and its value and benefit for modelling church growth. Section one presents reviews of literature covering leadership in secular businesses and churches, a summary of previous research using psychological type theory with religious leaders and a review of the GPI construct definitions. Section two describes the design of the survey and presents the results and analysis. The GPI results are examined in three ways, initially presenting the profiles for all of the clergy who completed the survey using the commercial format used by Glowinkowski International (GIL) in their consultancy business. Secondly the GPI construct was examined using the clergy responses and finally GPI profiles were compared for clergy working in churches which are growing, remaining steady or declining.

The commercial data format finds that the GPI provides new insights into the Chester Diocesan clergy, as a distinctive group of professional people. Close analysis of the clergy responses show there are areas where the wording in the survey may need to be modified for future use among clergy. The analysis of the GPI profiles for clergy in the three groups of churches did not present statistically significant differences, although this may have been influenced by the relatively small sample sizes available in this study.
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Introduction

This study, explores the relationship between leaders (based on their leadership characteristics and behaviours) and the resulting impact which they have on church growth. For the purposes of this study, growth is defined as an increase in numerical attendance and the statistics are drawn from the data which is published by the Church of England.

There are three primary research questions being addressed within this study:

- When using GPI as presented commercially what does it tell us about the clergy as a group?
- When GPI is opened to close examination how does it function among clergy?
- Does the GPI generate insights into differences in clergy who are managing decline and those who are resisting decline?

Commentators in the media and academe have highlighted the decline in church attendance, and some, such as Brown (2001) and Bruce (2002) have suggested that this decline is terminal. The statistics published by a number of denominations in the UK have indicated decline in attendances, over a number of years. However, some of the predictions of terminal decline have been recently challenged (see, Davie 2002; Green & Cottrell 2006). They examined the data and commented on the complexity of the situation along with the range of factors involved, and have drawn different conclusions.

Jackson (2005), Brierley (2006), Goodhew (2012), Lankshear and Francis (2011) have suggested that there are signs of growth occurring within some Dioceses and Denominations, in particular the Pentecostal churches. A number of these writers suggest that leadership is one of the critical factors which support growth, but the claims are not generally supported by research-based evidence.

There have been some strategic initiatives adopted by the Church of England nationally and at Diocesan level, designed to encourage churches to adopt a more outward focus on the communities which they are serving, and to make strategic choices about how they deploy limited resources. Examples of these initiatives include, Church of England (2004)
and Growth Action Planning process (Chester Diocese website), this latter process is now in its fourth year. There have been no major initiatives which addressed the theme of leadership and its relationship to numerical growth and spiritual maturity; however some work was published recently (Voas, 2014).

Section 1 provides the literature reviews and the theoretical frameworks which are adopted within this research.

Chapter 1 draws selectively on the literature which covers the field of leadership in secular organizations, showing how the models have evolved over time, with the recognition that leaders who are able to motivate and align the skills and capabilities of all of the people for whom they are responsible, generate significant benefits for the individuals and their organisations.

Chapter 2 examines leadership in the churches and this shows that the leadership models are less well developed and have not been as fully exploited as those in the secular organizations.

Chapter 3 looks at psychological type theory as it has been applied to church leaders and their congregations connecting with Francis Psychological Type Scale (FPTS) which is included in the clergy questionnaire.

Chapter 4 presents the Glowinkowski Predisposition Indicator (GPI) psychometric instrument which was designed for use in commercial business consultancy interventions. The GPI has not been tested with church leaders, nor have the commercial business case studies been published in academic journals. Examples of its application have been presented at conferences and in a book by Glowinkowski (2010). An additional feature of the GPI instrument is that the results it generates can be linked by correlations to a model of Leadership style, Behaviours and Competencies, which generates additional learning for individuals and teams. Glowinkowski International Limited (GIL) when applying the GPI instrument, in their consultancy work, requires that individuals and teams are provided with detailed feedback, using a unique Glowinkowski Integrated Framework Model. This methodology serves to differentiate the GPI and its associated instruments from the approaches adopted by other businesses that employ psychometric instruments. They do not always take time to fully explain the significance of the results and the implications for
the individuals involved, this lack of detailed feedback can mean that individuals are unable to consider how they may modify their behaviour in order to deliver the necessary improvements within their businesses. Details of this framework are presented in Appendix 1.

Section 2 provides the research data and analysis resulting from the application of the theoretical models described in Section 1. It addresses three research questions and draws conclusions as well as providing suggestions for future research studies.

Chapter 5 provides an outline of the research methodology adopted, including the design of the quantitative survey and the main areas addressed. The study uses attendance data provided by the Church of England (average and usual Sunday attendance aSa and uSa), as the primary measure of church growth.

Chapter 6 Introduces the Chester Diocesan clergy providing an overview of their responses to the survey. It briefly comments on the results provided by the use of Francis Personality Type Scale and Francis Burnout Indicator.

Chapter 7 presents the clergy GPI data, in the commercial feedback format adopted when the tool is used in consultancy. It discusses the learning and insights which these presentations provide for individuals and the group as a whole.

Chapters 8-13 are a set of chapters which look in detail at the construct of the GPI and its validity and reliability, along with the clergy responses and predispositions.

Chapter 14 explores the clergy GPI's correlated with attendance statistics. It includes a test for statistical significance of the GPI profiles for clergy in growing and declining churches. It also presents and discussions the detail of a set of the commercial GPI formats for those clergy who are serving in churches which are growing, steady or declining.

Chapter 15 discusses and summarises the results obtained, in particular the GPI research questions and considers if there is evidence which indicates that by using the GPI it is possible to demonstrate relationships between leadership behaviours and church growth. The chapter also comments on some potential implications which arise from this study for the senior clergy in the Chester Diocese.
Section 1

Literature reviews and theoretical frameworks

This section provides a review of the literature on leadership as exercised in secular business organisations and in churches. It presents the changes which are taking place as the models evolve to deal with the challenges which are described by leaders in situ, as growing in intensity. It addresses the relevance of these models of leadership for church leaders, in particular for those who are seeking to reverse the decline in church attendances and to reach out with the message of the gospel.

An important theme which emerges from the study of secular organisations is that those leaders who are able to engage the energy, to value the gifting and to motivate their staff by collaborating in a partnership mode, are more effective in achieving their objectives and are seen to be transforming the performance of their businesses. The possibility of transferring this learning into churches and encouraging clergy and lay members to collaborate and work together is a core theme of this study.

There is a brief review of the research literature which covers psychological type theory and its previous use with church leaders and their congregations. The Francis Psychological Type Scale (FPTS) was included within this current study.

The final section covers the construction and development of the Glowinkowski Predisposition Indicator (GPI), including its structure and definitions. This instrument is the primary focus for this research, which is testing the value and benefits of the GPI for modelling church growth.
Chapter 1

Leadership in secular organisations

1.1 Introduction and summary

This literature review deals primarily with those facets of leadership which are most relevant to the present research study. These cover the ways in which leadership is exercised and the impact which different leadership strategies have on individuals and corporate organisations.

Northouse (2010, p.1) states, in *Leadership: Theory and practice* that the literature on the subject of leadership is extensive and diverse and that researchers have developed a range of theories in order to describe the complexities of the leadership process. Therefore, as the topic is so broad, it is appropriate to focus on those areas of the literature which bear a direct relationship to the leadership concepts being researched.

The review begins with a section on *What is Leadership—some definitions* and discusses the major impact which Leadership has on the performance outcomes in secular organizations. There is an examination of the evidence which claims that there is a casual link between the behaviours of leaders and the performance delivered by individuals, teams or corporate bodies. It includes an exploration of the theory of competencies and their identification, focusing on those competencies which are described as ‘distinguishing’ and which are claimed to contribute to a differentiated performance from individuals and teams. When these ‘distinguishing’ competencies are fully developed, they lead to significant improvements in business performance, as evaluated by both hard and soft measures. Strategic performance management aims to link ‘hard measures’ business goals, operational targets and the business strategy with ‘soft measures’ such as employee motivation and organisation culture. The review outlines the relationship between competencies and the concepts examined within the field of personality psychology. This concentration on competencies is included because leadership competencies and their associated behaviours, which lead to successful outcomes, are core elements of this study.

This review provides a broad brush overview of how theories of leadership have been developed over recent years but then focuses on those studies which demonstrate that
researchers have moved from an examination of the theories of leadership and how it is delivered, to more measured examinations of how the different approaches to leadership and leadership behaviours have been shown to create enhanced business performance. It examines those studies which emphasise the leadership behaviours which have been shown to generate sustained long-term improvements and those behaviours delivered by leaders who are seeking to engage and to motivate all the people in their organization. These improved results have been recorded in private and public businesses as well as not-for-profit organizations.

Those studies which demonstrate a relationship between leadership behaviours and the delivery of successful outcomes across a range of sectors are especially important for this research project, which is setting out to test how the transference of learning from businesses to church communities can contribute to the creation of a climate and culture where both clergy and lay members are able to work together in partnership and generate real opportunities for church growth.

One purpose of this review is to emphasise the extensive body of literature which demonstrates the successful impact of leadership behaviours within business organisations, perhaps suggesting that the hypotheses of leadership being tested in this project may be shown to be equally valid within churches.

1.2 What is leadership—some definitions

There is recurring theme running through the literature on leadership, which stresses the complexity of the topic, and researchers comment that the challenges which face leaders today are both increasing in intensity as well as changing rapidly. In fact, it is difficult to find a comprehensive definition of leadership on which researchers worldwide will agree and hence the definitions as set out in the literature tend to focus on certain facets of the overall leadership process, tasks and challenges, rather than adopting definitions which provide a holistic picture of leadership. This section provides a small selection of the definitions which have been provided, to demonstrate the diversity of approaches. The fact that there is no common thread through these examples reinforces the case that a definition which has universal acceptance is difficult to attain.

For example, Barton et al, (2012, p.1), Leading in the 21st Century, state:
It is often said that the principles of great leadership are timeless, or based on immutable truths. When we meet with the men and women who run the world's largest organizations, what we hear with increasing frequency is how different everything feels from just a decade ago. Leaders tell us they are operating in a bewildering new environment in which little is certain, the tempo is quicker and the dynamics are more complex.

They develop this point further, drawing on their exchanges with a number of global business leaders suggesting that, in their view:

> today's leaders face extraordinary new challenges and must learn to think differently about their role and how they fulfil it. Those who do so may have an opportunity to change the world in ways their predecessors never imagined. (Barton et al, 2012, p.1).

This same point about speed of change and opportunities is expressed by Kotter (1998, pp. 37-60), *What Leaders Really Do*:

> Leadership is most fundamentally, about changes. What leaders do is create the systems and organizations that managers need, and eventually, elevate them up to a whole new level or... change in some basic ways to take advantage of new opportunities (p.1).

Yukl (2006, p. 8) adopts a slightly different approach in choosing to define leadership as ‘the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives;’ thus emphasising the benefits of a partnership approach to leadership.

Similarly Northouse (2010, p. 3), defines leadership as ‘a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal’ again placing a strong emphasis on processes which encourage people to collaborate and work together, rather than feel that they are being coerced or directed by the leader.

This view that leadership is complex and difficult to define is further supported in a review by Avolio et al, (2009). When drawing on a range of sources they suggest that ‘Leadership is no longer simply described as an individual characteristic or difference, but rather is depicted in various models as dyadic, shared, relational, strategic, global and a complex social dynamic’ (Avolio , 2007; Yukl, 2006, p. 422-423).
These ideas of complexity and diversity are further reinforced in a study by Stogdill (1974, p.7) who states that:

there are almost as many different definitions of leadership as there are people who have tried to define it. It is much like the words democracy, love and peace. Although each of us intuitively knows what we mean by such words, the words have widely different meaning for different people.

Kouzes and Posner (2007), in *The Future of Leadership*, suggested that ‘Self-awareness is central to being a successful leader’ stressing the need for leaders to fully understand and be aware of the impact which their behaviours have on those whom they are trying to influence. This requirement for leaders to develop a deep sense of self-awareness is further developed by Walsh (2010, pp.1-5). In a white paper he argues that:

Leadership is about two aspects; Leading self: inspiring ourselves to do what we truly want to do and, Leading others: inspiring others to achieve a shared vision.

He suggests:

A leadership culture is one where everyone is a leader at their own level, a culture where everyone is reaching their true potential, synergistically in pursuit of common goals.

This approach to leadership, highlighted by these authors and the definitions which they present, resonates strongly with that employed by a number of global businesses including the ICI Group. ICI adopted this strategy when investing in education, learning and development processes for all of their staff, independent of level or seniority. The business was seeking to create a climate which encouraged staff to release and realize their full potential.

Such definitions of leadership, and the concepts which underpin them, are at the core of this research project, which is testing the belief that when leaders understand their own strengths, skills, competencies, personality and capabilities, then it is possible to exploit that knowledge, to work in partnership and in a collaborative manner, aiming for a common purpose, for the common good. It is suggested that these principles hold true, whether that strategy is applied when driving an agenda of excellence within a business or in a different setting, where leaders seek to fulfil Christ’s commission within the context of a church (Matthew 28). One of the key beliefs being tested is that when leadership is
exercised in an open, empowering and collaborative manner it will deliver real benefits and successful outcomes whatever the organizational setting.

1.3 Leadership theories--a brief overview of the evolving theories and models

Boden et al, (2003), working at The Centre for Leadership Studies, produced a major report, *A Review of Leadership Theory and Competency Frameworks*. This document explains how the theories of leadership have evolved, from approaches which looked at ‘great man theories’ taking leaders such as Churchill and other historical figures, and have progressed through a series of theories characterized as trait, behaviourist, situational, contingency, transactional and transformational.

The *Trait approach* which was developed from the ‘Great Man’ theory attempted to identify the key characteristics of successful leaders. However this approach was unwieldy because of the very long lists of characteristics which were claimed to be important. These failed to provide a clear picture which would allow aspiring leaders to focus on a smaller number of key qualities which it was felt could make a difference when they were discharging their leadership roles.

The theories moved on to a *Behavioural School* led by McGregor (1960), *The Human Side of Enterprise*. He set the tone for the Behavioural Theories with his classic analysis and summary of Theory X and Theory Y Managers, which placed a major emphasis on the importance of developing human relationships, while continuing to meet the required output and performance targets.

Whilst these Behavioural theories did show managers that leadership behaviours were important, they did not provide sufficient clarity to the leaders, to allow them to focus on those behaviours, which would enable their performance to be effective across a broad spectrum of business situations.

By engaging with these models, researchers began to understand that there is no one single leadership style which could or should be adopted in all circumstances. This led to the development of a set of models representing the *situational or contingent school* Hersey-Blanchard (1999). These models suggested that the style which should be adopted is contingent on a broad range of factors such as the situation in which leaders find
themselves, the maturity and capability of the people involved, the nature of the tasks which are being addressed, the type of organization and the culture within the organization, as well as other environmental factors Adair (1979). This thinking reinforced the understanding that leadership is not a simplistic task: indeed to be carried out effectively and well, it requires an extensive range of skills and expertise. The best known of these situational school approaches were the Hersey-Blanchard (1999), Model of Leadership, Tannenbaum and Schmidt’s (1973), Leadership Continuum and Adair’s (1979), Action-Centred Leadership Model, these became widely accepted and were practised across diverse business sectors.

However researchers, wanted to advocate leadership definitions and models, which claimed, that for leaders to be successful, they should stand apart from the groups they were leading and adopt a directive approach and style to their leadership practice, similar to a military command and control style. Recent developments Belbin (2010), have placed a much greater emphasis on the importance of developing and fostering the relationships which exist between leaders, their followers and their teams. So the evidence in the literature has shifted significantly from a position which argued for hero or individualistic leaders, to a recognition and appreciation of the value of inclusive team leadership and empowerment strategies, which engage the thinking, competencies, expertise and experience of all of the staff within the organization and as a consequence have shown that these approaches deliver more profitable, attractive and sustainable outcomes Collins (2001).

An example of this collaborative approach is highlighted by the work of Greenleaf (1970, 1978), who introduced the concept of Servant Leadership, shifting the emphasis from one of leading and directing to one of serving, requiring leaders to see their role as serving the needs of the staff within their business as well as their customers. It has been adopted successfully by a number of business groups who have described it as an 'upside down model' of leadership(Timpson, 2010), as it challenges the conventional hierarchical models of leadership. This approach to leadership also draws heavily on the learning that has arisen from the application of models of empowerment within businesses.

Collins (2001 pp. 66-76) who has studied high performance organizations for over 20 years, conducted a five-year research project, exploring what catapults a company from
being merely good to truly great. He argues that the results of that research ought to change the way we think about leadership; his study convinced him that:

the key ingredient that allows a company to become great is having a Level 5 leader: an executive in whom genuine personal humility blends with intense professional will. To learn that such CEOs exist still comes as a pleasant shock. But while the idea may sound counterintuitive today, it was downright heretical when Collins first wrote about it—almost everyone believed that CEOs should be charismatic, larger than life figures.

Collins was the first to blow that belief out of the water. His research tested an approach to leadership, which suggested that working for the good of the whole is far more powerful and effective than leadership which is exercised by individuals who appear to want to promote their own ego and status.

This approach to leadership also connects with a number of studies which emphasise the value of developing the capacity and capability of teams, and encouraging them to work together. Key examples are Katzenbach and Smith (1993), *The Wisdom of Teams* and Belbin (2010) who in the late 1970’s conducted empirical research into those activities and behaviours which make teams successful and drawing on the learning from his studies, he put together a process map which identified the key roles which are essential within a team if they are to deliver their agreed aims and objectives. The study showed that when some of these processes are missing, then the teams will find it more difficult to complete their tasks within the allotted timescales.

The concepts of *Transactional and Transformational Leadership* have been expanded and developed by Macgregor Burns (1978, p.20) in his book *Leadership*, introduced the concept of ‘transforming leaders’ with a definition:

Transforming leadership ultimately becomes moral in that it raises the level of human conduct and ethical aspiration of both leaders and led, and thus it has a transforming effect on both.

Bass (2006) extended Burns concept of transforming leadership in his book *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*, into ‘transformational leadership’. Bass argues in his model that this leadership approach can deliver social change. Put simplistically, transformational leaders are endeavouring to empower individuals, teams or
organizations to operate and perform beyond their normal expectations, thus delivering high performance standards and excellence.

Marrin (2013) a management consultant who has worked with a range of business clients, in a personal communication, made clear that engaging people is the central theme of all of his work on leadership and organizational development. In particular, he finds that he needs to emphasise, explain and enable leaders to learn through their experiences and practice that they must be highly skilled in engaging people if they are going to gain their real commitment and get them to work together better to achieve their organizational and personal goals. He explained that he is operating with the notion that ‘working with’ is a far more successful leadership approach and style than ‘doing to’ people which he continually sees in managers’ practice either through their intent or by accident or ignorance.

This section has identified how leadership concepts and models have evolved over time to a broadly held view, which suggests that by placing a much greater degree of emphasis on participation and collaboration then it is possible to deliver real, measurable and sustainable benefits for individuals, teams and businesses. This shift in emphasis and the learning on which it is based is critical in encouraging leaders to operate more effectively and to enable businesses to compete successfully in global markets.

1.4 The development and use of competency frameworks

A number of the theories described above can be observed in operation, in public and private business sectors. For example, some organizations are attempting to embed the practices of the transactional and transformational leadership models, in order to generate an improved business performance Bass (2006).

Conversely, some observations suggest that negative practices prevail, such as those presented in programmes like, The Apprentice, led by Lord Sugar. These views are further supported by personal conversations with consultants who are assisting businesses with organizational development. These suggest that there are trends in certain organisations to return to more directive, authoritarian or ‘macho’ aggressive styles of leadership. These approaches are unattractive and have a tendency to create a bullying culture within which staff are expected to accept the conditions presented to them, with limited opportunities for
discussion or questioning. Such behaviours are thought to be driven by the difficult financial trading position many businesses are encountering and the restricted numbers of jobs which are available. Hence some individuals’ feel they are presented with a ‘take it or leave it’ set of circumstances which are far from the ideal.

By contrast, there are organizations which are accepting the challenge of embedding best practice and of developing ‘excellence or world class’ performance standards within their businesses including making use of leadership frameworks and models which can guide their initial selection and recruitment processes as well as providing a basis for the continuing development of their staff.

Some examples of these approaches include the Competency frameworks which originated from research work by McClelland (1973), at Harvard; this work was enhanced by Dubois (1993), and Schoonver (2002). McCelland (1973), became dissatisfied with the use of intelligence testing alongside traditional methods of job analysis when making personnel selection choices. He argued that intelligence tests, and other similar measures, such as scholastic grades and achievements, failed to predict which candidates would be effective and successful in the job roles for which they were applying and he proposed that selection processes should include competency tests.

Competency-based approaches have gained in popularity and were given support by the publication of the text by Boyatzis (1982), The Competent Manager: A model for effective performance. Boyatzis was initially at Havard but is now at Cape Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, and continues to work with the international management consultancy group, Hay/McBer.

Boyatzis (1982, p.14) argues that competency is a combination of motive, trait and skill and presented a definition for competencies as: ‘an individual's abilities that lead to or cause effective performance’ and this definition has been widely adopted by businesses which have used competency frameworks for the selection, recruitment and continuing development of their staff. In a more recent paper, Boyatzis (2010) argues that there are three clusters of competencies which can differentiate outstanding performance in the fields of Management and Leadership. These are:

1) Cognitive Competencies, such as systems thinking, pattern and problem recognition;
2) Emotional Competencies, including self-awareness, transparency & self-confidence;
3) Social Competencies, including empathy, inspirational leadership and influence.

These definitions link with studies conducted in the field of personality psychology, as competencies are seen as behaviours which are deep seated and are an intrinsic part of an individual’s make up. They are closely related to personality and are therefore more difficult to develop and enhance than either knowledge or skills.

Boyatzis (2008, pp. 5-12) suggests that:

today, almost every organization with more than 300 people uses some form of competency-based human resource management. Major consulting companies, such as The Hay Group, Development Dimensions International and Personnel Decisions Incorporated and many small consulting firms and independent consultants have become worldwide practitioners of competency assessment and development. Yet, the academic and applied research literature has trailed application.

This lack of published information is thought to be due in part to consultancy organisations wishing to protect the detail of their models which are seen as their intellectual property and also a reluctance to engage in the work necessary to achieve publication in reputable academic journals.

Further evidence that Competency frameworks have been widely adopted within businesses is provided by the Chartered Institute of Personnel & Development, CIPD (2007). This showed that 60% of organizations already have competency frameworks in place while almost half (48%) of those who do not have one, are intending to introduce one. There is wide recognition of the value provided by competency frameworks in assisting with the drive to improve business performance.

1.5 Learning from the practical development and use of competency frameworks

The ICI Group (1994) adopted competencies on a global basis and they worked in partnership with Boyatzis and the Hay-McBer organization as well as conducting primary research within individual businesses, and they created a purpose built framework which had four clusters of competencies. The ICI businesses built on the academic research and adapted the models for their organizational needs. This research showed which competencies and behaviours were displayed by staff whose performance was identified as
excellent or exemplar when compared to that of average performers. This work showed which activities and behaviours, developed and delivered on a more frequent basis by individuals and teams, generated sustained improvements in business performance, when measured against a range of key performance indicators (KPIs).

The ICI Model which emerged from the research included four clusters of competencies:

- The Thinking Competencies
- The Self managing Competencies
- The Influencing Competencies
- The Achieving Competencies

The definition of competency which was applied by ICI was ‘A predisposition to behave in ways which have been proved to result in successful outcomes.’ This is similar to that suggested by Boyatzis above.

The framework developed by ICI and expanded by Glowinkowski (2010, pp. 87-114) highlights a number of distinguishing behaviours and competencies, such as Strategic Thinking, Developing Others, Results Focus, Critical Information Seeking, Tenacity and Self Belief. When leaders develop these competencies, it has been shown that they are able to make significant differences in terms of the output and outcomes produced across a wide range of business sectors.

The Competency framework within ICI was a core component of their selection & recruitment processes and the Staff Development programmes for both the on and off-the-job learning approaches and coaching. It was a key element within an innovative approach to the ‘Assessment of Potential’. This process was adopted by career groups within the businesses to identify individuals, at an early stage in their career, whom they believed, had the potential to fill posts at the most senior levels within the ICI Group. Having identified individuals with potential, the career groups provided a range of different work experiences and job moves to enhance the capability of these individuals.

Other businesses that have successfully deployed competencies have developed tailored frameworks to match the specific needs of their staff and their organization. The requirement to tailor these competency and learning frameworks provides further evidence that leadership development is a complex process. Without adopting a thoughtful approach
to these methodologies, there is a significant risk that the investment in staff development processes will miss the mark and fail to deliver the desired benefits for the individuals or the business.

1.6 Evidence which links outstanding leadership behaviour with enhanced business performance

The literature shows that the emphasis has continued to move away from an interest in the theories behind leadership concepts, into a more business focused view which explores the correlation between outstanding leadership behaviours and individual, team and organizational performance. There is research which claims that there is a direct link between the quality of leadership delivered and the bottom line performance of a business.

Studies outlined below, provide evidence which shows that focusing on leadership capability is critically important, and they suggest that this is true for all organizations, whether they are secular or religious. The research studies highlight the fact that this learning exists in the public arena, but also that it is important that it is fully understood before attempting to modify the structure of an organization.

Paterson and West (1998) conducted a 10 year longitudinal study which confirmed that those organizations which addressed the leadership of their staff seriously, treating them as mature thinking adults, while applying high quality processes of selection and recruitment, induction, role clarity along with regular feedback on performance, were able to generate a 15-20% increase in both productivity and profitability.

West (2002, 2003, 2012), followed these manufacturing studies with similar research within the National Health Service (NHS), which showed that those hospitals which paid appropriate attention to the quality of leadership and the needs of their staff, delivered lower patient mortality rates, compared to units of similar size and complexity, where leadership performance was not given the same urgency or priority. Jenkinson (2009 p.30) reported similar outcomes to those presented by Paterson and West (1998) when Johnson Matthey Catalysts (JMC) adopted the Etsko Schuitema model of ‘care and growth.

He commented that a fundamental element of this model is:

that it gets managers to switch their attention away from 'using' their people to achieve results to focusing on the growth of their people as their primary purpose.
That sounds soft and fluffy but it is nothing of the sort. While there is a focus on the ability of direct reports to do their jobs, it is the role of the manager to hold them directly accountable and to both censure them if their tasks are not completed satisfactorily - and recognize when a good job is done.

The impact of introducing this model has been to reinforce and strengthen the role of line managers while highlighting their responsibility and accountability for the development of individuals and teams, the overall aim being to enhance business performance.

Tamkin et al. (2010) in a Work Foundation report, *Exceeding Expectations*, described the principles and impact which can result from the application of outstanding leadership. A key finding was that ‘outstanding leaders combine a drive for high performance with an almost obsessive focus on people as the means of achieving this. What is striking is that the research has uncovered clear differences between good and outstanding leadership. There is now evidence to support a systemic; people centred approach to high performance leadership. This is a paradigm shift for most leaders who remain focused on the numbers and has implications for all organizations seeking to improve their performance.’ pp. 5-9.

Varney (2002), CEO of The Centre for Management Creativity encouraged businesses to revisit their concept of leadership; he argued that for organizations to be successful they have to be willing to organize differently and harness the contribution of all of their staff.

Instead of organising in a way based on the mechanistic models of the industrial revolution, we now need to organize like nature. In business this means finding a way of being, that engages all the talent and mind-power, not just a hierarchical elite but of everyone in the organization. (p.1).

This focus on engaging all staff and the creation of a climate and culture which encourages and supports all staff is also emphasized by Glowinkowski (2010), in his book *It's Behaviour Stupid! What really drives the performance of your organization*. He sets out to show ‘that a leader’s behaviour, or rather the quality of their leadership delivery, drives the performance of the group or business for which they are accountable. This is irrespective of the size or scope of the leadership challenge.’ (Cover)

These claims are supported by consultancy work conducted by Glowinkowski International across diverse business sectors in the UK and overseas. Many of the studies are covered by confidentiality agreements with their clients, but the book includes a number of case studies (pp.185-230), which clearly demonstrate the importance of leadership capability in
creating the right climate for individuals and teams to grow and develop in a manner which is consistent with the business strategy and objectives.

Goffee and Jones (2006) address the question as to why, ‘while it is clear that leadership competencies and behaviours are accepted in principle as creating a difference for individuals and their organizations, there is still a perceived shortage of outstanding leaders in business communities.’ They argue that ‘firstly, this is because organizations often force individuals into a straight jacket, rather than allowing them to be themselves and to develop their capability to suit a range of situations. Secondly, the focus of leadership is often something we do to other people, whereas leadership should be seen as something we do with other people.’ They state that, ‘those aspiring to leadership need to discover what it is about themselves that they can mobilize in a leadership context, they need to identify and deploy their own personal leadership assets.’ pp. 9-10.

It is their view that to develop as effective leaders, there are three important aspects which need to be understood and addressed. These are one, that leadership is situational, so that one size does not fit all. Secondly it is non hierarchical; they feel that too much emphasis has been concentrated on those who assume the top position, rather than equipping staff at all levels to exercise their leadership skills and capabilities. Then, thirdly, leadership is relational; the leader needs to pay appropriate attention to the needs of those for whom they are responsible and accountable.

Iles and Preece (2006) questioned whether there has been a tendency to concentrate excessively on the leaders and their individual development rather than the broader sweep of leadership development.

They distinguish between Leader development which has an individual focus versus leadership development which takes account of the social, political, collective and other contexts of action and meaning. The upshot of this has been that there is a misallocation of resources in the attempt to develop leadership capacity.’

Tate (2009 pp. 3-18) makes similar points in The Search for Leadership, endorsing the views of the other authors cited here. He believes that leadership is not the sole preserve of those designated as leaders but needs to be more widely distributed within organizations.
Leadership is an organizational resource and it needs to be developed and managed. There has to be a shared responsibility for developing capability taken on board by both those in leadership and those being led. (pp. 3-18).

A research publication by DDI, *The Global Leadership Forecast 2011*, reports that:

organisations with the highest quality leaders were 13 times more likely to outperform their competition in key bottom-line metrics, such as, financial performance, quality of products and services, employee engagement and customer satisfaction. (pp. 8-13).

This selection of material demonstrates the wide range of studies which confirm the critical importance of outstanding leadership and the measurable benefits which it can deliver to the business bottom line.

**1.7 Conclusions**

This literature review has highlighted that leadership studies, especially in business communities, are extensive, and that some developments have a direct relevance for the current research project.

The review has shown the difficulty researchers have in reaching a clear consensus on an agreed definition of leadership, but indicates that there is a clear recognition of the value of developing leadership behaviours which are collaborative and empowering and which intend to engage fully all of the individuals and teams. It has shown that the leadership role is evolving, with a clear view that leadership is now perceived as more complex and challenging, even in comparison with the recent past.

There is a strong move towards producing leaders who bring a range of gifts, abilities, expertise and competencies to their roles; and translate these skill sets into observable and deliverable behaviours which genuinely make a difference for all. Outstanding leaders are also expected to pay special attention to developing the gifts, competencies, skills and potential of all of the people for whom they are responsible and accountable.

There is clear evidence which makes the connection between the qualities of leadership and the outcomes and performance of the businesses they are leading, when measured by a range of indicators including financial, as well as staff motivation and customer satisfaction.
The evidence drawn from leadership studies within secular business organizations is relevant and provides a potential learning opportunity for those who are engaged in church leadership, and this view is part of the hypotheses being tested in this project.
Chapter 2

Leadership in the churches

2.1 Introduction and summary

This literature review explores the various ways in which leadership is conducted in churches and the impact of those different leadership strategies on church development and growth.

Chapter 1 reviewed the literature which addressed leadership behaviours within businesses and secular organisations, it was noted that the literature on leadership is extensive and researchers have demonstrated that leadership is complex and believed to becoming ever more challenging. It is thought that similar views may apply to the situations pertaining within churches.

While this chapter is focusing on the literature which covers leadership behaviours within churches, it is fair to say that the theories and models which have been tested and adopted in business and secular organisations, have not been applied to the same extent within churches. This is thought to be partly because, a view is taken that churches are operating primarily in a spiritual arena, and hence some leaders and lay members argue that the models, which have been developed in commercial or business situations, do not necessarily sit comfortably within the orbit of church leadership. Others would argue that when such a negative stance is taken, then the opportunity to promote this essentially God given learning and to apply it in a thoughtful manner in churches, for the good of all, will be missed.

While this chapter is addressing the literature associated with leadership in churches, it is a hypothesis of this research that by addressing the learning from the business community, it can potentially bring new insights of leadership into church situations. By so doing, it may be possible to encourage leaders to develop those behaviours which will empower and release the gifts, skills and abilities of their church members, and as a consequence, create a culture and climate which has the potential to encourage church growth.
2.2 Leadership studies in Churches

The primary focus of this research is to explore the effect which leadership predispositions have on leadership behaviours and the resulting impact on church growth. Only two studies were identified directly relating to these studies, both of those in the USA and no examples of similar or comparable studies were found for the UK.

The two studies in the USA were Boyatzis (2010) and Ebener (2007), both of which were conducted in Roman Catholic parishes and they showed evidence that there are some distinguishing competencies which, when they are displayed and lived out in a consistent manner by the church leaders, have an impact on the spiritual life and quality of relationships within the church. As a result, they encourage and support the congregations in delivering their agreed shared vision.

Ebener (2010) developed his doctoral research and proposed a model which embodies the characteristics of Servant Leaders and he explored the result of delivering these behaviours on the vibrancy and spiritual life of the congregations as well as the impact which these churches have on the communities they are serving. This work is published in the text, Servant Leadership.

It is important to note that finding only two studies which directly address the subject of leadership competencies in churches, supports the claim of originality for this research in the UK. The two studies from the USA do provide encouraging evidence that the research questions which are being tested in this project will potentially be demonstrated to be valid.

Although no UK church leadership studies were found which directly link leadership behaviours with church growth, there are however, a number of texts which indicate that considerable thought and attention is being given to the broader topic of how to make the UK church in the twenty-first century both relevant and more effective and these studies do include some thoughts on church leadership.

These wide ranging studies, include Church of England (2004) which summarises the thinking and conclusions of a working group set up to examine the challenges of church planting and ‘fresh expressions’ within the changing and complex UK culture of the
twenty-first century. It provides a range of recommendations for churches who aim to be mission orientated and these covers themes such as Strategy, Leadership and Training, Resources and Working Ecumenically: a number of projects have been developed as a result of the thinking and the ideas presented in this text. However it is noted that, while extensive experimentation is taking place, with attempts to break new ground and reach out to those who may be reluctant to attend ‘church’ in an established church building or engage with the existing patterns of services, there does appear to be pressure placed on these ‘fresh expression groups’ to direct people whom they have reached, back into the current patterns of service and worship in established churches. These conflicting strategies can generate tensions among the leadership teams who feel that they are pursuing different agendas. Another aspect of ‘fresh expression’ activities which has not been addressed by the Church of England is that the regular statistics which are collated in parishes do not currently include those who are attending ‘fresh expression’ activities on weekdays hence the official statistics may represent an underestimate of the total numbers who are attending churches on a regular basis.

A number of publications are available such as the *Church Leaders Handbook*, (Rowdon, 2002) and *Serving God’s People: Re-thinking Christian ministry today*, (Rowdon, 2006) which brings together authors from across the UK, to explore themes, such as:

> Are the prevailing views of the nature of Christian ministry right, or do they need dramatic revision? What is to be learned from the Bible about the nature of ministry, and how can this be applied in the twenty-first century? Must Christian ministers be male, full-time and omni-competent? Do ministers themselves need care? What is the best way of going about the process of finding and appointing full-time Christian ministers? (Cover).

In a similar vein, *Creative Church Leadership*, Adair and Nelson (2004) tackles some major topics, bringing together authors who have had broad career experiences as well as representing a diverse range of churchmanship, to share their knowledge, ideas and thinking. It is presented in this manner:

> Creative leadership is one of the greatest assets that any organization can have, not least the church which is called to be a sign and servant of the kingdom of God, and yet which is as vulnerable to human failure and frailty as any other institution. What kind of leaders does the Church need today and how might the church begin to look if imagination, risk-taking leadership was fostered at every level of its life? (Cover).
It attempts to support these views and to provide some principles which will enable churches to grow and develop leaders, who are creative and who are not afraid to experiment, to take risks and to think ‘outside the box’ as they try approaches which are appropriate for their situations in 2014 and beyond.

There are two books *Church Next*, Gibbs and Coffey (2001) and *Leadership Next*, Gibbs (2005) written by experienced church leaders, whose purpose is to identify some of the challenges which are facing church leaders and they then attempt to provide ideas and solutions for ways forward, drawing on a broad range of church leadership practice.

*Leadership Next* specifically sets out to tackle the crucial issues of culture and the management of change, as here:

> Our culture is constantly changing, as fast as, or faster than we can adapt to it, in this context Christian leaders have not only to acquire new insights and skills, but also to unlearn what they previously knew. Even our definition of leadership is under review. (Cover).

These two texts make a truly compelling case, as to why church leadership must change and they identify a set of healthy characteristics for Christian leaders and suggest how these qualities can be nurtured and developed. This approach has some similarities with the secular models, described in Chapter 1, which identifies lists of traits or characteristics that are believed to be important for leaders who want to be effective.

Cuthbert (2006) in *How to Survive and Thrive as a Church Leader* and partly based on his own personal experiences, presents a very honest account of the issues and challenges which leaders encounter on a day to day basis. He shares some pointers designed to help leaders not only to survive but also to flourish as they discharge their service for Christ. He is quite direct and upfront, stating:

> After all, the calling to be a leader in the church is one of the greatest privileges in the world and is, in the main, a wonderful way to spend your working life. But it is hard. I am very glad that that is what I have spent most of my life doing, but I know it is not easy. (p.9).

He recognizes and tackles some of the practical issues with which leaders have to grapple and provides a Biblical and personal reflection to help and encourage leaders who are encountering similar issues.
A very different approach is adopted by Watson (2008) in the *Fourfold Leadership of Jesus*. In his book he examines what it means to lead as Jesus led, as he called his disciples *to come, to follow, to wait and to go*:

> These four commands embody the four different aspects of leadership that this book explores as a model for us today. As we follow Jesus, we are transformed by the Holy Spirit into the likeness of Christ. Disciples are raised up as leaders, who in turn nurture further disciples, so that the work of the kingdom continues to grow, and we too can dare to echo Paul's bold words. *Don't follow me. Follow Jesus*. (Cover).

Jackson (2005) in the *Road to Growth-towards a Thriving Church*, based on his research within a number of churches and dioceses across the UK, looks at how the church can overturn the underlying trend of decline and begin a new cycle of growth. This study is based on a thorough and detailed analysis of the available statistics, as he provides some important learning and insights into how the church can indeed grow. He provides information on the appropriate characteristics of church leaders and emphasizes the need to increase the involvement of lay people in leadership; he states:

> So it is no surprise that the churches that have been changing in the direction of increasing the involvement of lay people in their running and leadership have also tended to grow numerically. (p. 70).

The Foundation for Church Leadership (FCL), which was established to influence the debate on leadership and leadership development within churches, in 2008 published a draft version of a tool for churches to benchmark the capability and quality of their leaders, the stated aim being:

> To test whether it might be possible to develop an agreed statement on church leadership which can be widely owned across the churches and become a resource for those engaging in ministerial development review and shaping the education, training and foundation of church leaders from initial training to senior posts. (Draft version from website).

Personal communication with Steven Croft, The Bishop of Sheffield has indicated that The Foundation for Church Leadership has been disbanded and that the draft benchmarking tool is unlikely to be published. The draft did provide evidence of the different strands of the thinking which are taking place across churches and provided some evidence that consideration is being given to those challenges which leaders are facing today.
There are some similarities with the FCL benchmarking approach, in the work carried out by Schwarz, a director of the Institute for Natural Church Development (NCD). His research between 1994-96 examined the factors which are believed to be important in contributing to church growth. The study was extensive; it looked at 1000 churches on five continents, in 32 countries, and 18 languages, and the broad conclusions from this study were, that healthy churches are growing churches, which are able to make more and better disciples who serve in loving obedience to Christ. The learning from this research has been converted into a resource for leaders to allow them to carry out the NCD process. There are five steps, Prepare, Diagnose, Plan, Implement and Evaluate. A number of reports have been published by NCD and they claim that when this process is used by leaders, it is effective in increasing the ‘health’ of the church and in encouraging numerical growth.

In exploring church growth, Hayward, University of South Wales has adopted a very different approach to these process led strategies; his research has adopted a number of models of church growth, based on mathematical modelling and analysis. Hayward (2005) presents a General model of Church growth and decline, his models have been used to explore patterns of growth across different denominations and they show a good fit with the actual results on the ground. He has included the concept in the modelling work, that those who are new to faith, or first generation Christians, are particularly effective in sharing their faith journey and their experiences with others. This model is based on the idea, that a germ or virus can spread rapidly across populations and that new germs are especially effective in infecting the wider population, before medical research finds ways to counter their impact. Similarly new Christians appear to be more willing to ‘gossip the gospel’ and tell friends and family of their new found faith in Christ.

He argues that without this effect from new converts, that churches tend to reach an equilibrium position from which, sadly, they often decline numerically. This mathematical modelling approach provides fresh ideas and insights into what is happening within church congregations and can be useful in challenging the notion of an inevitable decline in church attendances. It also offers a significant resource for leaders who want to consider different ways of moving forward and working together in partnerships which could generate growth.
2.3 Conclusions

This review has shown that the scope and extent of the leadership studies within church communities are less well developed when compared to the volume and variety of thinking and models presented from business and secular organisations.

There is however, an increasing sense of urgency and a recognition among senior church leaders of the need to do something radical in order to develop a generation of leaders who themselves have a range of gifts and abilities, which they can translate into deliverable behaviours. They understand the need to pay particular attention to engaging with and developing the gifts and skills of all of the people for whom God has made them responsible and accountable.

The literature studies covering the use of leadership competencies within churches were more limited than those in secular settings, and only two papers were found which have some relevance to this research project, both from the USA.

The studies which relate to UK churches show that while the subject of leadership is being explored seriously and is moving up the list of priorities for a number of denominations, there do not appear to be any really distinctive or consistent approaches which could be shared and adopted across the wider spectrum of church leaders and denominations. The literature does not indicate that there are any major themes which are being addressed across all groupings of church leaders, and as a consequence the developments which are taking place appear to be rather adhoc and piecemeal.

These conclusions highlight the potential benefits and value which can result from this research study, which is testing the usefulness of a new psychometric instrument (GPI) in order to explore the relationship between leadership and leadership behaviours and church growth.
Chapter 3

Psychological type theory

3.1 Introduction and aims

The model of psychological type was originally proposed by Carl Jung (1971) and has been extensively developed through a number of psychometric indices, which include the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI; Myers & McCaulley, 1985), the Keirsey Temperament Sorter (KTS; Keirsey & Bates, 1978), and the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS; Francis, 2005). These tools have been widely used in business and sports psychology for individual, team and organisational developmental programmes, and in research studies which have examined the character, personality and psychological type of religious and church leaders across a number of denominations.

This literature review focuses on those studies which are particularly relevant to the research project, which is testing the relationship between Leadership (competencies, predispositions, personality and styles) and the contribution which leaders who display particular behaviours, can make to church growth. It shares the basis for including the FPTS in the clergy survey. The FPTS is positioned alongside a number of other tools and hence provides the possibility of exploring correlations between the various tools which have been adopted.

3.2 The key features of psychological type

There are a number of texts which describe psychological type theory and which have gained a wide acceptance in this field of study. They include Gifts Differing (Myers & Myers, 1980), Please Understand Me: 2 (Keirsey, 1998), Introduction to Type (Myers, 1998), and ‘Psychological Type Theory and Religious and Spiritual Experience’ (Francis 2009). These texts take the theory as originally produced by Jung (1974) and make it accessible to researchers and developers as well as providing an operational model which has been applied in a wide variety of situations.

The authors show that psychological type theory makes use of four bipolar psychological perspectives to provide a summary of an individual's type. There are two orientations
(introversion and extraversion), two perceiving functions (sensing and intuition), two judging functions (thinking and feeling), and two attitudes toward the outer world (judging and perceiving). The writers describe how in this model, the two orientations (introversion and extraversion) and the two attitudes (judging and perceiving), define the context and environment within which the human psyche functions, our ability to operate, think and explore ideas. While the two perceiving functions (sensing and intuition) and the two judging functions (thinking and feeling) define the mental processes which individuals apply as they seek to interpret and make sense of what is happening in the world, and in their sphere of interactions and influence.

In particular Myers and Myers (1980, p. 9) in *Gifts Differing* summarise the model in this manner:

They suggest that personality is structured by four preferences concerning the use of perception and judgment. A preference for Extraversion or Introversion allows individuals to focus on their dominant (favourite), process on the outer world or on the world of ideas, while a preference for Sensing or Intuition, impacts a person’s choice to use one kind of perception instead of the other, when either could be used. A preference for Thinking or Feeling relates to the decision to use one kind of judgment instead of the other when either could be used and the preference for Judgment or Perception, relates to the choice to use judging or the perceptive attitude for dealing with the outer world (p. 9)

They argue that ‘each of these preferences is a fork in the road of human development and determines which of two contrasting forms of excellence a person will pursue. How much excellence people actually achieve depends in part on their energy and their aspirations, but according to type theory, the kind of excellence toward which they are headed is determined by the inborn preferences that direct them at each fork in the road’.

This stance, however, does seem, to be overly deterministic, when compared with my own experience of using and gaining a working understanding of psychological type theory. This is because when working with individuals and groups, who are exploring these concepts and ideas, it has been helpful to suggest that individuals celebrate their type, rather than view it in a fatalistic manner or as a predetermined set of cards. In addition, when helping individuals to determine their preferences for each of the four bipolar perspectives those individuals who recorded scores near the mid-point rather than the either extreme of the scales, were found to be more capable of adjusting and modifying their behaviour in order to match the circumstances and cultures in which they were operating.
A benefit of personality type theory, particularly when it is used as part of a coaching strategy for developing the capability of individuals and teams, is that it provides a common language which enables people to understand their gifting. Some researchers suggest that an individual’s psychological type is fixed. However, it is possible by working with the framework to explore if there are ways in which personal behaviours can be modified. Such changes of behaviour may be appropriate when individuals are required to work in a culture which is not a natural fit with their psychological type. In such situations by adjusting behaviours, it may be possible to reduce the potential stress which can result when individuals operate outside of their comfort zone.

Francis (2009) further expands the definitions and the basis of the underlying theory. Drawing on Jungian theory, he explains that:

- each individual needs access to all four functions (sensing, intuition, thinking and feeling) for normal and healthy living. The two perceiving functions (sensing and intuition) are needed to gather information about the inner and outer worlds inhabited by the individual. These are the irrational functions concerned with collecting information, with seeing reality and possibility. The two judging functions (thinking and feeling) are needed to organize and evaluate information. These are the rational functions concerned with making decisions and determining courses of action. Although each individual needs access to all four functions, Jungian theory posits the view that the relative strengths of these four functions vary from one individual to another. The analogy is drawn with handedness. Although equipped with two hands, the majority of individuals prefer to use one and tend to develop skills with that hand to the neglect of the other hand. Similarly, empirical evidence suggests that individuals will develop preference for one of the perceiving functions (sensing or intuition) and neglect the other and that they develop preference for one of the judging functions (thinking or feeling) and neglect the other. (p. 129).

### 3.3 Previous studies of psychological type with churches and church leaders

There is a growing body of research literature which covers the use of psychological type theory with church congregations and church leaders (male and female). These studies cover a spectrum of church denominations, including the Church of England, Baptists, Methodists and Charismatic churches.

One series of studies has looked specifically at the psychological type of the church congregations Francis, Whinney, and Robbins (2013) highlight a range of studies which began in North America (Delis-Bulhoes, 1990; Gerhardt, 1983; Rehak, 1998; Ross, 1993, 1995), included a set of studies for the UK (Craig et al., 2003; Francis et al., 2004; Francis,
Robbins et al., 2007; Francis, Robbins, & Craig 2011; Village, Baker, & Howat, 2012), and a study in Australia (Robbins & Francis, 2011).

One of the main conclusions which are drawn from these extensive studies is that the church congregations are not representative of the psychological type profiles of the populations from which they have been drawn. These studies indicate that in general terms, church congregations, present a higher percentage of introverts than extroverts, a higher level of feeling types than thinking types and a higher level of judging types than perceiving types. It can be argued that God's call is presented openly to all types equally. However, these research studies are implying that some types appear to be more likely to respond to God's call. Alternatively that certain psychological types find the environment in the churches they have chosen to attend more welcoming and therefore appear to be able to integrate more readily into those settings and situations. This information raises some important questions for church leaders, about how inclusive and welcoming are their churches and if they are ministering to the full range of psychological types?

Francis et al. (2013), highlight a further series of studies which have used psychological type theory to examine the characteristics of the leaders who have been called to leadership roles in a range of churches across different denominations. These studies began with work in North America in the 1980's (Bigelow et al., 1998; Cabral, 1984; Harbaugh, 1984; Holsworth, 1984) but have then been developed more rapidly in the UK during the 2000’s.

This extensive body of research includes a diverse set of studies conducted with Bible College students (Francis, Penson & Jones, 2001), evangelical church leaders (Craig, Francis, & Robbins, 2004; Francis & Robbins, 2002;), missionary personnel (Craig, Horsfall, & Francis, 2005), evangelical lay church leaders (Francis et al. 2005), Roman Catholic priests (Craig, Duncan, & Francis, 2006), youth ministers (Francis, Nash et al. 2007), evangelical Anglican seminarians (Francis, Craig, & Butler, 2007), Assemblies of God theological college students (Kay, Francis, & Craig, 2008; Kay & Francis, 2008), leaders within the Newfrontiers network of churches (Francis, Gibb & Robbins, 2009; Francis, Robbins & Ryland, 2012), Anglican clergy serving in Wales (Francis, Littler & Robbins, 2010; Francis, Payne, & Jones, 2011), Anglican clergy serving in England (Francis, Craig et al., 2007; Francis, Robbins et al., 2010) and leaders within the Apostolic network of churches (Kay, Francis, & Robbins, 2011).
These research studies, present some broad conclusions which are that the psychological type patterns of the various groups of clergy in the studies are significantly different from the church populations from which they are drawn, and so, are also not representative of the population at large. There are differences in psychological type between the leaders across the different denominations, as well as them exhibiting differences in type from the congregations which they are leading.

These results perhaps suggest that the processes which are being applied in order to determine, who should present for ordination and who are subsequently placed in leadership roles in a variety of churches are tending to select a predominance of people with particular set of psychological type profiles. It is not clear whether this apparent skewing effect arises as a result of a disproportionate number of people from certain type groups presenting for selection and ordination, and therefore those who are leading the selection processes have limited options, or whether there are a reasonable cross section of types in the selection processes, but those making the choices are deliberately, or by chance, choosing a higher proportion from particular type groups. The outcome is that there is a limited spectrum of types represented in the leadership roles, compared to those present in the churches, or external population norm groups from which they were originally drawn.

Similar patterns can be observed within the data published for commercial business leadership roles. Certain groups, which broadly represent fairly small percentages of the population overall, do present as considerably higher percentages in the leadership and professional managerial roles across a wide range of businesses (OPP, 2011). For example, the INTJ and ENTJ types present as 1.4 % and 2.9 % respectively in the general population norm tables, but in the Managerial and Professional role tables appear as 5.7 % and 13.7 % respectively. These results provide a similar pattern to that which is observed in the studies of type and church leadership, but there is no clear evidence to show if this increase in percentage for certain types in leadership positions is due to conscious or unconscious bias arising within the selection processes. There tends to be a greater use of assessment centres for selection and recruitment in commercial businesses, and if these processes have been properly designed and are run by staff who are fully trained to use the various techniques which they adopt, then one would hope that this source of potential bias would be reduced or minimized.
These research studies of church leaders and church congregations are being extended and differences relating to gender are being examined along with studies which are testing the relationship between psychological type and the health well-being and risk of burn-out for leaders. Some studies have examined possible relationships between specific types and the likelihood of them suffering burn-out.

3.4 Conclusions

There is an extensive and expanding body of research which has examined the relationship between psychological type theory and leadership roles. These studies have looked at the differences due to gender; and have studied leadership roles across a wide variety of churches and denominations. The psychological type of congregational members has been investigated and significant differences noted between the general population at large, church congregations and church leaders. These studies provide insights into the characteristics of church leaders, and recently there have been studies which have explored correlations between psychological type and the possibility of clergy burn out.

There do not appear to be any studies published, which have examined the relationships and correlations between the psychological type of leaders and church growth. While this current research study does not address this aspect in depth, some limited data has been provided from the survey of the Chester Diocesan clergy (see Chapter 7).
Chapter 4

The Glowinkowski Predisposition Indicator (GPI)

4.1 Introduction and context

A number of tools have been developed for characterizing leadership behaviours; measuring personality and exploring the impact which leaders have on their organizations. However some of these tools, including those based on the Big Five theory, are perceived to have limitations which reduce their validity and usefulness when used by management consultants with clients.

The purpose of this chapter is to identify some of the concerns highlighted with these commercial instruments and to present a new instrument, Glowinkowski Predisposition Indicator (GPI) which was developed to specifically address these issues. This chapter outlines the five areas which were believed to present serious shortcomings, and it describes the development and construction of the GPI, including the definitions of key terms and associated language.

4.2 The challenges which exist within the global marketplace for management consultancy businesses

The development of various types of technology, (media formats, internet and social networks) allows businesses to share information and communicate rapidly. Therefore businesses which are offering Leadership and Management consultancy services, designed to improve the bottom line performance for their clients, find themselves in an increasingly competitive and global marketplace, and so they need to be able to differentiate the services they are offering, from those of their competitors. To survive and prosper, in this challenging environment businesses need to constantly review and update the quality and utility of their processes, tools and techniques which they are providing for their clients.

Glowinkowski International Ltd., which has been operating globally for over twenty years, has found itself competing with other management consultancy businesses and has undertaken detailed reviews of the tools which they are utilizing. Based on those reviews, they believed that some of the current commercial tools had shortcomings and so have developed alternatives which are built on the best theoretical psychology constructs and are
specifically designed to provide individuals, teams and organisations with a better understanding of the effects of their behaviours on their work performance and therefore to be able to focus on possible changes in behaviours which can improve the performance of their client businesses.

It is further recognised that the assessment and application of these psychometric tests and tools is complex and sometimes can generate conflicting views. The results and outcomes can be enhanced by the blending together of different viewpoints, bringing together the contribution from theologians, who have studied the relationship between personality and religious experience, and the impact this has on leadership attributes. The theologians also recognize the transformative impact which a belief in God has on individual lives and behaviours. For psychologists who engage in such assessments, their focus is on understanding the relationships between personality and religious experiences drawing primarily on their understanding of personality. They are then able to explore the variations in personality and the differences which this generates for individual actions and behaviours. Management consultancy businesses may employ staff, who take a broadly theological perspective as well as psychologists who will seek to use the range of tools with which they are familiar. It is hoped that the learning which emanates from these different perspectives can be brought together in this research project in such a way as to provide insights into how the behaviours of church leaders can have an impact on church growth.

It is important, to note that the terms ‘personality’ and ‘predisposition’ may be defined and used differently by theologians, psychologists and business consultants. Psychologists have tended to divide the field of personality studies and models into those which examine ‘traits’ or ‘psychological type’. This chapter will concentrate on a ‘traits’ analysis as that is the primary focus of the studies employed in the design and development of the Glowinkowski Predisposition Indicator GPI, model and instrument. Studies employing psychological type with church leaders have been reviewed in Chapter 3. The American Psychiatric Association, Glossary of Psychological terms, from Gerrig and Zimbardo (2002) define traits as ‘enduring patterns of perceiving, relating to, and thinking about the environment and oneself that are exhibited in a wide range of social and personal contexts’. (This reference presents the definitions in an alphabetical format, with no page numbers).
The theorists make the following assumptions that, a) traits are relatively stable over time, b) traits differ among individuals and c) traits influence behaviour. The most common models of traits have been built around three or up to five broad dimensions or factors. Modern studies have drawn widely on the work of Thurstone (1934); Fiske (1949); Cattell (1993); and Eysenck and Eysenck (1975 & 1991); much of which has been built on and further developed by McCrae and Costa (1987); and McCrae and John (1992).

4.3 The primary reasons for development of the Glowinkowski Predisposition Indicator GPI

As indicated earlier, Glowinkowski International Limited GIL is a management consultancy business working with clients in a variety of business sectors, and their core purpose is to enhance the capability and performance of individuals, teams and organisations as a whole. It is for this type of business intervention and culture that the GPI model and associated instruments have been developed, more recently GIL has extended the applications into the education sector and ‘not-for-profit’ organisations.

GIL and its team of consultants have a strong affinity for the Big Five factor model, but felt, based on their research, and analysis of their interactions across the wider business communities, that there were validity aspects of the Five factor model, including its ability to predict the impact of delivered behaviours, which were not ideal, but they continue to value the Big Five model, as a valid means of describing personality. So although there were a number of tools available, (California Psychological Inventory (CPI), Kirton Adaption-Innovation Inventory (KAI), Hogan Personality Inventory (HPI), Occupational Personality Questionnaire (OPQ), Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF), NEO Personality Inventory Revised (UK Edition), (NEOPI-R), none of these fully satisfied the meticulous requirements and standards which GIL has set for their business. So they decided to develop their own tool, the GPI, which they believe fully matches the requirements of their business, while remaining fully aligned with existing theories and academic research. Alongside the GPI model, they have also developed additional tools, and a number of correlations which describe leadership styles and which support the work they do with their clients.

There were five main areas where concerns with current instruments existed, which were addressed by designing the GPI model (GPI) these were:
4.3.1 Terminology and language

Predispositions and behaviours are different, and there is no right or wrong way for describing predispositions as they relate to the core make-up of an individual. Some existing instruments (see 4.3), do not differentiate clearly between predispositions and behaviours and tend to label certain predispositions as more attractive than others. This approach can cause individuals to believe that certain predispositions and behaviours are more important than others, rather than recognizing that they represent different facets of the make-up of complex and unique human beings. If however, predispositions can be defined as bi-polar, then presenting some predispositions as potentially more favourable than others, no longer occurs, as both poles of the predispositions represent potential strengths and weaknesses.

Some existing tools adopt pejorative terminology in both the analysis and output stages. Within the feedback process, which is considered to be a critical step when acting in a business consultancy mode, some tests can use terminology which appears to be more socially desirable, and as a consequence, those completing the tests tend to ‘fake good’. This type of result was noted by Dunnette (1962) with one in seven faking good, when completing personality tests, or in other words, trying to create a profile for themselves, which they believed was a preferred match for the situations in which the tests are being applied. It is for these reasons when constructing instruments that the choice of terminology and language is seen as critical, otherwise distortions can arise.

4.3.2 Conceptualization

As the GPI tool was designed primarily for use in businesses situations, it was felt to be important to present the output from the analysis in concepts and language which were directly relevant for business applications and in a manner which allows individuals and teams to directly apply the learning which results, in their workplace. The requirement was to develop an instrument and feedback processes which allowed individuals and teams to fully engage with the outputs, so the language adopted needed to be concrete, readily definable and applicable to the range and breadth of business processes which are being operated within diverse international organisations.
Unless this degree of clarity was achieved and the words and pictures provided were understandable and actionable, then there is a potential risk that the consultants would spend their time in feedback sessions, having to define and explain particular words and terminology, which had a specific and unique meaning for the instrument in question. Having to spend time in this way on what are viewed as unhelpful diversions can distract the individuals from the learning which it is hoped will be provided by the instrument as well as limiting the opportunity to modify and develop ones behaviour.

4.3.3 Statistical specifications

Validity, i.e. whether the test measures precisely what it claims to measure is clearly a key requirement when using these types of instruments.

When applying certain commercial instruments, GIL, had found themselves in business interventions where their clients appeared to be genuinely surprised by the feedback data, or in other cases, individuals appeared unable to appreciate how the profile which was provided related directly to themselves, or to their work situation. These types of results are unsatisfactory and unacceptable for a management consultancy, as they can raise questions in the minds of their clients about the validity and credibility of the instruments which are being provided. GIL had also experienced situations where the results provided, showed variable output for certain dimensions, with differences emerging between males and females, and across different cultures. It proved difficult to understand, or reconcile, these differences, hence these results raised further questions about validity and reliability and undermined their confidence in the existing products.

4.3.4 Practicality

Test designers have tended to argue about the preferred way, to provide the type and dimensional representations used for personality, however because GIL were operating in a business consultancy, they wanted ways of presenting information which allowed individuals and teams to gain deep insights into their predispositions and to fully appreciate the impact which predispositions have on their individual and collective behaviours, on their working relationships and consequently on business performance. So they designed feedback processes which were to minimise the risk of individuals being over faced with too much data or examples where individuals may find the information
interesting and stimulating at an intellectual level, but are unable to fully connect the outputs of the instruments with their work environment. If such situations arise they can produce a feeling of ‘so what’, with the individuals and teams, struggling to appreciate the relevance of the information, or indeed, how it can help them to consider modifying or developing their leadership style and behaviours. Ultimately creating such changes, could potentially generate significant improvements in business performance, and is the real purpose behind such consultancy interventions.

4.3.5 Predisposition and behaviour

Predispositions are *preferred* behaviours, those things which people have a preference for and which they feel comfortable and relaxed when they carry them out. *Actual* behaviour conversely is what is observed, it can be measured, it is concrete, and although it is influenced by predisposition and preference, the two can potentially be very different. Although these concepts are clear when defined in this manner, GIL found a number of the existing instruments; have tended to confuse the difference between predispositions and behaviours. GIL have shown it is possible to measure predispositions, motivation, competencies, values and other behavioural aspects within one survey; however it is essential, that the feedback processes which are adopted, make the distinctions between these different concepts, very clear.

GIL felt that across these five areas, some current tests (see 4.3), showed considerable degrees of variability, therefore, they were motivated to create a single test to match their business requirements. The feedback received from those individuals and businesses who have used GPI, along with the evidence from the case studies which demonstrate measurable improvements in business performance, confirm that GIL in the design of the GPI, (plus additional instruments and interventions), have been successful in achieving their stated objectives and these processes represent a considerable advancement over those instruments they had used previously.

4.4 An introduction to predispositions and the GPI tool

Predispositions represent the stable characteristics or traits of an individual. They can be viewed as describing the essence of ‘who we are’ as individuals and represent an individuals ‘preferred or natural’ approach to problem solving and managing social
interactions. They indicate the way in which individuals would prefer to operate if there were no constraints or other influences being applied to their situations. These traits can be viewed as a relatively fixed aspect of their underlying personality. Predispositions can influence or drive the behaviours delivered by an individual, but they are not necessarily the same as that delivered behaviour. For example, an individual may have a low preference for detailed methodical work but can often deliver an effective performance, when this type of approach is required for completing a specific task, or where there are no alternative solutions for completing the task. Other examples include managers who normally prefer to work with a big picture approach but demonstrate their competence when producing detailed and precise financial budgets, or individuals, who may be required within their job role to adopt a friendly and outgoing approach, yet in reality, their predisposition could be one, of being naturally cool and aloof. In these simplistic examples, people are delivering the behaviours which are required within their work situations. This applies particularly with paid employment, where individuals may be required to deliver behaviours which are not necessarily reflective or congruent with their natural approach, or predispositions and as a consequence are required to ‘act out of character’ with their preference. Unless individuals appreciate that when acting in this manner, they are developing a set of coping mechanisms; then they could become stressed and as a consequence of this stress, may deliver a work performance which is less attractive than they would wish. The GPI profiling tool was developed to help individuals and teams to understand their predisposition profile and as a consequence, become aware, of situations where they may be acting either in or out of character and to recognise the consequences of those behaviours and actions.

The Kurt Lewin equation, (Hersey et al, 2001) has been built into the GIL methodology and feedback processes which are designed to generate a deep understanding of the value and benefits of predispositions. This equation shows that the behaviour displayed B, is influenced by and is a function of both the stable characteristics of the person P (their predispositions) and the situations S, in which they are operating. This equation helps to reinforce the message that by developing a broader understanding of predispositions, then individuals gain insights which can enable them to choose which strategies they should adopt, to deliver behaviours, which are consistent and appropriate for the various situations in which the individuals are operating and therefore enable them to cope and work more effectively, as a result of this level of understanding.

\[ B = f (P \times S) \]
The reasons outlined above, confirm that the investment in this new instrument was commercially justified as it has enabled individuals and teams, to design and develop processes which have created enhanced business performances. It has also provided a unique methodology which has allowed GIL to differentiate themselves from other management consultancy businesses.

4.5 The development and construction of the GPI

As outlined above the GPI was designed to build on the established personality research which is captured by ‘the Big Five’. The GPI is constructed around these five categories, but they have been called ‘domains’. These domains encapsulate a predispositional style which addresses, how persons prefer to think about problems and the implementation of solutions to those problems, and how they prefer to interact with others. The domains and their associated bi-polar dimensions represent the ‘highest’ level of data within the GPI model; each domain is then further divided into a set of sub-domains. These sub-domains have bi-polar sub-dimensions, which represent and summarise the data within the GPI model. This decision to adopt bi-polar language is a distinctive feature of the GPI. The approach adopted by GIL, while based primarily on the Big 5 personality framework, was further expanded at the research phase, thus taking the opportunity while designing a new instrument to explore additional aspects alongside the Big 5 factors. GIL wanted to include a measure of the motivation and drive of individuals, but preferred a less ‘edgy’ approach, than that provided by the Emotionality dimensions. The purpose for this part of the model was to provide a measure of motivation which related to McClelland’s social motives model, McClelland (1961) so further items were defined under Persuasive-Consensual (representing Socialised Power), and Ambitious-Contented (representing Personalised Power).

The following table summarises the five predispositional domains, which relate directly to the Big 5 studies and the GPI definitions, with each domain measured using a bi-polar ‘dimension’. The table includes Drive for completeness, with its own bi-polar dimensions. This aspect of individual’s make-up is only briefly addressed in the feedback process, as the main focus of the analysis and feedback processes are on those aspects of the GPI which relate directly to the Big 5 model. The table demonstrates that the GPI model in some cases adopts the same language as the Big 5 model, but in others introduces new definitions and follows this language through into the dimensions, and these changes arise
from the intention to avoid terms which can be perceived as pejorative. The GPI as well as addressing the issues outlined above, is unique in that it sits within an integrated framework, which is designed to enable those who engage with the test, to place their results practically within areas where they can influence and modify their behaviours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Big 5</th>
<th>The domain of GPI</th>
<th>What does this domain concern?</th>
<th>The bi-polar ‘dimension’ presented in the GPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>Emotionality</td>
<td>How at ease you are with yourself</td>
<td>At ease-Ill at ease Disciplined-Impulsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>What energises you</td>
<td>Extraversion-Introversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>How you think about things</td>
<td>Incremental-Radical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>How you interact with others</td>
<td>Individualist-Collectivist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>Attainment</td>
<td>How you go about doing things</td>
<td>Flexible-Focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive</td>
<td>Nature of self drive</td>
<td>Measured-Driven</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section outlines the terms and definitions within the GPI instrument.

4.5.1 Emotionality: At-Ease/Ill-at-ease

The domain of Emotionality is concerned with the extent to which individuals tend to be at ease with themselves and the world around them, and the degree of volatility they experience in this area.

People who are At-Ease tend to be calm, disciplined and even-tempered, and are able to face stressful situations without becoming overly upset or agitated and generally feel a real sense of value and self worth.

People who are Ill-at-Ease are often less confident, tend to be more pessimistic in outlook and more given to reacting to their impulses. They may be less able to cope effectively with stressful situations when they occur, and may experience feelings of low self-esteem.

It is important to note that this particular domain and its dimensions can be viewed as a ‘State’ as well as a ‘Trait’, this means that over time an individual’s profile may be subject to change or fluctuations as a consequence of things which may be happening in their
personal life or work environments. Additionally, despite the expressed aim of the GPI to use non-pejorative language, when presenting the output from this domain in the feedback process it is tends to be regarded as inherently pejorative. This is because most people feel that it is better to be Self Contained than to be Expressive and it is difficult to overcome such inherent preconceptions which people may hold.

4.5.2 Extraversion: Extraversion/Introversion

The domain of Extraversion is concerned with the primary direction in which an individual's attention and energies are focused, whether is beyond themselves into the external world or within themselves into their inner world.

People who are more Extraverted in nature prefer to focus their energies on engaging with the world around them. They are generally at ease in social situations.

People who are more Introverted tend to direct their energies inwards, are more reflective by nature and generally prefer a more limited range of social contacts.

4.5.3 Cognition: Incremental/Radical

The domain of Cognition is concerned with the way in which individuals think about things, choose to make decisions and solve problems which they encounter.

People who are Incremental in orientation are concerned with more of a structured and rational analysis of situations, and tend to focus on whether the details of the issue or activity are connected together in well-ordered patterns.

People who are Radical in nature tend to think in broad terms and prefer to examine situations from different perspectives, being concerned to identify how the various aspects fit together into a coherent whole; they seek to explore the ‘big picture’

4.5.4 Agreeableness: Individualist/Collectivist

The domain of Agreeableness concerns how individuals think about people and groups, and their interactions with them.
People who are *Individualist* in orientation tend to consider people and situations in terms of their own aims and interests, and so tend to focus on how situations can be worked out to their own personal advantage.

People who are more *Collectivist* in approach are inclined to think in terms of the shared aims and interests of the people and groups with whom they engage, and so tend to focus on identifying the mutual benefits which can be generated in any given situation.

**4.5.5 Attainment: Flexible/Focused**

The domain of *Attainment* addresses individual's orientation when thinking about what they prefer to do when delivering or implementing outcomes.

People who are *Flexible* prefer to think in terms of responding to the demands made on them, and are stimulated by the thought of the activity itself, whether or not it produces a specific outcome, they will seek to enjoy the journey.

People who are more *Focussed* will tend to view situations in terms of tangible outcomes, and are stimulated by the possibility of achieving specific results from a limited number of activities or events.

**4.5.6 Drive: Measured/Driven**

As indicated earlier the GPI model, which is broadly built around the Big 5 Factor model, does generate some additional data which it is felt, adds to the richness and flexibility of the information available when providing feedback to business clients.

This additional item which is outside the scope of the Big 5 model, defines the dimension of *Drive* as being concerned with the underlying motivations of individuals in a work context. Specifically it addresses the nature of their motivations which are involved when they seek to influence others, when they are achieving their personal goals, and when delivering and achieving activities or tasks. All of these aspects can be linked into the concept of the need for power. Each aspect can have a major impact on relationships and the way, in which Leaders conduct themselves and are perceived by those they are leading, and these are particularly important in the workplace. These behaviours can influence the climate and culture which is created, especially for those organisations which are
endeavouring to empower all of their staff, and to engage them fully in the delivery of their business mission, strategy, objectives and goals.

People who have greater orientation towards being Measured are motivated to approach these work situations in a careful, thoughtful and deliberate manner.

People with a tendency towards being Driven are motivated to approach situations in a more single-minded way. They will tend to enjoy or favour adopting a more proactive approach to influencing, to have strong personal ambitions and in some cases, pursue status and the symbols of success.

The data generated by this part of GPI model, is a relatively minor section within the feedback processes; and it sits within the Creativity and Entrepreneurship model. If there are bigger issues within businesses which relate to Drive and the wider aspects of motivation, i.e. Power, Relationships and Achievement, they can be further explored by using the Glowinkowski Motivation Index, (GMI).

This GPI model as presented satisfied the criteria set by the GIL business, which were to provide a tool which addressed the concerns observed with existing tools, but also to deal with three key areas which were important for a business management consultancy. These were:

- An identification of the key concepts underpinning each of the five domains and the associated sub-dimensions
- An easy self-reporting method which clearly captured and presented each of these concepts.
- An easy and visual method by which the data would be presented back, to individuals and teams, in a manner which generates understanding and as a consequence leads to positive and constructive actions.

It is essential that individuals and teams fully understand the data which is being provided; otherwise the value and credibility of the instrument and the consultancy processes will be undermined. It was also decided to provide data in a variety of formats which satisfies those who prefer to explore detailed information as well as those who prefer to see information presented as a big picture. The style and format of the data within the feedback process was specifically designed to stimulate an open exchange between the consultant presenting the interpretative data and the individuals or teams receiving that information, in order to further enhance and deepen the learning process.
4.6 Detailed construction of the GPI

The GPI Domains are sub-divided into Dimensions using a Bi-polar format; these are shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain/Sub-Domains</th>
<th>Bi-polar Dimension/Sub-Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotionality</strong></td>
<td>At-Ease-Ill-at-Ease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>Relaxed-Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility</td>
<td>Placid-Discontented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>Optimistic-Pessimistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>Confident-Self-Conscious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsive</td>
<td>Disciplined-Impulsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extraversion</strong></td>
<td>Extraversion-Introversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociable</td>
<td>Outgoing-Reserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>Asserting-Accepting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedonism</td>
<td>Fun loving-Serious minded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Poise</td>
<td>Socially-assured-Socially uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognition</strong></td>
<td>Incremental-Radical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Orientation</td>
<td>Evolutionary-Revolutionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Processing</td>
<td>Practical-Conceptual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>Rational-Intuitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agreeableness</strong></td>
<td>Individualist-Collectivist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Affiliative-Unaffiliative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Trusting-Questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>Conforming-Dissenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modesty</td>
<td>Modest-Assuming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attainment</strong></td>
<td>Flexible-Focused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Style</td>
<td>Outcome-Spontaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td>Conscientious-Cursory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Perfectionist-Pragmatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drive</strong></td>
<td>Measured-Driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>Consensual-Persuasive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambition</td>
<td>Contented-Ambitious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>Paced-Energetic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section presents further details of the GPI instrument and summarises the concepts and the definitions with the domains/sub-domains and the dimensions/sub-dimensions.

4.6.1 Anxiety: Relaxed/Tense

Anxiety is concerned with individual’s predisposition to experience apprehension or tenseness and their tendency to worry.
Relaxed individuals tend to experience lower levels of anxiety, not dwelling on things if they should go wrong and tending to be relaxed and calm in most situations. Tense individuals have a predisposition to experience apprehension and tenseness and a tendency to worry. However, for some occupational groups ‘Tenseness’ can be correlated with high performance and successful outcomes, and can be seen as a positive feature, so the implied ‘negativity’ of being tense is not necessarily cleacut in all circumstances.

4.6.2 Hostility: Placid/Discontented

Hostility relates to the tendency for some individuals to feel anger and frustration in response to the difficulties they encounter when dealing with people or situations. It is normally grounded in their previous experiences of life where individuals may hold a sense of dissatisfaction or negativity about those past experiences. It is therefore an important sub-dimension which needs to be handled with care and sensitivity during the feedback processes. How it actually manifests itself in individuals delivered behaviours may vary considerably and therefore requires careful exploration.

Placid individuals take a relaxed view of themselves and their position within the world at large, and generally, feel positive about their past experiences.

Discontented individuals may experience anger and associated states of bitterness, and frustration when considering their life to date. However whether individuals express or contain their anger will be a function of other predispositions within their profile, such as, Extraversion/Introversion, Individual/Collectivist, and Disciplined/Impulsive, as these dimensions tend to overlap and interact with each other and as a consequence can result in some quite complex patterns of behaviour.

4.6.3 Confidence: Optimistic/Pessimistic

Confidence draws on the tendency of individuals to view their current and future circumstances in a positive or negative light.

Optimistic individuals tend to adopt a more positive view—‘their ‘glass is half-full’, they tend not to feel sad or dejected and are not readily discouraged. There can be downsides, as
they may be risk averse and have a tendency to hurry decisions, having not considered fully all the possible factors which could be involved. Pessimistic individuals tend to possess a more negative view of the future—their ‘glass is half-empty’, they may appear to be dejected about their future prospects, but they may therefore take a more measured approach to opportunities which are presented and consequently may deliver more thoughtful outcomes.

4.6.4 Self-Esteem: Confident/Self Conscious

Self esteem relates to individuals assessment of themselves and the extent to which they view themselves as persons of value, irrespective of the views and opinions which are expressed by others.

Confident individuals can hold and maintain a positive, yet appropriate, realistic balanced view of themselves. Normally they maintain a healthy degree of positive self-esteem, although the possibility exists that this stance may be viewed by others as arrogance.

Self conscious individuals perceive themselves as being of low self-worth and may present a view of that they make low value contributions. Individuals with low self esteem, tend to lack self belief, which may impact their decisions and performance even though in reality they are eminently capable of delivering high quality results.

4.6.5 Impulsiveness: Disciplined/Impulsive

Impulsiveness defines an individual’s tendency to exercise control over their desires and cravings or to seek instant gratification of those urges.

Disciplined individuals have a predisposition that allows them to effectively manage those urges, with a natural ability to defer impulsive responses and therefore, to be able to deliver high levels of self control.

Impulsive individuals tend to have a predisposition that makes it difficult to control their urges and have a need for immediate gratification. They are readily frustrated and can display short concentration spans, which can cause them to become bored and ‘drift-off’ without paying adequate attention.
4.6.6 Sociability: Outgoing/Reserved

Sociability deals with the impact of social engagement on those individuals who are involved.

Outgoing individuals have a predisposition to enjoy the company of other people, tending to thrive and draw their energy from such social stimulation. They are happy to explore and talk their ideas through with other people.

Reserved individuals draw their energy from within themselves. They will tend to prefer the internal world of their own ideas and concepts, rather than seeking the company of others. They will tend to prefer to develop their thinking and ideas alone, before being willing to share their thinking with others.

4.6.7 Assertiveness: Asserting/Accepting

Assertiveness addresses the way in which individuals tend to interact with others.

Asserting individuals tend to be relatively dominant, forceful and socially ascendant. They will speak out without hesitation and readily adopt leadership roles.

Accepting individuals tend to be more submissive in their interactions with others and may appear hesitant about speaking their mind in social situations. They will tend to prefer to listen and to keep their own counsel in any early group situations.

4.6.8 Hedonism: Fun Loving/Serious-minded

Hedonism is concerned with an individual’s general orientation towards life and whether their focus is in seeking pleasure or fulfilling their obligations.

Fun loving individuals tend to be dominated by a pleasure-seeking mentality where the pursuit of pleasure and fun is important to them in both their work and social activities.

Serious-minded individuals consider that a sense of duty and responsibility is more important to them than pursuing pleasure. They will focus on what they judge to be the serious aspects of their day-to-day activities.
4.6.9 Social Poise: Socially Assured/Socially Uncertain

Social poise explores the way individuals understand their own social nature and their role within groups or society.

Socially Assured individuals are comfortable in social situations and are not fazed by the prospect of meeting new people. They are confident engaging in large social gatherings and tend to be more gregarious and less socially selective.

Socially Uncertain individuals tend to be more hesitant within social situations and may feel uncomfortable when meeting new people. Their preference is to engage with smaller groups with whom relationships can be well developed, and therefore they are often more socially selective.

4.6.10 Change Orientation: Evolutionary/Revolutionary

The sub-domain of Change Orientation concerns the way that individuals generate ideas, relate to change and respond to problem solving situations which they encounter.

Individuals who are Evolutionary prefer to consider change in small controlled steps and to generate ideas in order to improve the systems and processes which already exist.

While those with a Revolutionary predisposition prefer to consider change of more significant scale and will tend to want to deliver new approaches and paradigms. A Revolutionary will tend to be attracted to finding entirely new ways of achieving things rather than modifying existing processes.

4.6.11 Information Processing: Practical/Conceptual

Information Processing summarises the manner in which individuals acquire, assimilate and apply information to generate ideas and to resolve problems.

Practical individuals will seek to utilize information which creates complete maps of the issue in hand and produce detailed definitions of the problem, in order to protect against
the risk of misunderstandings. Such approaches tend to deliver solutions to today’s rather than tomorrow’s problems and be associated with short-term approaches.

Conceptual individuals prefer to take a broader view, drawing information from a range of apparently disconnected and diverse sources to build a ‘big picture’. They are comfortable with the cognitive management of ambiguity and lack of coherence concerning future concepts, trends and dynamics, their focus tends to be on the problems of tomorrow, and the longer-term requirements.

4.6.12 Decision Making: Rational/Intuitive

Decision making concerns the processes by which individuals determine and make their decisions.

Rational individuals prefer to deal with hard and known facts and to apply logic and clear evidence before deciding on possible ways forward. At there most extreme, they will prefer to evaluate all available data before making a decision; this can potentially have a negative cost within a business.

Intuitive individuals apply their own insights, often drawing on personal experiences, when solving problems. They are willing to use their imagination rather than just to utilise facts, so may rely on their own ‘gut feel’ when finalizing decisions. When Intuitive types seek data to underpin and support their arguments, this can often be for others’ benefits rather than to satisfy their own needs, as they may personally have already reached a firm decision.

4.6.13 Affiliation: Affiliative/Unaffiliative

Affiliation is concerned with the significance individuals place on personal relationships.

Affiliative individuals ‘like to be liked’ they are focused on the needs of others and treat them as more important than tasks. They will tend to avoid saying hurtful things and may avoid confrontation; therefore affiliative managers can find it difficult to deliver some tough but necessary feedback to members of their team.
Unaffiliative individuals tend to be more orientated towards the task than the person. So they are less concerned about what others think, personal popularity or friendship. They find it easy to state their opinions and to surface difficult issues even where it may disrupt harmonious relationships. Unaffiliative managers can deliver critical feedback, but there is a risk that the important message which they need to communicate, may be obscured by causing an upset in relationships, which result from their tendency to be overly blunt when delivering the message rather than acting in a more thoughtfully manner.

4.6.14 Trust: Trusting/Questioning

Trust involves the approach which individuals take when assessing others motives and this forms the basis for the way in which they consider and think about their interactions with others.

Trusting individuals tend to view others as honest and well intentioned. They take people at face value and do not suspect them of possessing less conspicuous motives, and therefore open and straightforward relationships tend to be encouraged. The downside is that they may appear naïve, and be easily ‘hoodwinked’ as well as holding overly high expectations of others.

Questioning individuals tend to consider others as potentially dishonest, operating hidden agendas, and potentially dangerous. They rarely take people at face value and are cautious when dealing with others. This behaviour can sometimes lead to relationships being soured by cynicism or scepticism.

4.6.15 Conformity: Conforming/Dissenting

Conformity concerns the manner in which individuals are able to challenge or comply with the norms being adopted by a group of which they are a part.

Conforming individuals tend to co-operate rather than compete. They will seek to avoid voicing different viewpoints and are more comfortable fitting into the existing arrangements. They prefer to comply and accommodate the views of others; they can be seen as team members rather than team leaders.
Dissenting individuals tend to disagree with others, finding it easy to present an opposing point of view. Dissenting individuals will often attempt to ask tough, probing questions rather than make categorical remarks or statements; however if this is overplayed it can be disruptive.

4.6.16 Modesty: Modest/Asuming

Modesty is concerned with how individuals view themselves in relation to others. Modest individuals are discreet about their own achievements; they may 'hide their light under a bushel'. They prefer to continue their work than talk about their activities and achievements. The downside for managerial roles is such individuals may under-estimate the importance and value of giving regular clear feedback and praise to others, who may be working for them.

Assuming individuals may tend to believe that they are superior to others and place excessive demands on them. They enjoy describing their achievements and expect to receive praise for work; which they believe and wish to claim is theirs, even where it has clearly been achieved and delivered through collective team efforts, such behaviour can disrupt team relationships and cohesion. They may also tend to assume that their views and opinions will be accepted and have a tendency to override the views of others.

4.6.17 Implementation: Outcome/Spontaneous

Implementation is associated with the style of task delivery. Outcome orientated individuals focus on achieving results. They find it easy to be persistent, tend not to give up and can be single-minded when required to deliver repeated effort to achieve a desired outcome. They tend to be less interested in the 'journey' and more focused on the outcome; they prefer a structured approach, like to plan, and to decide quickly about the required endpoint.

Spontaneous individuals tend to be more flexible in their approach, finding it easy to change both direction, and their mind about how to do things and have a willingness to move onto new areas. They tend to be motivated by the nature of the process and the 'journey' and less about the final outcomes. They prefer to keep their options open for as long as possible.
4.6.18 Conscientiousness: Conscientious/Cursory

Conscientiousness concerns the tendency for individuals to be thorough in the way they approach their activities. Conscientious individuals will tie up all of the loose ends, find it relatively easy working to deadlines and prefer work which requires attention to detail and accuracy. They have a preference for clearly defined goals and objectives and are comfortable evaluating and analyzing all of the detail.

Cursory individuals feel that accuracy and detail is not necessarily as important and that detailed preparation can sometimes inhibit effectiveness. They are happy working with less well defined tasks and prefer to pursue the main points rather than the detail of a topic.

4.6.19 Achievement: Perfectionist/Pragmatic

Achievement deals with the tendency of individuals to set standards for themselves and the extent to which they allow those standards to vary when achieving a set of outcomes.

Perfectionist individuals will try to exceed their personal standards of excellence and enjoy being the best at all they do. They will have a tendency to be impatient and critical of their own errors and bring a perfectionist approach to their work.

Pragmatic individuals are willing to accept lower standards in order to deliver a particular outcome. They will have a predisposition for cutting corners when getting results and to adopting a ‘fit for purpose’ approach to their tasks.

4.7 Conclusions

This chapter has provided a summary of the reasons why Glowinkowski International Ltd (GIL), decided to construct a new psychometric instrument, designed to address the issues which they had identified with the existing tools which were available in the marketplace. Although there were a range of commercial tools available, GIL felt from their experiences of using the existing instruments with their clients, that there were areas which fell short of the standards which they wished to adopt when operating as an International Management Consultancy group.
The chapter has rehearsed these arguments and explained the basis for the development of a new tool Glowinkowski Predisposition Indicator (GPI); it has laid out the format of the instrument and provided a detailed summary and commentary on the construct and language which they have adopted.

The tool has now been applied widely by GIL within their business, with over 15000 records on their database, and it is a core element of their consultancy offering. With this extensive track record along with the evidence from case studies of successful outcomes and business performance improvements is was decided to adopt the GPI for this research project in order to test its potential value for modeling church growth.
Section 2

The research results, analysis and conclusions

This section presents the basis for conducting a quantitative research study and the detailed development and design of the survey. There is an overview of the main points which arise from the data provided by the clergy along with commentary on the significance of their responses. An examination is included of the data arising from the Francis Psychological Type Scale (FPTS) and Francis Burnout Inventory (FBI), linking the Chester Diocesan clergy results with similar studies. The main chapters in this section deal with the analysis of the data provided by the clergy when completing the Glowinkowski Predisposition Indicator (GPI), and address the three primary research questions. Initially the GPI data is presented in the formats which are used by Glowinkowski International (GIL) with their commercial business clients; these visual presentations provide information about the clergy predispositions both as individuals and as a total group. Chapters 8-13 examine the detailed construction of the GPI for validity and reliability and include the clergy responses. They draw conclusions about the usefulness of the instrument when used with clergy and suggest that there may be a requirement to revisit the construct and language adopted for a number of the items to make it more compatible with the nature of the clergy ministerial roles. The final part of this section examines the relationship between the GPI profiles of three groups of clergy; those who are working in churches which are growing numerically, those whose numbers have remained steady, and those whose congregations are declining. This analysis did not demonstrate any statistical differences in the GPI results for clergy in growing or declining churches. However, noting that the study was dealing with relatively small sample sizes, the commercial visual formats did suggest that there was evidence of some slight differences in the clergy GPI profiles, for growing and declining churches.

The final chapter summarises the results and the outcomes from the research questions. It suggests that the results raise questions and areas for exploration by the senior staff in the Chester Diocese. The study also highlights areas where the research could be extended and developed further.
Chapter 5

Research methodology

5.1 Introduction

This chapter summarises those factors which supported the decision to use a quantitative approach for this research project, and the basis for determining the research methodology. It discusses the ethical and economic factors which were considered and presents the design and construction of the survey chosen as the main component for this research study.

5.2 The title and research questions

The title of this study is: The relevance and value of the Glowinkowski Predisposition Indicator (GPI) for modelling church growth: a study in Chester Diocese. Arising from this title, there are three questions which are addressed to test the value of the GPI:

- When using GPI as presented commercially what does it tell us about the clergy as a group?
- When the GPI is opened to close examination how does it function among clergy?
- Does the GPI generate insights into the differences in clergy who are managing decline and those who are resisting decline?

A key hypothesis which is examined in this study suggests that when church leaders display and deliver a certain range of leadership predispositions and behaviours, then they are more likely to create the climate and conditions which can encourage church growth. The behaviours considered to promote church growth can be broadly characterized as empowering and supportive, while conversely, behaviours which are autocratic and controlling and consequently, fail to acknowledge and draw on the gifting of the congregational members, are considered to be more likely to cause church decline. This aspect is examined by means of the GPI instrument, which was chosen to test and measure the predispositions of the clergy within the Chester Diocese.
5.3 Research methods, selecting for appropriateness

A chapter by Siddell (1989) in *Making Connections*, provides a comprehensive summary of the issues which researchers need to address before embarking on their journey of discovery,

Research methodology … is the theoretical assumption upon which the choice of a particular research method is made. Methodology is a philosophical matter concerned with both the theories of knowledge, and in social sciences, theories about the nature of social reality and the relationship between human beings and society. So before we can decide how to find out about social life—that is, which methods to use—we have to work out how we know what we know and what it is we want to know about. Methodological issues critically affect that decision…choice is not, one methodology rather than another in the quest for knowledge, but an awareness that the different ways of pursuing knowledge make different assumptions about the status of that knowledge. (Siddell, 1989, p. 261).

The two main methodologies adopted by researchers are quantitative and qualitative. However, there is no simple formula or blueprint for choosing one method over the other: indeed the arguments presented tend to flow backwards and forwards, often unhelpfully, with some individuals adopting a fixed position rather than a more open assessment of the pros and cons. The final choice is likely to be a function of the research questions being examined and the nature of the study.

Quantitative research broadly embraces the assumptions and methods which are aligned with the natural sciences. This approach allows the researcher to quantify the variables which are relevant within the study, and to examine the relationships between the variables mathematically, by making use of statistical analysis methods. Normally quantitative research adopts a deductive approach to the hypotheses being tested where these hypotheses are based on theory. It is normal to collect data to test the validity of the hypotheses, thus allowing the researcher to move from a theory to the data, quantitative research is nomothetic (Oxford Dictionaries: online version: ‘relating to the study or discovery of general scientific laws’). Hence the aim of this study is to take the data from the survey completed by clergy in the Chester Diocese and consider if it can be generalised for clergy in the Dioceses of England and Wales.

An advantage of quantitative research is that the relationship between the independent and dependent variables can be explored in some detail and in certain cases it may be possible to compare the results produced with previous work of a similar nature. A disadvantage is
the size of the sample required, because in statistical analysis the accuracy increases with
larger data sets. This has direct cost and time implications when handling and processing
large amounts of data. It should be noted that while this study is focusing on the leadership
exercised by the clergy in the Chester Diocese, there are other factors which may impinge
on the growth or decline of church numbers which it will not be possible to address within
the scope of this project. The nature of the proposed study which employed a clergy survey
suggests that objectivity should be maintained as the researcher is analysing the data, rather
than interviewing the clergy and interpreting the transcripts which would be the case for a
qualitative approach.

Having examined the advantages and disadvantages of quantitative studies and taking into
account the nature of the study and the research questions being addressed, it was believed
that this approach was the most appropriate one for this project.

5.4 Ethical and economic issues and concerns explored

The Chester Diocese provided full support for the project through the offices of the Bishop
of Birkenhead, Keith Sinclair. A significant amount of preparatory work was required to
set the scene for the project and to encourage the clergy to take part, especially as the study
was using a new psychometric instrument (GPI) and it was recognised that this might be
viewed by some clergy as intrusive. The collection of data through the survey, especially
as the researcher was being allowed to access the parish statistics, did raise potential issues
of confidentiality and anonymity. The supporting documentation presented to the clergy
along with the survey, indicated that the intention was to utilise the parish statistics for
those clergy who had been in their current posts for at least five years, and that by
completing the survey, these clergy were agreeing to the researcher accessing these data.
The detailed proposals and procedures were presented to and approved by the Ethics
Committee, within Glyndŵr University.

The economic position was considered as handling large numbers of surveys and the
associated analysis have time and cost implications. The researcher was working on a self-
financing part-time basis, but the view was taken that a quantitative approach still
represented the preferred method for addressing the chosen research questions.
5.5 The design and construction of the survey

While the primary purpose of the survey was to test the utility and value of the Glowinkowski Predisposition Indicator (GPI; Glowinkowski, 2010), for examining leadership behaviours related to church growth in the Chester Diocese, there were a number of additional data sets which the researcher wanted to consider in order to provide a comprehensive picture of the clergy who completed the survey, so the survey was positioned under the broad theme of Ministry Today. It was decided to invite the participants to provide this additional information alongside the GPI; these covered a number of broad areas, which are reviewed below.

5.5.1 Personal Context

This section examined biographical data, such as, sex, age, marital status, those with whom the participants share their home, and information regarding their qualifications in theology and religious studies and other academic disciplines. A number of these items are standard in surveys of this type. The questions on qualifications were part of an examination to explore whether the candidates had conducted further studies or gained secular work experience prior to ordination.

5.5.2 Professional Contexts

This section addressed the participants’ experience of the world of work outside of church, the basic intent being to determine if those individuals who had gained a significant body of experience in leadership and managerial roles would be able to transfer that learning and experience to their church leadership roles and hence be able to make a difference by creating a culture and environment which supports and encourages church growth.

5.5.3 Ministry Contexts

This section explored the participants’ preparation for and experience of ministry. It examined topics such as length of experience in clergy roles and the type of ordination training they had experienced, the amount of time spent in their current role and the size of the population which they were serving. It tested the levels of support clergy had experienced from key personnel within the diocese. They were asked to rate the
importance which they placed on various aspects of their roles, and to compare their scores with a view of the importance which they felt their church members placed on those same facets of their roles. There were asked whether topics (such as leadership, working in teams, management of change, etc) had been addressed in their initial and continuing ministerial development training.

The final part of this section questioned how open and welcoming they believed the culture to be in their church, how willing the members were to embrace change, and whether the topic of church growth had been set as a strategic priority for the church.

5.5.4 Personal Predispositions

This section presented the Glowinkowski Predisposition Indicator (GPI) using the questions from the GIL commercial survey.

5.5.5 Personal characteristics

This part of the survey utilized the Francis Psychological Type Scale (FPTS) which has been used extensively in psychological type studies of clergy across a spectrum of church denominations and congregations (Francis et al., 2013). This was included so that comparisons for this cohort of clergy could be made with previous studies as well as providing an option for correlating the output from FPTS with that from the GPI.

5.5.6 Questions associated with Clergy Burnout

This section included the Francis Burnout Inventory (FBI), which has been used to identify some of the underlying reasons for burnout among clergy as well as to identify those clergy who are most at risk of burn out (Francis et al., 2011). By including it in this study, it allows for comparisons between this cohort and previous studies as well as providing the opportunity for exploring correlations between FBI and GPI.

5.5.7 Questions linked to personal well being

This part of the clergy survey adopted the Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale (WEMWBS). The WEMWBS questionnaire, established in 2007, is supported by the NHS Health Scotland in order to explore the mental-well being of individuals and groups.
(Tennant et al., 2007). Its inclusion provides the opportunity to explore relationships between WEMWBS and GPI as well as relationships between FPTS, FBI and WEMWBS.

5.5.8 Comments and supplementary input

This final section provided some free format questions asking whether the clergy had developed a strategy for church growth, whether they had adopted any innovative ways of conducting mission and for engaging with ‘Fresh Expression’ activities.

Candidates were provided with an opportunity to add any additional comments which they felt were of interest or relevance to this study.

Overall it was felt that this survey provided a balanced and comprehensive process designed to explore and gain an understanding of the clergy and their Ministry roles along with some of the factors which impinge on their leadership styles and behaviours and which can therefore affect the climate and culture which is created within their churches.

5.6 Conclusions

This chapter examined the choice of methodology proposed for testing the research questions and concluded that a quantitative approach was the preferred option. It considered some of the other issues which need to be addressed in a study of this type, including ethical and economic factors. It demonstrated that issues associated with constructing the survey and handling the data were addressed appropriately. It has described the detailed design and construction of the survey and explained the basis for the inclusion of each of the elements. These are designed to provide comprehensive background information about the participants who completed the survey and to raise the possibility of comparing the results obtained for the GPI with those provided by the other established instruments. These additional analyses are, however, outside the scope of this dissertation and will be addressed in subsequent work.
Chapter 6

Introducing the Chester Diocesan clergy

6.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to summarise key elements of the information obtained from the clergy survey. The main focus of the study was to determine the value and benefit of the GPI for profiling clergy in the Chester Diocese and for modelling church growth. The survey included additional questions designed to elicit data concerning the clergy’s ministry roles. The main points which emerge from the data are summarised and a link is made with previous studies of clergy which have employed the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS) and the Francis Burnout Inventory (FBI). The summaries are presented in sections which correspond with the sets of questions which the clergy completed.

6.2 Clergy: Personal Context

There were 203 questionnaires sent out to clergy in the Chester Diocese: 104 were returned (51.2%), and of those 100 (49.3%), were sufficiently complete to be included in the overall analysis.

The questions which dealt with gender and age, identified 26 females and 74 males with a spread of ages (as of 31 December 2012) from 30-39 (4) through 40-49 (20) and 50-59 (51) to 60-69 (25). Thus the average age of the clergy completing the survey is relatively high, which may create problems, in terms of seeking sufficient replacements as the current incumbents retire.

The question on marital status indicated that 12 were single, 81 were married, 2 were widowed, 2 were divorced and 3 were divorced and remarried.

The question which explored the level of qualifications gained by the clergy in theology and religious studies and in other academic disciplines showed that the majority of the group had degree level qualifications in theology and religious studies, of these 20 had Masters degrees and 5 had Doctorates. Three quarters of the group had degree level qualifications in other disciplines, with 10 who had Masters and 4 had Doctorates. There was considerable diversity in the other disciplines, with 9 who had Engineering
6.3 Professional Context

The clergy were asked if they had gained secular work experience before presenting for ordination and 94 out of 100 had done so with a spread of 15 who had 1-2 years experience, through to 26 who had 11-15 years, 6 who had 16-20 years with 18 who had more than 20 years experience showing that over half of the clergy had more than 11 years experience in other career roles prior to ordination. There was a similar varied pattern in the responses to questions on the number, the nature and seniority of the roles they had held. Overall these results indicated that there was a significant body of leadership experience and knowledge which was available to be brought to the clergy ministerial roles and hopefully to influence the way in which the clergy discharged their ministry roles. The business sectors having the highest representation were Education/Teaching with 21, Engineering with 12, NHS/Health Sector with 11 and Financial/Accountancy with 9.

This section of the survey was included in order to explore (in subsequent analysis) whether those clergy who had gained secular work experience prior to ordination, presented with a different set of leadership predispositions and behaviours because they were drawing on a body of learning from their secular employment and utilising it within their ministerial roles.

6.4 Ministry Context

The candidates were asked for details of their ordination training, whether they had completed a part-time or full-time course and for the name of college or course they had attended. The resulting lists were lengthy with no obvious patterns emerging.

Of the 100 clergy, 62 have been in their current position for at least five years and the parish statistics of this group were examined for evidence of growth. The results of this analysis are found in Chapter 14.

Clergy were asked to indicate the number of churches they were responsible for and the following data emerged: 57 have 1 church, 31 have 2, while 9 have 3 and 2 have 4. These figures show that leadership of multiple churches is not as extensive as appears in some
other Dioceses in England and Wales, however the results still need careful thought and consideration. The recent Church of England, *Church Growth* research report, has suggested that placing ministers in charge of multiple churches reduces the likelihood that they will grow.

The strategy of grouping multiple churches together under one leader has in general had a detrimental effect on church growth. Multi-church amalgamations and teams are less likely to grow. Churches are more likely to grow when there is one leader for one community. (*From Anecdote to Evidence*. p. 8. 2011-2013.).

It does appear that there are some challenging strategic decisions to be made by senior clergy leaders, as they grapple with the choices of retaining a presence in particular locations, whilst recognising that leadership of multiple churches may reduce the possibility of growth.

When the survey tested the degree of support that clergy were receiving from key personnel within the Chester Diocese, the results were mixed. Summing the agree and agree strongly responses, the percentages were as follows, Diocesan Bishop 44%, Suffragan Bishops 66%, Archdeacons 63%, Ministry Development Officers 31%, Spiritual Directors 40% and Local Church Members 78%. These figures may be suggesting that some clergy feel that the levels of support provided are lower than they would want.

The clergy were asked to place a priority rating on a number of aspects of their ministry role. The questions were repeated but in this case they were asked to indicate the priority which they believed their church members placed on the same facets of their role. The results when summing the agree and agree strongly responses, presented conflicting results; some answers highlight a very different view of ministry priorities between the clergy and their church members. This raises the question whether such differences of emphasis could be a potential source of tension and stress. Some examples of these differences are for *Teaching* (clergy 90% and church members 63%), *Corporate prayer* (clergy 78% and church members 46%), *Developing the gifts of congregational members* (clergy 87% and church members 44%), *Developing future leaders* (clergy 70% and church members 28%), *Developing a collaborative ministry* (clergy 84% and church members 40%), and *Administration activities* (clergy 36% and church members 53%). The extent of these differences is significant and indicates that the clergy and their church members appear to value quite different ministerial priorities. The differences in the results for developing the gifts of church members, developing future leaders and developing
collaborative ministry are striking and of particular relevance to this study as they suggest that there may be a number of management of change issues which need to be addressed if the clergy and lay members are to move forward together and to be able to work towards a more united agenda.

The final set of questions in this section explored the climate and culture within the churches. Again summing the agree and the agree strongly responses, 60% felt that their church members were open to and welcome change, 53% felt that church members were willing to use their gifts, 60% said that the environment is supportive of growth, 68% that growth is a key priority for the leadership team, and 61% said that the members were growing as disciples. These responses suggest that there appears to be an element of disagreement between the answers provided on the clergy priorities and the answers provided on church culture and climate.

6.5 Personal characteristics

This section included the Francis Psychological Type Scale (FPTS) and the Francis Burnout Inventory (FBI), both of which have been used extensively in studies of clergy covering a range of denominations. The FPTS and FBI have also been used to examine correlations between psychological type and burnout (Francis et al, 2013). In this survey 100 clergy completed the Francis Psychological Type Scale, which draws on the development of Jung’s classic model that distinguishes between two orientations (extraversion and introversion), two perceiving functions (sensing and intuition), two judging functions (thinking and feeling), and two attitudes (judging and perceiving). This same group completed the Francis Burnout Inventory which builds on Bradburn’s classic model of balanced effect to conceptualise poor work-related psychological health (burnout) expressed as high levels of emotional exhaustion in ministry in the absence of good levels of satisfaction in ministry.

These approaches have been widely tested and are presented in a series of papers summarised by Francis, Village, Robbins, and Wulff (2011). For their research with clergy, they translated the notion of negative affect into emotional exhaustion (measured by the Scale of Emotional Exhaustion in Ministry; SEEM), and the notion of positive affect into ministry satisfaction (measured by the Satisfaction in Ministry Scale; SIMS). Put together, these two 11-item scales form the Francis Burnout Inventory (FBI), which was adopted in this study.
Table 1

**Francis Burnout Inventory: scale properties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale of Emotional Exhaustion in Ministry</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel drained by fulfilling my ministry roles</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatigue and irritation are part of my daily experience</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am invaded by sadness I can't explain</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am feeling negative or cynical about the people with whom I work</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always have enthusiasm for my work*</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My humour has a cynical and biting tone</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find myself spending less and less time with those among whom I minister</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been discouraged by the lack of personal support for me here</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find myself frustrated in my attempts to accomplish tasks important to me</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am less patient with those among whom I minister than I used to be</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am becoming less flexible in my dealings with those among whom I minister</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEEM alpha</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction in Ministry Scale</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have accomplished many worthwhile things in my current ministry</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I gain a lot of personal satisfaction from working with people in my current ministry</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I deal very effectively with the problems of the people in my current ministry</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can easily understand how those among whom I minister feel about things</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel positive about my current ministry</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my pastoral ministry has a positive influence on people’s lives</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my teaching ministry has a positive influence on people’s faith</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my ministry is really appreciated by people</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am really glad that I entered the ministry</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ministry here gives real purpose and meaning to my life</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I gain a lot of personal satisfaction from fulfilling my ministry roles</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIMS alpha</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. This item has been reverse coded to compute the correlations, but not the percentage endorsement.

Table 1 presents the scale properties of the Francis Burnout Inventory in terms of the item rest-of-test correlations, together with the item endorsement as the sum of the agree and agree strongly responses. Both scales function with a high level of internal consistency.
reliability: SEEM, alpha = .86; SIMS, alpha = .88. The item endorsements suggest that overall the clergy are displaying a high level of satisfaction in their current ministry, but the evidence also shows indications of emotional exhaustion in ministry. For example, looking at satisfaction in ministry, 96% felt their pastoral ministry has a positive influence on people's lives; 87% were really glad that they had entered the ministry; 87% felt that their ministry is really appreciated by people; 86% gain a lot of personal satisfaction from fulfilling their ministry roles; 86% gain a lot of personal satisfaction from working with people in their current ministry; 81% feel that their teaching ministry has a positive influence on people's faith; 77% have accomplished many worthwhile things in their current ministry; and for 75% their ministry gives real purpose and meaning to their life. The remaining items were endorsed by approximately two thirds of the clergy, with 71% suggesting that they can easily understand how those among whom they minister feel about things; 68% felt very positive about their current ministry; and 59% said that they deal effectively with the problems of the people in my current ministry.

When looking at emotional exhaustion in ministry, the data found that over one third of the clergy in the sample from the Chester Diocese endorsed four of the eleven items in the Scale of Emotional Exhaustion in Ministry. Thus 51% felt drained by fulfilling their ministry roles; 40% did not always have enthusiasm for their work; 39% find themselves frustrated in their attempts to accomplish tasks important to them; 38% reported fatigue and irritation are part of their daily experience. The remainder of the items were endorsed by between one and three in ten of the clergy: 31% find themselves spending less and less time with attendees; 17% say that they are less patient with those among whom they minister than they used to be; 14% have been discouraged by the lack of personal support for themselves; 12% indicate that their humour has a cynical and biting tone; 12% that they are invaded by sadness that they can’t explain; 11% are feeling negative or cynical about the people with whom they work and 9% that they are becoming less flexible in their dealing with those among whom they are ministering.

The comparison of the results for the Chester Diocesan clergy with those presented by Francis et al. (2009) for 3,715 clergy from Australia, England and New Zealand, demonstrates that for a number of the items under satisfaction in ministry, that the Chester scores are higher. For example, ‘I feel that my pastoral ministry has a positive influence on people's lives’, scored 96% for the Chester clergy while in the larger sample it scored 86%. However for the items represented by the scale of emotional exhaustion in ministry, then scores from Chester also tended to be higher than those from the larger clergy sample.
Examples include: ‘I feel drained by fulfilling my ministry ’(51% vs. 35%), ‘I find myself frustrated in my attempts to accomplish tasks important to me’ (39% vs. 32%), ‘Fatigue and irritation are part of my daily experience’ (38% vs. 28%), ‘I find myself spending less and less time with those among whom I minister’ (31% vs. 19%) and ‘I am less patient with those among whom I minister than I used to be’ (17% vs. 15%). So whereas the Chester Diocesan results for the Satisfaction in Ministry Scale appear to be quite positive when compared with the earlier studies, the higher scores presented for the Scale Emotional Exhaustion in Ministry do need to be further examined as they are raising very important questions for those who hold responsibility for the pastoral care of the clergy.
Table 2. Type Distribution for: Chester Clergy
N = 99 (NB: + = 1% of N)

The Sixteen Complete Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(16.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFJ</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(16.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFJ</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(11.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(6.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(8.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(4.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTJ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(3.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESFJ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(6.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFJ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(6.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTJ</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(10.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dichotomous Preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>(40.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>(59.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>(45.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>(54.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>(43.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>(56.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>(75.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(24.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pairs and Temperaments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IJ</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>(50.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(9.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(15.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(25.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(20.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(25.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>(31.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(23.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>(41.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(4.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(20.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(34.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJ</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(34.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(17.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FJ</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>(39.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(26.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(28.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(12.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(18.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(22.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(34.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(25.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jungian Types (E)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-TJ</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(13.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-FJ</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(12.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES-P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(3.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN-P</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(12.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jungian Types (I)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-TP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-FJ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS-J</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(32.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN-J</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(18.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dominant Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dl.T</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(15.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dl.F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(19.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dl.S</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(35.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dl.N</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>(30.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2 presents the type distribution for the 100 clergy. This table is presented in the format well-established in the literature covering psychological type so as to allow for detailed comparisons between the Chester data and other published data.

These data demonstrate preferences for introversion (60%) over extraversion (40%), for intuition (55%) over sensing (45%), for feeling (57%) over thinking (43%), and for judging (76%) over perceiving (24%). The predominant type among these clergy is ISTJ and ISFJ (both 16%). These findings are consistent with the work of other studies that report clear preferences for introversion, intuition, feeling and judging among Church of England clergy. (Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, & Slater, 2007).

6.6 Conclusions

This chapter has presented and discussed some of the information provided by the clergy who completed the survey, Ministry Today. It has demonstrated the rich diversity of secular work and leadership experience which the clergy have brought to their ministerial roles.

It has made comparisons with some of the previous clergy research studies, Francis et al (2009) which adopted the FPTS and the FBI and this study shows similarities with previous work. There are some important issues which need to be addressed, because while the clergy are expressing high levels of satisfaction in ministry, these results should not be allowed to obscure the unacceptably high levels of exhaustion in ministry expressed by the Chester Diocesan clergy, which are higher than the levels expressed in the previous international studies. These results also reinforce the pastoral concerns and issues identified in Chapter 7 which analysed the clergy information based on the GPI commercial presentations.

These results have presented a number of topics which senior clergy and those responsible for pastoral care in the Chester Diocese may wish to consider. These include exploring whether the initial education and training of clergy and the continuing ministerial development of clergy are adequately addressing some of the underlying issues associated with psychological health and well-being and the potential risks of work related burnout. It raises the question as to whether the clergy are being equipped with a proper understanding of and effective strategies for coping with work-related stress and the associated risks of burnout.
A further theme which emerges concerns the apparent type biases which are reflected in previous clergy studies and which are again highlighted by this current study. Can we realistically maintain a theological argument which would suggest that God calls a disproportionate number of same types into ministry? Or is it more likely that the existing church structures, the composition of church congregations and the current selection processes which are employed are discriminating in favour of some types and negatively against other types. Can we really afford to exclude certain types from the leadership roles and would the result of including a wider spectrum of types have a positive impact on the life of the churches and the communities which they are serving?
Chapter 7

Clergy GPI commercial feedback

7.1 Introduction and outline of the feedback models

Glowinkowski International (GIL) present the results from the GPI analysis for individuals and teams in a set of pictorial formats which are provided in order to encourage discussion, and to promote a deeper understanding of the data as well as presenting it in a context which is directly relevant to the world of work. (Glowinkowski, 2010, pp. 17-24).

The principal purpose of this chapter is to address the first research question: By exploring the GPI formats as used in commercial situations, what does this tell us about the clergy as an overall group? The aim of this analysis is to test whether the GPI profiles from the Chester Diocesan clergy when presented in this format provide answers to the research question as well as generating new learning and insights which are beneficial to both individuals and Diocese as a whole. These commercial presentations of the GPI which are provided by GIL are designed to enable individuals and teams who have completed the psychometric instrument to appreciate and understand the full significance of their results and the interconnections which exist within the model. There are three types of interconnection which are considered when providing these results, these are:

- What GIL describe as the ‘shape’ which occurs within an overall dimension, e.g. Extraversion or Introversion.
- The many interconnections that exist between the various aspects of the overall dimensions, e.g. Collectivist or Individualist and Extraversion or Introversion.
- The total profile which reflects the many permutations, linkages and associations taking place between all of the dimensions within the model.

The motivation, when providing these models in a commercial context, is to provide practical information which helps individuals and teams, reflect on how their predispositions affect the way they operate in their job roles. GIL bring the information from the instrument together in three primary models which are presented in their distinctive visual format. The presentations are a series of two by two matrixes that help to capture the essence of the measurement in a visual format. By using a matrix, individuals
are able to identify which predisposition category they fall into, but also the extent to which they scored high or low for each predisposition.

7.1.1 Problem Solving and Implementation style

The model is designed to explain why an individual approaches problems in the way that they do and how they make decisions, the first matrix combines both the Cognition and Attainment domains and the visual presentation shows the relationship between the bipolar dimensions of Incremental/Radical and of Focused/Flexible.

These bipolar dimensions are presented on a two by two matrix, which forms a four quadrant model for the results of Problem Solving and Implementation style. This picture brings together an individual’s preferred thinking style with their preferred approach to tackling and completing tasks. This format is designed to enable individuals to reflect on the processes which they adopt for addressing problems and the plans and solutions they generate.

7.1.2 Communication and Interpersonal style

The model captures an individual’s attitude towards social interaction and the extent to which they are energised by being around people, it combines the Extraversion and the Agreeableness domains and the visual presentation shows the relationship between the bipolar dimensions Extraversion/Introversion and the bipolar dimensions of Collectivist/Individualist.

These bipolar dimensions are presented on a two by two matrix, which forms a four quadrant model for the results of Communication and Inter-personal Style. This diagram displays information about whether individual’s preference is to be with others or by themselves and this is linked to their predisposition either to support their ‘team’ fully (Collectivist) or to their preference to focus and drive their own agenda (Individualist). It therefore provides a snapshot of how individuals interact with others and the way in which they prefer to act and behave within a social context.
7.1.3 Feelings and Self-Control

The model represents how individuals feeling about themselves along with the extent to which they are able to control their emotions, it is built around only one domain, Emotionality and the visual presentation shows the relationship between the bipolar dimensions Disciplined/Impulsive and the bipolar dimensions At-Ease/Ill-at-Ease.

These bipolar dimensions are presented on a two by two matrix, which forms a four quadrant model for the results of Feelings and Self-Control. This diagram displays information about how individuals feel about themselves along with a sense of the extent to which they are able to control their emotions. It is combined with an indication of how emotional individuals tend to be, how comfortable they feel about themselves and the way they choose to react to their impulses and desires, overall it is summarising an individuals Expressive and Self-Contained behaviours.

There are a further two other visual presentations provided, which are relevant for businesses, especially in situations where businesses need to deliver improvements in their performance in order to compete more effectively. These improvements can be achieved, by encouraging individuals and teams to explore and implement new ways of learning and by developing a more creative and innovative group environment. These are:

7.1.4 Learning Styles

This visual presentation shows the bipolar sub-dimensions of Outgoing/Reserved and the bipolar sum-dimensions of Practical/Conceptual. These bipolar sub-dimensions are drawn from bipolar dimensions of Extraversion/Introversion and Incremental/Radical. This then shows the individuals preferences to learn in a Theoretical vs. Practical manner and in an Active vs. Reflective manner.

7.1.5 Creativity and Entrepreneurship

This visual presentation shows an integrated set of data which combines thinking style, communication processes, emotion and drive and it draws its data from all of the domains within the GPI model. The bipolar dimensions in this model are Developing/Transforming and Internalise/Externalise.
7.2 Clergy information presented in the commercial visual formats

The results for the 99 clergy (of the 100 clergy) who completed the GPI questionnaire have been analysed using the Glowinkowski software to provide a set of diagrams. The data has been aggregated in the same manner that would be adopted if GIL were providing feedback to their clients as part of a consultancy intervention. These five sets of commercial presentations are displayed below, displaying the information for the whole group of clergy (N = 99), for the clergymen (N = 74) and for the clergywomen (N = 25). The discussion initially addresses the results of the whole group, and then considers if there are any further differences which emerge when the group is segregated by gender and those results are discussed in section 7.3 (page 100 forward).
The Problem Solving and Implementation Style diagrams show a set of aggregated results for the clergy from the Chester Diocese.

Thirty three out of 99 present as Planners (Incremental and Focused). This group will tend to feel most comfortable when they are making things happen and enjoy achieving practical outcomes through the delivery of clearly defined goals. They will tend to be pragmatic and realistic but as a result may appear inflexible in their approach to change, preferring to remain with the tried and tested, rather than experiment with novel approaches.

Thirty three out of the 99 are described as Practitioners (Incremental and Flexible). They tend to enjoy being busy with many practical tasks on the go simultaneously. They prefer to look at situations in terms of the here and now, responding to logical interpretations of data about the current situation to conduct change that is an enhancement and a gradual improvement to what exists, they are less likely to take intuitive leaps.

Twenty seven out of 99 presented as Visionaries (Radical and Flexible). This group are predisposed to look at situations in terms of the bigger picture and to examine all of the possible future opportunities for change. They will tend to generate radical ideas, but may not work them through into practical phases and projects which can be implemented. While they are able to generate a wide range of ideas, they may not establish priorities for addressing them and tend not to enjoy the level of detailed planning required to implement their radical ideas.

Only six out of 99 presented as Strategists (Radical and Focused). Strategists are seen at their best when they are developing solutions to large scale and complex problems and overseeing the implementation stages in broad terms. They are particularly effective at managing change as they are comfortable combining a structured planning approach to the need for step change away from an existing situation.

With regard to the research question, this data provides new insights about the clergy within the Diocese as individuals and as a total group. It is anticipated that the clergy roles in the Chester Diocese will normally be defined with some broad clear objectives, so on that basis, it could be envisaged that the Planner group (33) will find that such arrangements are helpful and a match with their predispositions. The Practitioners (33) will
also have freedom within this overall set of objectives, to address problems and present modest changes. The Visionary group (27) may find it helpful if they are able to access support from their lay members to convert some of their expansive ideas into real deliverable improvements. The diagram shows that for the 99 clergy who completed the GPI survey, there are few Strategists (6). This group of clergy have the potential to drive and implement radical change, so having such a small number with these predispositions does present some interesting questions.

This diagram raises some questions for senior clergy in Chester Diocese: for example, does this blend of predispositions represent the mix of clergy that it would expect or want? Are the predispositions and the range of capabilities which are implied appropriate for the variety of ministerial tasks and challenges which the Diocese has to address? Do the leaders believe that their selection and recruitment policy is delivering the type of candidates they require? Would increasing the number of Strategists available be beneficial, especially if the Diocese intends to continue to engage in concepts and processes which are designed to address the decline in attendances such as Growth Action Planning (GAP) and ‘Fresh Expressions’? For these approaches to be effective then ideally one requires people who can think ‘outside the box’ and who are comfortable in leading and managing change.
The Communication and Interpersonal Style framework diagrams show a different perspective on the clergy who completed the GPI.

The largest group of clergy who completed the GPI (72 out of 99) are Supporters (Introvert and Collectivist). This group tend to be seen as unassuming, considerate and trusting of others, with a focus on helping the group of which they are a part to achieve its goals. Although they may appear reserved on first meeting, they are good listeners and will offer advice without necessarily wishing to impose it upon the receiver. This leadership style and associated behaviour may be appropriate when working with their congregations, if it does contribute towards shared goals and full involvement of the membership's gifts.

The second highest group (12 out of 99) are Independents (Introvert and Individualist). These individuals will be viewed by others as Rational and reserved and perhaps may appear detached from the rest of the group. They will tend to keep their views to themselves, only expressing them when they believe the situation requires it. They will be comfortable having views that differ from the group, and must be careful not to cause upset if they express these views without considering the potential impact on people's emotions.

The third group (8 out of 99) are Encouragers (Extravert and Collectivist). This group will tend to be seen by others as sociable, outgoing and group-orientated, and will endeavour to create a good atmosphere in the team. They have a natural tendency to be uncomfortable when handling conflict, and may therefore be inclined to hold back from addressing potentially difficult situations.

The final group (7 out of 99) are Challengers (Extravert and Individualist). This group will tend to be open, assertive and prepared to debate and challenge the views expressed by others within the group. They enjoy social settings, but may be more focused on achieving their own agendas than those of the wider group.

This summary shows a very high number of the clergy (84 out of 99) present in the introversion quadrants: this information may generate further questions and debate within the Chester Diocese. For example, against the strategies which they have set, does this mix of clergy provide the range of predispositions and capabilities which will be effective in delivering those strategies, or are there some benefits to be gained by adjusting the mix? Is it possible through the development processes and programmes (CMD) to encourage
clergy to review and perhaps modify their behaviours? As a result of such changes encouraging them to consider the benefits of working in a more collaborative manner. There is also a wider theological question about who are called to the ministry; is it envisaged that those who are called would perhaps reflect a rather narrow cross section of the population or is it anticipated that God would call clergy who present with a much broader mix of predispositions? (See also Chapter 6).
Feelings and Self-Control diagrams indicate that there is not an even distribution of the clergy across the quadrants.

There are (37 out of 99) who present as Contained. This clergy group may find it harder than others to openly express their feelings and emotions. Although there may be times when it would be constructive to suppress their natural emotions because demonstrating those emotions may serve to ‘make matters worse’. Internally these clergy may be experiencing strong emotions. They may be keeping a lid on things because of their predisposition to be Disciplined. However, if these clergy continually suppress their thoughts and emotions this can be stressful, and such stress has been shown over a period of time to have a negative impact on performance. Therefore these individuals will need a means of releasing this ‘pressure’ in a controlled and managed manner.

The next group are (34 out of 99) who present as Composed. This group will feel positive about themselves and maintain a level of self-discipline. There are benefits in interacting with persons who appear well adjusted and hard working. The downside may be that others question their level of engagement because; being At-ease they can appear to show little or no anxiety even during periods of acute stress.

There are (17 out of 99) who present as Expressive. This group may react suddenly and in a manner which could have an adverse impact on others. Potentially this group may be hard to manage, but their impulsiveness may enable them to cut through bureaucracy and red tape which they perceive to be impeding the changes which they believe are required.

The final group is (11 of the 99) who present as Energised. These individuals will be considered as open. When conducting negotiations and performance management activities, this openness can have both upsides and downsides, as others may tend to trust an open individual, but equally there are occasions when confidentiality is essential. The upbeat positive manner displayed by such individuals can help to lift the mood when the ‘chips are down.’ However it is equally true that such behaviour can be viewed by some individuals as annoying.

This commercial format and the information it is providing concerns complex and sensitive areas which need to be handled with considerable care. If the clergy group (Contained 37) are not able or willing to express their views and emotions openly and are thereby
experiencing stress, then they may need more support and help than is currently being provided or available. This situation may present a challenge if the resources within the Chester Diocese are limited or restricted, the risk being however that not addressing such issues may cause some of the clergy to suffer stress and potential burnout, which could have a long term implications for them and their families.
This model has a general utility and is designed to help individuals appreciate how they are predisposed to assimilate information and to develop understanding and new skills. Its importance lies in that it provides a picture which helps individuals understand more about learning processes in general as well as their own preferred learning style. The concept of learning styles is well established. David Kolb (1984) is one of the major authors in the field and he built on work by Peter Honey and Alan Mumford (1982), John Dewey (1938), Kurt Lewin (1942) and Jean Piaget (1983). The Learning Styles framework presents two important concepts:

- That individuals do tend to have a preferred learning style and learn more effectively when they match the medium they choose for their learning with their preference.
- That there is a defined learning cycle and whatever is the preferred mode of learning for an individual that when they consider new learning opportunities for themselves or others, these are likely to be more effective if each of the learning modes is covered. Individuals should ideally be encouraged to examine ideas and concepts in ways which may differ from their natural learning preference.

Within the GPI process the learning styles framework comprises two dimensions:

- The individual's preference with regard to how they process information, i.e. do they prefer Practical or Conceptual approaches.
- The individual's preferred way of assimilating and engaging with this information, i.e. Outgoing or Reserved.

The presentation for the clergy in this study showed that (50 out of 99) prefer to learn in a Practical and Reflective (Reserved) mode, while (25 out of 99) preferred a Conceptual (Theoretical) and Reflective mode for learning. A further (14 of the 99) expressed a preference for learning in an Outgoing (Active) and Practical mode and the balance of (10 from 99) indicated a preference for learning in an Outgoing and Conceptual mode.

So in addressing the research question, this presentation provides information which demonstrates the clergy’s learning preferences, as well as raising the possibility that there
may be value for the clergy when they are seeking new opportunities for learning to move out of their normal preference into a different part of the learning cycle and consequently this may result in enhanced and deeper learning outcomes. Such learning opportunities may be provided by the Chester Diocese as part of their continuing ministerial development programmes, or by the individuals themselves deliberately opting for learning opportunities and processes which create additional challenges.
Creativity and Entrepreneurship Framework

This visual presentation explores the type of ideas an individual has and the ways in which they are comfortable presenting those ideas to others in order to bring them into being.

The area of creativity is important and is often misunderstood. Views are promulgated which suggest that only a limited number of individuals within the wider population can be creative and entrepreneurial. This stance is challenged by this model. The model seeks to address some of the myths and misconceptions which are often held about creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship, such as:

- That in order to be creative or innovative individuals have to be Radical, whereas in truth, innovation can be applied to the development of existing ideas without a requirement to invent something totally new.
- That all entrepreneurs are hardnosed business people. While some may be there are others who are not and there is no fixed pattern. In reality entrepreneurs aim to create wealth and they do so by having personal assets invested in seeking successful outcomes. There is no evidence to show that they succeed by being predatory or by taking unfair advantage of others.
- That innovation equates to genius and this mistake is often made where the style of thinking is confused with the level or quality of thinking. Style and level are different things and this model is not measuring level. There are factors to consider when someone is observed ‘breaking the mould’ with their ideas and it is important not to judge those ideas as good or bad.

The GIL Creativity and Entrepreneurship model is quite complex as it is built around two sets of bipolar dimensions from the GPI construct. The first of these bipolar dimensions examines the nature of people’s ideas; are they Developing or Transforming? In this case Developing represents modifications to the existing situation, and so seeking to ‘do things better,’ while Transforming implies the application of fundamental change from the existing therefore seeking to ‘do things differently.’ This concept draws on three predispositional styles. Firstly, is an individual's thinking Evolutionary, i.e. bringing about improvement or enhancement, or is it Revolutionary? Therefore seeking to establish new approaches and practices, including paradigm shifts. Secondly do individuals ideas and thinking style, align with or oppose others; in other words are they Conforming or
Dissenting? Finally considering the extent to which individuals attend to the details within their tasks thus avoiding ‘loose ends’ are they Conscientious or do they adopt a broader approach, Cursory?

The second set of bipolar dimensions which are used, relate to how individuals approach the task of communicating and selling of their ideas to others. This aspect brings a further four predispositional styles into play. The first question is, how readily do individuals speak their mind, are they Asserting or Accepting? Secondly when considering future opportunities are people, Optimistic or do they adopt more cautious views of the future, Pessimistic? Thirdly, in the degree to which individuals think and deliberate before providing an opinion, are they Disciplined or Impulsive? Finally considering the manner in which individuals approach tasks, do they adopt a steady methodical manner, Paced or do they prefer to move more quickly and enthusiastically, Energetic?

The information for the Chester Diocesan clergy, shows (62 of the 99) present as Developing and Internalise, ‘Considered trial of an improvement to the existing,’ so it is likely that this group will want to test their ideas thoroughly before going public and potential innovations will therefore only progress slowly over a protracted period of experimentation and refinement.

The next highest group were (17 out of 99) who were Transforming and Externalise, ‘Rigorous pursuit of ground breaking ideas.’ For this group thinking is fast and fluid with ideas arriving in an almost fully formed state. Ideas will be energetically promoted to others without always stopping to reflect how they may be received. This perceived ‘pushiness’ may result in ideas being rejected, not because of the nature of the ideas themselves but rather because of the way they have been presented and ‘sold.’

The third group were (12 out of 99) who present as Transforming and Internalise, ‘A measured approach to communicating change.’ They will favour large scale change rather than incremental change, but with this approach they will appreciate the risks and hence a more cautious and considered approach will be adopted when promoting the ideas, possibly resulting in greater acceptance of their ideas.

The final group were (8 out of 99) who present as Developing and Externalise, ‘Enthusiastic promotion of adaptations to a theme’ The ideas generated will represent a
progression from the existing as opposed to mould breaking. Improvements will be presented with enthusiasm and energy. There will be a desire to improve situations without ‘throwing the baby out with the bathwater.’ Proven ideas from the past will be picked up and developed, refined and sold to others.

It is important to reiterate that this framework, especially the horizontal axis (Developing/Transforming) is concerned about the nature of ideas which people generate and not their intrinsic quality. This framework does provide a valuable perspective of the clergy who completed the GPI, as it indicates that the majority of the group will take a cautious approach to developing ideas and presenting them to others. Again it highlights the question: is this the type of mix which is wanted or required to move things forward and manage change across the Diocese? These data may have a practical relevance whenever the Diocese is bringing together project groups and committees to manage a range of activities and changes on their behalf. By considering the predispositions of those whom they wish to include in the teams, then it may be possible to create groups which will think topics through creatively and will also consider carefully how those ideas should be presented to their fellow clergy and the lay members across the Diocese. As a consequence they may move issues forward in a more successful and productive manner.

7.3 Presentation of the clergy data by gender

These data for the ninety nine clergy has been aggregated by gender and presented to consider if this provided any further insights into the predispositions and characteristics of the clergy.

The data for female (25) and male clergy (74) is shown alongside the aggregated data for the total group of 99 as this enables direct comparisons. It shows that for the female and male groups the patterns appear very similar to those discussed for the full group above. It is felt that the small sample sizes militated against any significant additional learning, but it is suggested that if this research were repeated in the future on a new larger sample of clergy that some gender related differences may be observed.

GIL completed a case study (Leadership: The Impact of Gender, January 2010). From the GPI database the study extracted data for 3719 individuals of whom 2328 were male and 1391 were female. They stressed that although differences did emerge within this study, it is essential to recognise that there are potentially positive and negative behavioural
implications associated with all predispositions. Hence looking at the differences between men and women is complex and requires careful consideration of the resulting advantages and disadvantages which may apply to both genders.

Clear differences were found in the raw data, with 17 out of the 22 scales showing a statistically significant difference. Highlighting only one of those areas of difference, they reported that the male and female forms of Extraversion look markedly different. Whilst the female Extraversion of Fun Loving and Outgoing implies encouraging warmth, friendliness and sociability-especially when combined with an Affiliative nature, the male ‘colour’ of Extraversion combining the more Assertive and Serious Minded tendencies, has a much harder edge. Combined with Social Assuredness and less of an Affiliative tendency the male engagement style is likely to be forthright and challenging. This example reinforces the need to look at the data carefully and to ensure that it is treated holistically.

7.4 Conclusions

It is clear from the examination and discussion of the commercial visual formats, that this approach does present a new perspective on the predispositions and behaviours of the clergy as individuals and as a total group.

This methodology provided a positive answer to the research question: ‘By examining the GPI format as used commercially what does this tell us about the clergy as a group?’ These presentations demonstrated the variations of predispositions which exist within the group and highlight some potential gaps, especially if it is believed to be important to have a cohort of clergy within the Diocese who display a wider and more even spread of predispositions within the primary and supplementary models. When these models are applied within businesses it is seen to be advantageous to have a degree of balance across the quadrants. This is not what has been observed with this group of clergy, for example in Problem Solving and Implementation, there are 6 clergy in the Strategist quadrant and in Communication and Interpersonal Style, 84 out of 99 appear as introvert. So it is valid to pose the questions do these figures fit well with the nature of the clergy leadership requirements within the Chester Diocese or are these data significant?

The discussion has highlighted further issues, for the current group of clergy, for instance would it be advantageous to have more individuals who are predisposed to develop new
ideas and drive them to successful conclusions? These commercial presentations have raised additional questions for the senior clergy in the Chester Diocese to consider and reflect on. It is suggested that there may be some merit when establishing project teams and task groups to work on topics on behalf of the Diocese as a whole, in bringing together clergy who present with different characteristics within the Creativity & Entrepreneurship model and who may have the potential to work together effectively because of the distinctive combination of predispositions and behaviours which they will bring to these groups. These differences could generate a positive impact both on the way the project teams approach the tasks and the manner in which they choose to communicate the results of their studies.

There is a possibility that by using this approach with other Diocesan groups of clergy in England and Wales it may contribute ideas for revisions to the designs of developmental programmes and continuing ministerial development processes. This summary has suggested that any future research, which used the GPI models in other Dioceses in England and Wales, would have to be with the clear intention to generate larger clergy sample sizes, as it is anticipated this could further enhance the learning which results.
Chapter 8

Extraversion-Introversion

8.1 Introduction

The second of the research questions is, When the GPI is opened to close examination how does it function among clergy? and this chapter specifically addresses this research question concerning extraversion and introversion. The definitions developed by Glowinkowski International for extraversion and introversion are presented as well as the items which make up the clusters. The clergy responses for the GPI extraversion and introversion dimensions are displayed along with a summary of the predispositions displayed by the clergy.

8.2 GPI Extraversion: Extraversion

8.2.1 Defining Extraversion

Glowinkowski International (GIL) defines Extraversion within this model as:

The domain of Extraversion is concerned with the primary direction in which an individual’s attention and energies are focused whether it is beyond themselves into the external world or within themselves into their inner world. People who are more Extraverted in nature prefer to focus their energies on engaging with the world around them. They are generally at ease in social situations and tend to be more physically and socially active, enjoying talking through issues, rather than reflecting. Extraverted individuals tend to enjoy and feel comfortable interacting with others at social gatherings. Extraverts will express their view readily and hold having fun as a priority. (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 7)

8.2.2 Exploring the clusters

There are four clusters within the dimension of Extraversion.

The first of these clusters is Asserting. According to the GPI Extravert model, ‘Asserting individuals tend to be relatively dominant, forceful and socially ascendant. They will speak without hesitation and easily adopt leadership roles’ (Glowinkowski, 2010, p1 1). On this account the GPI Extravert is someone who:
Prefers to state my views forcefully  
Is dominant  
Usually makes decisions  
Likes to take charge

The second of these clusters is Fun loving. According to the GPI model, ‘Fun loving individuals tend to be dominated by a pleasure-seeking mentality where pursuit of pleasure and fun is important in both social and work activities’ (Glowinkowski, 2010, p 11). On this account the GPI Extravert is someone who:

Prefers to have a good time  
Finds it easy to spoil myself  
Pursues pleasure as a priority  
Considers having a good time a priority

The third of these clusters is Outgoing. According to the GPI model, ‘Outgoing individuals have a predisposition to enjoy the company of other people, tending to thrive and draw their energy from social situations. They are predisposed to talk their thinking through with others’ (Glowinkowski, 2010, p 11). On this account the GPI Extravert is someone who:

Prefers to talk problems through  
Finds it easy dealing with others  
Enjoys the company of others  
Enjoys large social gatherings

While the fourth of these clusters is Socially assured. According to the GPI model, Socially assured individuals feel comfortable in social situations and are not fazed by the prospects of meeting new people. They are more gregarious, in other words they are less socially selective’ (Glowinkowski, 2010, p 11). On this account the GPI Extravert is someone who:

Feels comfortable when meeting new people  
Feels socially confident  
Feels comfortable in social situations  
Feels at ease with strangers
### 8.2.3 Scale properties

Table 8.2.3 GPI Extraversion: scale properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asserting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to state my views forcefully</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is dominant</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually makes the decisions</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes to take charge</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fun loving</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to have a good time</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finds it easy to spoil myself</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursues pleasure as priority</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers having a good time as a priority</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outgoing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to talk problems through</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finds it easy dealing with others</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoys the company of others</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoys large social gatherings</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socially assured</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels comfortable when meeting new people</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels socially confident</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels comfortable in social situations</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels at ease with strangers</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alpha</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.2.3 presents the scale properties of the GPI Extraversion scale in terms of the correlation between each individual item and the sum of the other fifteen items, and in terms of the item endorsement as the sum of the agree and agree strongly responses. The alpha coefficient of .84 indicates that overall the sixteen items cohere well, although the item correlations show two particularly weak items, falling below .3:
☐ Finds it easy to spoil myself (fun loving)
☐ Prefers to talk problems through (outgoing)

The GPI construct of Extraversion may be improved by the omission of these items.

8.2.4 Profiling clergy

Within the Asserting cluster of items, fewer than half the clergy describe themselves as dominant (20%), or say that they prefer to state their views forcefully (23%) or feel that they like to take charge (45%). Well over half, however, agree that they usually make the decisions (61%). Whilst not generally forceful, clergy are not shy of decision-making; they may just prefer not to force their decisions on others. For the asserting cluster of items clergy do not emerge as extraverts for three out of the four items.

Within the Fun-loving cluster of items, very few clergy feel that they pursue pleasure as a priority (8%), and fewer than one in five say that they find it easy to spoil themselves (18%) or that they consider having a good time as a priority (18%). The proportion grows to 42% who consider that they prefer to have a good time. For the fun-loving cluster of items clergy do not emerge as extraverts.

Within the Outgoing cluster of items, fewer than half enjoys large social gatherings (41%), while almost three quarters find it easy dealing with others (72%) and say that they prefer to talk problems through (74%). This rises to four out of five who say that they enjoy the company of others (84%). For the outgoing cluster of items clergy emerge as extraverts for three out of four items.

Within the Socially assured cluster of items, nearly two thirds feel at ease with strangers (64%), feel socially confident (68%) and feel comfortable when meeting new people (69%). A marginally higher figure says that they feel comfortable in social situations (70%). For the socially assured cluster of items clergy emerge as extraverts.

8.2.5 Summary

The GPI section of extraversion consists of four clusters, for one cluster (socially assured) the clergy emerge as extraverts and for one cluster (fun-loving) the clergy do not emerge as
extraverts. There are split results for the other two clusters, one cluster (outgoing) the clergy emerge as extraverts on three out of four items and on another cluster (asserting) the clergy do not emerge as extraverts on three out of four items. Overall for the GPI section of extraversion the clergy present as extraverts on 8 out of 16 items, across the four clusters.

8.2.6 Ideas for future consideration

The definitions discussed are specific to the Glowinkowski Predisposition Indicator (GPI) and represent an approach which has been designed and adapted for a commercial consultancy business which is supporting their clients to improve the performance of individuals, teams and organisations in line with the client's business strategy. It may be useful to test if the language used fits well with the roles of clergy as they are perceived within churches and Dioceses.

In addition to the two items highlighted in 8.2.3 which presented with fairly weak 'item rest-of-test correlations', this statement could be revisited;

- usually makes decisions (asserting)

Is this statement a true characteristic of someone who displays Extraversion? Even though the 'item rest-of-test correlation' presents at a satisfactory level.

The split results for the clergy within some clusters raises questions about the concepts as defined and the language used to construct certain of the items within the clusters.

8.3 GPI Extraversion: Introversion

8.3.1 Defining Introversion

Glowinkowski International (GIL) defines Introversion:

People who are more Introverted tend to direct their energies inwards, are more reflective in nature, and generally prefer a more limited range of social contacts. They can also be relatively lower in assertiveness than extraverted people. Introverts will tend to be more reserved and think things through rather than expressing their thoughts. They are likely to take their duties more seriously and will be more selective in who they're comfortable socialising with. (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 7)
8.3.2 Exploring the clusters

There are four clusters within the dimension of Introversion.

The first of these clusters is Accepting. According to the GPI model, ‘Accepting individuals have a predisposition to be more submissive within interactions and are sometimes hesitant about speaking their mind in social situations. They tend to prefer to listen and keep their counsel' (Glowinkowski, 2010, p 11). On this account the GPI Introvert is someone who:

☑ Prefers others to lead the way
☑ Lets others decide what to do
☑ Prefers not to be assertive
☑ Does not mind if others take charge

The second of these clusters is Reserved. According to the GPI model, ‘Reserved individuals draw their energy more from being in their own company. They tend to think in terms of their internal world of ideas and concepts and prefer this to situations involving the company of others. Often, they prefer this to work on their own so they can ‘think things through’ before sharing their views’ (Glowinkowski, 2010, p 11). On this account the GPI Introvert is someone who:

☑ Prefers solitary pursuits
☑ Enjoys my own company
☑ Prefers to work through a problem on my own
☑ Finds it easy to be on my own

The third of these clusters is Serious minded. According to the GPI model, ‘Serious-minded individuals consider a sense of duty and responsibility as being more important than pleasure. They are preoccupied by what they consider to be the serious aspects of their day-to-day activities. In a managerial context, however, Serious-minded individuals can sometimes under-estimate the importance of building ‘social’ and ‘fun’ activities into the working environment’ (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 11). On this account the GPI Introvert is someone who:
The fourth of these clusters is Socially uncertain. According to the GPI model, ‘Socially uncertain individuals tend to be far more hesitant with social situations and will feel uncomfortable when meeting new groups of people or where there is a lack of stability in the constitution of the group with which they engage. Their preference is to engage with smaller groups with whom relationships are well formed. They are more socially selective.’ (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 11). On this account the GPI Introvert is someone who:

- Prefers to mix with people I know
- Feels ill-at-ease with people of high status
- Feels ill-at-ease in social situations
- Feels uncomfortable expressing my views to strangers
8.3.3 Scale properties.

Table 8.3.3 GPI Introversion: scale properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accepting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers others to lead the way</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lets others decide what to do</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers not to be assertive</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not mind if other take charge</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reserved</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers solitary pursuits</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoys my own company</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to work through a problem on my own</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finds it easy to be on my own</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Serious-minded</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes work seriously</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursues work as a priority</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers having a good time a low priority</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoys T.V. Programmes that cover serious issues</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socially uncertain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to mix with people I know</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels ill-at-ease with people of high status</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels ill-at-ease in social situations</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels uncomfortable expressing my views to strangers</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alpha</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.3.3 presents the scale properties of the GPI Introversion scale in terms of the correlation between each individual item and the sum of the other fifteen items, and as the item endorsement as the sum of the agree and agree strongly clergy responses. The alpha coefficient of .65 for the sixteen items is close to the limit accepted for tools of this nature (DeVellis, 2003).
The item correlations show seven items which fall below .3:

- Lets others decide what to do (accepting)
- Does not mind if others take charge (accepting)
- Takes work seriously (serious minded)
- Pursues work as a priority (serious minded)
- Enjoys T.V. programmes that cover serious issues (serious minded)
- Prefers to mix with people I know (socially uncertain)
- Feels ill-at-ease with people of high status (socially uncertain)

The GPI construct of Introversion may potentially be improved by the omission of these items, but this omission would significantly reduce the number of items to be scored within the dimension of Introversion.

### 8.3.4 Profiling clergy

Within the accepting cluster of items less than one in ten prefers others to lead the way (9%), while fewer than half prefer not to be assertive (44%), and half agree that they let others decide what to do (50%). While two thirds do not mind if others take charge (64%). For the Accepting cluster of items the clergy emerge as introverted on two out of the four items.

Within the reserved cluster of items a third of the group prefers solitary pursuits (34%) and prefers to work through a problem on their own (35%). By contrast three quarters of the clergy group, finds it easy to be on their own (75%) and enjoy their own company (78%). When considering the nature of the roles which clergy are expected to deliver, there is a possible conflict between those items suggesting a preference for being on ones own rather than working with the congregation. For the Reserved cluster of items the clergy emerge as introverts on two out of the four items.

Within the serious-minded cluster of items, a quarter of the group say that they consider having a good time as a low priority (24%) and a third enjoy T.V. programmes that cover serious issues (33%). Four out of five agrees that they pursue work as a priority, (81%) while almost the whole group indicate that they take work seriously (99%). For the
Serious-minded cluster of items the clergy emerge as introverts on two out of the four items.

Within the socially uncertain cluster of items, fewer than a quarter feel uncomfortable expressing their views to strangers (15%) and feel ill-at-ease in social situations (17%). Close to a quarter agree that they feel ill-at-ease with people of high status (27%), and nearly half of the group say that they prefer to mix with people they know (47%). For the Socially uncertain cluster of items the clergy do not emerge as introverts.

8.3.5 Summary

The GPI section of introversion is made up of four clusters, for one cluster (socially uncertain) the clergy do not present as introverts, however for three of the clusters (accepting, reserved and serious minded), the clergy emerge as introverts on two out of the four items. Overall for GPI section of introversion the clergy present as introverts on only 6 out of 16 items across the four clusters.

8.3.6 Ideas for future consideration

With seven out of the sixteen items in the dimension of Introversion presenting with ‘item rest-of-test correlations’ below .3 then it would seem to be appropriate to review the construction of this dimension of the GPI model, for its use with clergy. As well as those items with low ‘item rest-of-test correlations,’ for some items the language is potentially ambiguous, and may benefit from a review or revision, examples include:

☑ Considers having a good time a low priority (serious-minded)
☑ Enjoys T.V. programmes that cover serious items (serious-minded)

It would be hoped that with clergy roles, which have a strong sense of vocation, then this would contribute to the clergy having ‘a good time’, but this may have been interpreted by some as a good time outside of the normal framework of the role, further, is the question, enjoys T.V. programmes which cover serious items, a real indicator as to whether someone is serious-minded?
The split results within the clusters for the clergy raise possible concerns about the construct of this dimension of the instrument.

8.4 Conclusions

The Extraversion and Introversion dimensions deliver variable degrees of fit when the clergy results from this study are examined. These results suggest that the clergy do not present as either extraverts or introverts, and the analysis indicates that the overall scale properties for extraversion are stronger than for introversion and that for introversion a significant number of the individual items produce low ‘item rest-of-test correlations’.

These results raise some questions for this pair of dimensions, are there problems with the overall concept and constructs, or does the language adopted for certain items present difficulties for the clergy. It has not been possible to explore these topics further within this project, which is why they have been highlighted as areas for future consideration, but they may need to be addressed if the GPI instrument were to be used with other cohorts of clergy perhaps in other Dioceses in England and Wales.

A further area which could be explored is whether when the GPI is used in commercial consultancy interventions, do the raw scores for the individuals who complete the GPI, show similar results to those presented here, or in fact, are these results for the clergy unusual. For example, in three of the four clusters within introversion, the clergy presented as introverts on two out of the four items, so do these results imply that as we are dealing with complex, unique individuals, or that it is proving not to be simple and straightforward to design a set of items which provide consistent results, and which fully characterise the individuals under test.
Chapter 9

Emotionality-Ill-at-Ease//At-Ease-Impulsive/Disciplined

9.1 Introduction

The second of the research questions is, When the GPI is opened to close examination how does it function among clergy? and this chapter specifically addresses this research question for two pairs of dimensions from the GPI, Emotionality; Ill-at-Ease and At-Ease, and Impulsive and Disciplined. These pairs of dimensions are used in the GIL feedback process which shares the results with individuals or teams. In the presentation of Feelings and Self Control, this pair of dimensions are the horizontal and vertical axes which form a two by two matrix used to provide a visual display of the results of the GPI.

9.2 GPI Emotionality: Ill-at-ease

9.2.1 Defining Ill-at-ease

Glowinkowski International (GIL) defines Ill-at-ease within this model as:

‘The domain of Emotionality is concerned with the extent to which an individual tends to be at ease with themselves and the world around them, and the degree of volatility they experience in this. People who are Ill-at-ease are less confident, tend to be more pessimistic and are more given to reacting to their impulses. They can be less able to cope with stressful situations in an effective manner and can experience feelings of low self-esteem. It is important to recognise that this particular dimension can be seen as ‘State’ as well as ‘Trait’. By this we mean that over time an individual’s profile can be more subject to change. Also, despite the fundamental aim of GPI to be non-pejorative, this domain is regarded as inherently pejorative because it is generally felt better to be At-ease rather than Ill-at-ease.’ (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 7)

9.2.2 Exploring the clusters

There are four clusters which sit within the dimension of Ill-at ease.

The first of these clusters is Discontented. According to the GPI Ill-at-ease model, ‘Discontented individuals may experience anger and associated states of bitterness, frustration and discontented when considering their life’s passage. However, whether
anger is actually expressed or contained will depend upon the position of other predispositions such as Extraversion/Introversion (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 13-14). On this account the GPI Ill-at-ease person is someone who:

- Is easily irritated by interference from others
- Is seen by colleagues as temperamental
- Often feels discontented
- Often feels angry

The second of these clusters is Pessimistic. According to the GPI model, ‘Pessimistic individuals will tend to possess a far more negative view of the future-their ‘glass is half-empty’. They may more readily feel sad and dejected about their prospects for the future. The ‘upside’ for a pessimist is that they will tend to have a more cautious or measured response to an opportunity or situation and, therefore, deliver a less hurried and more thoroughly considered response’ (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 13-14). On this account the Ill-at-ease person is someone who:

- Views the future as lacking in opportunity
- Tends to be pessimistic
- Sometimes feels negative about the future
- Tends to see negatives of a situation

The third of these clusters Self-conscious. According to the GPI model, ‘Self-conscious individuals perceive themselves as being of low self-worth and they conjure an image of themselves as making low value contribution. An individual with low self-esteem can tend to lack self-belief, which may block or inhibit performance or decisions that are eminently within their grasp in terms of actual capability and potential’ (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 13-14). On this account the GPI Ill-at-ease person is someone who:

- Feels self doubt
- Tends to underestimate my capability
- Tends to be self-critical
- Feels hurt when criticised
The fourth of these clusters is Tense. According to the GPI model, ‘Tense individuals have a predisposition to experience apprehension and tenseness, with a tendency to worry. In some occupational groups ‘Tenseness’ can correlate with high performance, e.g. where being alert to changing circumstances is required, so the supposed ‘negativity’ of being tense is not so clear cut’ (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 13-14). On this account the GPI Ill-at-ease person is someone who:

- Worries about all the things which may go wrong
- Often feels tense
- Always feels a sense of urgency
- Is obsessive about meeting deadlines
9.2.3 Scale properties

Table 9.2.3 GPI Ill-at-ease: scale properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discontented</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is easily irritated by interference from others</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is seen by colleagues as temperamental</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often feels discontented</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often feels angry</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pessimistic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views the future as lacking in opportunity</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tends to be pessimistic</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes feels negative about the future</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tends to see negatives of a situation</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-conscious</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels self doubt</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tends to underestimate my capability</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tends to be self critical</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels hurt when criticised</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tense</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worries about all the things that may go wrong</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often feels tense</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always feels a sense of urgency</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is obsessive about meeting deadlines</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alpha</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.2.3 presents the scale properties of the GPI Ill-at-ease scale in terms of the correlation between each individual item and the sum of the other fifteen items, and in terms of the item endorsement by the clergy as the sum of the agree and agree strongly responses. Alpha coefficient of .87 shows that overall the sixteen items coheres well, although the item correlations highlight three weaker items, which fall below .3:
Feels hurt when criticised (self-conscious)
Always feels a sense of urgency (tense)
Is obsessive about meeting deadlines (tense)

It is likely that the GPI construct of Ill-at-ease may be improved by the omission of these items.

9.2.4 Profiling clergy

Within the discontented cluster of items approximately one in ten agree that they often feel angry (13%), while close to a quarter say that they often feel discontented (20%) and are seen by colleagues as temperamental (24%). A third of the clergy overall indicate that they are easily irritated by interference from others (33%). For the discontented cluster the clergy do not emerge as Ill-at-ease.

Within the pessimistic cluster of items less than one in fifty views the future as lacking in opportunity (2%), suggesting that the majority of the group do recognise future opportunities. Nearly two in ten agree that they tend to be pessimistic (16%), while approximately a third of the group sometimes feel negative about the future (36%) and tend too see the negatives of a situation (37%). For the pessimistic cluster the clergy do not emerge as Ill-at-ease.

Within the self-conscious cluster of items nearly two thirds agree that they feel self doubt (58%) and tend to underestimate their capability (58%). While approximately three quarters of the group feel hurt when criticised (70%) and tend to be self critical (78%), there is a possible connection between being self critical and underestimating capability. For the self-conscious cluster the clergy emerge as Ill-at-ease.

Within the tense cluster of items, then around two in ten are obsessive about meeting deadlines (18%), and a quarter always feels a sense of urgency (26%). Just over a third worry about all the things that may go wrong (35%) and often feel tense (37%). For the tense cluster the clergy do not emerge as Ill-at-ease.
9.2.5 Summary

The GPI section of ill-at-ease consists of four clusters, for one cluster (self-conscious), the clergy emerge as ill-at-ease and for the other three clusters (discontented, pessimistic, and tense), and the clergy do not emerge as ill-at-ease. Overall for the GPI section of ill-at-ease the clergy present as ill-at-ease on only 4 out of 16 items, across the four clusters.

9.2.6 Ideas for future consideration

The definitions presented here are specific to the Glowinkowski Predisposition Indicator (GPI) and represent an approach which was designed for use in a management consultancy processes to drive improvements in business performance, it was not been designed specifically with church leaders in mind and it may be that some adjustments of the language would provide improvements to the instrument when used with church leaders.

In addition to the three items highlighted in 9.2.3 above, there are two other items which present with fairly weak ‘item rest’of-test correlations with scores just above .3:

- Is seen by colleagues as temperamental (discontented)
- Tends to underestimate my capability (self-conscious)

It may be appropriate to review there contribution to this dimension overall.

The statement is seen by colleagues as temperamental, (discontented), could potentially be difficult for the clergy to score, as they tend to work quite a lot of the time on their own, rather than within teams where feedback from colleagues could be provided. It could also be valuable to test if the item, Is obsessive about meeting deadlines, (tense), is really measuring tenseness or some other behavioural characteristic.

9.3 GPI Emotionality: At-ease

9.3.1 Defining At-ease

Glowinkowski International (GIL) defines At-ease within this model as:
People who are At-ease tend to be calm, disciplined and even-tempered, and are able to face stressful situations without becoming overly upset or agitated and feel a real sense of worth.

It is important to recognise that this particular dimension can be seen as ‘State’ as well as Trait. By this we mean that over time an individual’s profile can be more subject to change. (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 7)

9.3.2 Exploring the clusters

There are four clusters which sit within the dimension of At-ease.

The first of these clusters is Confident. According to the GPI At-ease model, ‘Confident individuals tend to hold and maintain a positive, yet appropriate, realistic view about themselves. Generally, they maintain a healthy sense of positive self-esteem, although at the extreme this could be construed as tantamount to arrogance’ (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 13). On this account the GPI At-ease person is someone who:

- Is not bothered by criticism
- Feels comfortable with life
- Is not troubled by self-doubt
- Feels comfortable with who I am

The second of these clusters is Optimistic. According to the GPI At-ease model, ‘Optimistic individuals tend to see a far more positive and optimistic future—‘their ‘glass is half full.’ They will tend not to feel sad or dejected and are not easily discouraged. The downside for the optimist, however, can be a tendency to see things through rose-tinted spectacles’ and therefore, be less risk averse and tend to hurry decisions having not considered all possible factors’ (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 13). On this account the GPI At-ease person is someone who:

- Sees the positive side of most situations
- Thinks the future is full of hope
- Is an optimist
- Always looks on the bright side
The third of these clusters is Placid. According to the GPI At-ease model, ‘Placid
individuals take a relaxed view of themselves and their position within the world at large
and, generally, feel positive about their previous experiences’ (Glowinkowski,
2010, p. 13). On this account the GPI At-ease person is someone who:

☑ Is tolerant of others  ☑ Is not provoked by unwarranted criticism
☑ Is easy going  ☑ Does not get angry in situations of conflict

The fourth of these clusters is Relaxed. According to the GPI At-ease model, ‘Relaxed
individuals tend to experience much lower levels of anxiety, not dwelling on things that
may go wrong and tending to be calm and relaxed in most situations. At the extreme, the
individual may appear laid-back and to possess a laissez-faire demeanour’ (Glowinkowski,
2010, p. 13). On this account the GPI At-ease person is someone who:

☑ Tends to be laid back  ☑ Rarely feels tense
☑ Does not worry unduly  ☑ Rarely feels anxiety when things go wrong
### 9.3.3 Scale properties

Table 9.3.3 GPI At-ease: scale properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confident</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is not bothered by criticism</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels comfortable with life</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is not troubled by self-doubt</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels comfortable with who I am</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Optimistic**           |     |       |
| Sees the positive side of most situations | .75 | 78    |
| Thinks the future is full of hope        | .54 | 74    |
| Is an optimist                         | .68 | 73    |
| Always looks on the bright side         | .58 | 54    |

| **Placid**                |     |       |
| Is tolerant of others      | .37 | 86    |
| Is not provoked by unwarranted criticism | .58 | 33    |
| Is easy going             | .59 | 72    |
| Does not get angry in situations of conflict | .32 | 58    |

| **Relaxed**               |     |       |
| Tends to be ‘laid back’   | .32 | 38    |
| Rarely feels tense        | .65 | 34    |
| Does not worry unduly     | .68 | 41    |
| Rarely feels anxiety when things go wrong | .52 | 19    |

**Alpha**                  | .88 |

Table 9.3.3 presents the scale properties of the GPI At-ease scale in terms of the correlation between each individual item and the sum of the other fifteen items, and in terms of item endorsement as the sum of agree and agree strongly responses. The alpha
coefficient of .88 shows that the overall sixteen items cohere well. There are no individual items which fall below .3; there were two items which scored .32, these were:

- Does not get angry in situations of conflict (placid)
- Tends to be ‘laid back’ (relaxed)

### 9.3.4 Profiling clergy

The item endorsements and summaries for the clergy as a total group show a wide spectrum of responses against the GPI At-ease, (with a range of 19-86%).

Within the Confident cluster of items, fewer than one in five, say they are not bothered by criticism (19%), and just over a third suggest that they are not troubled by self-doubt (38%). Whereas four out of five affirm they are comfortable with life (79%) and feel comfortable with whom I am (80%). For the Confident cluster there is a split outcome and the clergy emerge as At-ease on two items and not At-ease on two items.

Within the Optimistic cluster of items, just over half, always look on the bright side (54%), while around three quarters describe themselves as optimists (73%) who think the future is full of hope (74%) and are able to see the positive side of most situations (78%). For the Optimistic cluster the clergy emerge as At-ease.

Within the Placid cluster of items, a third indicate that they are not provoked by unwarranted criticism (33%), and just over half do not get angry in situations of conflict (58%). Around three quarters say that they are easy going (72%) and nearly nine out of ten are tolerant of others (86%). For the Placid cluster the clergy do not emerge as At-ease for one item, but emerge as At-ease on the other three items.

Within the Relaxed cluster of items, about one in five rarely feels anxiety when things go wrong (19%), while approximately a third of the clergy, rarely feels tense (34%), and tend to be ‘laid back’ (38%), and do not worry unduly (41%). For the Relaxed cluster the clergy emerge as not At-ease.
9.3.5 Summary

The GPI section of At-ease consists of four clusters, for one cluster (optimistic) the clergy emerge as At-ease and for one cluster (relaxed) the clergy do not emerge as At-ease. For another cluster (confident) the outcome is split with the clergy emerging as At-ease on two out of four items, while for the final cluster (placid) the clergy emerge as At-ease on three out of four items. Overall, there is a complex set of outcomes for the At-ease dimension, and for the GPI section of At-ease the clergy emerge as at-ease on 9 out of 16 items.

9.3.6 Ideas for future consideration

Bearing in mind that the definitions being used within the GPI were prepared primarily for business consultancy situations, and noting that the results from the clergy are not straightforward then it may be appropriate to review the language which has been adopted for certain of the items, as it raises the question, are the clergy finding that the language adopted is not a good fit with the nature of their roles and ministry. For example in the Placid cluster where the clergy appear as placid on three out of the four items, it would be instructive to explore the language of the item which does not present as placid, a third (33%) said they were not provoked by unwarranted criticism, while in the Ill-at-ease dimension and the self-conscious cluster, nearly three quarters (70%) indicated that they feel hurt when criticised, see (9.2.4). This poses a question, has the addition of the qualifying term ‘unwarranted criticism’ had an impact on the results? Similarly there appears to be a possible conflict with the results for the confident cluster, as around one in five (19%) suggest they were not bothered by criticism, while nearly three quarters (70%) indicated that they were hurt by criticism in the Ill-at-ease dimension.

A further query arises, has the use of a negative in the Confident cluster, is not troubled by self-doubts (38%) producing a skewed result?
9.4 GPI Emotionality: Impulsive

9.4.1 Defining Emotionality: Ill-at-Ease: Impulsive

Glowinkowski International (GIL) defines Emotionality within this model as:

The domain of Emotionality is concerned with the extent to which an individual tends to be at ease with themselves and the world around them, and the degree of volatility they experience in this.

See also section 3 (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 13-14)

9.4.2 Exploring the clusters

There is only one cluster within the domain of Impulsive. This is labelled Impulsive. According to the GPI model, ‘Impulsiveness is concerned with an individual’s tendency to exercise control over their desires and cravings or to seek instant gratification for those urges. Impulsive individuals tend to have a predisposition that makes it difficult for them to control their urges and, instead, have a need for immediate gratification. They are easily frustrated and can possess short spans of concentration causing them to become bored, ‘drift off’ and not pay attention. They can appear impatient and be described as ‘wearing their heart on their sleeve’ (Glowinkowski 2010, p. 13-14). On this account the GPI Impulsive person is someone who:

- Is quick to draw a conclusion
- Reacts immediately to situations
- Is impulsive
- Is quick to deliver an opinion
9.4.3 Scale properties

Table 9.4.3 GPI Impulsive: scale properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impulsive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is quick to draw a conclusion</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reacts immediately to situations</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is impulsive</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is quick to deliver an opinion</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alpha</strong></td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.4.3 presents the scale properties of the GPI Impulsive scale in terms of the correlation between each individual item and the sum of the other three items, and in terms of the item endorsement as the sum of the agree and agree strongly responses. The alpha coefficient is low at .57 below the minimum recommended (DeVellis, 2003) and two of the four items have low ‘item rest-of-test correlations,’ below .3:

- Reacts immediately to situations (impulsive)
- Is impulsive (impulsive)

The GPI construct of Impulsive may be improved by removing these items.

9.4.4 Profiling clergy

The item endorsements and summaries for the clergy overall show a fairly narrow range of responses, 20% to 38%.

Within the Impulsive cluster of items, two in ten agree that they are impulsive (20%), approximately a quarter say they are quick to draw a conclusion (26%), while nearly a third are quick to deliver an opinion (31%) and just over a third reacts immediately to situations (38%). For the GPI Impulsive dimension the clergy do not emerge as impulsive.
9.4.5 Summary

The GPI section of impulsive has one cluster. For the one cluster (impulsive) the clergy do not emerge as impulsive. Those who have indicated they respond promptly to perceived needs may feel this is what is required of them in their role.

9.4.6 Ideas for future consideration

In addition to those items highlighted in section 9.4.3 it would be useful to explore the consistency of responses provided for the clusters impulsive and disciplined. An overall check for consistency within the responses provided for the domain of Emotionality would be beneficial.

9.5 GPI Emotionality: At-ease: Disciplined

9.5.1 Defining terminology

Glowinkowski International (GIL) defines Disciplined within this model as:
A section of Emotionality: At-ease. For additional definitions see also Chapters 4 and 7.

9.5.2 Face validity

There is only one cluster for the term Disciplined.

This is labelled Disciplined. According to the GPI model, ‘Discipline individuals have a predisposition that enables them to manage those urges effectively, with a natural ability to defer impulsive responses, and, therefore, deliver a high level of self control’ (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 15). On this account the GPI Disciplined person is someone who:

- Considers all aspects before reacting to something
- Deliberates before giving an opinion
- Listens carefully before reacting
- Tends to look carefully at things before reacting
9.5.3 Scale properties

Table 9.5.3 GPI Disciplined: scale properties

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers all aspects before reacting to something</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberates before giving an opinion</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listens carefully before reacting</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tends to look carefully at things before reacting</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha .76

Table 9.5.3 presents the scale properties of the GPI Disciplined scale in terms of the correlations between each individual item and the sum of the other three items, and in terms of the item endorsement as the sum of agree and agree strongly clergy responses. The alpha coefficient of .76 shows that overall the four items coheres well.

9.5.4 Profiling clergy

The item endorsements and summaries for the clergy indicate a set of high scores presented over a relatively narrow range, 67% to 82%.

Within the Disciplined cluster of items, two thirds agree that they consider all aspects before reacting to something (67%) and tend to look carefully at things before reacting (68%). While close to four out of five deliberates before giving an opinion (78%) and listens carefully before reacting (82%). For the Disciplined cluster of items the clergy emerge as Disciplined.

9.5.5 Summary

The GPI section for disciplined consists of one cluster, for this one cluster (disciplined) the clergy present as disciplined.
9.5.6 Ideas for future consideration

The type of behaviour implied by this dimension could be an important one to explore in terms of the clergy roles and leadership, where such measured responses and behaviours may be more likely to encourage congregation members to engage and to assist with the management of change when that is required.

There could be some value in exploring the consistency of responses provided by the clergy across sections, 9.2, 9.3, 9.4 and 9.5, and testing if they present a balanced type of picture overall.

9.6 Conclusions

The results obtained for Emotionality, Ill-at-Ease and At-Ease; raise some questions about consistency of results produced by the GPI. For the pairs Placid and Discontented and Optimistic and Pessimistic, the clergy responses appear to match up, but for Relaxed and Tense there is an apparent conflict, as for Relaxed dimension the results suggest the clergy are not At-Ease, so conversely this might imply that the clergy were Ill-at-ease, however for Tense cluster the results presented as not Ill-at-ease, so this outcome remains as an unresolved. While for the pair of clusters, Confident and Self-conscious, there is not a full match, as for Confident the clergy emerged At-Ease for 2 out of 4 items, whereas for Self-Conscious clergy emerged as Ill-at-Ease on all four items, so there is some inconsistency in these outcomes. This may be due to the construct of the pairs and the language adopted for certain items. For the pair Impulsive and Disciplined, the results appear to be self consistent.

What has not been tested, due to time and resource constraints, is if these results for the clergy are typical and would be replicated if sets of managerial data were taken from the GIL database for GPI and subjected to a similar analysis process.
Chapter 10

Agreeableness-Collectivist/Individualist

10.1 Introduction

The second of the research questions is, When the GPI is opened to close examination how does it function among clergy? and this chapter specifically addresses this research question for Agreeableness, Collectivist and Individualist. The definitions developed by Glowinkowski International, for collectivist and individualist are presented as well as the items which make up the clusters. The clergy responses for the GPI collectivist and individualist dimensions are displayed along with a summary of the predispositions displayed by the clergy.

10.2 GPI Agreeableness: Collectivist

10.2.1 Defining Collectivist

Glowinkowski International (GIL) defines Collectivist within this model as:

The domain of Agreeableness is concerned with the terms in which an individual thinks about people and groups, and their interactions with them. People who are more Collectivist in approach are inclined to think in terms of the shared aims and interests of the people and groups with whom they engage, and so tend to focus on identifying the mutual benefits available in a situation. Collectivists are generally more affiliative or tender minded and conforming in style. (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 7)

10.2.2 Exploring the clusters

There are four clusters within the domain of Collectivist

The first of these clusters is Affiliative. According to the GPI Collectivist model, ‘Affiliation is concerned with the significance of personal relationships to an individual. Affiliative individuals 'like to be liked.' They are concerned about other people’s needs and treat them as more important than tasks. In addition, they avoid saying hurtful things and will avoid confrontation; thus the affiliative manager may find it difficult to deliver
tough feedback. They want to help people and will expend incremental effort to do so’ (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 12-13). On this account the GPI Collectivist is someone who:

- Goes out of their way to be helpful to others
- Tends to consider people before tasks
- Is concerned about the needs of other people
- Prefers to avoid saying hurtful things
- Prefers to avoid confrontation

The second of these clusters is Conforming. According to the GPI Collectivist model, ‘Conforming is concerned with an individual’s tendency to mentally challenge or comply with the approach adopted by a group of which they are a part. Conforming individuals tend to co-operate rather than compete. They will avoid expressing a contradictory view and feel more comfortable in terms of fitting into existing arrangements. They will prefer to comply and focus on the views of others or the group. Conforming types are inherently more team members than team leaders’ (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 12-13). On this account the GPI Collectivist is someone who:

- Prefers to co-operate with others
- Considers others before myself
- Finds it easy to conform
- Hesitates to express a contradictory view

The third of these clusters is Modest. According to the GPI Collectivist model, ‘Modesty is concerned with how an individual sees themselves in relation to others. Modest individuals are discreet about their own accomplishments and will only talk about them if pressed. They tend to ‘hide their light under a bushel.’ They prefer to get on with doing their work rather than talk about what they’ve done. They may be less certain about the validity and accuracy of their own views. The managerial downside is that modest types tend to underestimate the importance of giving others praise; they don’t want it themselves so they don’t see the need in giving it’ (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 12-13). On this account the GPI Collectivist is someone who:

- Prefers to get on with my work rather than talk about it
- Is unassuming
Is discreet about my own accomplishments
Is modest

The fourth of these clusters is Trusting. According to the GPI Collectivist model, ‘Trust is concerned with an individual’s general view on peoples’ motives, and this forms the start point in the way in which they think about their interactions with others. Trusting individuals tend to consider others as honest and well intentioned. They take people at face value and do not suspect they may possess less conspicuous ulterior motives. In believing what others say, open and straightforward relationships are encouraged. On the downside, they risk delivering naïve behaviour, being easier to ‘hoodwink’ and to holding overly high expectations of others, which can lead to them being disappointed at what subsequently transpires’ (Glowinkowski, 2010, p.12-13). On this account the GPI Collectivist is someone who:

- Finds it easy to trust people
- Takes people at face value
- Tends not to suspect the motives of others
- Tends to believe what others say
### 10.2.3 Scale properties

Table 10.2.3 presents the scale properties of the GPI Collectivist scale in terms of the correlation between each individual item and the sum of the other sixteen items, and in terms of the item endorsement as the sum of the agree and agree strongly clergy responses. The alpha coefficient of .72 indicates that the seventeen items do cohere. The item correlations show that six of the seventeen items fall below .3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliative</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goes out of their way to be helpful to others</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tends to consider people before tasks</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is concerned about the needs of others</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to avoid saying hurtful things</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to avoid confrontation</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conforming</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to co-operate with others</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers others before myself</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finds it easy to conform</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesitates to express a contradictory view</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modest</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to get on with my work rather than talk about it</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is unassuming</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is discreet about my own accomplishments</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is modest</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trusting</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finds it easy to trust people</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes people at face value</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tends not to suspect the motives of others</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tends to believe what others say</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alpha** .72

Table 10.2.3 GPI Collectivist: scale properties
Tends to consider people before tasks (affiliative)
Prefers to co-operate with others (conforming)
Prefers to get on with my work rather than talk about it (modest)
Finds it easy to trust people (trusting)
Tends not to suspect the motives of others (trusting)
Tends to believe what others say (trusting)

The GPI construct of Collectivist may be improved by the omission of these items.

### 10.2.4 Profiling clergy

The item endorsements and summaries for the clergy as a total group show a wide spectrum of responses, ranging from 29% to 97%.

Within the Affiliative cluster of items, two thirds respond positively to, tend to consider people before tasks (64%), and prefer to avoid confrontation (67%). While almost nine out of ten say that they prefer to avoid saying hurtful things (85%), and go out of their way to be helpful to others (89%). While almost the whole group affirmed that they are concerned about the needs of others (97%). These responses appear to be consistent with the nature and expectations of the clergy roles and for the affiliative cluster the clergy emerge as collectivist.

Within the Conforming cluster of items, a third hesitates to express a contradictory view (29%), while two out of five find it easy to conform (40%). Nearly three quarters considers others before myself (74%), and nine out of ten prefer to co-operate with others (91%). For the conforming cluster the clergy do not emerge as collectivist on two items but do emerge as collectivist for the other two items.

Within the Modest cluster of items, just under half are unassuming (47%) and just over half prefer to get on with my work rather than talk about it (55%). Then nearly three quarters agreed they are modest (73%) and are discreet about their own accomplishments (74%). For the modest cluster the clergy do not emerge as collectivist on one item, but do emerge as collectivist for the other three items. The one item not presenting as collectivist is very close to 50%, so it could be suggested that for this cluster the clergy are broadly presenting as collectivist.
Within the Trusting cluster of items, around half take people at face value (53%), and tend not to suspect the motives of others (53%) while almost two thirds agree that they tend to believe what others say (61%) and find it easy to trust people (62%). For the trusting cluster the clergy are emerging as collectivist.

10.2.5 Summary

The GPI section of collectivist consists of four clusters, and for two of these clusters (affiliative and trusting) the clergy present as Collectivist. For the third cluster (modest) the clergy present as collectivist on three out of four items, with the fourth item very close to 50%, while for the cluster (conforming) the clergy present as collectivist on two out of four items. Overall for the GPI section of collectivist the clergy present as collectivist on 14 out of 17 items across the four clusters.

10.2.6 Ideas for future consideration

In addition to the items highlighted in 10.2.3 above, then the one item within the modest cluster (Is unassuming), which scored close to 50% could be reviewed and alternative or additional wording provided.

The results show that for the GPI Collectivist dimension, the clergy are presenting as Collectivist across many of the items (14 out of 17), a question could be asked, is this characteristic and behaviour what is expected and required for the clergy roles when they are working with their congregations, certainly it could be expected that they would start from a position of seeing the ‘best’ in people.

These results suggest areas for further research in the future, where the Clergy are presenting Collectivist behaviour, is this proving to be supportive and does it encourage clergy and lay members to work together in partnership which leads to church growth? Are the collectivist predispositions and behaviours, a true reflection of the clergy preferences, or does this delivered behaviour arise because they perceive that clergy are expected to behave in this way?
10.3 GPI Agreeableness: Individualist

10.3.1 Defining Individualist.

Glowinkowski International (GIL) defines Individualist within this model as:

People who are more Individualist in orientation tend to think about people and situations in terms of their own aims and interests, and so tend to focus on how situations can work to their own advantage. They tend to be more tough minded about others also, perhaps, more task than people focused. (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 7)

10.3.2 Exploring the clusters.

There are four clusters within the dimension of Individualist and seventeen items.

The first of these clusters is Assuming. According to the GPI Individualist model; ‘At the extreme, assuming individuals tend to believe they are superior to others and make excessive demands on them. They enjoy talking about their achievements and expect praise for good work they consider is theirs although it has been delivered through collective effort. In addition, they may demonstrate a tendency to assume that their views will be found acceptable’ (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 12-13). On this account the GPI Individualist is someone who:

- Sometimes gives the impression of being self-important
- Assumes my views will be accepted
- Tends to make excessive demands on people
- Likes to talk about my achievements
- Believes my own ideas are better than those of others

The second of these clusters is Dissenting. According to the GPI Individualist model; ‘Dissenting individuals tend to disagree with others, finding it easy to take an opposing view. They will tend to prefer to focus on their own views or ideas. Dissenting individuals are likely to ask quite tough, probing questions rather than make categorical remarks. This is driven by how this sub-dimension ‘marries' with the earlier described Asserting/Accepting sub-dimension within Extraversion’ (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 12-13). On this account the GPI Individualist is someone who:
Asks tough probing questions
Finds it easy to oppose
Finds it easy to take an opposing view
Tends to disagree with what others say

The third of these clusters is Questioning. According to the GPI Individualist model; ‘Questioning individuals tend to consider others as potentially dishonest, to possess an unknown agenda, even to be dangerous. They rarely take people at face value and are cautious and curious when dealing with others. This sometimes leads to relationships being soured by cynicism or scepticism. Primarily, Questioning types will be naturally questioning of others ‘motives, concerns and capabilities’ (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 12-13). On this account the GPI Individualist is someone who:

- Tends to be suspicious of the motives of others
- Tends not to believe what others say
- Rarely takes people at face value
- Tends to be mistrustful of others.

The fourth of these clusters is Unaffiliative. According to the GPI Individualist model; ‘Unaffiliative individuals tend to be more orientated towards the task than the person. They are less concerned about what others think, personal popularity and friendship. They find it easy to state their opinion and surface difficult issues irrespective of how that may disrupt harmonious relationships. Being less concerned with being liked, the unaffiliative manager can deliver critical feedback but the genuine message may be lost in the upset caused by overtly blunt delivery’ (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 12-13). On this account the GPI Individualist is someone who:

- Is not overly concerned about friendship
- Is not concerned about personal popularity
- Finds it easy to state my opinion irrespective of the threat to personal relationships
- Prefers to deal with the task to be done rather than the people
## 10.3.3 Scale properties

Table 10.3.3 GPI Individualist: scale properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assuming</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes gives the impression of being self important</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumes my views will be accepted</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tends to make excessive demands on people</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes to talk about my achievements</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believes my own ideas are better than those of others</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dissenting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks tough probing questions</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finds it easy to oppose</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finds it easy to take an opposing view</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tends to disagree with what others say</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questioning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tends to be suspicious of the motives of others</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tends not to believe what others say</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely takes people at face value</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tends to be mistrustful of other</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unaffiliative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is not overly concerned about friendship</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is not concerned about personal popularity</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finds it easy to state my opinions irrespective of the threat to personal relationships</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to deal with the task to be done rather than the people</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alpha</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.3.3 presents the scale properties of the GPI Individualist scale in terms of the correlation between each individual item and the sum of the other sixteen items, and in terms of the item endorsement as the sum of the agree and agree strongly clergy responses. The alpha coefficient of .59 is lower than the normal recommended minimum for these.
types of surveys, which is .65; (DeVellis, 2003) there are a high number of items with coefficients below .3 (11 out of 17 items):

- Sometimes gives the impression of being self important (assuming)
- Assumes my views will be accepted (assuming)
- Tends to make excessive demands on people (assuming)
- Believes my own ideas are better than those of others (assuming)
- Asks tough probing questions (dissenting)
- Finds it easy to oppose (dissenting)
- Tends to be suspicious of the motives of others (questioning)
- Tends not to believe what others say (questioning)
- Is not overly concerned about friendship (unaffiliative)
- Is not concerned with personal popularity (unaffiliative)
- Prefers to deal with the task to be done rather than the people (unaffiliative)

The GPI construct of Individualist may be improved if these items were reviewed.

10.3.4 Profiling clergy

The item endorsements and summaries for the clergy overall show a range of responses varying from 5% to 55% across the items.

Within the Assuming cluster of items, less than one in ten say that they tend to make excessive demands on people (7%), while only one in ten say they sometimes give the impression of being self important (10%), or that they like to talk about my achievements (10%). Less than two in ten believe their ideas are better than those of others (16%), and around a third assumes their views will be accepted (32%). For the assuming cluster the clergy do not emerge as individualist.

Within the Dissenting cluster of items, only one in twenty affirm that they tend to disagree with what others say (5%), and a third say they find it easy to oppose (32%). While approximately half say they find it easy to take an opposing view (48%) and that they are prepared to ask tough probing questions (55%). For the dissenting cluster the clergy do not emerge as individualist for three of the four items and for one item they do emerge as individualist.
Within the Questioning cluster of items, less than one in ten tends not to believe what others say (5%) and tends to be mistrustful of others (6%). Whereas just less than two in ten tends to be suspicious of the motives of others (16%) and rarely takes people at face value (17%). For the questioning cluster the clergy do not emerge as individualist.

Within the Unaffiliative cluster of items, less that two in ten, prefers to deal with the task to be done rather than the people (14%), while just over two in ten, are not overly concerned about friendship (21%). Around a third, find it easy to state their opinion irrespective of the threat to personal relationships (30%), and are not concerned about personal popularity (33%). For the unaffiliative cluster the clergy do not emerge as individualist.

10.3.5 Summary

The GPI section of Individualist consists of four clusters, and for three of these clusters (assuming, questioning and unaffiliative), the clergy do not present as individualist. For the final cluster (dissenting) the clergy do not present as individualist on three out of the four items. Overall for the GPI section of individualist the clergy present as individualists on only 1 out of 17 items.

10.3.6 Ideas for future consideration

As highlighted in 10.3.3 there are a significant number of items within this dimension which display modest ‘item rest-of-test correlations,’ therefore it may be appropriate to re-examine the language of this dimension when used with clergy.

Within the dissenting cluster, only one item scored over 50% (asks tough probing questions), the question could be asked, is this item really a true measure of dissenting behaviour, or does it represent more normal or typical behaviour between individuals as they explore ideas and develop their relationships.

Overall for the GPI Individualist the clergy are not presenting as Individualist, this appears at first sight to be broadly consistent and in line with the requirements of the roles which they are expected to fulfil, but it may be appropriate to ask if some of the clergy were
displaying individualist behaviour would this have an impact on the climate and culture within churches and be helpful in creating the conditions which might such church growth. There are always positives and negatives outcomes which flow from certain behaviours, and it would be useful in the future to revisit these types of results and test if there is a consistency of responses for the clergy for the Collectivist and Individualist dimensions, or have the language and concepts as defined generated some apparent conflicts.

10.4 Conclusions

Although the alpha coefficient for Individualist showed a lower performance level than those for a number of the other GPI Dimensions, and a number of individual items had low coefficients, overall the results, for Collectivist and Individualist do appear to be broadly consistent. With the clusters, Collectivist and Individualist, the results appear to correlate, for example, for Affiliative the clergy appear as Collectivist and for the Unaffiliative they do not appear as Individualist, implying that both sets of items have been answered in a broadly consistent manner.

The commercial feedback plots shown in Chapter 7 show that the majority of the clergy present as Collectivist which suggests that they will seek to meet the objectives of the group as a whole.
Chapter 11

Attainment-Focused/Flexible

11.1 Introduction

The second of the research questions is, When the GPI is opened to close examination how does it function among clergy? and this chapter specially addresses this research question concerning GPI Attainment: Focused and Flexible. The definitions developed by Glowinkowski International for focused and flexible are presented as well as the items which make up the clusters. The clergy responses for the GPI focused and flexible are displayed along with a summary of the predispositions displayed by the clergy.

11.2.1 Defining Attainment: Focused

Glowinkowski International (GIL) defines Attainment: Focused within this model as:

The dimension of Attainment concerns an individual's orientation to think about what they do in terms of delivering or implementing outcomes. People who are more Focused will tend to view situations in terms of tangible outcomes, and be stimulated by the thought of achieving specific results from a limited number of activities. They enjoy the outcome of a project or piece of work and generally are driven to understand the detail and achieve perfection. Focused types like to have their ‘ducks in a row’. (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 6-7)

11.2.2 Exploring the clusters.

There are three clusters within the domain of Focused:

The first of these clusters is Conscientious. According to the GPI Focused: conscientious model, ‘Conscientiousness concerns the tendency of an individual to be thorough in the approach they adopt towards their activities. Conscientious individuals will tie up all loose ends, find it easy to work to deadlines and prefer work that requires attention to detail and accuracy. They prefer to have clearly defined goals and objectives and enjoy the details of a task. Conscientious types like to evaluate and analyse all the detail’ (Glowinkowski 2010, p. 10). On this account the GPI Focused person is someone who:
Prefers work that requires attention to detail
Finds it easy to work to deadlines
Prefers to tie up all loose ends
Is always conscious of getting the details right

The second of these clusters is Outcome. According to the GPI Focused: outcome model, Outcome orientated individuals are focused on achieving outcomes. They find it easy to be persistent, with a tendency not to give up and are single-minded in terms of delivering repeated effort to achieve an outcome. They tend to be less interested in the ‘journey’ and rather more focused on the outcome and will demonstrate a tendency to be resistant to changing a course of action. They enjoy a structured approach, like a plan, decide quickly about the required outcome and achieve ‘all the ducks in a row’ (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 10). On this account the GPI Focused person is someone who:

Prefers to work to set deadlines
Likes to establish clear milestones to complete the job on time
Like to be highly organized in what I do
Prefers to plan my work carefully
Finds it difficult to leave tasks incomplete

The third of these clusters is Perfectionist. According to the GPI Focused: perfectionist model, ‘Perfectionist individuals will try to exceed personal standards of excellence and enjoy being the best at what they do. They will tend to be impatient with their own errors and very perfectionist in their approach to their work. They gain very high standards of satisfaction when they have the opportunity to personally exceed against a standard of excellence’ (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 10). On this account the GPI Focused person is someone who:

Is often impatient with my own errors
Enjoys being the best of what I do
Tries to exceed personal standards of excellence
Is a perfectionist
11.2.3 Scale properties

Table 11.2.3 GPI Focused: scale properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conscientious</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers work that requires attention to detail</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finds it easy to work to deadlines</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to tie up all loose ends</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is always conscious of getting the details right</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to work to set deadlines</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes to establish clear milestones to complete the job on time</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes to be highly organised in what I do</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to plan my work carefully</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finds it difficult to leave tasks incomplete</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perfectionist</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is often impatient with my own errors</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoys being the best at what I do</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tries to exceed personal standards of excellence</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a perfectionist</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alpha</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.2.3 presents the scale properties of the GPI Focused scale in terms of the correlation between each individual item and the sum of the other twelve items, and in terms of the item endorsement as the sum of the agree and agree strongly responses. The alpha coefficient of .84 shows that overall the thirteen items cohere well; there are three items which are weak and fall below .3:

- Finds it easy to work to deadlines (conscientious)
- Prefers to work to set deadlines (outcome)
- Enjoys being the best at what I do (perfectionist)
The GPI construct of Focused may be improved by the omission of these items.

### 11.2.4 Profiling clergy

The item endorsements and summaries for the clergy as a total group for GPI Focused show a moderate spread of relatively high scores in the range 37% to 74%.

Within the Conscientious cluster of items, over a third prefer work that requires attention to detail (37%) while two out of five are always conscious about getting the details right (42%). While two thirds of the group prefer to tie up loose ends (67%) and almost three quarters, finds it easy to work to deadlines (74%). For the conscientious cluster of items the clergy do not emerge as focused for two items and for two items they do emerge as focused.

Within the Outcome cluster of items, over half likes to establish clear milestones to complete the job on time (57%), and prefer to plan their work carefully (58%). Nearly two thirds of the group finds it difficult to leave tasks incomplete (61%) while almost three quarters, like to being highly organised in what they do, (70%) and prefer to set work deadlines (73%). For the outcome cluster of items the clergy emerge as focused.

Within the Perfectionist cluster of items; just over a third sees themselves as perfectionists (37%), and nearly half of the group tries to exceed personal standards of excellence (48%). Around two thirds enjoy being the best at what I do (61%) and are often impatient with my own errors (62%). For the perfectionist cluster of items the clergy do not emerge as focused for two items and for two items they do emerge as focused.

### 11.2.5 Summary

The GPI section of focused consists of three clusters, and for one cluster (outcome) the clergy present as focused. While on two clusters (conscientious and perfectionist) there is a split outcome with the clergy presenting as focused on two out of four items. Overall for the GPI section of focused the clergy present as focused on 9 out 13 items, across the three clusters.
11.2.6 Ideas for future consideration

In addition to those items highlighted in 11.2.3, the split results may arise from the language chosen for those items in the Conscientious and Perfectionist clusters, this could be re-examined.

Another area which could be considered is to ascertain whether the drive to achieve high standards of excellence and to strive for perfection is a true preference and reflects the individuals own drive and predispositions or whether the clergy perceive that this standard is a requirement of their role and is essentially set by the Diocese organisation and culture. Determining where this motivation and desire to achieve challenging standards arises, may help with an understanding of some of the aspects which can cause stress and in some cases result in ill health for the clergy.

11.3 GPI Attainment: Flexible

11.3.1 Defining Flexible

Glowinkowski International (GIL) defines Flexible within this model as:

People who are more Flexible prefer to think in terms of responding to the demands made on them, and are stimulated by the thought of the activity itself, whether or not it results in specific outcome. They enjoy the journey. They are generally low in their need for a tight and formal organisation structure and possess little appetite for carrying out detailed work. They are less inclined to exert effort to establish standards for their work-they are more pragmatic.
(Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 6-7)

11.3.2 Exploring the clusters

There are three clusters within the dimension of Flexible, with thirteen items:

The first of these clusters is Cursory. According to the GPI Flexible model, ‘Cursory individuals feel that accuracy and detail is not all that important and that detailed preparation can sometimes inhibit effectiveness. They are happy to work to a higher level of description in terms of what they do. Cursory types like to peruse the main points not
the detail of an issue’ (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 10). On this account the GPI Flexible person is someone who:

- Feels that accuracy is not all that important
- Prefers not to give my full attention to one thing at a time.
- Finds it hard to deal with detail
- Feels that detailed preparation can sometimes inhibit effectiveness.

The second of these clusters is Pragmatic. According to the GPI Flexible model, ‘Pragmatic individuals will accept lower standards in order to deliver an outcome. They will be predisposed to cut corners in order to get results and feel that ‘fit for purpose’ is acceptable in terms of delivery’ (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 10). On this account the GPI Flexible person is someone who:

- Finds it easy to accept lower standards in order to deliver an outcome
- Is pragmatic in order to get the task done
- Finds it easy to accept ‘fit for purpose’ rather than perfection
- Cuts corners to get results

The third of these clusters is Spontaneous. According to the GPI Flexible model, ‘Spontaneous individuals tend to be more flexible in their approach, find it relatively easy to change direction and their mind about doing things and moving onto something new. They have a predisposition to quickly see the value of new approaches to solving problems. They tend to be motivated by the process or experience of the ‘journey’ and less about the actual outcome. They enjoy keeping their options open for as long as possible’ (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 10). On this account the GPI Flexible person is someone who:

- Finds it easy to move on to something new
- Likes to be flexible in how I organise my work
- Is quick to see the value of new approaches to solving problems
- Considers planning a restraint
- Finds it easy to change direction
11.3.3 Scale properties

Table 11.3.3 GPI Flexible: scale properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cursory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels that accuracy is not all that important</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers not to give my full attention to one thing at a time</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finds it hard to deal with detail</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels that detail preparation can sometimes inhibit effectiveness</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finds it easy to accept lower standards in order to deliver an outcome</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is pragmatic in order to get the task done</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finds it easy to accept 'fit for purpose' rather than perfection</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuts corners to get results</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finds it easy to move on to something new</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes to be flexible in how I organise my work</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is quick to see the value of new approaches to solving problems</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers planning a restraint</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finds it easy to change direction</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.3.3 presents the scale properties of the GPI Flexible scale in terms of the correlation between each individual item and the sum of the other twelve items, and in terms of item endorsement as the sum of the agree and agree strongly responses. The alpha coefficient of .75 shows that overall the thirteen items cohere well, although there are four items with scores below .3:

- Is pragmatic in order to get the task done (pragmatic)
Finds it easy to move onto something new (spontaneous)
Considers planning a restraint (spontaneous)
Finds it easy to change direction (spontaneous)

The GPI construct of Flexible may be improved by the omission of these items.

11.3.4 Profiling clergy

The item endorsements and summaries for the clergy as a total group show a variable set of responses for GPI Flexible, with scores ranging from 2% to 82%.

Within the Cursory cluster of items, only about one in ten feel that accuracy is not all that important (13%), around a quarter prefer not to give their full attention to one thing at a time (23%) and find it hard to deal with detail (23%). While around a third agrees that detailed preparation can sometimes inhibit effectiveness (37%). For the Cursory cluster of items the clergy do not emerge as flexible.

Within the Pragmatic cluster of items, just over one in ten affirm that they cut corners to get results (15%), a third find it easy to accept lower standards in order to deliver an outcome (33%). About half find it easy to accept ‘fit for purpose’ rather than perfection (48%), while nearly three quarters suggest that they are pragmatic in order to get the task done (74%). For the Pragmatic cluster of items the clergy do not emerge as flexible on three out of four items.

Within the Spontaneous cluster of items, less than one in fifty agree that they consider planning a restraint (2%). Just over half find it easy to change direction (55%), and find it easy to move on to something new (59%). While four out of five are quick to see the value of new approaches to solving problems (78%), and like to be flexible in how they organise their work (82%). For the Spontaneous cluster of items the clergy emerge as flexible on four out of five items.

11.3.5 Summary

The GPI section of Flexible consists of three clusters, and on one cluster (cursory) the clergy do not emerge as flexible. While on another cluster (pragmatic) they do emerge as
flexible for three out of four items, and on the third cluster (spontaneous) the clergy emerge as flexible on four out of the five items. Overall for the GPI section of flexible the clergy present as flexible on only 5 out of 13 items across the three clusters.

11.3.6 Ideas for future consideration

It would be instructive to compare the responses of GPI Focused and Flexible for the clergy to determine if they have been answered consistently or if there are any apparent conflicts.

In addition to those items highlighted in 11.3.3, it would be useful to examine if certain of the items as defined do fit appropriately within the clusters, for example in the Spontaneous cluster is planning really a restraint and does it inhibit spontaneous behaviour?

11.4 Conclusions

The analysis of the GPI Attainment, Focused and Flexible, produces some interesting results, for example for the Focused, Outcome cluster, the clergy appear to present as Focused on all five items while for the Flexible, Spontaneous cluster the clergy present as Flexible on four out of the five items, suggesting that for some of the Predispositions, the clergy appear to present as both Focused and Flexible, this result may be driven by the nature and requirements of their roles, which contain a diverse range of activities and tasks and consequently require individuals who can modify the way they work to meet the needs of different situations. The other two clusters within the Focused and Flexible dimensions do appear to be broadly consistent in terms of the clergy results obtained.

These results do raise a question as to whether this type of result is what is to be expected from the GPI, and if a set of business personnel were extracted from the GIL database and their responses analysed, would the results appear similar? It has not been possible within the scope of this project to conduct such a comparison.
Chapter 12

Cognition-Radical/Incremental

12.1 Introduction

The second of the research questions is, When the GPI is opened to close examination how does it function among clergy? and this chapter specifically addresses this research question concerning Cognition: Radical and Incremental. The definitions developed by Glowinkowski International for radical and incremental are presented as well as the items which make up the clusters. The clergy responses for the GPI radical and incremental are displayed along with a summary of the predispositions displayed by the clergy.

12.2.1 Defining Radical

Glowinkowski International (GIL) defines Radical within this model as:

The dimension of Cognition is concerned about the way in which individuals think about things, solve problems and make decisions. People who are more Radical in nature tend to think in broad terms and look at situations from different perspectives, being largely concerned to identify how the various aspects fit together into a coherent whole; they consider the ‘big picture.’ They are more likely to favour radical change, i.e. paradigm shifts, than continuous improvement. They make intuitive decisions more so than ones based on empirical evidence. They enjoy considering the future rather than the circumstance of now. (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 6)

12.2.2 Exploring the clusters

There are three clusters within the dimension of Radical.

The first of these clusters is Conceptual. According to the GPI Radical model, ‘Information processing concerns the manner in which an individual acquires assimilates and applies information to generate ideas and resolve problems. Conceptual individuals prefer to take a broader view, taking information from a variety of apparently disconnected sources in order to assemble the ‘big picture.’ They are comfortable in the cognitive management of ambiguity and lack of coherence concerning future concepts, trends and dynamics. Their
focus is more on the problems of tomorrow so their thinking gravitates to their organisations and their own longer term aims and aspirations’ (Glowinkowski 2010, p. 9). On this account the GPI Radical person is someone who:

- Enjoys seeing the ‘bigger picture’
- Prefers to take a broader view
- Is comfortable considering future possibilities
- Enjoys thinking about how different ideas interrelate

The second of these clusters is Intuitive. According to the GPI Radical model, ‘Decision making concerns the process by which individuals make their decisions. Intuitive individuals use their own insight, often born from personal experience, when solving problems. They can exercise their imagination rather than fact, so may rely primarily on their own ‘gut feel’ to finalise a decision. Whilst intuitive types will seek data to underpin their ‘case,’ this is not to satisfy their own requirements but is for others’ benefit because they have already ‘made up their mind’ (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 9). On this account the GPI Radical is someone who:

- Prefers to follow my own insight when solving problems
- Puts imagination before information when problem solving
- Prefers to use intuition to solve problems
- Likes to use my imagination

The third of these clusters is Revolutionary. According to the GPI Radical model, ‘Change orientation concerns the way an individual generates ideas, relates to change and responds to problem-solving situations. Revolutionary individuals prefer to consider change that is more significant in scale and will deliver new approaches and paradigms. A Revolutionary is typically less interested in ‘continuous improvement’ and is more attracted to finding entirely new ways of doing things’ (Glowinkowski 2010, p. 9). On this account the GPI Radical is someone who:

- Prefers the more radical solutions to problems
- Finds it easy to think of many different solutions to problems
- Is comfortable with radical change
- Prefers to find different ways of doing things
12.2.3 Scale properties

Table 12.2.3 GPI Radical: scale properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enjoys seeing the 'bigger picture'</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to take a broad view</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is comfortable considering future possibilities</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoys thinking about how different ideas interrelate</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intuitive</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to follow my own insights when solving problems</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puts imagination before information when problem solving</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to use intuition to solve problems</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes to use my imagination</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revolutionary</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefers the more radical solutions to problems</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finds it easy to think of many different solutions to problems</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is comfortable with radical change</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to find different ways of doing things</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpha coefficient of .77 shows that overall the twelve items cohere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well, although the item correlations show that two items falls below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12.2.3 presents the scale properties of the GPI Radical scale in terms of the correlation between each individual item and the sum of the other eleven items, and in terms of the item endorsement as the sum of the agree and agree strongly responses. The alpha coefficient of .77 shows that overall the twelve items cohere well, although the item correlations show that two items falls below .3:

- Prefers to take a broad view (conceptual)
- Prefers to follow my own insight when solving problems (intuitive)

The GPI construct of Radical may be improved by the omission of these items.
12.2.4 Profiling Clergy

The item endorsements and summaries for clergy as a total group show scores which are quite high and a range from 31% to 94%.

Within the Conceptual cluster of items, around three quarters say they enjoy thinking about how different ideas relate (77%), and approximately nine out of ten say they prefer to take the broad view (85%), and are comfortable considering future possibilities (87%) and enjoy seeing the ‘bigger picture’ (94%). For the conceptual cluster of items the clergy emerge as radical.

Within the Intuitive cluster of items, just over a third agree that they put imagination before information when problem solving (31%) and two out of five prefer to use intuition to solve problems (40%). Slightly over half prefer to follow their own insights when solving problems (53%), while almost nine out of ten, agree that they like to use their imagination (86%). For the intuitive cluster of items there is a split result and the clergy emerge on two items as radical and two items as not radical.

Within the Revolutionary cluster of items, a third say they prefer the more radical solutions to problems (33%), a half are comfortable with radical change (50%) and two thirds prefer to find different ways of doing things (67%) and nearly three quarters find it easy to think of many different solutions to problems (71%). For the revolutionary cluster of items the clergy emerge as radical on three of the four items.

12.2.5 Summary

The GPI section of Radical consists of three clusters, and for one cluster (conceptual) the clergy emerge as radical. While for another cluster (revolutionary) the clergy emerge as radical on three out of four items and for the third cluster (intuitive) the clergy emerge as radical on two out of four items. Overall for the GPI section of Radical the clergy present as radical on nine of the twelve items, across the three clusters.

12.2.6 Ideas for future consideration

In addition to those items highlighted in 12.2.3 it could be instructive to explore if the
language adopted for those items on which the clergy do not present as radical was an obstacle to interpretation, or if it the items were not perceived by the clergy as fitting into the theme being explored by the cluster.

A future study could explore whether GPI Radical behaviour is particularly relevant for those clergy who are engaging with change and ‘fresh expressions’ and who are developing new ways to present the message of the gospel as well as seeking to address the decline in church attendances.

12.3 GPI Cognition: Incremental

12.3.1 Defining Incremental

Glowinkowski International (GIL) defines Incremental in this model as:

People who are Incremental in orientation are concerned with more of a structured and rational analysis of situations, and tend to focus on whether the details connect together in a well ordered manner. They tend to prefer change to be of ‘step by step’ magnitude and their ideas will more likely concern practical improvement rather than abstract new concepts and theories. (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 6)

12.3.2 Exploring the clusters

There are three clusters which sit within the dimension of Incremental.

The first of these clusters is Evolutionary. According to the GPI Incremental model, ‘Evolutionary individuals prefer to consider change in small controlled steps and to generate ideas to improve what is there already, e.g. enhancing arrangements and well regulated situations’ (Glowinkowski 2010, p. 9). On this account the GPI Incremental person is someone who:

- Is more comfortable with things as they are
- Tends to be uncomfortable with radical change
- Prefers well-regulated situations
- Prefers change to be in small controlled steps
The second of these clusters is Practical. According to the GPI Incremental model, ‘Practical individuals will prefer to utilise information that can create complete maps of the situation at hand and present clear definitions of the problem to mitigate any risk of misunderstanding. These tight information structures are a means to solving today’s rather than tomorrow’s problems. Practical types like to consider how to deliver tasks in the short-term and have a clear and practical link to organisational aims and objectives’ (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 9). On this account the GPI Incremental person is someone who:

- Prefers to deal with the detail of tasks
- Prefers to concentrate on practical solutions
- Prefers to work on well specified tasks
- Prefers a structured approach to things

The third of these clusters is Rational. According to the GPI Incremental model, ‘Rational individuals have a preference to deal with hard facts and to apply logic and clear evidence before deciding on a way forward. At the most extreme, they prefer to evaluate all the available data before they make a decision’ (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 9). On this account the GPI Incremental person is someone who:

- Prefers decisions based on logic
- Prefers to have clear evidence before deciding a way forward
- Prefers to deal with hard facts
- Prefers to evaluate all available data before making a decision
12.3.3 Scale properties

Table 12.3.3 GPI Incremental: scale properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evolutionary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is more comfortable with things as they are</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tends to be uncomfortable with radical change</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers well-regulated situations</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers change to be in small controlled steps</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practical</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to deal with detail of tasks</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to concentrate on practical solutions</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to work on well specified tasks</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers a structured approach to things</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rational</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers decisions based on logic</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to have clear evidence before deciding a way forward</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to deal with hard facts</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to evaluate all available data before making a decision</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alpha</strong></td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12.3.3 presents the scale properties of the GPI Incremental scale in terms of the correlation between each individual item and the sum of the other eleven items, and in terms of the item endorsement as the sum of the agree and agree strongly responses. The alpha coefficient of .74 shows that overall the twelve items coheres well, although the item correlations show that two items fall below .3:

- Prefers decisions based on logic (rational)
- Prefers to have clear evidence before deciding a way forward (rational)

The GPI construct of GPI Incremental may be improved by the omission of these items.
12.3.4 Profiling clergy

The item endorsements and summaries for the clergy as a total group for GPI Incremental present responses which cover the range 13% to 69%.

Within the Evolutionary cluster of items, around one in ten are more comfortable with things as they are (13%), while one in five is uncomfortable with radical change (21%). Two in five prefer change to be in small controlled steps (40%) and almost two thirds prefer well regulated situations (57%). For the Evolutionary cluster of items the clergy do not emerge as incremental for three out of the four items.

Within the Practical cluster of items, about half prefer to deal with the detail of tasks (51%), and around two thirds, say they prefer to work on well specified tasks (60%), prefer to concentrate on practical solutions (65%), and prefer a structures approach to things (68%). For the practical cluster of items the clergy emerge as incremental.

Within the Rational cluster of items, three out of five prefer decisions based on logic, (57%) and prefer to deal with hard facts (57%). While almost two thirds prefer to evaluate all available data before making a decision (61%) and prefer to have clear evidence before deciding a way forward (69%). For the rational cluster of items the clergy emerge as incremental.

12.3.5 Summary

The GPI section of incremental has three clusters, and for two clusters (practical and rational) the clergy emerge as incremental. While for the cluster (evolutionary) the clergy do not emerge as incremental on three out of four items. Overall for the GPI section of incremental the clergy present as incremental for 9 out of 12 items, across the three clusters.

12.3.6 Ideas for future consideration

In addition to the items already identified in 12.3.3, the language and construct of some items in the evolutionary cluster could be re-examined.
12.4 Conclusions

The results from the examination of the GPI Cognition, Radical and Incremental dimensions produced a variable set of results. For example for the Radical dimension, and the Conceptual cluster, the clergy present as Radical while for the Incremental dimension and Practical cluster the clergy present as Incremental, this raises questions as to whether the instrument when examining these dimensions with the clergy is separating the predispositions sufficiently to differentiate their results. Therefore it could be helpful to revisit the construct, concepts and language for these dimensions especially if the GPI is to be used in the future with other groups of clergy. Alternatively is there a possibility that within the complex roles which the clergy are required to fill, that it is necessary to adopt behaviours which are both Radical and Incremental.

It is true that, the nature and shape of the roles for clergy do tend to differ from those encountered in business organisations and teams. The clergy tend to be able to exercise a considerable degree of autonomy and are perhaps more isolated within their parishes and hence the range of relationships and activities in which they engage may differ from those experienced within businesses, where there may be more opportunities, for leaders to discuss issues or topics, to seek support from within their teams, or from other functions within their business.
Chapter 13

Drive-Driven/Measured

13.1 Introductions

The second of the research questions is, When the GPI is opened to close examination how does it function among clergy? and this chapter specifically addressing this research question concerning drive, driven and measured dimensions. The definitions developed by Glowinkowski International, for drive, driven and measured are presented as well as the items which make up the clusters. The clergy responses for the GPI drive, driven and measured are displayed along with a summary of the predispositions displayed by the clergy.

13.2.1 Defining Driven

Glowinkowski International (GIL) defines Driven within this model as:

The dimension of Drive is concerned with the notion of an individual's underlying motivations in a work context. Driving, represents a highly energised individual that enjoys being in charge and is always seeking a greater level of status and success. As mentioned, this data, while generated by the GPI system, is only considered in part during the feedback process (in the Creativity and Entrepreneurship model). Issues concerning Drive and wider aspects of motivation, i.e. Power, Relationships and Achievement, are considered by the Glowinkowski Motivation Indicator (GMI). (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 7)

13.2.2 Exploring the clusters

There are three clusters in the dimension of Driven.

The first of these clusters is Ambitious. According to the GPI Driven model, ‘Ambitious—feels that status is important and actively seeks promotion for the greater prestige it brings; likes to dwell in the potential of the future’ (Glowinkowski, supplement to Consultant’s Manual), on this account the GPI Driven is someone who:

- Seeks positions of importance
☐ Is ambitious
☐ Seeks promotion
☐ Feels that status is important
☐ Enjoys prestigious situations

The second of these clusters is Energetic. According to the GPI Driven model, ‘Energetic-tends to work at a quick pace and is animated in conversation; has an innate energy that is evident in their character, coming across as driven and spirited.’ (Glowinkowski, supplement to Consultant’s Manual), on this account the GPI Driven is someone who:

☐ Gets through work at a brisk pace
☐ Finds it easy to generate enthusiasm
☐ Is energetic
☐ Is animated in conversation

The third of these clusters is Persuasive. According to the GPI Driven model, ‘Persuasive-enjoys being in charge and having the opportunity to make decisions for others; innately enjoys positions of leadership.’ (Glowinkowski, supplement to Consultant’s Manual), on this account the GPI Driven is someone who:

☐ Enjoys making an impact
☐ Likes to be seen as influential
☐ Prefers to achieve by managing the actions of others
☐ Enjoys persuading others
☐ Enjoys being in charge
13.2.3 Scale properties

Table 13.2.3 GPI Driven: scale properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seeks position of importance</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is ambitious</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks promotion</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels that status is important</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoys prestigious situations</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ambitious**

- Gets through work at a brisk pace
- Finds it easy to generate enthusiasm
- Is energetic
- Is animated in conversation

**Energetic**

- Enjoys making an impact
- Likes to be influential
- Prefers to achieve by managing the actions of others
- Enjoys persuading others
- Enjoys being in charge

**Persuasive**

- Alpha .80

Table 13.2.3 presents the scale properties of the GPI Driven scale in terms of the correlation between each individual item and the sum of the other thirteen items, and in terms of item endorsement as the sum of the agree and agree strongly responses. The alpha coefficient of .80 shows that overall the fourteen items coheres well, although the item correlations show that three items fall below .3:

- Gets through work at a brisk pace (energetic)
- Is energetic (energetic)
Prefers to achieve by managing the actions of others (persuasive)

The GPI construct of Driven may be improved by the omission of these items.

13.2.4 Profiling clergy

The item endorsements and summaries for the clergy as a total group present scores ranging from 6% to 72%.

Within the Ambitious cluster of items, less than one in ten, feel that status is important (6%), and seek positions of importance (7%), or seek promotion (8%). While approximately one in five agreed they are ambitious (18%) and enjoy prestigious situations (20%). For the ambitious cluster of items the clergy do not emerge as driven.

Within the Energetic cluster of items, about half say they get through work at a brisk pace (51%). While around two thirds is animated in conversation (64%) and find it easy to generate enthusiasm (68%) and close to three quarters say they are energetic (72%). For the energetic cluster of items the clergy do emerge as driven.

Within the Persuasive cluster of items, one in five like to be seen as influential (22%) and a third prefer to achieve by managing the actions of others (36%). While three in five say that they enjoy being charge (59%) and two thirds enjoy persuading others (66%) and enjoy making an impact (69%). For the persuasive cluster of items the clergy emerge as driven on three out of the five items.

13.2.5 Summary

The GPI section of driven has three clusters, and for one cluster (ambitious) the clergy do not emerge as driven, while on another cluster (persuasive) they emerge as driven on three items out of five. For the third cluster (energetic) the clergy do emerge as driven. Overall for the GPI section of driven the clergy present as driven on only 7 out of 14 items, across the three clusters.
13.2.6 Ideas for future consideration

In addition to those items highlighted in 13.3 it will be useful to revisit certain items, particular for the ambitious cluster and test if they do fit appropriately within the clusters as defined.

13.3 Drive: Measured

13.3.1 Defining Measured

Glowinkowski International defines Measured within this model as;

‘Measured-an individual content with their current position in life, without a driving desire to ‘better themselves’, and happy to enjoy the ‘here and now’. (Glowinkowski, 2010, p. 7)

13.3.2 Exploring the clusters

There are three clusters within the dimension of Measured.

The first of these clusters is Consensual. According to the GPI Measured model, ‘Consensual- would rather be led by someone else than be in a position where they are in charge of others; prefers to have clear directions set for them’ (Glowinkowski, supplement to Consultant’s Manual), on this account the GPI Measured is someone who:

☑ Does not enjoy positions of influence
☑ Does not enjoy positions of power and influence
☑ Prefers not to be in charge
☑ Tends not to enjoy positions of authority

The second of these clusters is defined by Contented. According to the GPI Measured model, ‘Contented-feels happy with their position in life and is not actively seeking promotion; happy to enjoy the ‘here and now’ of the present’ (Glowinkowski, supplement to Consultant’s Manual), on this account GPI Measured is someone who:

☑ Is content with my position in life
Is content with my current job
Is satisfied with life in general
Is comfortable in my work

The third of these clusters is Paced. According to the GPI Measured model, ‘Paced-tends to be measured in their working pace and makes steady progress; comes across as paced, composed and relaxed in character’ (Glowinkowski, supplement to Consultant’s Manual), on this account the GPI Measured is someone who:

- Prefers time to think before having to take action
- Approaches work tasks in a measured way
- Prefers to make steady progress
- Tries to avoid making hasty decisions
### 13.3.3 Scale properties

Table 13.3.3 GPI Measured

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consensual**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not enjoy positions of influence</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not enjoy positions of power and influence</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers not to be in charge</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tends not to enjoy positions of authority</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contented**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is content with my position in life</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is content in my current job</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is satisfied with life in general</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is comfortable in my work</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Paced**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefers time to think before having to take action</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaches work in a measured way</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to make steady progress</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tries to avoid making hasty decisions</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alpha**

| Alpha | .75 |

Table 13.3.3 presents the scale properties of the GPI Measured scale in terms of the correlation between each individual item and the sum of the other eleven items, and in terms of the item endorsement as the sum of the agree and the agree strongly responses. The alpha coefficient of .75 shows that overall the twelve items coheres well, although one item falls below .3:

- Is comfortable in my work (contented)

The GPI construct of Measured may be improved by the omission of this item.
13.3.4 Profiling clergy

The item endorsements and summaries for the clergy as a total group show a wide range of responses from 13% to 85%.

Within the Consensual cluster of items, just over one in ten prefer not to be in charge (13%), one in five do not enjoy positions of influence (22%), while approximately a third tend not to enjoy positions of authority (29%) and do not enjoy positions of power and influence (33%). For the consensual cluster of items the clergy do not emerge as Measured.

Within the Contented cluster of items, two thirds indicate that they are content with their position in life (67%), nearly three quarters say they are content in their current job (71%) and are satisfied with life in general (72%). While nearly nine out of ten say they are comfortable in their work (85%). For the contented cluster of items the clergy do emerge as Measured.

Within the Paced cluster of items, two thirds indicating that they approach work tasks in a measured way (67%) and prefer to make steady progress (67%), and around three quarters prefer time to think before having to take action (76%). While four out of five say that they try to avoid making hasty decisions (80%). For the paced cluster the clergy do emerge as Measured.

13.3.5 Summary

The GPI section of Measured consists of three clusters, and for two clusters (contented and paced) the clergy emerge as measured, while for the third cluster (consensual) the clergy do not emerge as measured. Overall for the GPI section of measured the clergy present as measured on 8 out of 12 items, across the three clusters.

13.3.6 Ideas for future consideration

In addition to the item highlighted in 13.2.3, there appears to be scope for exploring the construct and language for some of the items in this section, in particular the consensual cluster.
13.4 Conclusions

The GPI Drive, Driven and Measured dimensions provide a set of results which may require further examination if the GPI were to be used in the future with other clergy within other Dioceses. At a superficial level there does appear to be some conflict in the nature of the roles which clergy are expected to fill, which includes exercising leadership and the responses in this section, which indicate that some clergy do not enjoy positions of influence and authority. This tension between preferences and predispositions and the roles to be filled could be a factor which contributes to the high levels of stress which have been observed for some clergy. Other examples are for the Driven, Energetic cluster the clergy present as Driven, while for the Measured, Paced cluster, the clergy present as measured. This opens for discussion the question as to whether the items within the clusters are fully differentiating the clergy predispositions, or whether this type of result is typical for the GPI instrument and similar results would be obtained if a sample of responses for individuals from business organisations, which have completed the GPI, was taken from the GIL GPI database.

The GPI Drive Dimension is one which is used in the commercial secondary feedback models of learning styles and creativity and entrepreneurship.
Chapter 14

Clergy GPI’s correlated with attendance statistics

14.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the potential relationship between clergy characteristics, specifically their GPI profiles, and the growth or decline in their parish attendance statistics. It is addressing one of the key research questions:

Does the GPI generate insights into differences in clergy who are managing decline and those who are resisting decline?

The parish statistics were provided by two sources within the Chester Diocese, data sets were provided by John Roberts, who manages the parish statistics on a digital database (see example in Appendix 2) and information provided by Richard Burton, Parish Development Officer. There were gaps in the data available for some parishes, and the two sources were used to provide the most consistent sets of data overall. The study choose to examine the parish data for those clergy who had been in post for five years or more, as this was believed to provide a sufficient period for the incumbents to have had an impact on the thinking and strategic direction within their parishes while working alongside the lay members of their congregations. The aSa figures (average Sunday attendance), provided a more consistent and complete set of data than the uSa figures (usual Sunday attendance), so these were adopted for this study. The figures for the two years 2007 and 2008 and for the two years 2011 and 2012 were averaged and the means compared to determine if there was evidence of growth over this period or if the numbers had remained steady or had shown a decline.

The results were examined in two ways, firstly by using a test for statistical significance, comparing only the growing and the declining church results and then by using the GPI Commercial presentations for all three groups of clergy, with a similar format to those presented in Chapter 7. The first test did not identify any statistically significant difference in the clergy GPI data, but individual scores for Extraversion, Collectivist, Radical and Incremental were higher for clergy in Growing rather than declining churches. Although the visual presentations showed only small differences, there was enough separation between the plots for the three groups of clergy to suggest that this type of analysis may
produce additional learning and provide some differentiation within the clergy GPI profiles.

Additional testing is beyond the scope of this research project, however, if this process were to be repeated with clergy groups in other Dioceses, then it would be important to ensure that those studies employed larger samples of clergy, as it is believed that part of the reason for the lack of separation within the GPI plots was due to the relatively small sample sizes available, as well as some variability within the parish statistics.
### 14.2 Statistical analysis of the results

The analysis was conducted between the clergy in the growing and declining groups of churches, in order to identify any degree of differentiation between these two groups of clergy the information is shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>declining</th>
<th>growing</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introversion</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill-at Ease</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Ease</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivist</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualist</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsive</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplined</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radical</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14.3 Using the commercial presentation format for clergy GPI profiles in growing, steady and declining
The GPI commercial feedback formats are provided for the three clergy groups and the discussion explores if this style of presentation highlights any apparent differences in the GPI profiles for the clergy in each group.

14.4 Discussion

The GPI commercial profiles present the results in an aggregated manner for the three groups of clergy in order to note if there are observable differences, between the groups.

When reviewing and analysing each of these five GPI plots, it is difficult to identify and claim any significant differences and this is consistent with the statistical analysis of the data. It is thought that the small sample size may have been a contributory factor for the lack of major differences in the GPI profiles for the clergy.

However it is suggested that the methodology does show sufficient promise to consider if there is justification for repeating the approach in a future studies of clergy from other Dioceses, with the caveat that larger sample sizes would be essential.

14.4.1 Problem Solving & Implementation style

Bearing in mind that the statistical analysis did not identify any significant differences then these commercial plots do need to be interpreted with care and it is important not to read too much into the presentations.

When looking at the visual formats, then for the clergy group in churches which are demonstrating growth, the results appear to suggest a more balanced picture, with clergy presenting in all four quadrants.

When the data for the growing and steady groups is added together, there are more clergy in the radical sections than in the incremental sections, while the declining parishes have more in the incremental sections of the profiles. Radical predispositions are associated with and reflect a greater willingness to experiment and try out new ideas for dealing with problems and for generating viable solutions. These types of predisposition could be valuable when dealing with the challenges presented by declining numbers and the generation of ideas and approaches for halting that decline.
The declining parishes show very limited numbers of clergy presenting as Strategists, the predispositions of Strategists correlates with a willingness to try out new ideas and is associated with the successful management of change, if these characteristics are missing in the declining churches, then there may be a lack of ability to make significant changes which can address the decline in attendances.

These presentations do suggest some apparent small differences across the predisposition profiles of the clergy within the three groups, and raise some interesting questions about the possible outcomes which might result across the churches if more clergy presented with GPI profiles which indicated an increased number of Strategists and Radicals. Would more clergy with this set of GPI predispositions, begin to make a difference on the ground and help to address the decline in attendances?

**14.4.2 Communication and Interpersonal style**

An initial examination of these presentations for Communications and Interpersonal Style shows that they appear very similar to the GPI plots for the clergy group as a whole as presented in Chapter 7. They demonstrate that for all three groups (Growing, Steady and Declining), the majority of the clergy present as Introverted and Collectivist, so these behaviours equate with a general desire to help the group achieve its objectives, in this case their congregations. They may not however, be providing enough drive and energy to encourage change to occur in terms of thinking or actions and may not be as committed to working in partnership with the lay members in a manner which could begin to create a climate and culture which will encourage and support growth.

While, noting the small sample sizes for each group, it does appear that for the group showing growth, there are slightly more clergy in the extraversion quadrants than those presented in the steady or declining groups.

With the steady group, the majority of clergy appear in the collectivist quadrants, and the largest group presents as Supporter, so again very little encouragement of change.

For the declining group, the majority of clergy are represented in the Introversion quadrants and there is only one member of the clergy in the Encourager quadrant.
14.4.3 Feelings & Self-Control

For the group exhibiting growth, there are more clergy in the Disciplined than Impulsive quadrants and more present as At-Ease compared to Ill-at-Ease, so it may appear that these clergy are comfortable with things as they currently exist.

For the steady group, clergy are represented in all four quadrants, and for the declining group, there is a higher proportion of Disciplined than Impulsive but a higher proportion presenting as Ill-at-Ease compared with At-Ease. These slight variations in GPI profiles might suggest the possibility that clergy in growing parishes are more at-ease with themselves and may be willing to address the challenges presented by decline in attendances and to have the energy to attempt to reverse those patterns of decline.

The results may suggest the possibility that the group in the declining parishes are finding the situations they are experiencing very tough, but their predispositions indicate that they may not choose to voice these concerns openly and consequently may be finding themselves under stress. It may be important to consider their pastoral needs, exploring if the levels of support and encouragement which are currently provided are adequate and sufficient for these clergy working in challenging ministry situations.

14.4.4 Learning Style & Environment

For the growth group all four quadrants are represented, but there are more clergy in the Practical than in the Conceptual quadrants.

For the declining group, the majority of the clergy present in the Reserved (reflective), quadrants and the largest group are in the Testing (laboratory) quadrant, but there are no apparent real differentiators between these groupings in the presentations

The point made in Chapter 7 bears restating, that the Learning style presentation, not only provide a factual record of individuals predispositions and preferences, but that there are benefits to be achieved when individuals are encouraged to experiment with learning strategies which are outside of their main preference as this can lead to enhanced and deeper learning outcomes. Therefore the Chester Diocese may wish to consider if their
continuing ministerial development programmes are offering learning processes and programmes which operate across the full spectrum of the learning styles cycle.

14.4.5 Creativity & Entrepreneurship

For the growth group, the majority of clergy are in the Internalise quadrants, with the highest number appearing in the Developing and Internalise quadrant (leads to considered trials of improvement to the existing processes or situations), so this group may not want to address more radical approaches to change.

For the steady group, the majority of the group appear in two quadrants and the quadrant Internalise and Transforming (a measured approach to communicating change), is not represented. There is a possibility that those in the quadrant Transforming and Externalise may be willing to explore more creative ways of addressing the needs of their parish and to experiment with new approaches.

For the declining group the majority of clergy present in the Internalise quadrants, with the largest number in the Internalise and Developing quadrant, this is similar to the growth group of clergy.

Based on samples provided for this study, these GPI representations are not showing any significant differentiation between the three groups.

14.5 Conclusions

The statistical analysis of the GPI profiles for clergy in growing and declining parishes, did not demonstrate a statistically significant difference between these two groups.

The commercial visual presentations of the GPI for clergy in churches with growing, steady or declining attendance figures only indicated some minor variations between these three groups and this has been discussed above. It is thought that some of the reasons for this lack of differentiation may result from the relatively small sample sizes available for the three groups as well some degree of variability in the quality of the attendance data, as the data sets, were not fully complete for each of the churches represented.
The research question being addressed was, ‘does the use of the GPI generate insights into differences in the clergy who are managing decline and those who are resisting decline.’ Based on the evidence presented from this detailed analysis it is suggested that in using the commercial GPI profiles that there are some limited new insights provided for the clergy managing declining or clergy resisting decline. These tentative conclusions are supported by the detailed examination of the statistical analysis (Table 1).

The question remains unanswered as to whether if it were possible to repeat this approach as part of a future study in another Diocese but drawing on larger groupings of clergy, would this methodology provide GPI profiles which do differentiate significantly between the predispositions and characteristics of the clergy working in declining and growing
Chapter 15

Summary of the results and overall conclusions

This research addressed the overall theme of: The relevance and value of the Glowinkowski Predisposition Indicator (GPI) for modelling church growth: a study in Chester Diocese and this was subdivided into three primary research questions:

- When using GPI as presented commercially what does it tell us about the clergy as a group?
- When GPI is opened to close examination how does it function among clergy?
- Does the GPI generate insights into differences in clergy who are managing decline and those who are resisting decline?

The first question examined the commercial GPI profiles and did produce a positive outcome in terms of the new learning and insights which were gained into the characteristics of the clergy in the Chester Diocese (see Chapter 7). The Problem Solving and Implementation style format indicated that there are very few Strategists (6) in the total group. Individuals with this set of Strategist predispositions are more likely to initiate and manage change. The Communications and Interpersonal style format showed over 80% of the clergy presented as Introvert. It appears appropriate then to ask the question as to whether the characteristics, predisposition profiles and associated leadership styles of the clergy as demonstrated by these commercial presentations are a good match with what is expected or required by their congregations or if they fit within the wider strategic needs of the Chester Diocese.

The second question conducted a detailed analysis of the GPI in terms of its reliability and validity and presented the clergy predisposition profiles (Chapters 8-13). Some of the results showed that for certain areas within the pairs of dimensions, then the consistency of the results when used with clergy could be improved by revisiting the construct and the language which was adopted within the commercial tool. There were examples where the language used for specific questions with the GPI did not appear to be fully aligned with the vocational nature of the clergy roles and seemed to cause difficulty for the respondents. Overall this detailed GPI analysis did provide some differentiation of the clergy in terms of their predispositions and characteristics. However it is recommended
that if the GPI instrument were to be used with groups of clergy in future research projects, there could be a benefit in re-examining the construct and the language, rather than using the current version which was developed primarily for business consultancy purposes, such changes would need to be considered alongside the benefits of being able to compare the results from clergy studies, with a range of other functions, disciplines and job roles.

The third research question for the GPI (Chapter 14) set out to examine if the clergy GPI profiles showed any differences between those who are managing decline and those who are resisting decline. The t-test analysis did not show any statistically significant differences in the GPI profiles of the clergy in declining and those in growing churches, but the clergy in growing churches did generate higher scores for certain individual items. The commercial plots did appear to indicate some minor variations, particularly between growing and declining churches but it was not possible to draw totally definitive conclusions from these results. It is thought that this lack of differentiation may be due in part to the small sample sizes which were obtained and to some variability in the quality of the parish attendance statistics which were available. It is felt that the methodology may have the potential for highlighting differences between the clergy if it were to be used with larger samples.

Overall the GPI section of the study has presented new information about the nature of predispositions which are present for this group of clergy in the Chester Diocese. It has suggested that there are some strategic gaps in the range of behaviours and capabilities which are available. This is especially so if it is the intention within the Diocese to continue to support processes, such as Growth Action Planning (GAP), which it is hoped will contribute to a reversal in the decline in attendances. For such processes to be effective they will require clergy who are able to manage change, to provide a leadership style which engages all of the lay members and which will require an ability to be creative and to ‘think outside of the box’ in order to generate a range of innovative solutions to what are recognised as very intractable problems.

So while the GPI was the central element within the survey Ministry Today, which was presented to the clergy in the Chester Diocese, there were a number of other instruments which were included along with questions which explored biographical data, working career experience prior to ordination, and the priorities which the clergy placed on various aspects of their ministry roles.
A total of 203 clergy in the Chester Diocese were sent the survey, along with covering letters which explained the basis and purpose of the study, and 104 were returned with 100 which were sufficiently complete to be included in the analysis. The overview of the clergy responses is provided in Chapter 6. The results from the Francis Psychological Type Scale (FPTS) and the Francis Burnout Inventory (FBI) were similar to those which were presented in earlier studies of clergy, but for the Chester Diocesan clergy the FBI produced a higher set of scores for the Scale of Emotional Exhaustion in Ministry (SEEM) than those recorded in the studies in New Zealand, Australia and UK. This suggests that there may be some pastoral issues which could be explored; this concern about whether there are adequate levels of pastoral support also surfaced when reviewing the clergy GPI profiles for both the total group and for those clergy in churches which are exhibiting a decline in their attendance figures.

The results from the GPI and the FPTS both confirm the presence of a high number of introverts in the Chester clergy and therefore suggest that there could be some benefits from reviewing the current selection and recruitment processes for clergy. This would be to test if the processes are encouraging a sufficiently wide spectrum of applicants and if they are then delivering a sufficiently diverse set of candidates to move into ordination training.

The review of the relevant literature on leadership as it is conducted in secular businesses and in churches provided some valuable knowledge and challenging learning. The study of secular businesses consistently stressed the point that the rate and extent of changes which have and which are continuing to take place within the leadership models and structures is huge. The major shift in emphasis in the leadership models is from those which are largely hierarchical to ones which place a much greater emphasis and value on leadership behaviours which are able to engage all of the people for whom the leaders are responsible and accountable. When leaders operate in this way clear evidence is presented which suggests that this approach does deliver sustained transformations and enhanced business performance. Models such as ‘Servant Leadership’ and ‘bottom up leadership’ are specific examples which demonstrate the benefits and value of adopting styles of leadership which are collegiate and which rely on building effective partnerships between all of the staff who are operating within the business.

By contrast, the examples and models of leadership presented from churches did not show that the same degree of change and development are occurring. There were some examples
which indicated that considerable strategic thinking is being applied to the topic of leadership but that the developments have not progressed as rapidly as those in secular businesses. It is believed that church leaders could gain considerable benefit from examining the business models and exploring whether the learning which has been generated could be adapted and employed in the situations which the clergy are encountering in churches. The most relevant of these are the leadership approaches which have been shown to deliver measurable benefits. These occur where leaders behave in an empowering manner and are able to draw on the knowledge, skills, competencies, expertise and experience of all of the people within their business. Other areas which could be explored include the learning which arises from developing the capability of teams, especially as an increasing numbers of clergy are being required to provide leadership to two, three, four and sometimes more parishes. If such clergy are to survive and flourish then they may need to learn to lead with a light touch and to increasingly invest effort in developing and building partnerships between themselves and the lay members, in order to work together to deliver Christ’s commission: ‘Go therefore and make disciples of all nations … and remember I am with you always’ Matthew 28: 19-20.

The literature which examined the research which has employed psychological type theory with religious leaders is extensive and growing. These studies have examined the psychological type of leaders and church congregations. The results show that church congregations are not representative of the wider general population from which they are drawn and that the church leaders are themselves not representative of the congregations from which they are drawn. These studies raise important questions about how effective churches are at welcoming a representative spectrum of the wider population into membership and reinforce the point made above about the current selection processes. Do the processes which are used to determine who will be accepted for ordination training have some inbuilt elements of bias?

In summary the research has addressed the three primary questions associated with the GPI instrument and provided some interesting and valuable results which can be further examined to consider if the existing group of clergy will be able to successfully address the decline in attendances which is taking place in some of the parishes. It has also raised some challenging questions for the senior clergy in the Chester Diocese and they may wish to reflect on the points which have been identified.
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Appendix 1

A contextual overview: GPI applications and the value and benefits which they can generate

1 Introduction

In Chapter 4, The Glowinkowski Predisposition Indicator (GPI), it was demonstrated that the GPI instrument is based primarily on the Big Five Factor model of personality along with the inclusion of some additional dimensions to extend its scope and utility. It was developed primarily for use in management and organizational development consultancy applications, where the role of the consultant is to raise the capability and contribution of individuals and teams in order to optimise the performance of each business. With Glowinkowski International (GIL) this is normally done by focusing on the behaviours of individuals and teams and linking their behaviours to the bottom line performance of the business. GIL, have recently extended their consultancy offering into the Education sector, and ‘not-for-profit’ organizations In the education sector they have been successful in helping leadership teams to transform the performance of their schools.

This requirement for an alignment of staff behaviours with the business performance means that the feedback processes have to generate a full understanding of the output from the GPI instrument. These feedback processes have been designed to be as practical and user friendly as possible, with the clear intention of encouraging and empowering individuals and teams. This is done to help them to appreciate the value and benefits which can result from changes of behaviours, both for themselves and their businesses.

This appendix provides an overview of the unique Glowinkowski Integrated Framework, which positions the GPI and other models developed by GIL within a Business performance model. The framework examines all of the activities and processes which are essential for businesses to thrive and be successful over the long term. It also makes the link between predispositions (GPI), leadership competencies and models of leadership style.
1.2 Business performance and the Glowinkowski Integrated Framework

It is helpful to define the language which has been selected and to clarify what is meant by the term 'performance' within this framework. For many businesses there is often an unwritten assumption that the financial measures of performance are the most important, such as, profit, cashflow, capital investment, debt levels, operating margins, return on investment, and added value etc. However recently governments and business analysts have introduced the concept of Corporate Social Responsibility, so leaders of organisations are required to develop, a broader and deeper understanding of the effect and impact which their businesses are having on their employees, their suppliers, their customers and the communities within which they are operating. As a consequence, it is essential to analyse business performance across a more comprehensive set of parameters, which include items such as, employee satisfaction and motivation, customer loyalty, product innovation, (see the paper on Business Performance Measurement by Andy Neely, 2002.). The requirements of a Corporate Social Responsibility Strategy (International Organisation for Standardisation, ISO 26000, Social Responsibility), are set out in this standard which provides guidance on the additional performance measures which should be adopted by those businesses which want to compete effectively and deliver a sustained performance.

The world of work has become increasingly complex and many individuals can no longer anticipate having a ‘job for life’, and hence the concept of ‘portfolio careers’ has been developed to describe both the variety and numbers of jobs, which individuals may expect to experience throughout their working life’s. However, whether individuals choose to work in organisations for short or long periods of time, it is critically important for the business leaders to fully comprehend what drives their employees’ motivation, and further to appreciate what it is, that causes employees to want to contribute towards improving the business performance and thus supporting its success in what are increasingly competitive marketplaces. The research by Pfeffer (1998) into motivation showed that most people are motivated by a range of factors, other than straight financial reward. Similar longitudinal research studies have shown that productivity and profitability are higher and that the staff within the business are happier, when they fully understand and are clear about how their roles and contributions fit into the overall strategy, aims and purposes of their businesses, Patterson and West (1998).

Most organisations are built around units with functions, departments and teams. Research by Tuckmann (1965) showed that when new teams are formed, they progress through a
number of distinctive development phases, as they develop ways of working together and establishing high performance standards which results in excellence. These stages were described as forming, storming, norming and performing, and these discrete stages need to be understood and considered when teams are being brought together or changed regularly, and perhaps to manage short-term projects as such changes will have a direct impact on the performance which the teams can deliver.

When exploring performance and how it can be improved it is essential to ensure that the strategy and aims of the business are fully defined and shared with all of the staff, including taking account of the motivational needs of all of the employees. These requirements are essential if it is intended to deliver high level of business performance and sustain it over extended periods, Alimo-Metcalfe & Alban-Metcalfe (2008), Tamkin et al (2010), Pearson (2011). Other recent studies have highlighted the contribution which leadership can bring to these complex business situations. Rob MacLachlan (2012) summarises, an interview with Peter Cheese, the newly appointed Chief Executive of the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development CIPD, quoting Cheese, in his recent article, (pp 20 & 21);

You’re right, the bar for leaders—in terms of expectations about how they should behave and act---has never been higher. Trust is at the heart of this.

He extends this point further;

Recently, people’s belief in the trustworthiness of leaders generally has been quite damaged. If you’re my boss, I might think of you as being a good, trustworthy, authentic and open leader, but with every report in the media about breaches of trust—whether by politicians, business leaders, journalists or others—my level of challenge goes up a notch or two. So I want you to make it even clearer that you are somebody I can trust with the leadership of my organisation.

He reinforces the importance of Corporate Social Responsibility Strategy;

To be frank, some of the early manifestations of ‘corporate social responsibility’ were really paying lip service. But now boards are more aware that if a business interacts positively with the society in which it works then people are more likely to say this is a good business, whose products or services they want to buy, or that they want to work for. And that will make it a more sustainable business in the long-term.
Hashi Syedain (2012) quotes Stuart Kerr, the Chief Executive of Ford Retail, who explains, how their organisations Leadership development programmes have helped to create a cultural transformation (pp 27):

Over the past half decade, however, a new focus on leadership and culture has turned them into a more unified group…..At the same time the group has a strategy of improvement that Kerr describes as an extension of leadership development—find out what you’re really good at and do more of it. This relies on good metrics.

From this brief description of the terms adopted, and an overview of business performance coupled with some of the research which has suggested ways in which improvements can be achieved, it is clear that the situations within businesses are complex. The challenge for leaders is in developing a deep appreciation of these factors which drive and motivate employees within a business, so as to plan for and to deliver real and sustained improvements through people. The importance associated with creating this level of understanding within business communities, encouraged GIL to bring together the learning from their research and studies conducted for over twenty years across a diverse range of business sectors and in many countries, into their unique Integrated Business Framework. Its purpose is to bring together, in a comprehensive model the major elements which leaders have to address if they are to succeed, in partnership with all of their staff in driving the business performance to the highest possible levels and standards.

1.2.1 The Glowinkowski integrated business framework provides a visual picture of these key elements and processes which operate within businesses, showing how they link together and interact with one another, paying particular attention to the contribution and impact of predispositions, behaviours and climate.

The GIL business consultancy adopts a major focus on behaviours (Glowinkowski 2010), as they passionately believe, based on their own international research and experience, that it is behaviours which deliver the required performance outcomes for organisations. Hence they concentration on personality and GPI, which are viewed not as a topics on their own, but as a means of understanding behaviours and therefore they are in a position to help managers to understand why they do, what they do, as well as encouraging them to reflect and learn about the implications and consequences of their actions. Leadership behaviours are a key component when it comes to creating a conducive and supportive environment within organizations and this includes ensuring that innovation and creativity are fully
supported and that staff at all levels, feel ownership and pride in what they are doing and achieving. These leadership behaviours, (see the GIF diagram), are the bridge between predispositions, motivation and climate.

The Integrated Framework provides businesses with a model, which they can use to demonstrate their intent, beginning with their Strategic objectives and the Critical Success Factors, which they are responsible for designing and setting. The model further suggests
that by operating through a series of appropriate business processes, provided they are
designed and operating effectively, then there is a sequence, which links and drives high
standards which should then contribute to the delivery of the required business
performance.

1.2.2 By examining this framework in detail, it indicates that **Business Performance** has a
direct relationship with and is driven by ‘Climate’ climate as it is defined within this
framework, relates to ‘how people feel about working within the business. These feelings
are measured by their clarity of focus, their commitment to and their pride in being part of
the organisation. The sense of well being achieved is impacted at a fundamental level by
the relationships which are generated and the manner in which individuals, managers and
leaders interact and behave with one another, and this is further reinforced by the
framework. **Climate** in the GIL framework then, is defined as ‘**What it feels like to work
here**’, it is different from but interdependent with the concept of culture, which itself can
be defined as, ‘How things are done here’.

In order to measure the climate generated within an organisation, such as a commercial
businesses, or in the case of this research study, the organisation within and around
churches, then it is important to set and agree, a clear and consistent set of definitions. The
clarity which results from defining the key terms can help to deliver a degree of
understanding, which can be used to provide clear measurements. Without reaching this
level of understanding of the business processes and interactions, it would not then be
possible to identify and recommend appropriate changes, where they are required in order
to improve the business performance. As part of a set of business improvement tools and
instruments, GIL has developed a qualitative questionnaire which can measure the climate
within an organisation. When applying this instrument, the studies conducted by GIL
across different businesses sectors have shown that; When all other facets and factors
which are being measured are perceived to be equal, then they have observed that the
**Climate** scores, do differentiate an average organisation from an outstanding organisation,
in other words the higher performing organization will generate a higher score for **climate**.

=GIL have shown that irrespective of the current level of performance in an
organisation, if a measurable improvement is generated in their climate score, then
that business will as a consequence of this higher climate score, see an
improvement in their hard performance measures, such as sales volume, customer
service satisfaction, productivity, efficiency and profitability. This can be presented another way; the GIL studies have shown that measurable and positive changes in leadership behaviours will drive a quantifiable improvement in the climate scores. This outcome demonstrates that they have observed a direct correlation between leadership behaviours and performance improvement and it has been shown to be independent of external macro economic factors, such as the growth or decline in the overall performance of the economy. In other words their work indicates that this correlation has been shown to hold true even in times of recession.

The model of Climate which is being used for these studies, draws on work by Burke & Litwin (1992), Ekvall (1991), and Goleman et al (2003) but is further built on by the learning gained by Steve Glowinkowski and his team when working with a wide range of businesses for over twenty years. Climate is a measure of the mood or atmosphere which prevails within a given work place and environment and is the result of the coming together of three key performance drivers;

- the behaviour of the manager, (or the wider management team).
- the effectiveness and clarity of the organisations structure and job designs, and the nature and shape of the individual and team roles which have been created within these structures or functions.
- the quality and effectiveness of the work processes which are operating within the business. This quality is achieved when organisations have developed systematic approaches and processes which are ‘lean’ and which have been simplified wherever possible, in order to remove waste and eliminate redundant effort.

The definition of Climate, used in this model, can itself be further sub-divided into six core sub-dimensions. In Chapter 2, of his book, It’s Behaviour Stupid! Glowinkowski (2010, pp 39-63), provides some examples from their work with businesses which amplify and demonstrate the importance of the different core sub-dimensions of climate. He argues that the Clarity dimension represents the single most important element of the climate model and that without this clarity, then an organization will struggle to build up the strength of the other five dimensions. He illustrates this point by using an example of a visit by J. F. Kennedy to NASA, shortly after his speech committing the nation to send Apollo missions to the moon, when he encountered a man sweeping the floor and the conversation is reported to have been;
What are you doing? I’m helping send a man to the moon, Mr. President. But you’re sweeping the floor. Yes I know Mr. President, but I have to keep this place spotless so the rocket isn’t contaminated with dirt.

This apparently trivial example, emphasises the importance of ensuring that individuals and teams really do comprehend the relevance and importance of what they are doing and why, and just how it contributes to the achievement of the organisation’s overall goals and objectives. Therefore when this Clarity is reached: the people do in reality, have a clear understanding of what the organisation is trying to achieve and why, as well as an appreciation of the overall business direction and strategy. As individuals they fully comprehend their role and how and where they are contributing to the key strategic goals, purpose and objectives of the business.

Challenge is an essential element and a basic human drive, we require personal objectives and purpose in our lives, in order to create that sense of ‘what’s the point’ or ‘raison d’etre’. Without this degree of challenge, which provides the necessary energy, we can become listless and uncertain about whether our contribution is valid or valued. When organisations provide this degree of Challenge, then the staff do sense that they are working towards challenging yet realistic and achievable goals. They feel that they are appropriately ‘stretched’ in terms of their contribution, but equally important that they are being appropriately resourced, supported, coached and equipped to deliver these objectives.

Change Orientation is an important component for businesses, so while clarity and challenge are core requirements. It is has been shown that those organisations which can respond flexibly and quickly to the changing business and market conditions, while harnessing the creativity and innovation of their staff are then able to make the changes which allow them to compete successfully in a sustained manner. When this approach to Change orientation is achieved then the employees recognise and regard change in a positive light rather than a negative one. They fully appreciate the need to be flexible and change direction so as to drive important improvements within the business, which are designed to meet the demands of their customers and the constantly changing marketplace.

The dimension of Autonomy highlights the fact that when people feel they can make a real difference to the performance of the organisation or the teams of which they are members, then they feel empowered to take action and responsibility for their work and decisions.
This autonomy results, where staff feel they can make decisions, without constantly having to refer everything ‘up the line’ to their manager. There is however, a balance to be struck in this area as there will be some procedures and activities which do need to be observed and not by-passed, otherwise problems could arise. When seeking to achieve this appropriate balance, it would be easy for Leaders in the name of autonomy, to adopt a laissez faire approach where staff feel abandoned, and such an approach can cause teams and departments to perform badly. With an appropriate level of Autonomy, people feel a real sense of ownership and responsibility for the outcomes of their work and tend to have clearly defined scope and roles, so they do not have to constantly check back with their boss before making decisions.

The next factor in the climate framework is Recognition, to obtain high scores for this factor, staff do have to believe that there is a clear link between what they contribute in terms of their efforts and the end results as well as the ‘reward’ which they receive. In addition to monetary rewards some organisations do make an effort to identify and highlight special contributions from their staff, using notice boards or newsletters. Often the measurement processes adopted include peer reviews and customer comments which greatly enhance the value of the Recognition which results for the staff. This factor of Recognition is important, people expect to experience a definitive link between their efforts, the outcomes that result and the reward mechanisms which are in place. Part of this includes operating regular, timely and effective feedback processes so that staff do know they are truly valued and appreciated. As a consequence, they feel empowered and are able to perform effectively; they also expect assurances that performances within the team which are below the acceptable standards will not be tolerated, but will be addressed appropriately.

The sixth factor in the make up Climate, is Involvement, this measures the degree to which staff ‘buy-into’ and ‘commit’ to the aims, objectives and long-term direction of their organisation. When there is a strong level of involvement, then the passion for the organisation is very visible and staff will feel personally slighted should the business receive some bad press. Fully involved staff will work incredibly hard to resolve problems which may arise and customer complaints, while also seeking to develop innovative ways of working which minimize the risk that such problems can recur. When real tangible Involvement is achieved, then staff experience a strong sense of commitment to their organizations purpose and objectives and feel justly proud to work for the organization. It
is fair to say that Gen Y (defined by demographers as the segment of the population born between 1982 and 2002), will have a great desire to be actively involved in these processes which establish and agree the organisations future aims. They believe that they can make a real and significant contribution to the business and its forward direction. If their ideas are rejected, then they will expect to be provided with clear explanations as to why, rather than just being dismissed ‘out of hand.’

Each of these six factors need to be addressed and if they individually produce low scores, then there are clear consequences for the business performance. For example, low levels of clarity result in a lack of priorities, and if recognition is low, then the talent within the business may leave and future recruitment may become more difficult.

At the next level, the framework links **Climate**, into three change levers which it has been shown, have a direct bearing on and drive the climate which is generated and which is felt directly by the employees operating within the business, these are;

- Organisational structure, (the roles and relationships)
- Behaviours, (of managers and management teams)
- Processes, (which ideally, should be simple, straightforward and streamlined)

By taking each of these factors in turn then it is possible to identify those aspects which are deemed to be important in order to create a positive climate. This is where individuals, want to and indeed are prepared to, give of their best, perhaps even being willing to make discretionary contributions which may be described as going above and beyond the call of duty.

Taking initially, **Structure/organisation**, this requires a business to thoughtfully consider its activities and to design the structure in such a manner that the tasks, activities and responsibilities undertaken by the individuals, teams, departments and functions do not overlap, no essential tasks been omitted and gaps do not exist. Such a structure, while internally robust, clear and strong, should still provide sufficient flexibility which allows for an appropriate speed of response to market demands and changes and which is fully responsive to customer needs and expectations. The spans of control within the structure should be set in a manner which ensures that there are clear accountabilities, but that the jobs themselves remain practical and achievable. The standards of performance and
excellence should be well defined and should have been communicated clearly and be fully owned by all concerned.

Secondly for **Job characteristics**, the businesses should aim wherever possible to put together job roles which represent, ‘whole tasks’. This means that individuals and teams are able to appreciate the significance and importance of their work in terms of delivering the overall business strategic objectives. The jobs should be designed in such a way which allows the job holders discretion, freedom of operation and use of initiative within an overall flexible framework. Jobs should also be created which make full use of people’s knowledge, skills, competencies, expertise and experience, as well as being set up so staff receives regular and clear feedback on whether the jobs are being executed effectively.

The third area is **Motivation and feelings**, the jobs provided, within the functions and teams should represent an appropriate degree of challenge and volume of work, along with an expectation that the job holders will be expected to constantly explore ways of simplifying the work and tasks, which they are responsible for, drawing on the application of their detailed knowledge and understanding of their work area and roles. Where they are able to generate and introduce significant improvements this will maximise their sense of personal fulfillment and motivation.

### 1.2.3 Business processes and their links to climate

When individuals come together within teams they will tend to bring their own distinctive ways and modes of operating to their work. Such variations in approach can produce variable outcomes because individuals are performing these tasks in different ways. This aspect should be held in balance or tension, with a clear expectation that staff will look for ways to determine what are the optimum methods for the teams to adopt, and with a recognition that there may be some distinctive behaviours which can deliver the preferred result and ensure more successful outcomes. The GIL integrated framework draws on their learning extracted from case studies with clients, to define these processes which are seen to be critical if the business is to achieve success, for example;

- What processes when employed, will help to generate effective decision-making?
- Is the decision-making an effective process within particular groups of people?
- Is the decision-making supported by accurate data in a timely fashion?
When difficulties arise, is sufficient time allocated for the team to analyse the problems fully and to get to the true root cause of the problems, rather than just dealing with the symptoms, and as a consequence missing out on important learning opportunities, which could contribute to long-term, sustained improvements in performance?

Do the business planning processes provide a holistic link which embraces the corporate plan, and the individual performance plans, or do individuals or groups of staff experience a sense of disconnect between what they are being asked to do and what the business is seeking to achieve?

The framework which is built on practical experience from across a wide range of businesses, defines thirteen critical business processes which drive Climate and they are summarised here. The research confirms shows that, where these processes have been carefully designed, are fully implemented and are delivered effectively, then they have a direct and a positive bearing on the climate which is generated and the scores measured. This research further supports their hypothesis which states that leadership behaviours have a major impact on the climate.

There are four areas which they consider Planning, Relationships, Team Effectiveness and Performance, and each are sub-divided to create the thirteen critical business processes.

**Planning:**

- Planning Processes
- Business Planning
- Goals & Objectives

It is essential that processes have been appropriately and thoughtfully designed, are established and that they have been fully tested to demonstrate their effectiveness. Consequently these processes drive what is done and are fully supported, because they provide clear goals and objectives for staff at all levels.

**Relationships:**

- Team communication
- Organisational communication
Openness/Trust
Supportive behavior

Relationships sit firmly at the heart of businesses and they require that comprehensive and effective communications should occur within and between teams and across all of the business disciplines and functions. When these relationships are managed well then staff report that a mutual trust exists, which further encourages staff to be open with each other and to extend bi-lateral support. Overall the needs of teams, acting on behalf of the business, should come before those of the individuals. Organisations should be alert to the fact that modern social networks and communication processes do bring new issues which require careful management. For example, it may be possible for staff within the business to have informally shared key information widely, before the corporate machine has swung into action, so that the information which is being communicated through the formal channels is in danger of being ‘yesterday’s news’.

Team Effectiveness:
Skill balance
Individual development
Feed-back and review

Successful teams are made up of staff that have the appropriate blend of knowledge, skills, competencies, expertise and experience which allows them to collaborate and to discharge their responsibilities fully and well. These teams should be supported by simple, effective, but flexible, performance management processes, which are fully owned and utilised thus allowing the teams and their members to know, how they are performing. These approaches should also generate ideas and areas for continuous improvement and individuals and teams should be proactively encouraged to continually develop their own gifts, expertise and capability, in order to release and realise their full potential.

Performance:
Decision making
Efficiency
Co-ordination
People should be fully aware of and understand how decisions are made within the business and should recognise that the systems and processes which have been adopted are chosen for a specific purpose, rather than appearing overly bureaucratic. Resources should be allocated to tasks and jobs in a way which efficiently matches the skills available with the demands of the job. As a consequence of adopting these approaches, then there is a high degree of co-ordination and co-operation between teams, departments and functions. Gaps in knowledge and/or skills where they exist are then dealt with in a timely manner, by providing a wide range of different learning strategies and methods, designed to match the learning styles and preferences of the staff.

1.2.4 Leadership behaviours, (of managers and management teams), and the link to climate

This section considers how leaders, managers or management teams can use a range of different behavioural strategies to carry out the wide range of activities, tasks and requirements which are a core component of their roles. This can include, high level tasks, such as, the requirement to generate a clear sense of direction and purpose for individuals and teams, as well as encouraging their buy-in to the business strategy, vision, mission and longer term objectives. It can also be creating the inspiration, enthusiasm and motivation for staff by providing, the space to nurture, coach and develop individual's talents, skills and gifts in line with the overall business objectives, generating a win-win environment, where staff are valued and appreciated. The behaviours which managers choose to adopt need to be tailored for specific circumstances, and to be consistent for dealing with a wide range of situations and personnel, which can include, their team members, their peers, senior executives as well as external groups, such as suppliers, customers, community leaders and regulatory bodies etc. There is therefore no suggestion that ‘one style of leadership’ can fit all of these circumstances and situations, hence leaders need to be flexible and adaptable and tuned into the situations for which they are responsible. The Integrated Framework model which is based on results and learning from a range of business sectors shows that the leadership dynamic which is being created and adopted does have a direct and a critical bearing on the climate which is generated within any group or any collection of staff for whom the leader is responsible.

Behavioral are an essential part of this dynamic and when they are delivered effectively they help to create a Climate, where individuals and teams strive continually to deliver a
sustained and improving high quality performance. If however, any of the behaviours outlined here, are absent, then managers can expect that the climate scores for the group will decline and the performance of the unit or business will suffer, when measured using both soft and hard measures.

The **Leadership Behaviours model** which has been developed within the Integrated Framework model covers **six broad based behavioural** approaches, which are subdivided into subordinate themes:

**Directional:**

*Strategic*

*Long-term direction*

*Alignment*

Under the **Directional** area, Leaders are required to develop a set of detailed business options for the future and therefore to create a comprehensive long-term direction and strategy for their enterprise. In fast changing and complex marketplaces this direction will need to be reviewed and updated regularly. They should set out to ensure that all the activities, work processes and tasks are coordinated and aligned to deliver the strategic vision, mission and objectives; by producing this focus it helps to minimise wasted effort and ensure that the staff are not operating on non-strategic objectives.

**Engaging:**

*Commitment*

*Presence*

This approach is required when Leaders have to explain, persuade and win the commitment of others to contribute to successful delivery of the agreed long-term direction. If fully engaged then those individuals may be willing to provide discretionary effort and to give 110% effort towards achieving the business objectives. To tap into this level of commitment, however, leaders need to establish credibility and have presence when communicating; when they are successful in this regard they will often be described by those who work with them, as inspirational.
Positional:

Activity level

Delegatory

This behaviour is characterized by Leaders who are focusing on their own work activities and their unique contribution towards the success of the business. They should avoid the temptation of working at inappropriate levels, such as by attempting to operate at their team member's level as such behaviour can destroy trust and staff motivation. They should show that they can delegate effectively by virtue of allocating sufficient time to fully equip and coach their staff for all aspects of their roles and responsibilities.

Constructive:

Relationships

Conflict management

Leaders ideally, will seek to build long-term open, constructive and mutually beneficial relationships. This desire to deliver long-term positive relationships does not imply that they avoid raising any challenging or difficult issues or aspects of poor performance with individuals, teams or functions. They will be willing to confront important issues in a constructive and positive fashion rather than choosing to either ignore such issues or to allow them to fester with the possible consequence that they become corrosive, in terms of staff relationships and undermine the achievement of the desired business outcomes. They effectively manage good and bad performance, encouraging and rewarding the good while seeking to eliminate poor performance. They address the performance issues by building in plans which are designed to deliver staff development and continuous process improvements.

Democratic:

Information sharing

Consultation

Motivational

Leaders operating in this way, seek to treat staff as mature thinking adults and to share openly appropriate levels of information, whilst recognizing that in certain circumstances, there may be topics which have to remain confidential. They will genuinely consult and seek the views of others by involving them at the earliest possible design stages of
improvement projects, as well as encouraging the staff to be fully engaged in the implementation of those improvement projects.

**Developmental:**

*Coaching*

*Career planning*

*Developing performance*

Leaders, who take this aspect seriously, will consistently provide timely, relevant, objective and actionable feedback to others, so that individuals and teams fully understand how they are performing as well being able to recognise potential areas for development and improvement. Such leaders appreciate that the development of their staff, and the provision of an environment for them to grow and to realise and release their full potential, is a core responsibility and a critical component of their role, which must not be ignored or neglected, otherwise negative results will arise both for the individuals and the business.

**1.2.5 The added value of this approach**

The **Integrated Framework** as described above provides a detailed and comprehensive business picture. This assists individuals and teams who engage with the GPI, competency models, leadership style models and other psychometric instruments to place the results and the information which they learn about themselves, their teams and their organisation within a holistic model and framework. This therefore helps them to link their own unique contributions to that of the wider business. This approach, of providing comprehensive and intelligible feedback on the personality and other psychometric information, within a broader business context is unique. Certainly in terms of the researcher's experience of this field, this focus is unusual and can reduce the risk of situations which occur where individuals when receiving feedback and personal information which are not positioned within a wider context, can be left asking questions, ‘so what?’ or ‘what can I do next?’ or ‘what am I supposed to do with this information?’ Greater clarity is created by this approach, because sufficient time and effort has been allocated to placing the feedback within a business and organisational context. The overall intention is to help individuals, teams and organizations to fully appreciate their own predispositions, performance and behaviours and therefore to be in a position to evaluate how changes to their behaviours could have a direct and beneficial impact on the business performance. The purpose of
these types of interventions is to drive sustained improvements of the soft and hard business measures within realistic yet achievable timescales.

The Integrated Framework as described, is not just a theoretical one but is supported and based on firm and defensible statistical evidence which has been derived from many years of research, within a practical business consultancy, which has operated across all stages of the economic cycle during periods of growth and recession. It has been thoroughly tested across different employment sectors and in different countries around the world. Being able to draw on this wide range of applications provides the confidence for GIL to present Climate as the key driver of performance, where climate can itself be enhanced by addressing the components of each of the input change levers. This work, has in GIL’s experience demonstrated a causal link between climate and the behaviours of leaders and/or managers. The case studies both published and unpublished work, which are part of the intellectual property of GIL, have confirmed that these conclusions are valid for many varied circumstances. These research studies and management consultancy interventions have shown that those leaders who focus on developing effective behaviours and delivering them within well designed organisational structures, which are supported by lean and effective processes, will succeed in creating a high-performance Climate which can be sustained and developed over the medium and longer-term. The Integrated Framework therefore helps to define the requirements and conditions which should be put in place to create sustainable high performance outcomes, and makes direct links between predispositions, (GPI), motivation and behaviours, and by presenting this information as a visual map, promotes clarity and understanding. In summary, the added value, of this unique model is that it emphasizes the following points:

- Climate correlates directly with and drives the bottom line performance for businesses
- The three change levers, of behaviour, structure and processes, drive climate, and together they represent a powerful leadership dynamic
- It is this leadership dynamic that any successful leader needs to fully understand, to embrace and deliver, so as to increase the business scores for climate, which in turn enhance the results of the bottom line.
- All of these factors can be measured in a benchmarked context and by consultancy intervention and taken together represent a powerful balance sheet, which provides clear direction on how to drive a performance improvement.
1.3 Behavioural connections

Chapter 4 described the concept, construction and content of the GPI, and above we have presented the unique Glowinkowski Integrated Business Framework; which is employed when providing feedback to individuals and teams who have completed the GPI instrument.

GIL believe that it is important, that those individuals who deliver the feedback from the GPI and associated instruments have themselves developed a thorough and comprehensive understanding and ‘feel’ for the connections which exist between the Predispositions as reported by the GPI and the actual delivered behaviour which is observed on the ground. This level of consultant competence is essential, in order to translate and explain the underlying personality traits into the world of work in which the clients are operating.

Without the ability to develop this relationship and generate an understanding of the business, then there is a risk that the feedback which is provided can become a mechanistic recital or playing back of raw scores, and the individuals or teams may miss the opportunity to understand their behaviours and the consequences of their actions. To further support this feedback processes, there is another area which the individual or consultant providing feedback needs to be familiar with. This is the GIL Generic Competency framework, where competency in this context is defined as ‘a characteristic behaviour associated with successful organizational outcomes’. A competency defined in this manner is entirely behavioural; it does not embrace skills, knowledge, expertise or personal values. It draws on and builds on the research and work of McClelland (1973) and Boyatzis (1982) and is supported by their own additional research. GIL have identified 18 behaviours, sub-divided into four clusters. They have shown that leaders who deliver these behaviours, do in fact exhibit superior and exemplar performance.

These types of competency models have been widely used within international businesses, being employed as part of selection and recruitment assessment centres. Some businesses have used them as part of a process to assess individual potential at an early stage within their careers, thus allowing organisations to begin to provide tailored developmental processes and a range of cross discipline experiences which are designed to allow staff to develop and reach high levels of seniority within the business.
Recently, this purist approach to competencies has been rather confused by researchers who have begun to mix the concept of being competent, which they have used to define knowledge and skills, along with competencies, which define behaviours. Boyatzis, who was one of the original pioneers of competencies studies, has in his recent work been combining competencies with emotional intelligence; the downside with such changes in approach is that it becomes difficult to compare recent research studies and their conclusions, with work which was reported earlier.

Table 1 The GIL Competency framework is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thinking</strong></td>
<td>Strategic Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analytical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forward Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Customer Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Influencing</strong></td>
<td>Strategic Influencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter-personal Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concern for Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achieving</strong></td>
<td>Results Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concern for Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Information Seeking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-managing</strong></td>
<td>Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GIL have combined the learning taken from the Predispositions model, GPI, their Generic Competency framework and their leadership behaviours and styles model (Blue 4), to help clients to appreciate some of the links which flow from predispositions into the competencies and the leadership models. They have done this to strengthen and reinforce the messages about the approaches, behaviours, and key attributes which leaders need to develop and deliver consistently, if they wish to be effective and presenting these models successful.

They have developed a diagram, which links predispositions and their competency framework. This shows that only a relatively small number of the cells are connected directly, for example **Radical Predisposition**, links with four of the Thinking Competencies, one Influencing Competency, one Achieving Competency, one Self-
Managing Competency and one of the Leadership Approaches. A further example shows that Extraversion, links with one Thinking Competency, three Influencing Competencies, one Self-Managing Competency and three of the leadership approaches. By providing these models and helping leaders to gain an understanding of the relationships and their interconnections then it is possible to highlight the significant differences which can appear between preferred style and what is actually delivered and observed. By making use of this information it is possible to help individuals to begin to appreciate how the different characteristics of their individual style can directly impact certain aspects of how they actually behave. Putting this another way, there some interesting and subtle cross-dependencies occurring which are characteristic of the individuals or teams and the preferred behaviours. These exist alongside the influences and pressures which are being exerted by the business situations and environments in which the individuals have to operate. Often the tension which can result between an individual's preferences and the business requirements can create conflicts and stress and as a consequence individuals and teams will then perform less well than they would wish.

The second diagram provided identifies the preferred Leadership Behaviour, Directive and Concerned, characterized as Blue 4. In the studies conducted by GIL, when leaders adopt this behaviour, then this has been shown to correlate with real and sustained improvements in business performance. Leaders delivering Blue 4 behaviours, are seen to be effective and successful, because they are able to blend together a genuine concern for their people with their intent to deliver a sustained and high quality business performance. This type of approach often makes good sense for people within the businesses, because they recognize that without sustained high levels of performance, then the businesses will struggle commercially and job security may be threatened.

For many leaders, a significant proportion of their time is spent in communication processes, however; there is considerable variability in how well leaders communicate in practice, as good communication skills do not necessarily come naturally. Predispositions are defined as ‘natural’ behaviour; as such behaviours feel more comfortable to deliver and often individuals will revert to these behaviours, when under pressure or stressed. The prime link between these predispositions models is captured in the Communication and Interpersonal Style commercial feedback section, however the linkages are not ‘set in stone’ and often the Blue 4, behaviour is something that needs to be learned and worked at. The evidence supports the case that making the effort to work in this way is fully justified.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Approaches</th>
<th>Predispositions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directional</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Managing</th>
<th>Predispositions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tendancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achieving</th>
<th>Predispositions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results Focus</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for Excellence</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Information Seeking</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competences</th>
<th>Predispositions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Influencing</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Awareness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influencing</th>
<th>Predispositions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Radical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Thinking</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Thinking</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical Thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward Thinking</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Understanding</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4 Relevance to church leadership situations

This appendix has majored on the evidence which exists and which supports the value of applying GPI, The GIL competency framework and GIL leadership model, as developed by GIL for their business consultancy. It has demonstrated the value, benefits and importance of the unique Glowinkowski Integrated Framework. Clearly the work which has been conducted by GIL with these models has been primarily directed at business
situations and only a few church leaders have completed any of these instruments. However, part of the hypotheses which this research project has explored, includes the view that the learning which can be obtained and shared from business communities is relevant and can be applied to those situations which church leaders are experiencing.

The view has been taken that by providing this information along with the models within a contextual basis which summarises how the approaches have been applied in a range of businesses, does itself provide a significant body of learning from which church leaders could potentially benefit. It is hoped that by providing this summary it will help to create an understanding of and background to predispositions and leadership styles that church leaders may be able to consider. Then to possibly reflect on the ways in which they are currently working with their lay congregational members and to consider if there may be some benefits for themselves and the church members if they were to initiate some changes in their behaviours and leadership approaches.

The models are also important as they provide a link with Appendix 3, which looks at some areas where the research could be further developed and extended in the future.

1.5 Conclusions

This appendix has summarised the applications and uses of the GPI instrument, and presented an overview of the unique Glowinkowski Integrated Framework, which presents a model designed to help individuals and teams to think about and to initiate changes which could lead to sustained business performance improvements.

It has briefly touched on the links and connections which exist between GPI, competencies and leadership style frameworks. These are also designed to provide leaders with a deep understanding of their behaviour and the resulting impact which those behaviours can have on their business organisation.

These frameworks, models and their application are supported by a significant body of evidence gathered by GIL, when working in a variety of business sectors, and more recently supplemented by the learning gained in the Education and ‘not-for-profit’ sectors. A considerable about of the material and information which is presented here, has been provided specifically for and directly to the researcher, through personal access to the
Glowinkowski Technical manuals and the case studies held at their Colchester offices and the information has been further amplified and extended by the author for the purposes of this research project. In addition the researcher has added in and integrated his own research and learning which is associated with leadership and people development processes, which was gained while operating as a senior manager within the chemical sector, in a number of different disciplines and functions. The researcher further extended this learning when running his own consultancy, which provided services to a number of businesses, during the period 2000-2007. The primary focus for that consultancy was Business Performance Improvement through People, which has a direct link to and relevance for this research project which is exploring the impact of leadership on church growth.
Appendix 2

An example of the parish statistics used in Chapter 14

Parish Summary Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Inducted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linked Parishes</th>
<th>Inducted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28/01/2014
Parish Data

History of Electoral Roll Membership

Electoral Roll

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

History of Adult (16yrs+) Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Usual Sunday Attendance</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Sunday (Oct) Attendance</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Weekly (Oct) Attendance</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adult (16yrs+) Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>uSa</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aSa</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>awa</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

History of Child (<16yrs) Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Usual Sunday Attendance</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Sunday (Oct) Attendance</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Weekly (Oct) Attendance</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Child (<16yrs) Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>uSa</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aSa</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>awa</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
History of Festival Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Attendance</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Communicants</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter Attendance</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter Communicants</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Christmas Attendance graph](image)

![Easter Attendance graph](image)

History of Baptisms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

History of Weddings or Blessings of a Civil Ceremony

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weddings</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blessings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

History of Church Funerals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parish Church</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crem/Cemetery</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 3

Some ways in which the study of clergy leadership could be developed

3.1 Introduction

This section provides an outline of three areas, which could potentially be developed in the future as an extension of the research which has been looking at the value and benefit of using GPI for modelling church growth. These areas lie outside the scope of this existing research project but are presented as a way of indicating how the analysis could be extended in the future.

The first area draws on the clergy GPI profiles and uses the GIL correlation which connects with their Blue-4 Leadership model (see Appendix 1). This section looks briefly at the predicted clergy leadership strengths and describes the possible areas within the Blue-4 model where they might operate when they are not delivering the preferred style of behaviour, which is Blue-4.

The second area extends the presentations presented in Chapter 14, which looked at the GPI profiles for clergy in growing, steady or declining churches, and identified some differences, but which did not indicate any statistically significant difference in the GPI profiles for clergy in growing or declining churches. The material which is provided in this appendix examines the GPI profiles created by the GIL software, at the sub-dimension level and explores if by investigating at this extended level of detail it may be possible to highlight some further differences between the clergy groups.

The third area briefly extends the statistical analysis and considers if there are some statistically significantly relationships between some of the additional data provided by the clergy survey. This approach is not developed in any detail but it does provide pointers for how future research into church growth could be developed and directed.
3.2 Linking the Clergy GPI profiles to their Leadership strength profiles: Analysing the Results from the Clergy Leadership Strength Profiles

**Pool Statistics:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Amber</th>
<th>Green</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likelyhood of Delivering non-Blue 4 Behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directing Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organising</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovating</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resourcing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interacting with People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathising</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflecting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency and Flex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typically</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primarily</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predominantly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL = 99 respondents</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-Blue 4 Behaviour:

![Non-Blue 4 Behaviour Pie Chart]

3.2.1 Purpose of this analysis of Leadership strengths profiles
Chapter 7 presented an analysis of the clergy GPI profiles for the total group who completed the GPI questions in the survey Ministry Today, and this methodology did provide some fresh insights into the make up of the clergy in the Chester Diocese as individuals and as total group.

GIL have developed their GPI profiles to link via correlations with their models which describe Leadership Competencies and Leadership Style profiles (Blue 4 model). These models and their interconnections are described in Appendix 1. The Leadership styles (Blue 4) model presents the extensive research evidence drawn from a range of business sectors and collated by GIL. This research shows that those leaders who deliver behaviours which sit within the Blue 4 quadrant have been found to be the ones who are most successful in driving change and delivering sustained business performance improvements. Each of the other quadrants within the model have been observed to have serious downsides, which means that leaders who deliver behaviours within any of the Red 1, Amber 2 and Green 3 quadrants will be less effective in achieving their overall aims and objectives.

By developing the Chester Diocesan clergy GPI profiles into Leadership strength profiles; these provide a picture of the leadership styles which this group of clergy are most likely to adopt especially in those situations when they are not displaying the preferred leadership style (Blue 4).

3.2.2 Analysis of Leadership strengths

The table and the pie chart show that the majority of the clergy (56 out of 99) when not exhibiting Blue 4 behaviours, were most likely to display the Green-3 Leadership Behaviours. The alternative to Blue 4, in this case Green-3 is what the model suggests that the individual reverts to if they are having a difficult day, which can be equated with days when those clergy are feeling most under pressure or stressed. This result may be seen as making a considerable degree of sense when it is considered that this study is exploring the unique requirements of spiritual leaders. The clergy as individuals and as a group are perhaps atypical leaders in that their roles require a considerable emphasis on leading people, their lay congregational members, in an emotional and spiritual capacity which is potentially quite different in comparison to the leadership exercised by what might be
described as traditional business leaders. In business situations the leaders are required to balance the provision of support to individuals with the requirement to provide direction as to how they can meet the business goals and objectives. It could possibly be argued that there are fewer measurable physical goals to be accomplished ‘as a team’ when you are a clergy leader, and many of these group-orientated goals are designed around providing spiritual direction and support for growth into discipleship. This spiritual guidance and direction will tend to be delivered most effectively through the careful and tactful consideration of the congregation’s existing theology and comfort zones; therefore it could be suggested that attention to people’s needs is a key and major job requirement for the clergy, hence their desire to adopt the fallback position of Green-3 leadership.

If this analysis of the nature of the clergy roles is correct then it is perhaps not surprising, that the two types of behaviour characterised by Indifference towards peoples’ needs and opinions appear less frequently in the results for this particular profession. In addition this view supports the greater preference for Amber and Green, as these two behavioural types are characterised by Passive behaviour as opposed to that for Red which is characterised by Directive behaviour. This Passive behaviour may be generated because some of the clergy judge that certain members of their congregation may resent being told or directed as to how to develop their spiritual lives. This reaction could arise because the spiritual journey may be considered to be an individual and personal one and therefore members of a congregation may prefer a leader that doesn’t appear to push them too hard compared to a leader who is seen to be more directive.

There may also be a skew in the personality characteristics for this particular pool of leaders, as there is a traditional expectation that clergy members will deliver Christian ‘behaviour’; therefore, people with a natural predisposition towards those characteristics may well fit in more effectively as clergy members. There is perhaps an unspoken understanding that church leaders will be expected to demonstrate characteristics such as selflessness, service-orientation, peacefulness, love, understanding and humility. While such characteristics that some might consider ‘ungodly’ or perhaps viewed as representing poor spiritual leadership such as an inability to see things from other’s point of view, distancing themselves from the needs and lives of their congregation, being domineering, critical, pessimistic, speaking harshly, self-orientated and acting in a rash or aggressive manner would be viewed as unattractive. In addition, some congregations may not be comfortable with leaders who tend to exhibit strong spiritual views which might differ
from their own beliefs, as they may feel unduly threatened or challenged. However expectations and stances within congregations across the various denominations are likely to vary and the members will value different characteristics in their spiritual leaders. The table below provides a list of typical predispositions for each non-Blue colour, in the leadership model, and they are highlighted orange if it is thought that they might be received negatively within a church setting and blue if it is thought that they would be likely to be accepted more warmly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typically Red Predispositions</th>
<th>Typically Amber Predispositions</th>
<th>Typically Green Predispositions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asserting</td>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td>Accepting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissenting</td>
<td>Unaffiliative</td>
<td>Affiliative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaffiliative</td>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td>Conforming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolutionary</td>
<td>Dissenting</td>
<td>Outgoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsive</td>
<td>Pessimistic</td>
<td>Optimistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assuming</td>
<td>Serious Minded</td>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontented</td>
<td>Disciplined</td>
<td>Fun Loving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table indicates that the Green-3 leadership style is associated with what are thought to be more ‘acceptable’ behaviours for clergy members than either Red or Amber. While Amber does include quite a few potentially unfavourable predispositions, the Serious-minded and Disciplined characteristics may make them more suited to a traditional Church setting which might possibly account for its slightly higher prevalence in the candidate pool than Red-1. Therefore, it is suggested that the characteristics that may be typically thought of as representing ‘good’ spiritual behaviours and leadership may also make the leaders predisposed to Green-3 behaviour, which provides an explanation for these findings. A question which could be asked in the future and which has not been addressed or developed within this study, would be if clergy were to display more Blue-4 leadership behaviour would that have a similar positive effect and result on their congregation and communities as is observed when this model is applied in a business setting where Blue-4 is shown to deliver a significantly enhanced performance.
Blue-4 Behaviour Dimensions

These two pie charts present examples of Blue-4 Leadership behaviours as displayed by this cohort of Chester Diocesan clergy, it can be noted that for ‘Interacting with People’ chart there is a very high result for the empathising segment whereas for the ‘Directing Activity’ chart the results are more balanced. This may suggest that the way the leader interacts with people is more of a defining characteristic for clergy members compared to their predisposition to Direct. This may again arise from their unique role as spiritual leader, as explored earlier, where there is an increased requirement for sensitivity & engagement with lay members and less importance placed on setting direction to achieve objectives than would be expected in traditional business leadership roles.

The Directing Activity dimensions are reasonably balanced between Organising, Resourcing and Innovating behaviours, but there is a significant smaller percentage exhibiting Directing behaviour. In terms of the GPI, Directing behaviour within GPI, involves a Focused and Radical approach to solving problems and providing direction, and is characterised by the ability to put structure around large scale complex problems, to think about long-term development needs and to provide others with a fresh approach to change. There is no apparently straight-forward reason why this particular combination should present as less favourable than the other dimensions. One possible interpretation which could be explored may be that different styles of congregation prefer and react differently to different types of leaders. When considering possible interpretations of the data, it may be that more conservative, traditional church environments may be prefer Organising leaders (these are Planners in the GPI model, Focused and Incremental) who
enjoy dealing with structure and details. While, on the other hand, more liberal churches with younger or more diverse congregations may prefer leaders who are Flexible in their thinking, irrespective of whether they are Incremental or Radical, and thus either Innovating or Resourcing leaders fit best into those situations. This again raises the question as to where leaders who display Directing/Strategic behaviours might fit most effectively. These results do have a direct link to the feedback formats presented in Chapter 7, which indicated that only 6 out 99 clergy were Strategists, with correlates with the low score for Directing.

As highlighted above the Interacting with People dimension is highly dominated by Empathising individuals. Empathisers are Supporters in terms of GPI, and this behaviour does appear to fit with what some might define as the ‘ideal’ spiritual leader – Empathisers are Collectivists, team players, and support others, which are important characteristics for the community orientated role which the clergy are expected to adopt. They are also Introverted, meaning they are reflective and have a preference to listen and take other’s views into account as opposed to the more vocal and self-confident Engaging/Encourager profile, which may again be viewed as preferable in the role of supporting spiritual leaders.

3.2.3 Evaluation:

This data set comes from a relatively small pool (99), of individuals in specialized clergy roles. There is no additional data for clergy available on the GIL database with which to make any direct comparisons, so it is difficult to determine whether these results are statistically significant or not. It would increase the validity and understanding of the data, to be able to compare these results to datasets for clergy in different locations, and to isolate any differences between the congregations they lead or their particular job role and requirements which may be impacting on the results.

Other interesting areas which could be explored in terms of this data set are:

- Attempt to cross-compare the Directing Activity of the Leaders with the type of church and congregation which the clergy are leading. Such a study might test if more modern, less traditionally structured and youthful churches may be more likely to attract ‘Radical’ leaders (Innovators and Resourcers) whose directing ability is liberal and matches the more flexible service style and theology often
experienced in these types of churches; however these types of leaders may struggle with the constraints that traditional churches may bring in the form of liturgy and service structure. Conversely, one might expect that Organising clergy members would feel more attraction towards the detail orientation and structure provided within more traditional Anglican churches. In addition, it may be possible to test if more lively & liberal churches prefer fun-loving and spontaneous leaders over more conservative churches that might prefer more serious-minded and disciplined leaders.

A further stage in the analysis of Leadership strengths and styles would be to include some feedback from the congregational members; so that a view is obtained of how effective the leaders are as viewed by their congregations, with this information sitting alongside the self assessment of the GPI profiles. The results might show that leaders with Red-1 tendencies are not as effective in churches as those with Green-3 or Blue-4 tendencies. It would also be possible to consider if the analysis showed that Reflecting, Involving or Amber-2 clergy members are perceived as aloof or uninvolved by individuals in the congregation.

A further area for extension would be to compare the Leadership strengths and styles of this cohort drawn from the Chester Diocese with spiritual leaders from different Dioceses or denominations to explore if there are differences in character traits which are valued in different ways within different denominations and if these then are reflected and impact on the leader's style.

### 3.2.4 Leadership strengths and preferences within growing, stable and declining churches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Congregation</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Amber</th>
<th>Green</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declining</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table compares the leadership style which is most likely to be adopted when the leader is not displaying Blue-4 characteristics, (this is the style individuals revert to on what is
defined as a bad day or when stressed), with data analysed in Chapter 14 for Clergy in Growing, Steady and Declining churches.

The size of the sample is very small so it is not possible to draw firm conclusions from the information; however it is possible to note there is a higher percentage of clergy in declining churches who display Red and Amber behaviours (58%), as compared to steady churches (33%) and growing churches (32%). In order to draw any substantive conclusions, the work would need to be repeated with larger samples, perhaps in other UK Dioceses.

3.2.5 Conclusions

This limited summary of GPI profiles which correlate with Leadership strengths and styles has presented a brief overview of the way in which the GPI profiles could be used to extend the research which is examining the relationship between clergy leadership and church growth. It has posed some unanswered questions, which are outside the scope of this research, about whether the Leadership styles being displayed by the clergy represent what is ideally the leader’s natural style or are the churches and congregations with whom the clergy are working having a major impact on the style which they feel they need or are obliged to adopt.

There is a tentative suggestion, based on the limited results, that a greater number of the leaders who are working in declining churches, have a tendency to adopt Red and Amber leadership styles.

Overall by developing such approaches it may be possible to provide further insights into the impact which clergy leadership predispositions and behaviours can have on church growth.

3.3 An example of developing the commercial GPI profiles to the sub-dimension level: Problem Solving & Implementation Style sub-dimensions for Declining, Growing and Steady churches

The purpose of this section was to try to extend the analysis of the clergy GPI profiles as presented in Chapter 14 for clergy in growing, steady and declining churches.
The analysis in Chapter 14, showed no statistically significant difference for GPI profiles between clergy in growing or declining churches, although the mean differences did highlight some key differences. In addition the GPI profiles of the five feedback plots as used in the GIL process demonstrated some minor variations and it was not possible to provide a conclusive result for the research question; ‘does the GPI provide insights into differences in clergy who are managing decline and those who are resisting decline?’.

The feedback plots as presented in Chapter 14 used the high level dimensions and definitions provided within the GPI construct. It was decided therefore to explore if there was any apparent differentiation between these three clergy groups when a summary plot was developed which adopted the sub-dimensions within the GPI tool.

The Problem Solving & Implementation Style profile was chosen for this additional exploration, partly because there did appear to be more clergy present in the incremental quadrants, as well as fewer clergy in the Strategist quadrant when the declining churches and growing churches were compared.

### 3.3.1 Problem Solving: Incremental-Radical

There are three parts to this presentation, a set of pie charts for the three clergy groups, a set of definitions of the sub-dimensions and a table showing the numbers (as %) of clergy presenting these sub-dimensions in each group, declining, growing and steady.

Visual inspection of the pie charts and the summary table, do show some apparent differences across the groups, for example Evolutionary Conceptual Rational, declining 6%, growing 0%, Revolutionary Conceptual Intuitive, declining 13%, growing 21%.

The results have not been tested for statistical significance and therefore it is not appropriate to speculate about what the apparent differences implied in terms of clergy behaviours.

### 3.3.2 Problem Solving: Implementation: Focused-Flexible

A similar set of charts and tables are provided for Focused-Flexible, with some visual differences in the pie charts and the tables for growing and declining churches, for
example, Outcome Conscientious Perfectionist, declining 26% and growing 11%, and Outcome Cursory Pragmatic declining 0% and growing 16%.

Again the results have not been tested for statistical significance and this breakdown of the dimensions of the GPI dimensions is not a practice which has been adopted by GIL where they have normally used the material and the higher level as a tool which gives individuals and teams a holistic view of their behaviours and any potential implications which arise from those behaviours.

The information is presented here as a way of demonstrating that it might be possible to explore the results at a sub-dimension level and then to try to interpret what the results are suggesting. That has not been possible within the boundaries and scope of this study. It may be felt that this use of the sub-dimensions is too speculative an approach and further analysis of clergy if it is to be undertaken using the GPI instrument, should concentrate initially on seeking larger samples of clergy in other Dioceses within England and Wales.
Problem Solving: Incremental - Radical

Key:
- ECI: Evolutionary Conceptual Intuitive
- ECR: Evolutionary Conceptual Rational
- EPI: Evolutionary Practical Intuitive
- EPR: Evolutionary Practical Rational
- RCI: Revolutionary Conceptual Intuitive
- RCR: Revolutionary Conceptual Rational
- RPI: Revolutionary Practical Intuitive
- RPR: Revolutionary Practical Rational
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Declining</th>
<th>Growing</th>
<th>Steady</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolutionary Conceptual Intuitive</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolutionary Conceptual Rational</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolutionary Practical Intuitive</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolutionary Practical Rational</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolutionary Conceptual Intuitive</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolutionary Conceptual Rational</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolutionary Practical Intuitive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolutionary Practical Rational</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation: Focused - Flexible

Key:
- O Co Pe: Outcome Conscientious Perfectionist
- O Co Pr: Outcome Conscientious Pragmatic
- O Cu Pe: Outcome Cursory Perfectionist
- O Cu Pr: Outcome Cursory Pragmatic
- Sp Co Pe: Spontaneous Conscientious Perfectionist
- Sp Co Pr: Spontaneous Conscientious Pragmatic
- Sp Cu Pe: Spontaneous Cursory Perfectionist
- Sp Cu Pr: Spontaneous Cursory Pragmatic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Declining</th>
<th>Growing</th>
<th>Steady</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Conscientious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionist</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Conscientious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Cursory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionist</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Cursory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious Pragmatic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cursory Perfectionist</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cursory Pragmatic</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EVOLUTIONARY – REVOLUTIONARY SUB-DIMENSION

CONCEPTUAL-PRACTICAL SUB-DIMENSION

INTUITIVE-RATIONAL SUB-DIMENSION
3.4 Supplementary statistical testing of clergy data for growing and declining churches

3.4.1 Introduction

This section provides some supplementary statistical analysis data for the clergy in growing and declining churches. It is included basically to demonstrate other aspects of the research study which could be developed further, but was not included in the main body of the study so as not to divert the reader from the main conclusions which were established for research questions which were directed primarily at the use of the GPI psychometric tool.

This summary presents three sets of data for clergy in growing and declining churches, firstly it will examine some elements of psychological type, secondly burnout information for the two groups of clergy and finally GPI profiles for clergy with little work experience (5 years or less) and those with an extended work experience period (11 years or more) prior to presenting for ordination training.

3.4.2 Clergy in growing and declining churches, and elements of psychological type, (ESTJ)

Table 3.4.2 t-tests for church growth and E S T J

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Declining</th>
<th></th>
<th>Growing</th>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
<th>pL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensing</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judging</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 29 (declining)
N = 19 (growing)
The statistical analysis shows that the data for Extraversion, Sensing and Thinking do not show any statistically significant difference. For Judging there is P-value of .01 indicating that there is an element of difference in the psychological type profiles for the clergy in these two groups of churches. The mean for Extraversion is higher in Growing rather than declining churches.

### 3.4.3 Data from the Francis Burnout Inventory and declining and growing Churches

Table 3.4.3 t-test for Satisfaction in Ministry Scale (SIMS), Scale of Emotional Exhaustion in Ministry (SEEM), and growing and declining churches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Declining</th>
<th>Growing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMS</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEM</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 29 (declining)  
N = 19 (growing)

The Francis Burnout Inventory (FBI) consists of two scales each with eleven questions, Satisfaction in Ministry Scale (SIMS), and Scale of Emotional Exhaustion in Ministry (SEEM). The statistical analysis of the SIMS and SEEM data for the clergy in declining and growing churches did not show any statistically significant difference, implying that this measure as used with these small samples did not provide a means of separating these groups of clergy.

It might be useful in a future research project to repeat this type of analysis with a larger set of data from another Diocese, if differences were to be identified one might have imagined that clergy in churches which are declining, might show higher scores for the Scale of Emotional Exhaustion in Ministry (SEEM), if they were finding their roles challenging and stressful.
### 3.4.4 GPI mean score comparison between clergy with little experience of work and clergy with more experience

Table 3.4.4 t-test for GPI mean score comparison between clergy with little and extended experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Little experience</th>
<th>Extended experience</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>pL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introversion</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ill-at-ease</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-ease</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivist</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualist</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsive</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplined</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radical</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 35 Little experience (5 years or less)
N = 50 Extended experience (11 years or more)

The questions on length of work experience and levels of responsibility prior to ordination training, were included in the survey in the hope that it might be possible to identify some differences in the way those clergy with extensive work service, behaved and led their churches compared to those who either went straight into a clergy role or had spent only a very limited time in a secular work situation.
In looking at the relationship between the clergy GPI profiles and their length of work service, this was an attempt to examine if there were any differences in the GPI profiles for these two groups of clergy. There was a possibility that those clergy who had spent extended periods of time in secular job roles, often at senior levels, may have learnt behaviours which effectively modified their GPI profiles.

However this statistical test demonstrates that there is no statistically significant difference in the GPI profiles for those who had only a little work experience compared to those with longer dwell times, although there are some interesting variations in the mean scores of certain GPI dimensions.

Therefore this avenue of exploration has not been especially beneficial, but it serves to demonstrate and highlight the type of studies which may be possible in future research projects.
Appendix 4

The survey, Ministry Today which was sent to the clergy in the Chester Diocese
Ministry Today

This survey is being sent to Church Leaders in the Chester Diocese.

Your replies will be treated in a confidential manner. The number at the top of this questionnaire is there only to help us identify those who do not send a questionnaire back so that we can send them a reminder. Please help by completing this questionnaire and returning it:

Henry Ratter
12 Pine Gardens
Upton
CHESTER CH2 1DB

If you have any queries about this questionnaire please contact me at the above address, via email ratterh@aol.com or telephone 01244 380827.

Thank you for your help.

Henry Ratter  Leslie Francis

April 2013
Introducing the study

This study has been designed to listen to the experiences and aspirations of clergy working in parish ministry in the Diocese of Chester. The research will help the Diocese to appreciate the full range of experience and skills currently being brought to parish ministry. The study has also been designed to listen to the stresses and strains of parish ministry. I hope that you will be able to assist my research by completing this survey.

Copyright Notices and Definitions

© Copyright 2013 Henry Ratter and Leslie J Francis.

Definitions

Paid secular and career employment—working roles and jobs which you filled before deciding to seek ordination

Business and professional activities—these represent the broad brush split of the various different employment sectors and categories which exist across the UK
Part 1 Personal context
This section explores key issues about yourself and your education experience.

1. What is your sex?
   - Male 1
   - Female 2

2. What was your age on 31 December 2012?
   - 20-29 1
   - 30-39 2
   - 40-49 3
   - 50-59 4
   - 60-69 5
   - 70-79 6

3. What is your marital status?
   - Single 1
   - Married 2
   - Widowed/Widower 3
   - Widowed/Widower but remarried 4
   - Separated 5
   - Divorced 6
   - Divorced but remarried 7
   - Same sex Partnership 8
4. With which of the following do you share your house?—(please circle all that apply)

- Your partner 1
- Pre-school children 1
- School aged children 1
- Post school children 1
- Your parents 1
- None of these 1
- Pets/animals 1
- Others 2

(Please write in) ........................................................................................................................................

5. (a) What is your highest University level qualification in Theology & Religious studies?

- None 1
- Diploma programme level 2
- First degree 3
- P/G Certificate 4
- P/G Diploma 5
- Masters 6
- Doctorate PhD or DMin 7

(b) What is your highest University level qualification not in Theology & Religious studies? (Humanities, Science, Engineering, Management, etc)

- None 1
- Diploma programme level 2
- First degree 3
- P/G Certificate 4
- P/G Diploma 5
- Masters 6
- Doctorate PhD or DMin 7

Please write in the subject and discipline for your highest qualification..........................
Part 2 Professional context
This section explores key issues about your experience prior to ordination.

6. Prior to ordination training, how much experience did you have of a secular career or work?

None  1
1-2 years  2
3-5 years  3
6-10 years  4
11-15 years  5
16-20 years  6
More than 20 years  7

If you have not had experience of a secular career or work go to question 8.

7(a) In that secular career or work, how many jobs did you hold?

One job post  1
Two job posts  2
Three job posts  3
Four job posts  4
Five job posts  5
More than 5 job posts  6

(b) How would you describe the highest level of your management role and responsibility?

None  1
First Line Manager  2
Middle Manager  3
Senior Manager  4
Director Level  5
Other  6

(Please write in). ........................................................................................................................................
(c) What type of organisation were you working for the greatest part of your career?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not for profit or voluntary sector</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed basis (including consultancy)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please write in) ........................................................................................................

(d) In what area were you engaged for the greatest part of your career?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education/Teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial/Accountancy sector</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Sector</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing/Processing Sector</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Construction Sectors</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS/Health Sectors</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Care sectors</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please write in) ........................................................................................................

(e) How many people did you manage?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of People</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. How many years is it since you were ordained deacon?

- Under 5 years: 1
- 5-9 years: 2
- 10-14 years: 3
- 15-19 years: 4
- 20-24 years: 5
- 25-29 years: 6
- 30-34 years: 7
- 35-40 years: 8
- 40 years and over: 9

9. What type of ordination training programme did you follow?

(a) Residential programme: 1
(b) Non-residential programme: 2

(b) Please name the college and the title of the course you completed.

10. How many years have you been in your current appointment?

(Please write in):

11. What is the population of the area served by your ministry appointment?

- Less than 1,000: 1
- 1,000—1,999: 2
- 2,000—3,999: 3
- 4,000—5,999: 4
- 6,000—9,999: 5
- 10,000—14,999: 6
- 15,000 or more: 7

12. How would you describe the ‘main’ area served by your ministry?

- Rural: 1
- Urban: 2
- Suburban: 3
13. How many churches are you responsible for?
One 1
Two 2
Three 3
Four 4
Five or more 5

14. What is your present status?
Nonstipendiary 1
Stipendiary 2
Ordained Local Minister 3
Other 4

(Please write it) .................................................................

15. Please indicate where you feel you currently are on the following scales?
Evangelical 1 2 3 4 3 2 1 Catholic
Liberal 1 2 3 4 3 2 1 Conservative
Charismatic 1 2 3 4 3 2 1 Noncharismatic

16. What level of support do you feel you have had from the following?
Diocesan Bishop little 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 much
Suffragan Bishop little 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 much
Archdeacon little 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 much
Rural/Area Dean little 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 much
Clergy Chapter little 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 much
Ministry Development Officer little 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 much
Spiritual Director little 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 much
Retired Clergy little 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 much
Local church members little 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 much

Please write in all others who have supported you and indicate their level of support

...........................................................................................................
17. How much importance do you place on the following roles for your ministry?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>little</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral care for the congregation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral care for the local community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Prayer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Prayer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrating the Sacraments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring that the organization works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in and with the local community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing the gifts of church members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing future leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating as a coach/mentor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing collaborative ministry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising income to match the parish share</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others- Write in other roles which are key for you and rate their importance

18. Which of the following leadership themes were covered by your initial ministerial training? (Please circle all of those which apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management of Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership styles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning styles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation &amp; Creativity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team working processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering &amp; developing others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying gifts in others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and budgeting tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing vision, mission &amp; strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. If you had secular career and work experience before ordination, how well did these experiences equip you for the following ministerial roles?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>little</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading change in the church</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leadership aspects of the ministry role</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing spiritual gifts &amp; life, yourself &amp; others</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative use of your free time</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying the gifts of congregational members</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing and growing the gifts of others</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing and preparing future leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. How well did your initial ministerial training equip you for the following ministerial roles?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>little</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading change in the church</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leadership aspects of the ministry role</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing spiritual gifts &amp; life, yourself &amp; others</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative use of your free time</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying the gifts of congregational members</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing and growing the gifts of others</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing &amp; preparing future leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. How well has your Continued Ministerial Development (CMD), equipped you for the following ministerial roles?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>little</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading change in the church</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leadership aspects of the ministry role</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing spiritual gifts &amp; life, yourself &amp; others</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative use of your free time</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying the gifts of congregational members</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing and growing the gifts of others</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing and preparing future leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. How much importance do you church members place on the following roles for your ministry?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>little</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral care for the congregation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral care of the local community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Prayer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Prayer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrating the Sacraments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring the organization works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in and with the local community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing the gifts of congregational members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing future leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating as a coach/mentor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a collaborative ministry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising income to match the expected parish share</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add any other aspects which the congregation would expect you to fulfill and rate the importance they place on those additional activities.

Please write in: ........................................................................................................................................

23. How would you assess the culture in your church?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>little</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The members are open to and welcome change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The members are willing to use their gifts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The environment is supportive of growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New members are readily welcomed into the church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New members stay in the church after their initial engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth is a key priority for the leadership team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The members are growing as disciples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 4 Personal Predispositions
This section explores some of your personal predispositions.
Read each description carefully: Do you agree that this is a good description of the way you see yourself?

If you Agree Strongly, put a ring round

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to deal with the detail of tasks</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes gives the impression of being self-important</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers all aspects before reacting to something</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goes out of their way to be helpful to others</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not enjoy positions of influence</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers solitary pursuits</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoys seeing the 'bigger picture'</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers work that requires attention to detail</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels that accuracy is not all that important</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to get on with my work rather than talk about it</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers not to give my full attention to one thing at a time</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to have a good time</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels comfortable when meeting new people</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks positions of importance</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is unassuming</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is not overly concerned about friendship</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finds it easy to trust people</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is ambitious</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoys making an impact</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is easily irritated by interference from others</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to state my views forcefully</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is often impatient with my own errors</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers others to lead the way</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is content with my position in life</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you Agree, put a ring round

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to deal with the detail of tasks</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes gives the impression of being self-important</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers all aspects before reacting to something</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goes out of their way to be helpful to others</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not enjoy positions of influence</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers solitary pursuits</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoys seeing the 'bigger picture'</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers work that requires attention to detail</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels that accuracy is not all that important</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to get on with my work rather than talk about it</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers not to give my full attention to one thing at a time</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to have a good time</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels comfortable when meeting new people</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks positions of importance</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is unassuming</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is not overly concerned about friendship</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finds it easy to trust people</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is ambitious</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoys making an impact</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is easily irritated by interference from others</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to state my views forcefully</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is often impatient with my own errors</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers others to lead the way</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is content with my position in life</td>
<td>AS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sees the positive side of most situations
Prefers to work to set deadlines
Is tolerant of others
Is not provoked by unwarranted criticism
Takes work seriously
Pursues work as a priority
Is easy going
Is content in my current job
Finds it easy to move on to something new
Worries about all of the things that may go wrong
Tends to consider people before tasks
Gets through work at a brisk pace
Often feels tense
Seeks promotion
Likes to be seen as influential
Is quick to draw a conclusion
Prefers to talk problems through
Likes to be flexible in how I organise my work
Finds it easy to work to deadlines
Is not concerned about personal popularity
Prefers the more radical solutions to problems
Does not enjoy positions of power and influence
Prefers to achieve by managing the actions of others
Reacts immediately to situations
Tends to be 'laid back'
Deliberates before giving an opinion
Feels selfdoubt
Is seen by colleagues as temperamental
Is satisfied with life in general
Listens carefully before reacting
Is concerned about the needs of other people
Tends to be suspicious of the motives of others
Finds it easy to spoil myself
Tends to look carefully at things before reacting
Prefers to take a broad view  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Prefers to cooperate with others  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Finds it easy to think of many different solutions to problems  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Enjoys being the best at what I do  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Finds it easy to accept lower standards in order to deliver an outcome  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Is comfortable with radical change  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Lets others decide what to do  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Tends not to believe what others say  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Prefers to avoid saying hurtful things  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Finds it easy to generate enthusiasm  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Rarely takes people at face value  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Is energetic  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Is comfortable in my work  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Prefers decisions based on logic  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Prefers to mix with people I know  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Is comfortable considering future possibilities  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Is not bothered by criticism  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Prefers to follow my own insight when solving problems  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Is more comfortable with things as they are  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Prefers time to think before having to take action  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Does not get angry in situations of conflict  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Enjoys my own company  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Feels comfortable with life  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Prefers to work through a problem on my own  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Is discreet about my own accomplishments  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Takes people at face value  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Prefers to have clear evidence before deciding a way forward  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Is pragmatic in order to get the task done  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Tries to exceed personal standards of excellence  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Enjoys thinking about how different ideas interrelate  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Prefers to deal with hard facts  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Prefers not to be in charge  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Assumes my views will be accepted  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Feels ill-at-ease in social situations  AS  A  NC  D  DS
Feels socially confident
Rarely feels tense
Tends not to suspect the motives of others
Is animated in conversation
Considers having a good time a low priority
Considers others before myself
Tends to make excessive demands on people
Asks tough probing questions
Puts imagination before information when problem solving
Often feels discontented
Feels comfortable in social situations
Likes to establish clear milestones to complete the job on time
Tends to believe what others say
Prefers not to be assertive
Is quick to see the value of new approaches to solving problems
Prefers to use intuition to solve problems
Is dominant
Thinks the future is full of hope
Finds it easy to oppose
Enjoys persuading others
Finds it easy dealing with others
Likes to use my imagination
Prefers to find different ways of doing things
Finds it easy to accept ‘fit for purpose’ rather than perfection
Always feels a sense of urgency
Feels ill at ease with people of high status
Finds it easy to conform
Feels at ease with strangers
Pursues pleasure as a priority
Views the future as lacking in opportunity
Considers planning a restraint
Finds it easy to change direction
Tends to be pessimistic
Feels uncomfortable expressing my views to strangers
Like to be highly organized in what I do
Enjoys T.V. programmes that cover serious issues
Finds it easy to be on my own
Prefers to concentrate on practical solutions
Finds it easy to take an opposing view
Feels that status is important
Is impulsive
Does not mind if others take charge
Prefers to tie up all loose ends
Is modest
Approaches work tasks in a measured way
Enjoys being in charge
Tends to underestimate my capability
Cuts corners to get results
Is always conscious of getting the details right
Likes to talk about my achievements
Does not worry unduly
Is a perfectionist
Prefers to make steady progress
Prefers to plan carefully
Prefers to work on well specified tasks
Finds it difficult to leave tasks incomplete
Tries to avoid making hasty decisions
Prefers a structured approach to things
Tends to be self-critical
Believes my own ideas are better than those of others
Tends not to enjoy positions of authority
Tends to be uncomfortable with radical change
Sometimes feels negative about the future
Is quick to deliver an opinion
Is an optimist
Prefers well-regulated situations
Tends to see negatives of a situation
Often feels angry
Tends to disagree with what others say
Prefers change to be in small controlled steps
Tends to be mistrustful of others
Enjoys the company of others
Is not troubled by self-doubt
Prefers to avoid confrontation
Enjoys prestigious situations
Usually makes the decisions
Rarely feels anxiety when things go wrong
Enjoys large social gatherings
Feels comfortable with who I am
Finds it hard to deal with detail
Feels hurt when criticised
Prefers to evaluate all available data before making a decision
Hesitates to express a contradictory view
Feels that detailed preparation can sometimes inhibit effectiveness
Is obsessive about meeting deadlines
Likes to take charge
Always looks on the bright side
Prefers to deal with the task to be done rather than the people
Part 5 Personal characteristics- For each pair tick one box next to that characteristic which is closer to the real you, even if you feel both characteristics apply to you. Tick the characteristic that reflects the real you, even if other people see you differently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>or</th>
<th>Reflective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>active or reflective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interested in facts or interested in theories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concerned for harmony or concerned for justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happy with routine or unhappy with routine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotional or unemotional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private or sociable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspirational or practical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analytic or sympathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structured or open-ended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contented or discontented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>having many friends or a few deep friendships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the concrete or the abstract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feeling or thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to act on impulse or to act on decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feel secure or feel insecure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dislike parties or like parties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prefer to design or prefer to make</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tend to be firm or tend to be gentle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>like to be in control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you tend to ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>have mood swings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>have mood swings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stay stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>energised by other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>energised by other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>adaptible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>drain by many people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stay stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inventive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inventive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>affirming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>affirming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>have mood swings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you tend to ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>remain placid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you tend to be more ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>socially involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you tend to be more ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>socially involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you tend to be more ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>concerned about details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you tend to be more ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>concerned about details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you tend to be more ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>logical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you tend to be more ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>humane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you tend to be more ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>humane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you tend to be more ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>easygoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you tend to ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>easygoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you more...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>feel guilt free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you more...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>feel guilt free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you more...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>talkative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you more...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>talkative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you more...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you more...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you more...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>imaginative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you more...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>imaginative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you more...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>truthful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you more...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>truthful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you more...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>organised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you generally...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>organised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you mostly ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>an extravert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you mostly...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>an extravert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you mostly focused on ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>future possibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you mostly focused on ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>future possibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you mostly focused on ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>emphasising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you mostly focused on ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>emphasising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you mostly focused on ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>organisational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you mostly focused on ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>organisational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you mostly focused on ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sceptical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you mostly focused on ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sceptical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you generally...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>at ease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you mostly focused on ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>at ease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you mostly focused on ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>at ease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you mostly focused on ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>at ease</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Are you mostly ... leisurely ☒ or ☐ punctual
Do you tend to ... stay calm ☒ or ☐ panic easily
Do you ... speak before thinking ☒ or ☐ think before speaking
Do you prefer to ... improve thing ☒ or ☐ keep things as they are
Do you ... stay calm ☒ or ☐ panic easily
Do you ... speak before thinking ☒ or ☐ think before speaking
Do you prefer to ... improve thing ☒ or ☐ keep things as they are
Do you ... seek for truth ☒ or ☐ seek for peace
Do you ... dislike detailed planning ☒ or ☐ like detailed planning
Do you ... frequently get irritated ☒ or ☐ rarely get irritated
Are you ... happier with uncertainty ☒ or ☐ happier with certainty
Are you ... up in the air ☒ or ☐ down to earth
Are you ... warmhearted ☒ or ☐ fair-minded
Are you mostly ... unbothered by things ☒ or ☐ easily bothered by things
Are you ... systematic ☒ or ☐ Casual
Part 6. These questions are about how you feel working in your present ministry. Please read the sentence and think 'How true is this of me?'

If you Agree Strongly, put a ring round
If you Agree, put a ring round
If you are Not Certain, put a ring round
If you Disagree, put a ring round
If you Disagree Strongly, put a ring round

I feel drained in fulfilling my ministry roles
I have accomplished many worthwhile things in my current ministry
Fatigue and irritation are part of my daily experience
I gain a lot of personal satisfaction from working with people in my current ministry
I am invaded by sadness I can't explain
I deal very effectively with the problems of people in my current ministry
I am feeling negative or cynical about the people with whom I work
I can easily understand how those among whom I minister feel about things
I always have enthusiasm for my work
I feel very positive about my current ministry
My humour has a cynical or biting tone
I feel that my pastoral ministry has a positive influence on people's lives
I find myself spending less and less time with those among whom I minister
I feel that my teaching ministry has a positive influence on people's faith
I have been discouraged by the lack of personal support for me
I feel my ministry is really appreciated by people
I find myself frustrated in my attempts to accomplish tasks important to the day
I am really glad I entered the ministry
I am less patient with those among whom I minister than I used to be
The ministry here gives real purpose and meaning to my life
I am becoming less flexible in my dealings with those among whom I minister
I gain a lot of personal satisfaction from fulfilling my ministry roles
Part 7 Below are some statements about feelings and thoughts. Please tick the box that best describes your experience of each over the last 2 weeks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>None of the time</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Some of the time</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>All of the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I’ve been feeling optimistic about the future</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve been feeling useful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve been feeling relaxed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve been feeling interested in other people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve had energy to spare</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve been dealing with problems well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve been thinking clearly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve been feeling good about myself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve been feeling close to other people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve been feeling confident</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve been able to make up my own mind about</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve been feeling loved</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve been interested in new things</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve been feeling cheerful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 8 Comments and supplementary input

This part is provided for those who would like to add some comments and views in addition to the question sections.

Have you developed a strategy for church growth?  
Yes  1  
No  2

If yes, can you outline the key elements of the strategy?

Are you exploring & developing innovative ways for conducting mission?  
Yes ….  1  
No ….  2

Would you describe these approaches as ‘Fresh Expression’ activities?  
Yes ….  1  
No ….  2

If yes, can you outline the main features of these approaches?

Can you list the main factors which in your experience account for people joining the church?

Can you list the main factors which in your experience account for people leaving the church?
If you have comments, please add them here.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.