ABSTRACT

What Are You Doing Here, Elijah: The Influence of Mentoring Relationships on Clergy Satisfaction

by

Charles A. Shoemaker

"There are too many Lone Ranger Pastors." I remember hearing this statement very early in pastoral ministry. The itinerant nature of pastoral ministry in the United Methodist Church can at times make isolation and loneliness feel like the default position of ministry, but this is not the example that we find in Scripture nor in John Wesley's design of the Methodist Movement. This study explores benefits of clergy mentoring relationships as it connects to clergy satisfaction and ministry longevity between pastors serving in two districts in the Kentucky Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church.

The Literature Review delves into biblical and theological foundations by providing examples of mentoring relationships particularly between Elijah/Elisha, Jesus and The Twelve, and Paul and the New Testament Church. Erik Erikson's understanding of generativity combined with J. Korte and Kathy Kram's works in generativity and mentoring are demonstrated as they connect back to biblical and theological foundations through the Wesleyan discipleship model of classes and bands.

A pre-intervention, mixed methods approach was used in this study. Ordained clergy appointed as pastors were invited to participate in an online survey with both forced answer (primarily Likert Scale) and open response components.

The findings of this study demonstrate that the role of mentoring is seen differently and thereby functions differently between generational cohorts. It also highlights a need to recover a sense of calling as a unifying theme among pastors and demonstrate how mentoring relationships can help renew that identity.

What Are You Doing Here, Elijah::
The Influence of Mentoring Relationships on Clergy Satisfaction

A Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of

Asbury Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Ministry

by

Charles A. Shoemaker

May 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This journey began in 2014 with a cohort of fellow students that quickly became brothers and sisters, and through circumstances of life, I also joined in with another cohort of friends in this process together. Thank you for all the conversations, encouragement, and support.

I am thankful to the Beeson Program—staff, faculty, and administrators—who have helped me in this program during times of great change and life circumstances. I especially want to thank Dr. Milton Lowe who would keep asking if I was making progress on my dissertation whenever he saw me on campus.

I am very appreciative to Dr. Tony Headley, my dissertation coach, who has helped me greatly in this experience, especially for the commitment to help me finish in this past year.

I am greatly appreciative to my congregation, Claylick United Methodist Church, as they have graciously loved my family and me from our very first Sunday together. Thank you for giving Jane and myself the time and support we needed to complete school.

Above all else, I want to thank my wife, Jane and my two sons, Rob and John. Your love and support through this process is what has made it all possible. Even in the moments when I felt like giving up, at just the right time, you would encourage me. I look forward to spending more time together as a family!

CHAPTER 1

NATURE OF THE PROJECT

Overview of the Chapter

This chapter addresses the personal background that lead to the investigation of the problem. Following this is the statement of the problem, purpose of the project, research questions, and rationale. Next is the definition of key terms, parameters of the study as well as description of the participants involved. Then a review of relevant literature, research methodology, data collection and data analysis are then discussed. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the potential for the project to be duplicated following the research methodology.

Personal Introduction

Ministry is hard! Yes, I know that anyone in ministry will think that is the most obvious statement in the world. However, I do not recall anyone telling me this. It is just something I have had to learn on my own and, at times, overcome on my own. I think therein lies the problem. Often, at least in my context as a United Methodist pastor in Kentucky, we feel alone because, at times, we are indeed alone.

The Kentucky Annual Conference is a conference primarily made of small-town churches and rural churches because Kentucky is a state of small towns and rural locations. Add to this the demands of ministry and family life and there are times, at least for me, that ministry has been overwhelming even to the point of quitting.

In my own life, I can see several stressors contributing to my own burnout and the temptation to find ministry opportunities outside the Kentucky Annual Conference and pastoral ministry. The first of these stressors is the appointment system itself. I was

serving a church that seemed to be growing both in discipleship and outreach. Worship attendance was up. We were on the cusp of real numerical growth when I was moved. I was transplanted to a very different subculture than what I was accustomed to and, while trying to figure out my new "home," I was also engaged. My fiancée now lived over 200 miles away and in another state. I was trying to live in two worlds at the same time. Overwhelmed and tired, I began searching for other opportunities, ministries, and callings that would allow me more freedom than in the appointment system in the Kentucky Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church.

Four years later, the conditions improved. My wife and had I started to raise a family, but we struggled with balancing family life in the parsonage and congregational expectations. We had two boys born 15-months apart and both had been pre-mature with stays in NICUs before they came home. We did not have twins, but it really felt like it. We were managing and thought we were able to get through this. It was probably more like coping with our situation than managing it successfully especially since my wife started seminary in between the birth of our two sons and I went back to seminary to begin a Doctor of Ministry. Coping would be a more accurate description of my life.

By the time we felt like we had learned the culture of the church, it was time to move again. This time, however, things would be different. Instead of taking my appointment, I took an unpaid sabbatical for one year (officially called voluntary administrative leave). I felt that with our family situation (my wife and I are both in seminary with two small children), we could not address the needs of our family and the needs of a new congregation with healthy boundaries.

In talking with other clergy families, they faced similar challenges when it comes to harmonizing being a pastor and meeting the needs of families. Congregations often have unrealistic expectations and desires that require a lot of intense emotional connection.   These unrealistic congregational expectations often stretch us so far that it prevents us from meeting the emotional needs of our families. I found in my own ministry experience that these unrealistic expectations are the most intense when the congregation is located in a very rural setting.

Seminaries seem to be training more pastors for suburban/urban settings than for rural congregations. However, the problem in Kentucky is that the majority of our United Methodist Churches are in town/country settings, creating a rift (often unintentional) between ordained clergy and their appointed congregations. The unrealized expectations from the congregation and the pastor only continue the feelings of discontentment for both.

The unrealistic expectations on the part of congregations and pastors alike and the workaholism in our culture contribute to a spiritual decline in our churches. Instead of seeing ministry as a calling, pastors perceive it as an occupation or as a duty to serve ungrateful congregations. Many times, pastors view churches as steps to more significant professional opportunities rather than being wholly committed to servant leadership. Congregations, likewise, see pastors as ungrateful and uncaring but also underperforming. The truth is a different paradigm for ministry needs to be in place.

Instead of searching for a new ministry setting outside of the appointment process, maybe I needed to search for something different. I realized what was missing—mentors. During my time at the church that was experiencing growth, I was a

part of a Wesleyan-style class meeting with other pastors (four United Methodists and one Anglican). Two of us were serving our first full-time churches while the other three had been in ministry for nearly twenty years. There was peer/near-peer mentoring and advice from those who had more experience with those of us who did not. Through all of it, we learned from each other. Once I discovered what was missing, I started a similar group and it has changed my perspective. The difference this time is that I am the one with the most ministry experience. It is changing my outlook and helping me learn and become a better pastor. I did not need a change of ministry as much as I needed a mentor, and I needed to be a mentor.

Statement of the Problem

Many clergy feel ineffective and that ministry has taken a toll on their life and the lives of their family. Some have even told me that they wonder if ministry is even worth the price. I believe the issue is not so much ministry as our perception of ministry.

The problem is our current paradigm of ministry often leaves a pastor in isolation. This is not effective, and it is not biblical. A mantra within the United Methodist Church is that disciples make disciples. One of the most effective and earliest discipleship models is a mentoring relationship. Clergy are not typically in these relationships in the United Methodist Church unless it is in an official capacity helping one navigate through the ordination process. The problem is that a mentoring relationship needs to be an ongoing process far beyond active ministry and retirement.

Purpose of the Project

The purpose of the research was to evaluate the effectiveness of mentoring on clergy satisfaction in two districts (Bluegrass and Lexington) of the Kentucky Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church.

Research Questions

The research questions align with the statement of the problem in helping the project demonstrate the need and benefits of an ongoing mentoring relationship. Mentoring relationships happen in an official capacity for those exploring ministry (candidacy) and those going through the ordination process (residency). After these phases, the mentoring process is perceived as finished by many clergy even though the mentoring process should probably be ongoing.

Research Question #1

How does being in a clergy mentoring relationship affect one's own satisfaction in ministry?

Research Question #2

How is one's own spiritual relationship affected by being in a mentoring relationship?

Research Question #3

What effect can serving as a clergy mentor have upon the mentor's feelings for future generations of pastoral leadership?

Rationale for the Project

The reason this study matters is that the Church is called to make disciples and not causalities of ministry. In the Matthew 28, the Great Commission, the church is

instructed to make disciples. Then we see in Acts 2, as the Holy Spirit empowers the disciples to share the gospel, 3,000 souls are added to the church. However, the discipleship process did not stop with just getting converts. "They devoted themselves to the apostles' teaching and fellowship, and the breaking of bread and prayers" (Acts 2.42, NRSV). The discipleship process is not a one-time occurrence but a life lived in community, a covenant community.

Clergy in the United Methodist Church are also called to live in a covenant community together in the annual conference. Scripture is very clear that the mathematics of the Church is about multiplication, not subtraction. Through a nurturing discipleship process, the early church brought in those to help lead, guide, and direct the church but never apart from the covenant community.

Congregations are affected by the outlook of their pastor. If the pastor has a positive outlook on ministry, it is likely to assume that the pastor will also have a positive view of the congregation and the ministries of the congregation. It could have lasting impacts on the congregation reaching the community.

The third reason this study is important is the potential leadership vacuum that losing clergy creates for the Kentucky Annual Conference as baby-boomers continue to retire. It is estimated that over half of all full-time clergy in the Kentucky Annual Conference will retire within the next ten years. The large number of retirements could potentially impede the ministries of the local congregations and the Kentucky Annual Conference as a whole if we do not multiply ministries through mentoring relationships. We must address the need for continued mentoring relationships to be good stewards of the resources we are given to expand the Kingdom of God

Definition of Key Terms

Mentoring: In this study, mentoring is viewed broadly as one with more experience even if it is just a little more experience guiding another in a formal or informal relationship.

Clergy Satisfaction: This term is used to describe how a clergy is fulfilled in the work of ministry and to help determine the longevity of the clergy in pastoral ministry. Ultimately, clergy satisfaction helps determine if there is a desire to remain in pastoral ministry or to transition into another career.

Wesleyan-style Class Meeting/Wesleyan Covenant Groups: This term will be used to describe a group of pastors meeting regularly in a covenant relationship. The dynamic of this group allows for various types of mentoring relationships to exist.

Delimitations

This study was comprised of ordained clergy who are members of the Kentucky Annual Conference serving in pastoral ministry positions in the Bluegrass and Lexington Districts (both deacon and elders).

Ordained clergy have graduated seminary and are not typically in a formal mentoring process. Some are candidacy mentors and residency mentors, but most are not in these types of relationships.

Review of Relevant Literature

The literature chosen in this research was based primarily on dealing with the benefits of a mentor in a mentoring relationship. The literature ranged from various disciplines including the social sciences, leadership theory, theology, and biblical foundations.   This study was primarily concerned with how mentoring benefits pastors,

more specifically, United Methodist pastors. A considerable amount of research was spent exploring the foundations of Methodism through John Wesley's Class Meeting structure and how it intersected with various disciplines and theories in regard to mentoring.

Within the field of social sciences, various journal articles and text were examined. The foundational texts for this section are based off of Erikson's <u>Childhood and Society</u>, and <u>Identity, Youth, and Crisis</u>; as well as Levison's <u>Seasons of a Man's Life</u>. While these texts are dated, they do seem to be foundational in the theories of development and generativity.

Kotre, Kram, McAdams, and Johnson all built off of the theories of Erikson and Levison to develop better theories of generativity and how they related to mentoring. McAdams and Kram, in particular, dive deeper into Erikson and the generativity theory. McAdams demonstrates how generativity exists at more than one stage of life while Erikson said it was only dealt with in middle adulthood (McAdams and de St. Aubin; McAdams et al.; E. Erikson). Kathy Kram demonstrates how a mentoring relationship is not static but rather a constantly changing dynamic in the life of the mentor and mentee changing both people (Kathy E. Kram).

John Wesley's Class Meeting system is explored through the lens of social psychology and theology. Henderson and Watson greatly demonstrate how these relationships work with a theological context. The small group dynamics found in the early Methodist Class Meetings demonstrate how a mentoring relationship worked in early Methodism (Henderson, *A Model for Making Disciples – John Wesley's Class Meeting*; Watson). This also connects with Robert Coleman's eight components of

Jesus' discipleship/mentoring model with the Twelve. Coleman's work and Kram's work

are connected in how mentoring works using Jesus' model of discipleship.

The research also includes several Scriptural paradigms when exploring the

benefits of being a mentor and being a mentee. Perhaps the greatest example of the

benefits and transformation of a mentor is Elijah and Elisha. Elijah demonstrates a

complete change in attitude once he is in a mentoring relationship with Elijah (1 Kings

19.19-2; Kings 2:12).

Acts 2:43-47 serves as a model of mentoring in the early church with examples

connecting back to Jesus, traditional rabbinical teachings of the first century, and Paul

and Barnabas. All demonstrate how cultural norms were used and changed to establish a

biblical model of mentoring.

This project tries to combine the areas of social science, theology, and Scripture.

The discoveries of the social sciences give light to the theological and biblical

perspective as does the biblical and theological foundations which all demonstrate the

truth found within the research of the social sciences. Connections and applications are

made to help improve the quality of clergy life in demonstrating the need for ongoing

mentoring relationships whether one is a mentor or a mentee.

Research Methodology

The research explored the biblical foundations of mentoring and identified

relationships between pastors who are currently in a mentoring relationship and those

who are not. The research utilized a pre-intervention study.

A questionnaire was sent through survey monkey to ordained pastors in the

Kentucky Annual Conference serving in the Bluegrass and Lexington Districts. This

questionnaire asked various questions about mentoring relationships and their current

outlook on ministry.

Type of Research

The type of research used for this study is a preintervention study using a survey

to find out how pastors are currently utilizing mentoring relationships for personal and

spiritual growth.

Participants

The participants were ordained clergy in the Kentucky Annual Conference of the

Bluegrass and Lexington Districts. A survey was sent to all ordained clergy serving in

pastoral ministry in these districts. No extension ministers serving outside a local

congregation were included. The Lexington district has a large urban center and then

varies between larger cities and very rural ministry appointments. The Bluegrass District

does not have a large urban center but does vary between larger cities and very rural

ministry appointments. Several of the communities in the Bluegrass District are bedroom

communities to Lexington.

Instrumentation

The researcher developed the Ministry Mentoring Survey that contained both

qualitative and quantitative components. The nature of the instrumentation was to help

identify trends as they relate to the research questions.

The instrumentation consists of twenty questions including a demographic section

asking for gender, age, and ministry settings. Questions relating to the research question

use a force choice Likert Scale with open-ended questions to allow for elaboration by the

participant. The goal of these questions was to find trends as they connect mentoring relationships with clergy satisfaction.

Data Collection

Data collection was an online survey distributed through email using SurveyMonkey. Each United Methodist Elder or Deacon serving in the Bluegrass District and Lexington District as a pastor within a local church appointment received an invitation to be a part of the study. This list was comprised form the 2019 Appointment List of the Kentucky Annual Conference. Each email included an invitation with a brief background about the researcher, the reason for the study, instructions, and a link to the online survey via SurveyMonkey. Data collection remained anonymous from the online provider. The instruction in the survey indicated that informed consent will be given by responding to and returning the emailed survey. There were no ethical concerns considering anonymity of the responses due to the online format of SurveyMonkey. The data was collected over a three-week period of time. After the first week, a reminder email was sent out to all participants to remind each person that they have two weeks left. On the third week, another reminder email was sent out to those who have not participated inviting them to do so if they wish to be a part of the study. At the end of the third week, the study was considered closed.   All data was collected through the SurveyMonkey online system and then stored on my personal laptop in a password protected folder.

Data Analysis

The data consist of quantitative and qualitative data. The raw data was initially organized through SurveyMonkey by using their online data analysis tool.   Then the data

was entered into an Excel spreadsheet which was used to help run data, find correlations to their corresponding research question, and demonstrate any variation between demographics and ministry placement (district). Inferences and predictions were made based on the sample mean, sample standard deviation, and t-distribution from the sample size of the two districts.

The open-ended responses and open-ended questions provided qualitative dates. These responses were read and coded according to certain themes that will keep recurring in the data. This data was saved in a Word Document connecting each response with its corresponding theme to determine if a pattern emerges.

Generalizability

The project was unique in that it was limited to two districts in the Kentucky Conference of the United Methodist Church. The districts are distinct in that one has a large urban center, and one does not. One district also required pastors to be in a Wesleyan-style Covenant Group; the other district did not. This project allowed pastors and conference leaders to determine the benefits of being a clergy mentor. While this project was unique in its scope, it could be duplicated in another ministry setting.

<div align="center">**Project Overview**</div>

Chapter 2 deals with research material and mentoring models (both secular and in ministry) as well as biblical foundations and cultural backgrounds that emphasis the importance of mentoring as a normative for Christian leaders. Chapter 3 explains the research method and design of the pre-intervention project, as well as instrumentation and data analysis. Chapter 4 describes the analysis of the data collected in the project.

Chapter 5 deals with major findings of the three research questions, implications for

future pastoral leadership development, and any unexpected results.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW FOR THE PROJECT

Overview of the Chapter

The goal of this project is to evaluate the effectiveness of mentoring on clergy satisfaction in ministry. The literature deals with issue of different mentoring paradigms: peer/near-peer mentoring, reverse mentoring, and traditional mentoring models. This chapter deals with how these paradigms fit into theories of generativity. Various research journal articles are explored testing theories, generativity, and satisfaction as they relate to mentoring relationships. It also connects mentoring to biblical and theological examples from Elijah/Elisha and Jesus and his Disciples as well as looking at John Wesley's Class Meetings and the Early Church in relation to issues within the contemporary church.

Biblical Foundations

Clergy mentoring relationships models are found more than just through secular mentoring research with a veneer of spirituality; it is Scriptural. As we will later explore in the theological foundations of Methodism, accountability is key to a Christian understanding of mentoring. This means that those involved must be authentic with each other and with God in the process. The truth of a mentoring relationship and the truth of scriptural holiness (in a Wesleyan context) will become evident in the lives of those in the mentoring relationship and how they live out this authentic relationship. As we shall see in some biblical examples, it transformed the lives of those involved in these mentoring relationships with a blessing of satisfaction in ministry, longevity in ministry, and generativity in ministry.

We will explore how mentoring is demonstrated in the relationship between Elijah and Elisha. Those rudiments of Elijah and Elisha's life are developed more within classical rabbinical teaching, and it becomes a model of mentoring—a model that Jesus appears to use with the Twelve Disciples. We will see how mentoring is the primary discipleship model in the early church with Paul and Barnabus.

Elijah and Elisha

Engston and Jenson quote psychiatrist Harry Stack Sullivan:

> All personal damage and regression, as well as all personal healing and growth, come through our relationships with others. There is a persistent, if uninformed, suspicion in most of us that we can solve our own problems and be the master of our own ships of life. But the fact of the matter is that by ourselves we can only be consumed by our problems and suffer shipwreck. (Engstrom and Jenson 3)

Perhaps there is no better Biblical example of this lonely shipwreck than in the Old Testament prophet, Elijah.

Elijah the Tishbite (1 Kings 17.1) is a prophet who was sent to speak to King Ahab. Ahab was a king who, "did more to provoke the anger of the LORD, the God of Israel, than had all the kings of Israel who were before him" (1 Kings 16.33b). Ahab was influenced by his Canaanite wife, Jezebel (1 Kings 16.31). Elijah faces no small task. There are times when Elijah's very life was in danger. God sent Elijah to the Wadi Cherith to hide from Ahab. There he was taken care of with the water from the wadi and ravens brought him food (1 Kings 17.3-7). After the stream dried up, he was sent outside the kingdom to a widow's house in Zarephath (1 Kings 17.8-17).

The climax of the contest between Elijah and Ahab (and his wife Jezebel) took place on the top of Mount Carmel, the center of Baal worship. It was a contest between Elijah and the Prophets of Baal. The god who answered by fire would win. Ultimately, it

was indeed the God of Israel who answers Elijah's prayer with fire that consumes the

sacrifice and the altar (1 Kings 19.1-18). He is alone again, even though Elijah

demonstrated that he is a true prophet and achieved a "win" by anyone's account. Jezebel

threatens to kill him (1 Kings 19.1-3). Even after this great victory, Elijah flees, isolating

himself in a cave. His sense of doubt overwhelms him, and he feels like he and he alone

is the only one who worships the LORD. However, God reminds him that he is not alone

in those who have not worshipped Baal in Israel (1 Kings 19.4-18).

The toll of ministry is almost too much for Elijah. His feelings of isolation make

his life a shipwreck. Immediately after this low moment, God told Elijah to find Elisha

(1 Kings 19.16). Elisha will be his protégé and a new prophet, and he will anoint Jehu as

the new King of Israel. Elijah eventually came to the end of his ministry, and it was time

to pass it on to Elisha.

Passing on the mantle of leadership from one generation to the next is essential.

In this passage, Elijah passed on his place and prophetic office to Elisha. One of the

significant issues in the North American Church is our lack of making disciples. Elijah

devoted himself to Elisha in order to replicate himself for the future. "Effective mentors

seek to replicate their own lives and ministries with those they train" (Newton 23).

Quality leadership does not happen by accident. Elijah invested his life into

Elisha for one clear purpose, to pass on the leadership of being a prophet. This is evident

when Elisha asks for a double portion of the same power that Elijah had. When leaders

replicate themselves in the next generation of leaders, the church will be able to do

greater things than it did in the past.

We must examine the transfer of power from Elijah to Elisha (2 Kings 2.1-19). The conversation between Elijah and Elisha demonstrates the type of relationship between the two.   Elijah says, "Stay here…" and Elisha responds, "I will follow you" This happens three separate times in the text. Each time Elijah never insists that Elisha obeys him. He allows Elisha to continue on in the journey. This demonstrates the close relationship found in a mentor/mentee relationship. A mentoring relationship that does not have love will not allow the investment of time and energy to mature into that type of a relationship. It is similar to a parent and a child. In fact, Elisha will cry out to Elijah as "father" when he is carried away to heaven. Elijah has invested so much of his time and energy into Elisha's life that Elisha cannot imagine his life without him. Good leadership will naturally replicate itself and step down to allow the next generation space to lead when the time is right.

We also see this reflected in the relationship between Paul and Timothy. In many ways, this relationship mirrors Elijah and Elisha. First, there is a parent/child relationship with Paul and Timothy. Paul calls Timothy his "true son in the faith" (1 Tim. 1.2). Looking back to Elijah and Elisha, we see that Elisha cries out to Elijah as "father" (2 Kings 2.12). There is a strong bond between these pair of leaders.

Paul also sets the standard for leadership for Timothy. "You, however, have followed my teaching, my conduct, my aim in life, my faith, my patience, my love, my steadfastness, my persecutions and sufferings that happened to me at Antioch…" (2 Tim. 3.10-11, ESV). Paul set the example for Timothy, just like Elijah set the example for Elisha.

There was also a mutual sharing of the ministry with Paul and Timothy. This happens when Paul calls Timothy his "fellow worker" (Rom. 16.21). There comes a point in leadership when the mentor/mentee relationship ceases to exist, and, instead, it is a relationship of equals. Throughout 2 Kings chapter 2, Elijah asks Elisha to remain in each of the locations they travel, but Elisha refuses to leave his side. If Elijah and Elisha were not on the same level as co-equals, then Elijah would have insisted that Elisha remain. Instead, he is not rebuked but allowed to travel on with the prophet.

In any mentoring relationship, especially if we consider the dynamics of a parent/child relationship, there comes a time when the mentee must "grow-up" and become independent. There is significance in Elijah and Elisha crossing the Jordan near Jericho. It could very well be the same place that Moses transferred his power to Joshua in Deuteronomy chapters 34-35 (Sweeney). If this is the case, then it definitely would suggest that God is about to do something new in the history of Israel and yet at the same time connect it back to his covenant with Israel.

Different phrases occur in this passage that suggests the type of relationship that Elijah and Elisha possessed. First, Elijah keeps trying to get Elisha to remain at Gilgal, Bethel, or Jericho. Elisha refuses and says, "I will not leave you" (2 Kings 2.2, 4, and 6). The verb "leave" conveys in Hebrew a sense of abandonment (Brueggemann). No matter what happens, Elisha is not going to abandon his mentor, Elijah. This is a very close relationship

At the end when Elijah's time on earth is nearing, he asks Elisha what he wants. Elisha replies, "Please let there be a double portion of your spirit on me" (2 Kings 2.9, ESV).. Hobbs, House, and Jones all seem to agree that Elisha is asking to be the spiritual

heir to Elijah and leader of the Sons of the Prophets (House; Hobbs, *World Biblical Commentary: 2 Kings*; Jones).

There is a question that remains about the "double portion" whether or not it is a quantity amount of the spirit or just a symbolic phrase. Again, Hobbs sides with the idea that Elisha is conveying the sentiment that he is owed "twice as much as any heir" to being the lead prophet in Israel (Hobbs, *World Biblical Commentary: 2 Kings*). If Elisha was just asking to be the successor, Elijah should not have replied, "you have asked a difficult thing" (2 Kings 2.10). The reason is that Elisha has already been picked as Elijah's successor (1 Kings 19.19ff). However, it appears that "Elisha outstrips Elijah in the number, variety, and magnitude of his miraculous deeds" (Long). Others are convinced that this is not about the quantity of the spirit, just the symbolic portion due to the "eldest son" (May and Metzger).

The phrases "double portion" and "father, father" definitely show that Elijah/Elisha had a parent/child relationship in a spiritual sense. Elijah was passing on more than just a piece of cloth (the mantel) to Elisha; there was a discipleship process in place for Elisha as well. Elijah had invested himself in Elisha, and Elisha was asking for the strength to carry on without his mentor.

The relationship between Elijah and Elisha had a profound effect on Elijah. We see no record of loneliness and despair again in Elijah's ministry even after a new king tries to seize Elijah (2 Kings 1.9-16). Instead of fleeing, he calls down fire from heaven. It is now evident that Elijah has changed; he is a different person which may be due to his mentoring relationship.

Pre-Elisha, Elijah seems to have reached "obsolescence anxiety" (Creps 41). He is at the end of his rope and just cannot seem to get past his problems even after a great accomplishment. Now Elijah has a renewed sense of purpose and is rejuvenated as he is passing on leadership to the next generation. There seems to be a greater sense of intrinsic satisfaction in his life (McKinsey 11). Elijah is no longer stagnate with his problems but is fulfilling his need of generativity through God's calling him to train Elisha (Erikson 130-131).

Classical Rabbinical Relationships

We can see from Elijah's life the transformation and benefit that a mentoring relationship brings in the life of a mentor. This is also demonstrated as we examine classical rabbinical relationships and see how this is the model that Jesus used and intended for the training of leaders and disciples.

In classical rabbinical teaching, boys (six to twelve years of age) would start in the *Bet Sefer* ("house of books") where they would begin to memorize Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy (the Torah). Students who excelled in this first phase moved to the "House of Learning"—*Bet Talmud.* Those who did not move forward returned home to learn the family vocation. This is possibly demonstrated in Luke 2.46: "After three days they found him in the temple, sitting among the teachers, listening to them and asking them questions" (NRSV). The teaching method for studying the Talmud was answering questions with questions. This went beyond the memorization phase of the Torah study in the early stage (Ransbottom-Stallons 30–31).

If one could prove themselves in the second phase, they went on to the next step. This involved the student approaching the Rabbi and saying: "Rabbi, I want to become

your disciple, your *talmudeen*, your student. Please let me in your *Bet Midrash* ("house

of study")" (Ransbottom-Stallons 30–31).

It was at this point that the Rabbi would determine if the student was capable.

The Rabbi vetted the student to see if he would take him on and if the student could

handle the Rabbi's interpretation of Scripture—his yoke. To those whom the Rabbi

picked, he would respond by saying, "*Lech Acharaii*—come follow me" (Ransbottom-

Stallons 30–31).

Classical Rabbinical teaching developed after the Babylonian Captivity; however,

we see elements of this even with Elijah asking Elisha to follow him by throwing his

mantle on to Elisha at the very end (1 Kings 19.19; 2 Kings 2.13).This connects to the

model that Jesus' used for the Twelved. Elijaha/Elisha's model is also used in the New

Testament Church

Jesus' Model for Mentoring

Classical Rabbinicism did exist in First Century Judaism. Jesus was well aware of

this model as was everyone else. When Jesus calls out to his disciples, "Come, follow

me," he was taking on the role of the Rabbi, and the Twelve Disciples would be the

talmudeens (Matt. 4.18-22; Mark 1.16-34; Luke 5.1-11). Rabbis only taught those who

would be future rabbis. It is, therefore, reasonable that Jesus had the same expectations.

He expected the disciples to continue teaching and to be in a mentoring relationship with

him (Ransbottom-Stallons 30–31).

Phil Newton references an older book by AB Bruce (Newton 23-36). This book

demonstrates how Jesus practiced and modeled a mentoring relationship. Jesus invested

his time and he invested himself in the lives of his disciples. Leaders must invest their

time and their lives in those they are mentoring in order to be effective and to replicate

themselves (Newton 23).

Figure 2.1: Jesus' Example for Mentors

<u>**Jesus' Example for Mentors**</u>
1.) Christ provides an example of servant leadership
2.) Christ demonstrates a priority for relationships with the 12
3.) Christ models love and service in leadership
4.) Jesus mentors with the cross in view
5.) Jesus' ministry includes correction

(Newton 34-36)

Jesus demonstrates the example to his disciples of what leadership is supposed to

look like for the church. While Jesus does follow a rabbinical model, he changes it to

show a new way of teaching—servant leadership. Jewish rabbis expected their followers

to attend to their needs. In contrast, Jesus says that the leader must be the one that serves

(Luke 22.26). This servant leadership is demonstrated in washing his disciples' feet

(John 13). Jesus shows us that it is through example that the mentor has the most

influence (Newton 34).

Through intimate relationships, Jesus provides a model for the importance of a

close-knit community of friends and followers. Jesus did not establish a school; he spent

his time connecting with his disciples and preparing them to be sent out as apostles. The

disciples were persons, not projects, and Jesus valued their personhood by investing

personally in their lives (Krallman 55). Friendship is important in a mentoring

relationship in ministry as can be seen through how Christ interacted with his disciples

(John 15.15) (Newton 34).

Christian leadership is defined by Christ through servant leadership. Robert Greenleaf contends that truly great leadership is grounded in service and that the leader must first learn to serve before being in a leadership role or will have to learn to serve once in that role (Greenleaf loc. 348). Christ lived out generosity, forgiveness, service, and humility (Luke 16.1-31; 17.1-10; 18.9-30). Jesus' servanthood is the model that every Christian needs to live out, especially as it relates to mentoring in the context of ministry (Newton 35).

Christ's servanthood ultimately led him to the cross (Matt. 27). Christ's journey to the cross demonstrated what he meant when he said we each must deny ourselves, take up the cross, and follow him (Matt. 16.24-26). "The disciples life consists of basic self-denial" (Bock 24). The cross is central to Christian theology and it is crucial in mentoring clergy. Mentors must demonstrate the importance of giving over gaining in view of the cross (Newton 35).

Out of love and service, Jesus' model includes correction. Jesus corrected John when he tried to prevent those casting out demons (Luke 9.49-50). Christ rebuked James and John wanting to call down fire on the Samaritans (Luke 9.51-56). It was only because of the closeness and intimacy that Jesus had with his disciples that he was given credibility to correct his disciples (Newton 36).

Connections are seen between Jesus' mentoring model and the relationship that existed between Elijah and Elisha and even the classical rabbinical way of teaching. An emphasis on the investment of time and the personal commitment of the mentor to the mentee and the mentee to the mentor was present in each demonstrating a proper Biblical model for pastoral leadership/mentoring. In North America, our CEO style pastoral

leadership and attraction-based model worship service has left a void within the church. At times it seems the model of ministry that is prevalent is more program based and less personal. Jesus, Elijah, and Elisha show us how personal mentoring needs to be. "The gospel is not purely a personal matter. It is a communal affair" (Newton 64).

In pastoral leadership, we must realize that "Jesus supplies the church with everything necessary to promote the growth of the body until it matches his own fullness" (Bruce 344–45). It is Jesus who sets the pattern, and his pattern is best understood from the mentoring relationship of a rabbi. Jesus builds off of this rabbinical tradition to establish a "community that trains leaders who will shepherd, plant, and revitalize discipling communities who replicate the same work" (Newton 21).

The only way for this to happen is if clergy mentoring relationships exist, not just for the benefit of the clergy, but also to train and develop lay leadership as well. This model has been lost in most of North American Christianity, and it needs to be revived and restored as the normative model for discipleship and ministry. At some point, "training must eclipse the theoretical to embrace the experiential" (Newton 22). Mentoring relationships are essential to help younger clergy move from the theoretical of seminary training to the experiential of ministry outside of the academy. Mentoring is not limited to just the traditional paradigm of a mentoring relationship. Even reverse mentoring can help the more experienced pastor understand different technologies and practices of ministry, retooling, and retraining from older models that they were trained to use.

Coleman argues that Jesus has a deliberate strategy with the Twelve. He invested more time and effort with these Twelve Disciples than he did with anyone else (Coleman

42). Coleman outlines a deliberate strategy used by Jesus to prepare the Twelve to go

and multiply themselves, thus making disciples. The chapter titles of Coleman's book

outline the basic strategy that Jesus used: 1.) Selection, 2.) Association, 3.) Consecration,

4.) Impartation, 5.) Demonstration, 6.) Delegation, 7.) Supervision, and 8.) Reproduction.

Selection. While ministering to the masses, Jesus selected a few to concentrate

his efforts to multiply his ministry. As mentioned earlier, this was strategic. This

strategy is essential for us to understand today as well. Lay and clergy both live hectic

lives. The ministries of the church often seem like we rush from one area to the other

without really accomplishing anything. We are busy, but we have nothing to show for it.

Coleman says that by modeling our evangelism on Jesus' model of multiplication it may

go slow at first, but the end result will eventually be evident. Coleman's question to

clergy (and laity) is a question of which generation are we living for—the present or the

future (Coleman 3). Jesus' model of evangelism/discipleship demonstrates this generative

aspect.

Association. Christ was with his disciples. Where he went, his disciples

followed. "[B]efore these men were 'to preach' or 'to cast out devil' they were to be

'with him'" (Coleman 40). Jesus took time and invested of himself in the lives of these

disciples. Mentoring relationships take a lot of effort and time. Association is hard in

our culture and time. We want quick fixes, and yet, in a mentoring relationship, nothing

can replicate the need to invest time and energy into the relationship. Some will opt for

"coaching" over "mentoring" because of the time commitment that is involved (Collins

19). If we are truly going to follow the model of Jesus, we must opt for the relationship

that is costly (Coleman 51–52).

Consecration. Jesus did not have the "time nor the desire to scatter himself on those who wanted to make their own terms of discipleship" (Coleman 52). The disciples had to be committed to the process and to Jesus himself. We can see this was the model in classical rabbinical training. The student would approach the rabbi asking to be his student, and the rabbi would determine if the *talmudeen* could take up the rabbi's yoke of teaching (Ransbottom-Stallons 30). Jesus was asking for complete devotion. Today, perhaps the problem we have in the North American Church (both laity and clergy) is that we have settled for mediocrity and have not consecrated our lives to following Christ (Coleman 59). Mentoring relationships demand time and commitment, and we must be devoted to the process if we are to expect any transformation (Wright 137).

Impartation. Jesus gave of himself. The disciples were not committed to a process but rather to Jesus who loved them (Coleman 61). We must give of ourselves in a mentoring relationship if it is going to be successful. Mentoring in a Christian sense must acknowledge that God is present in the relationship. This is the accountability to the Holy Spirit that Watson discussed in regards to covenant discipleship using Wesley's Class Meeting model. Christ is present in the fellowship and transformation of Christian mentoring and discipleship (Watson 46).

Demonstration. Christ modeled how to live to his disciples (Coleman 71). Modeling is essential in any mentoring relationship. Jesus knew that he had to demonstrate and make his life an example of how to live for his disciples to truly understand what it meant to be a part of God's kingdom. Christ did not lecture for three hours but lived life with them because "discipleship is caught more than taught" (Kreider 113). This translates into any mentoring relationship. Mentoring is a learned skill, and

skilled mentors need to train mentees to become mentors as well because few people

have opportunities to learn (Taherian and Shekarchian 3). Clergy mentors must be

prepared to have mentees follow them as they follow Christ (Coleman 77).

Delegation. Jesus was preparing his disciples to one day take over his work.

Ultimately, the mentor must allow the mentee more and more freedom. This is

demonstrated in the lives of Elijah and Elisha. Eventually, the two moved from mentor

and mentee to a different, more peer like relationship. Jesus, while divine and could

never be a peer, allowed the disciples more and more responsibilities in ministry

(Coleman 79–82).

Supervision. While Jesus was cultivating a transition in his relationship with the

disciple in empowering them to take over the ministry, he still checked in on them. "He

kept after them constantly, giving them increasingly more attention as his ministry on

earth came to a close. He would not let them rest in success or failure" (Coleman 96).

Supervision is important in pastoral leadership. Few biblical leaders finished well, and of

the biblical leaders that did finish well, each had a significant relationship with another

person (Stanley and Clinton). Jesus supervised The Twelve because he wanted them to

finish and finish well. Clergy mentoring needs to focus on helping each clergy to finish

well and move to the next level.

Reproduction. The mission of the church is to make disciples (Matt. 28.19) and

to be witnesses of Jesus Christ (Acts 1.8). "Jesus intended for the disciples to produce his

likeness in and through the church being gathered out of the world (Coleman 99).

Replication is an important aspect of ministry and mentoring. Generativity is an

important aspect in ministry. As Christendom has died in North America, Christians find

themselves in a place of stagnation. Christians are not productive nor creative within the

church and have settled for stagnation (E. H. Erikson, *Childhood and Society*). Due to

the fact that Christians have not practiced replication, Christians have created spiritual

orphans (Kreider 115).

Looking at Coleman's different phases of Jesus' mentoring ministry with the

Twelve, a pattern of ministry emerges that lines up closely with Kram's Four Stages in a

Mentoring Relationship as detailed in Figure 2.2. The stages may not be a perfect

correlation, but Jesus keeps moving the disciples closer and closer to *Redefinition*,

particularly when he changes the description of his relationship with the disciples. "I do

not call you servants any longer, because the servant does not know what the master is

doing; but I have called you friends, because I have made known to you everything that I

have heard from my Father" (John 15.15, NRSV).

Figure 2.2: Kram's Four Phases & Coleman's Master Plan Outline

Kram's Four Phases & Coleman's Master Plan Outline	
1.) Initiation	*Selection*
	Association
	Consecration
2.) Cultivation	*Impartation*
	Demonstration
3.) Separation	*Delegation*
	Supervision
4.) Redefinition	*Reproduction*

Early Church Model

The early church model in Acts follows Kram's Four Phases of Mentoring in that

it starts with a redefinition of what discipleship looks like in the absence of Jesus'

physical presence (Kram). Luke links the early Church back to the ministry of Jesus

Christ and suggests that what is mentioned in this book is a continuation of "all that Jesus

did and taught from the beginning" (Acts 1.1, NRSV; Mullholland). This the beginning

of the reproduction strategy as outline by Coleman.

Immediately after the Holy Spirit came upon the believers, we see that leadership

was to happen in people's homes around the table over a meal by breaking bread in a very

similar manner to how Wesley's Class Meetings worked.

> They devoted themselves to the apostles' teaching and fellowship,
> to the breaking of bread and the prayers. [43] Awe came upon
> everyone, because many wonders and signs were being done by
> the apostles. [44] All who believed were together and had all things in
> common; [45] they would sell their possessions and goods and
> distribute the proceeds to all, as any had need. [46] Day by day, as
> they spent much time together in the temple, they broke bread at
> home and ate their food with glad and generous hearts, [47] praising
> God and having the goodwill of all the people. And day by day the
> Lord added to their number those who were being saved. (Acts
> 2.42-47)

The idea that people gathered in homes is a double entendre. It literally is talking

about homes but is also connecting the concept back to classical rabbinical teaching in

asking to enter into the rabbi's *bet midrash*—"house of study" (Ransbottom-Stallons 20–

21). The Pharisees in particularly during this period would be gathering as a house

forming "fellowship (*chaburim)"* to assist in living a holy life, a primary concern of the

Pharisees (Mullholland 939).

The new community of God was using the old structures and reinventing them to

aid in their model of discipleship/mentoring by gathering in houses, sharing a communal

meal, and worshiping at the Temple. On the surface, this change was essentially the

same Judaism that they had known, except this time they were becoming a new Christian

community (Mullholland 939). The disciples had been through an intense mentoring

process; now was the time to replicate and redefine their relationship with the past and

live into the future that God had for them.

Throughout Acts, it seems that God's strategy was to plant "Acts 2.42-47 style

churches" in every city (Newton 20). The spirit of this style of ministry seems to

naturally lead to a type of discipleship that involves mentoring and mutual support. This

style of ministry demonstrated a culture in which the church was about creating small

intimate relationships with accountability as the key. As we shall see, accountability is a

key component to a Wesley Class Meeting and is essential if a mentoring relationship is

going to be successful as well.

As Wesley Class Meetings demonstrated cognitive, behavioral, and affective

modes, these modes are also seen in Acts 2.42-47 style churches in their core values.

Newton says that the core values of the early church in Acts 2 are community, generosity,

service, and gratitude (Newton 20). These values were shared across the entire church

and are also elements that change a person and help them develop in spiritual and

personal growth (behavioral). The Apostle's Teaching would also be cognitive in nature.

Fellowship and Breaking Bread would be behavioral aspects, and Prayers could be

connected to affect.

The redefinition/reproduction really takes shape in Acts 2 as the Holy Spirit is

filling the disciples. After this experience, the Church forms itself around the core values

(Acts 2.42-47) as previously mentioned.

Figure 2.3:

Acts 2.42-47 Style Churches		
A Church Devoted To:	Apostles' Teaching	Values Community
	Fellowship	Values Generosity
	Breaking Bread	Values Service
	Prayers	Values Gratitude
		(Newton, 20)

The context of community shapes the nature and witness of Christians as they are engaged in the mission of the church. This context, in turn, helps develop our character and shapes our ethics, ultimately guiding our behavior when in relationships with God and with other disciples. Through community, Christians form a distinctly Christian life and know God personally (Keller 311–14). Christian formation cannot happen in a vacuum. Mentoring relationships are important no matter what paradigm of mentoring they take. "Mentoring focuses on we want to be, not on what we want to do" (W. Wright xx). Through the intentional mentoring process that Jesus had with the Disciples, he demonstrated how to live. The discipleship process was shaping the disciples into leaders to allow the Holy Spirit to form the church into a new Christian Community with its own unique values that differs from the Judaism of the past.

Paul and Barnabas

Developing women and men to become leaders and disciples is not an easy task. It requires time and "constant personal attention" similar to a parent/child relationship (Robinson 45). Investment in the time creates the biggest payoff in the mentoring relationship. Even while our culture, as previously mentioned, may suggest that there is no time to make these investments because of your proclivity to see production and invest of time is important in organizations (DeLong et al. 115). Investing time in each other is

essential in the church. Mentoring communities are where Christians have to make themselves vulnerable to become aware of the work the Holy Spirit in their lives—filling the void—drawing us closer to one another and ultimately closer to God (Robinson 91).

The mentoring relationship is demonstrated in the relationships found in Acts, particularly Paul and Barnabas. Barnabas led Paul and encouraged him (Acts 11.19-30). In Acts 13 while on their first missionary journey as the mission of the church was transitioning to include gentiles and not be exclusively Jewish, Paul and Barnabas switch roles. In an example of reverse mentoring, Barnabas steps back strategically allows Paul to step forward in an "authority switch" (Egeler 141).

This model of allowing the mentee to surpass the mentor is not only demonstrated with Paul and Barnabas but also with Elijah and Elisha when Elisha asks for a "double portion" of Elijah's spirit (2 Kings 2.9-13). Similarly, Christ says of his disciples that they will do greater things through the power of the Holy Spirit as he ascends to the Father (John 14.12).

This model of strategically allowing the mentee to surpass the mentor is a model that most young Gen Xers and Millennials desire and appreciate in a mentoring relationship. The team approach to ministry is similar to the migration of geese. As geese migrate, flying in a v-formation, the leadership of the flock changes. As one goose gets tired, another will take the goose's place and lead. The geese take turns in leadership as their abilities allow (Collins 74). This appears to be precisely how Paul and Barnabas worked together. Barnabas was getting into a world he did not know as well, Greco-Roman culture, and so Paul, who was a Roman Citizen (Acts 22.28), understood this world better and was allowed to lead for the strategic purpose of the church's mission.

Paul, Barnabas, and the churches they planted in the Book of Acts used a model of investing in each other's lives. In Acts 13.42-43, a pattern begins in the ministry of Paul and Barnabas. The established Jewish community, the "old covenant community," seeks to ally with the political power structure to stop the new work (Mullholland 940). This movement forces Paul and Barnabas to spend time developing and training Gentile leaders, some who do not know about Judaism. They set up a system of elders (Acts 14.23) in each congregation to continue the process. Then throughout Acts, even as Paul and Barnabas part ways, each takes with them people to mentor.

In Acts 16, Timothy joins Paul and Silas on Paul's next missionary journey. Timothy at times stays or is sent on ahead, but all the while, Paul is investing his time cultivating and demonstrating what Christian leadership looks like to Timothy (Kathy E. Kram; Coleman). Paul invests not only time in Timothy (1 Tim. 1.2) but also Titus (Tit. 1.4). Paul is spending enough time with them to call them his "sons in the faith."

The action of investing time into the lives of people is the missing step in North American Christianity. "We invite people to programs but never invite people into our lives" (Ransbottom-Stallons 21). The investment of time also demonstrates Bronfenbrenner's concept of the role that microsystems play in mentoring relationships (Bronfenbrenner). The influence of individuals and their interactions within their setting changes the individual (Suffrin et al. 534). Even as Paul and Barnabas separated in different directions (Acts 15.36-41), they both continued to mentor younger generations and multiplied their ministry through John Mark (Barnabas) and Timothy (Paul). They continued to invest in the lives of others and encouraged their mentees to make the same investment as they moved into the role of mentor.

Theological Foundations

John Wesley started the Methodist Movement in the mid-1700s. In recent years within the United Methodist Church, there has been a resurgence in exploring what Wesley did, how it worked, and whether it can be done again to revitalize the United Methodist Church. Wesley developed a model for discipleship. This model very much displays some of the ideas behind mentoring relationships. Discipleship and mentoring could even be considered synonyms, particularly when you are talking about mentoring in the context of ministry.

Wesleyan Class Meetings

Wesley's Class Model for discipleship is based on three main components: (1) The Society; (2) The Class; (3) The Bands. These three levels of discipleship worked together to provide a holistic approach to the Methodist. The Classes and the Bands were not Bible Studies, Sunday School Classes, or Prayer Meetings. Although prayer and Scripture were elements within the societies, classes, and bands, they were not the primary function of Wesley's discipleship model. The idea behind Wesley's model was the transformation of the heart and life of the believer. The model was holistic in its approach of transformation, focusing on cognitive, behavioral, and affective redirection (Henderson, *A Model for Making Disciples – John Wesley's Class Meeting*).

Figure 2.4: Henderson's Wesleyan Discipleship Model

1.) The Society	**Cognitive Mode**
	-Primary Focus was Cognitive Instruction
	-Large Group Presentations
	-Corporate Worship/Singing
2.) The Class	**Behavioral Mode**
	-Every Methodist is in a class of 10-12
	-Personal Supervision and Spiritual Growth
	-Tool for the Alteration of Behavior
3.) The Band	**Affective Mode**
	-Smaller Group, same sex and similar age
	-more intense accountability

This discipleship model metaphorically aims at the head, the hands, and the heart. The Society meeting is the head. This is primarily where preaching and dissemination of doctrine would take place. The Class meeting is the hands, the place where being a disciple is lived out through the weekly questions and accountability of "How is it with your soul?" The Class Meeting was the primary method of discipleship, and the class leader was a layperson. The Band meeting was much more intense meeting than a class meeting, and it was aimed at the heart. It was typically three or four people who were similar in age and same-gendered (Henderson, *A Model for Making Disciples: John Wesley's Class Meeting* 112).

John Wesley's model contains natural places for mentoring to occur, particularly within the classes and the bands. Classes and bands would provide opportunities for near/peer mentoring and reverse mentoring to take place instead of investing a lot of time and energy in multiple mentoring relationships

As mentioned earlier, Shafer says that mentors serve six roles within an organization: (1) Advisor; (2) Agent; (3) Confidant; (4) Role Model; (5) Sponsor; (6)

Teacher (Gotian 2). These roles seem very evident in John Wesley's system for discipleship. The Class would assume all six of these roles as well as a more intense demonstration of them in a band meeting.

Wesley's discipleship system of Societies, Classes, and Bands is designed to change the person. Through these relationships with the Classes and Bands in particularly, transformation changed the individual. This is the same type of "life-altering relationships" that Johnson said would be the result of a mentoring relationship (Johnson et al. 14)

The theological implications of Wesley's system of interlocking groups demonstrate the importance of accountability in the discipleship/mentoring process. David Watson said that Wesley's model contained five elements of accountability that connects to biblical and theological foundations. Watson's five essentials are: (1) Accountability in Christian Discipleship; (2) Accountability in the Means of Grace; (3) Accountability in the World; (4) Accountability for the Church; (5) Accountability to the Authority of the Holy Spirit (Watson 40-51).

Accountability in Christian Discipleship. The key to understanding Wesley's Class Meeting Model is understanding the dynamic that accountability plays within the societies, classes, and bands. The class meeting was more than just an intensive small-group experience or a means for spiritual growth, albeit those components did exist. The main goal in a class meeting was to "watch over one another in love" (Watson 44). In other words, the goal was mutual accountability in being concerned for one another. As a result, they experienced positive personal growth. This type of relationship is similar to the same dualism present in mentoring relationships as it relates to generativity.

The ingenuity of the Wesley Class Meeting demonstrates that long-lasting spiritual transformation is not a "product of dynamic preaching or of correct doctrine" but rather a product of serious disciple-building (Henderson, *A Model for Making Disciples: John Wesley's Class Meeting* 181). Johnson quotes Kram as saying, "mentoring relationships can be life-affirming relationships that inspire mutual growth…mentoring relationships have the capacity to transform individuals, groups, organizations, and communities" (W. Brad Johnson et al. 14).

Accountability in the Means of Grace. Each Methodist was accountable to the means of grace. The Methodists understand the means of grace as channels that help Christians in their relationship with God. Therefore, spiritual growth is indeed an aspect of the class meeting but not the sole aspect. To truly understand the means of grace, one must realize that the channels created to help Christians in their relationship with God are both individual and corporal activities. Each Methodist was to spend time in prayer, reading Scripture, and fasting. They were also to spend time together in public worship and regularly receive the sacrament of holy communion in the parish church. Christian fellowship and meeting was a means of grace for Wesley. Christianity was not just a private thing it had to be lived out; solitary Christianity did not work (Watson 45).

Accountability for Living in the World. Methodist class meetings were not only concerned about each other, but they were outward focused as well. The questions asked in the meetings challenged each Methodist to think about how to live as a disciple in the world around them. They were not called to monastic life or to retreat behind the walls of a church or society. Faith had to be lived in the day to day life of the world. During John Wesley's day, he was not the only force within the Evangelical Revival; in

fact, other groups seemed more prosperous. However, the Methodist movement remained because of the believer's active witness in the world (Watson 45).

Accountability to the Church. The Wesleyan Class Meeting held each Methodist accountable to the church and also held the church responsible for its mission. Being a part of the class meeting meant you made a covenant to be present for the sacrament of Holy Communion at the local Church of England parish. The covenant said you would attend worship service there and that societies, classes, and bands would not meet during times the Church of England had service. The Methodists, being a part of the Church of England, helped the church to be accountable to not only personal holiness but also to social responsibility in the world (Watson 46). Like a mentoring relationship, Wesley's Class Meetings had a generative effect on the Church of England.

Accountability to the Authority of the Holy Spirit. Above all, Methodist accountability is found in God. Watson said this was lived out in the early Methodists as they were a part of the larger church structure (ecclesia) and Methodism itself "functioned as a collection of little churches" (ecclesiolae) (Watson 46). This functionality allowed the classes to be free to respond to the promptings of the Holy Spirit as they took their message into their daily lives and abroad.

The five aspects of the Wesleyan Class Meeting are still relevant today in the continued development of disciples and how they relate to clergy mentoring relationships. As mentioned earlier, the time constraints on pastors today seem to pull a pastor in many different directions at once. Accountability in a mentoring group with other pastors would not only strengthen the pastor by sharpening their skills for ministry

but also makes them accountable in ways that a pastor cannot be accountable to their congregation.

As seen in the organizational and theological foundations of Methodism, accountability is key. Discipleship and mentoring can be used synonymously, especially when talking about developing Christian leadership with pastors.

United Methodist Concerns

When examining the articles and research in the various methods and paradigms of mentoring, it is evident that mentoring is needed to be recovered in ministry. Clergy mentoring happens but does not seem to be happening at the level or frequency that clergy mentoring should.

The need for pastoral mentoring is greatly felt within the United Methodist Church. As the baby-boomers transition to retirement, the church is seeing waves of those who are eligible for retirement retire every year. While this is happening, the median age of United Methodist clergy is fifty-six (Irwin 21). The median age of pastors in the United Methodist Church is four years older than the national average in the Barna State of the Pastor Study (*The State of Pastors* 12). The time for baby-boomers to mentor the next several generations will need to come during retirement.

Unfortunately, many denominations (including the United Methodist Church) have policies in place that insist on a clean break with clergy upon retirement. However, these policies do not address clergy needs and effective use of gifts for retired clergy. Allowing clergy to become succession interims might help fill the leadership void that is being created and mentor future generations into the roles they will soon occupy.

Mentoring will allow retired clergy to feel useful and also free up time and energy for

clergy in this process (Irwin 23).

There are other areas that need to be examined as in how mentoring relationships

could work within the context of ministry and more specifically the United Methodist

Church.   An examination of theological and biblical foundations of mentoring are also

important to consider and how they interact with the paradigms and approaches already

discussed.

An Overview of Mentoring

Odysseus started a quest that would take him away from his family. He sent his

son to be cared for by Mentor—renowned for his wise counsel. The Greek idea for the

word "mentor" means "enduring" (Taherian and Shekarchian). The word itself implies a

long-range and enduring relationship that is not just a casual acquaintance but an

investment of time for each person, a commitment. Mentoring does not just happen by

chance but is intentional. Carl Jung says that a mentor symbolizes "knowledge,

reflection, insight, wisdom, cleverness, and intuition" (Gotian; Jung).

This type of relationship is about transformational change and self-actualization.

A genuine mentoring relationship "focusses on who you want to be, not on what we want

to do" (W. Wright). Mentoring is essential in accomplishing any mission, particularly in

the church. Natasha Robinson contends that great leaders mentor (Robinson). Mentoring

is a crucial benefit to any organization because the very nature of mentoring is about

multiplication. Eric Parsole gives a good working definition of mentoring: "Mentoring is

to support and encourage people to manage their own learning in order that they may

maximise their potential, develop their skills, improve their performance and become the

person they want to be" (*Mentoring: Definitions and Principles)*. The concept of growth

in Parsole's definition, and in the concept of ministry and Christianity, is discipleship.

David Talley says that discipleship has both a personal transformational component and a

desire to share that transformation with others ("What Does It Mean to Be a Disciple and

to Disciple Others?").

There are other mentoring paradigms than the traditional more experience leading

the less experience. Within the scope of mentoring is peer/near peer mentoring and

reverse mentoring. Peer/near peer mentoring happens when two people are close in age,

status, or position. One learns from the experience of another through coaching, advise

and role modeling. This type of mentoring tends to be more organic but is still mentoring

nonetheless (*Peer, Near-Peer, and Mentor Support | DO-IT*). Reverse mentoring is when

a younger (or less experienced) person helps another person understand new and

innovated techniques and skills (*Reverse Mentoring at Work: Fostering Cross-*

generational Learning and Developing Millennial Leaders - Marcinkus Murphy - 2012 -

Human Resource Management - Wiley Online Library) (Creps).

Effective mentoring is a learned skill that every mentor should pass on to

protégées or mentees. Few people are given opportunities to be in mentoring

relationships or to learn this skill (Gotian 3). In the context of the church, this should not

be unique, but mentoring is not the primary discipleship method used today. A ministry

of multiplication cannot truly reach its potential unless "effective mentors seek to

replicate their own lives and ministries with those they train" (Newton 23). For the

church, clergy mentoring is also vital as pastors continue to get older in North America.

In twenty-five years, the median age of clergy has increased from forty-four to fifty-four years old (*The State of Pastors* 12).

The survey of literature will demonstrate that mentoring has a positive effect on mentees and organizations but also has a profound impact on the mentor as well (Suffrin et al.). Mentoring is a biblical model for training and discipling people (Newton 25). Mentoring was the model that Elijah used with Elisha and the model that Paul and Barnabas developed. Mentoring relationships are essential in John Wesley's Class meeting model. Mentoring improves ministry resiliency and provides an opportunity for clergy to truly discover who they are within the context of the body of Christ.

Understanding the Benefits of a Mentoring Relationship

Clergy mentoring is beneficial in preventing burnout. As a group, clergy burnout rates are similar to those of teachers and social workers (Adams et al. 148). However, clergy, as a whole, have higher burnout rates than counselors. In Barna's Research State of the Pastor study in 2017, one out of every three pastors faces burnout at some point in ministry. Also, one in four clergy has some form of extreme doubt about themselves and ministry at some point within their ministry (*The State of Pastors* 12).

Mentors play an important role in an organization (religious or secular). Schafer says that a mentor serves six roles in an organization: (1) Advisor; (2) Agent; (3) Confidant; (4) Role Model; (5) Sponsor; (6) Teacher (Gotian 2). These roles play into the "life-altering relationships" that grow out of mentoring experiences. They can impact and transform individuals, groups, organizations, and communities (W. Brad Johnson et al. 14).

These relationships form a Mentoring Relationship Continuum (MRC). At one end of the continuum is transactional relationships that are characterized by hierarchy. The main focus of this relationship is to develop skills in a particular vocation. At the opposite end of the continuum are transformational relationships. Many times these relationships become reciprocal in nature (W. Brad Johnson et al. 14).

James MacGregor Burns, who first brought forth the theory of transactional and transformational relationships in his examination of leadership, demonstrates the MRC. In transactional leadership, one takes the initiative "in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of valued things" and there is "no real enduring purpose that holds them together" (Burns, *Leadership* 19, 20). Conversely, in transforming leadership models one sees personal interactions where both the leader and the follower "raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality" (Burns, *Leadership* 20).

Leadership works on this continuum between transactional and transformational with both aspects operating with the potential to be beneficial to both the leader and the follower (Burns, *Leadership* 429). As these relationships emerge and evolve on this continuum, Burns contends that there are no "final stages" but a continuation of change with new motivations and new objectives (Burns, *Leadership* 441).

The difference in the two ends of the leadership (and Mentoring Relationship Continuum) comes down to a question of personal gain or personal growth. Often times these two can be intertwined with one another and hard to extrapolate, but one's motivation must be determined. In a mentoring relationship, this is also the case. The following questions, Burns says, must be asked of any leader: Are we wanting to be mentored to advance our career? Are we mentoring others to gain followers to advance

or is there a other purposes for our relationships? (Burns, *Leadership* 460). Our

motivation will impact mentoring relationships as it would any relationship. Again, both

transactional and transformational relationships can be beneficial, but motivation will

determine where this type of relationship falls on the MRC.

The idea of the MRC is supported by K.E. Kram (Allen et al. 128). Kram states

that there are two types of mentoring relationships: Care-related support and

Psychosocial support. In a career-related supporting relationship, the focus is on the

mentee's (or protegee's) advancement in an organization. The progress is achieved

through a variety of means like coaching and sponsorship. The primary goal for the

mentee is to "learn the ropes and skills needed" (Allen et al. 128). In a psychosocial

relationship, the focus is more interpersonal. The "aspect of the relationship enhance an

individual's sense of competence, identity, and effectiveness in a professional role"

(Kram 32). Networking is an essential aspect of the Psychosocial relationship. The

networking provided in the association helps the mentee advance in his/her career just as

much as skills learned through the mentoring (Allen et al. 128).

A survey of the Utah Bar Association found that the mentoring relationship

benefited both the mentor and the mentee professionally and personally. Many mentor

and mentees said the relationship provided more professional contacts and challenged

both groups to become better members of the legal community by focusing on best

practices.   Other benefits mentioned by both groups were that these relationships

developed into lifelong friendships. Mentors also demonstrated great satisfaction in that

they were contributing positively to their profession by helping future generation. The

study found that 88.7 percent thought the relationship was beneficial and that 94 percent

of the mentors said they were willing to maintain their relationships with the mentees after the program was over. The majority of the mentors (87.37 percent) also said they personally benefited from the experience (E. Wright).

Barna's study confirms the importance of mentoring or something similar to mentoring in the pastor finding satisfaction in ministry. Pastors who are not engaged in a mentoring relationship tend to be "less satisfied with their vocation or current church ministry" (*The State of Pastor* 87).

In Barna's study, the vast majority of pastors are satisfied with ministry: 53 percent were very satisfied, and 41 percent were somewhat satisfied. The majority of pastors in ministry were very satisfied especially when compared to those in ministry between fifteen to twenty-nine years. This study also saw that as a general rule, pastors who were a part of growing congregations had a higher sense of satisfaction than those who are a part of declining congregations (*The State of Pastors* 94, 95) .

An interview with Terry Linhart, Professor of Christian Ministries at Bethel College (Mishawaka, IN), reveals three factors that help strengthen a pastors' ministry and give feelings of satisfaction. Those three factors are: (1) A Clear Call; (2) A Strong Community; (3) A Loving and Supporting Church Community (*The State of Pastors* 89).

Pastors who have a strong sense of calling do not tend to leave, but, when faced with negative feelings and stimuli, tend to retool or reinvent their identity in ministry (Chng 88).   In his work on small churches that went from stagnation to growth, Ron Crandall discovered that one of the unifying factors in pastoral leadership of churches that began to grow was a strong sense of calling to ministry in the life of the pastor

(Crandall). These types of pastors have a strong sense of satisfaction even in the painful realities of ministry.

In identifying the pastoral support community, Linhart says, "too often pastors feel isolated and alone; it's difficult to be 'real' with those in our congregations. However, if a pastor regularly gathers with those who share their experience—that is, other pastors—their companionship provides needed perspective on the call to ministry and ministry's reality" (*The State of Pastors* 90). Thus, having at least one peer dyad is beneficial in ministry.

Congregational and community support is also important. In a study of five denominations, each showed a dropout rate among pastors at 15 percent, and this rate seems to remain unchanged for several years. Hodge and Wegner explored reasons for this rate, but the data did not present one single cause for pastors dropping out of local church ministry. Instead, it presented a combination of push and pull factors within the local church ministry and push and pull factors outside of local church ministry. The most significant outside pull factor was an opportunity for employment outside the local church that appealed more to the pastor. Congregations and denominations, however, were also contributing push factors. Among the ways pastors felt a push outside of local church ministry were flawed organizational and interpersonal issues within the local congregation. Among those pastors who had already left local church ministry, they cited push factor as conflicts, burnout, and lack of denominational support for leaving (Hodge and Wenger). If a congregation can be an underlying cause for a pastor leaving, then it can certainly be a reason to stay within pastoral ministry.

Interpersonal relationships are vital in ministry. Walter Wright argues that mentoring is basically "two people committed to learning, to growth, and each other" (137). In other words, mentoring is a relationship where both mentor and mentee benefit. Mentoring is a relationship that is worth the time and commitment, but different mentoring paradigms exists other than just the older teaching the younger. Peer mentoring and reverse mentoring also produce productive mentoring relationships and may be better suited in pastoral ministry.

Organizational Satisfaction

A mentors' satisfaction is also contingent on the view that the mentor has of the organization they belong to. In the study with people who mentored teens, several microsystems were examined: (Microsystem 1) perceived cultural relationships; (Microsystem 2) relationships with mentee family; (Microsystem 3) satisfaction with the mentoring organization. This test used the Mentor Satisfaction subscale of the Match Characteristics Questionnaire (MCQ Adult ver. 2.0) and the modified CCCI-R. Microsystems 1 and 2 did not show a significant range of satisfaction (Suffrin et al. 561).

Similarly, Microsystems 1 and 3 did not show much change in satisfaction as well. When microsystems 2 and 3 were compared together, there was a significant change. Upon further examination, when the satisfaction of the organization (Microsystem 3) was isolated by itself, it showed the most likely indicator of mentor satisfaction with the mentoring relationship (Suffrin et al. 561). The more satisfied one is with the organization, the more initiative they will take in a formal relationship with the mentee (Suffrin et al. 565).

Organizational satisfaction could help with clergy resiliency. In the <u>State of the</u> <u>Pastor</u> study, pastors were given two paradigms to describe their ministry. Paradigm 1: manager, counselor, referee, administrator. Paradigm 2: entrepreneur, coach, doctor, leader. Those who identified ministry with Paradigm 2 had a higher level of satisfaction with their ministry context than those pastors who describe their ministry context with Paradigm 1 (*The State of Pastor* 72, 73).

Job satisfaction can also be connected to organizational satisfaction for the pastor. In some ways, they are opposite sides of the same coin. Job satisfaction is straightforwardly defined as "how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs" (Spector). Job satisfaction is divided into two categories relating to positive and negative feelings. A positive outlook is defined as satisfaction, and a negative outlook is defined as dissatisfaction (Spector). Within the constructs of satisfaction and dissatisfaction are push and pull factors in the working environment. Ministry is not without its set of push and pull factors pushing and pulling the pastor in one direction or another (Chng 42).

The stresses of ministry, unrealistic expectations, intrusive nature of ministry, and interpersonal conflicts, can create a feeling of discontentment for a pastor (Chng 45). This dissatisfaction with ministry creates strong push/pull reactions to leave. The push of negative issues in ministry and the pull of outside employment at times seems to tip the scales. However, pastors who are strongly committed to ministry typically do not leave. The more satisfied a pastor is in ministry, the higher likelihood of that pastor remaining in ministry (Hodge and Wenger).

In exploring clergy stress, Chng suggests that pastors should create hospitable environments to provide rest, leisure, and play (58). Within this environment, space for mentoring relationships to take place must be present. While a mentoring relationship cannot replace rest, it can create an environment from which the pastor can see what is going on from another viewpoint. A mentoring relationship is not a cure for burnout but can help with pastor longevity. In fact, Maslach says that the development of social support is necessary to prevent burnout (Maslach). Mentoring relationships aid in the support that is needed.

Mentored individuals tend to be more satisfied in their career and are more likely to advance within an organization. They possess greater potential to stay with the organization then to leave for another (Allen et al. 130). Mentors who like an organization tend to make better mentors for that organization and are more likely to remain with that organization. Organizational contentment could impact clergy resiliency for the mentor and the mentee as well as have an impact on the future leaders within the denomination or particular congregation.

Generativity

Another benefit for the mentor is that this role of being a mentor may provide intrinsic satisfaction because mentoring fulfills a psychosocial need of "generativity" (E. H. Erikson, *Insight and Responsibility* 130–31). Generativity is defined as "primarily the concern in establishing and guiding the next generation" (E. H. Erikson, *Childhood and Society*). An organization will benefit from the ideals of generativity due to generativity's connection to organizational satisfaction. This concept is an important aspect of one's personal development (Hulta and Zuroff).

An individual with generative concern and action typically has a great sense of wellbeing and satisfaction not only with a career or calling but also with life in general. Generativity not only impacts work satisfaction but also creates social responsibility in the life of the individual and tends toward a great sense of moral concern (Ackerman et al.; Hulta and Zuroff; Rossi).

As there is satisfaction and dissatisfaction within a vocation, there is also generativity or stagnation in life in general. Erikson suggests that if one does not resolve the conflict of generativity over stagnations by middle adulthood than one regresses to self-indulgence and pseudo-intimacy. Thus, Erikson sees generativity as a virtue, and, with its successful resolution, generativity would elicit care, empathy, and a general concern for others in old age. He also sees this resolution as resulting in higher productivity and creativity in the life of the individual (Erikson, *Childhood and Society*).

Generativity is a two-edged sword. It has a lot of virtue, but it can also carry vice as well. Kotre says that within generativity, there is "a desire to invest one's substance in forms of life and work that will outlive the self" (Kotre). Expanding upon Erikson, Kotre said that generativity could manifest itself in selfless ways but can also be evident in selfish desire and is not limited to one stage of development. This manifestation is illustrated in four types of generativity (Kotre):

Figure 2.5: Korte's Types of Generativity

Type	**Generative Outlet**
1.) Biological	Having Children
2.) Parental	Feeding, Sheltering, Clothing, and Loving
3.) Technical	Teaching Skills to Successors or Apprentices
4.) Cultural	Creating/Maintaining a symbolic system to pass on

Within each of these types, there are selfless and selfish acts. Knopik observed that Kotre's research reveals a paradox. This paradox is the two-edged sword of generative theory—generativity blends both altruism and narcissism in an individual (Knopik 14). At the heart of the issue is the combination of symbolic immortality and selfless action toward the next generation.

This plays out in a mentoring relationship. Bakan put it this way, "it is the balance between the fact that humans desire dominance (agentic striving) and the need for social connections (communal striving)" (Bakan). It is a question a pastor must ask, "Am I concerned with the future and the future of the church, or am I concerned with how I will be remembered?" The benefits of generative are affected by how one answers this question and tells their life story. In searching to improve Erickson's theory of generativity, McAdams developed the idea of generative script. He said that our stories shape identity. People tell a narrative of what has happened and also begin to construct a narrative of what will happen (McAdams et al.).

It is through our desire for symbolic immortality, a need to be needed, and the societal demands for caring for future generations that one moves from stagnation into generative concern, generative action, and generative narration (McAdams and de St. Aubin). Generativity is not only a two-edged sword but is also multidimensional. In one study done by Mansfield and McAdams, they wanted to examine how generative adults express agency (focusing on individual accomplishments) and communion (focusing on community) in life narration. The result of the study was that generativity is influenced greater by communion than by agency and relationships crucial to generativity (Mansfield and McAdams).

Relationships (communion) are an important aspect of generativity and generativity has its own intrinsic/extrinsic satisfaction. The benefits of generativity seem to outweigh any negative aspect. While one may not escape the paradox of altruism and narcissism blended in the generative individual, if held in balance, the two work in tandem to make a mentoring relationship beneficial for both the mentor and the mentee.

These relationships reflect the transactive and transformative relationships that Burns and Johnson discuss (Burns, *Leadership*; W. B. Johnson et al.). The benefits of generativity have both a transactive component and a transformative component. The two do not seem to exist without the other. Therefore, the benefits of a mentoring relationship can be transactive to help the mentor and the mentee develop professionally but can also have an ongoing transformative effect that develops beyond a professional level to a more personal level.

Faculty mentors for undergraduates experienced two primary benefits as part of being a mentor: (1) Personal; (2) Professional. These two benefits played together in the professors becoming better teachers and in realizing they were making a difference in the next generation of undergraduate students (McKinsey 11). In another study of faculty mentors, a similar result appeared. The mentors had several extrinsic and intrinsic benefits. The extrinsic benefits, identified by the faculty as a result of the mentoring relationship, are more significant scholarly activity, broader networking, and increased professional recognition. The faculty also identified the following intrinsic benefits as a result of their mentoring relationship with undergraduate students: better career satisfaction, felt more energetic and rejuvenated, and greater feelings of generativity (Cobb et al. 41).

Kathy Kram developed four phases of a mentoring relationship: (1) Initiation; (2) Cultivation; (3) Separation; (4) Redefinition (Kathy E. Kram). These stages are important to understand as the benefits and satisfaction in a mentoring relationship for both the mentor and the mentee are explored. The stages were developed as a result of a five-year empirical study demonstrating a model in which mentoring influences psychosocial development and career development in young and middle adulthood (Kathy E. Kram 608).

Young adulthood is a time for an individual to begin to form dreams and aspirations. During young adulthood, individuals develop their occupational identity and develop intimate relationships as well as mentoring relationships (Levinson et al.). It is a time that competence, achievement, and dreams are most salient (E. H. Erikson, *Childhood and Society*; E. Erikson). Middle adulthood is a time of re-tooling and reassessment of the dreams and achievements realized or unrealized from young adulthood. Middle adulthood is also a time of confrontation to adjust and achieve those dreams or to abandon the aspirations of young adulthood (Levinson et al.). Kram says that early adulthood is "one of initiation" and middle adulthood is one of "reappraisal" (Kathy E. Kram 608).

Kram also considers Erikson's theory of stagnation versus generativity as it plays out in middle adulthood. She says that those in middle adulthood could be more responsive to a mentoring relationship as they try to re-evaluate unrealized achievements and dreams that were established in young adulthood. In exploring these relationships, she found different functions of a mentoring relationship. These functions are put into two categories: career functions (primarily enhances career mobility) and psychosocial

functions (primarily enhances a sense of competence, clarity of identity, and effectiveness). These functions play into the developmental stages of a mentoring relationship and how the mentor and mentee see each other. (Kathy E. Kram 608).

Figure 2.6: Kram's Function and Stages of Mentoring

Career Functions	**Psychosocial Functions**
Sponsorship	Role Modeling
Exposure-and-visibility	Acceptance-and-confirmation
Coaching	Counseling
Protection	Friendship
Challenging assignment	

(Kathy E. Kram 614)

In the initiation stage, the mentor is often admired and respected for the competence and support provided to the mentee. The mentor sees the mentee as "coachable" and is concerned with the mentee's growth and success (Kathy E. Kram 615). Cultivation is the next phase that the relationship will enter. The fantasy and imagination of the initiation stage gives way to the reality of the relationship. "Each individual discovers the real value of relating to each other" (Kathy E. Kram 616). The full range of career and psychosocial functions become evident and are developed more and more. The mentee becomes more self-competent in their own abilities, and the mentor feels empowered as change and success is seen in the life of the mentee through the mentor's tutelage. Both the mentor and the mentee experience personal satisfaction in this stage (Kathy E. Kram 617).

The relationship then begins to experience significant change. This change starts the separation stage. It can be a time of great upheaval, turmoil, and anxiety in the mentoring relationship. The "equilibrium of the cultivation phase is disrupted" (Kathy E.

Kram 618). This disruption can be caused by a number of issues both positive and

negative. The mentee may have advanced and been promoted or moved. The mentor

may experience a threat by the mentee and prevented advancement or gave harsh

criticism. Regardless of the reasons for the dynamic relationship change, this is a critical

stage in the development of the mentoring relationship. The mentee starts to develop and

demonstrate skills and abilities independently of the mentor. During this time, the

mentor validates to peers and their own self that there was success in the mentoring

relationship (Kathy E. Kram 620).

The separation stage necessitates a new phase in the relationship with the mentor

and the mentee. Redefinition is the fourth and final stage of a mentoring relationship.

The mentor is now seen more as a peer by the mentee. The mentor has been "removed

from the pedestal" that she or he was placed on in the initiation stage (Kathy E. Kram

620). The mentee is seen as proof of the effectiveness of the mentor's abilities to pass on

knowledge and skill. Both the mentor and the mentee must "acknowledge that what was

is no longer" (Kathy E. Kram 620). A new relationship has emerged and often this

relationship results in friendship (Kathy E. Kram 621; E. Wright 36). This ongoing

friendship is a positive benefit of a mentoring relationship.

There are numerous other benefits for a mentor in a mentoring relationship

whether the model of mentoring is traditional, peer mentoring, or reverse mentoring.

While at times, mentees have more initial benefits of the mentoring relationships,

mentors, if they are willing to make the most of the relationship, can reap a significant

number of benefits as well.

Being a mentor provides an outlet for connectivity and networking. Mentoring gives the mentor a better connection to the organization. It helps the mentor maintain longevity within an organization. This can significantly help with clergy resiliency and burnout. Being a mentor aids in sharpening skill sets and helps to develop and learn new skills. Mentoring promotes being a life-long learner.

Reverse Mentoring

Reverse mentoring happens in mentoring relationships when the mentor begins to learn from the mentee in areas that the mentor needs help and growth. One of the benefits for the mentor in the mentoring process is that this paradigm allows one to join a subculture or generational cohort that a person does not belong to or understand. This style of mentoring overcomes "cultural blackouts" that develop in cultures and subcultures over time that the mentor was not previously a part of before the relationship (Creps 21–23).

Engagement with a younger mentee can aid in the reverse mentoring process where the mentor feels satisfaction and fulfillment in the relationship. One study of 247 mentors to teens found that mentors were far more able to overcome age, generational, and cultural differences than they what they previously conceived they were able to do. This study used a modified Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory-Revised (CCI-R) to arrive at this conclusion (Suffrin et al. 557). Our preconceived barriers are often what inhibits learning in mentoring relationships. A robust mentoring relationship happens when each person (mentor and mentee) surrenders their agenda and their lives into one another (Robinson 97). "Individual development is influenced by an individual's interactions with others within their immediate settings (i.e., their microsystems)"

(Bronfenbrenner). Mentoring failure seems to happen when mentors cannot cross

cultures (Spencer). Generational divide would be one of these "cultures." Reverse

mentoring happens when the mentor realizes the mentee has just as much to offer as they

do to the relationship. The benefit of reverse mentoring far outweighs its deficits.

Many key influencers in an organization find that their abilities are at their limit

long before the mid-point of their career. "Despite pure motives and hard work their

leadership models and skills simply clock out…" (Creps 35). This limitation causes

many pastors and leaders to be fearful that their day in the sun has passed. Once this

happens, the leader develops *obsolescence anxiety*—the perception that one's age carries

a demographic penalty (Creps 41). Reverse mentoring can help one overcome this

problem. Once the mentor realizes that they will benefit and learn from the mentee, then

a relationship transaction can occur.

Older generations must learn to embrace younger generations by building

relationships instead of outsourcing them to others (Creps 76). Reverse mentoring can

also make one aware of positional blindness, allowing the mentor a new perspective.

This new perspective may include even stepping back from an area professionally to

enable everyone in the organization to step forward strategically (Creps 41, 51).

In the 2018 Barna Study, nine out of ten pastors said that they welcome different

ways to think about important topics (*The State of Pastors* 54). The advantage of reverse

mentoring relationships is that they provide and offer opportunities for out of the box

thinking. Reverse mentoring relationships can aid in dismantling preconceived notions

and challenge the mentor to keep their skills sharp in ministry (Creps 85).

Near-Peer Mentoring

Near-peer mentoring occurs when people are of similar status, but the mentor is more advanced and a slightly different status than the mentee. This often occurs when the mentor is a couple of years older than the mentee (*Peer, Near-Peer, and Mentor Support | DO-IT*).

In a qualitative study of near-peer mentoring involving an interdisciplinary group of urban planning students (mentees) and research psychology students (mentors), the mentors did not realize they had as much to offer as they did in the process until they experienced it. The mentors came out of the experience realizing that they possessed a broader skillset then what they initially thought they possessed. The process of near-peer mentoring changed them and helped them to realize they had something to offer (Wagner and du Toit).

A positive mentoring relationship is symbiotic in that individual development is influenced by interactions within our microsystems (Bronfenbrenner). Clergy developing relationships outside their denomination or even with leaders of parachurch ministries would greatly benefit them in what they could mutually learn from each other.

Peer Mentoring

Peer mentoring happens in organizations when more experienced members at the same basic status take responsibility for the development and guidance of a less experienced member (Fine and Pullins 89). In a study of experienced salespersons, one group of more experienced salespersons helped a newer group of salespersons. They were peers in job status because both groups were not in management. Peer mentoring adds a dimension of "mutuality" in the relationship. This mutuality creates peer dyads

within the organization (Fine and Pullins 89). These dyads prove to be very beneficial to

salespeople because they are frequently in remote settings and have minimal contact with

managers within their organization (Fine and Pullins 91). This is also true of many

pastors, particularly in the Kentucky Conference of the United Methodist Church, who

feel isolated and disconnected from conference leadership.

In many organizations, the problem with mentoring is that it takes people who are

dedicated to the process and who will commit to the time needed to develop the

relationship. Most feel that there is "not time for this in organizations that are lean and

focused on pressures of change management and strategic planning. People are paid for

what they produce, not for the time they spend developing others" (Morris 146).

Unfortunately, this mentality also finds its way in the church. Many pastors do not feel

they have the time to invest in a mentoring relationship with all the demands that ministry

brings. Mentoring has declined in many organizations because of "hypercompetitiveness

and rapid growth," but mentoring may be needed in organizations now more than ever

(DeLong et al. 115–21).

Mentoring is Discipleship

There is a connection in the theological and biblical foundations and in the

research on mentoring and its connections with generativity. The Wesleyan

understanding of accountability adds a dimension to the mentoring relationship that

makes Christians accountable to God. There are no limits to God's gracious gifts given to

people. The leadership responsibility for pastors is to cultivate the leadership gifts God

has given them and the skills they learn to build up the kingdom of God. Pastors do have

a choice; they can resist, or they can grow and thrive (Watson 50). If they step out and engage in a mentoring relationship, they will notice that it does draw them closer to God.

Mentoring draws people closer to others. There are numerous examples of great leaders and pastors through Church History who saw the importance of mentoring Christian leaders. They understood that faith is not purely a personal matter but that faith has a social dimension. Faith is a communal affair as is demonstrated in the life of Ulrich Zwingli who took younger pastors and helped train them in his *Prophezei* (Newton 83). One of Zwingli students said, "You have offered me not only books, but also yourself" (d' Aubigne' 14). An authentic mentoring relationship will draw one closer to others.

Mentoring allows people to be authentic to themselves. Ministry is not so much a call to a profession as it is a call to a purpose. Nowhere in Scripture do you find someone who is called to a profession; instead, you see the lives of the patriarch, prophets, and apostles devoted to a purpose. People are the happiest and the healthiest when living for a purpose beyond themselves (Oakes). The image of God—*imago Dei*—is relational. Christian mentoring is more than just self-improvement. It opens up oneself to others, and it opens oneself to God and his mercy in grace. Once one opens themselves up horizontally (to others) and vertically (to God), one finds fulfillment in their life and in ministry, and one begins to understand how God has created them and their true selves.

If mentoring is practiced as a foundational principle in ministry, mentoring will: "1.) Draw us closer to God, 2.) Draw us closer to others, and 3.) Draw us closer to our authentic selves" (Robinson 162). Future generations need to be mentored, and current generations need to be mentors to become the person God has fully called us to be.

Research Design Literature

This project used mixed methods, both qualitative and quantitative analysis, through a pre-intervention questionnaire. Questionnaires are important for research because they provide an artifact in written form and allows the research the potential to understand behavior through a specific lens as the data is analyzed (Miller 394). Questionnaires are also beneficial in surveying "program managers, administrators, and other decision makers" particularly in that the research is evaluating goals and visions within an organization (Miller 532). Pastors certainly fit this category and this project ultimately seeks to discover how mentoring affects satisfaction within pastoral appointments in the United Methodist Church. Questionnaires can contain both quantitative and qualitative elements. Surveys are typically used for more quantitative analysis, but descriptions and open-ended questions within the survey can provide sufficient data for qualitative research (Fischer 410). This questionnaire also falls more into the category of an analytic survey as it seeks to determine relevant variables and they are related (Davis and Smith 475).

Qualitative research is valuable for discovering what happens to people and how certain groups of people will respond and behave in a particularly manner (Fischer 410). Qualitative analysis moves from particulars to more generalized observations of themes, codes, or categories (Creswell 43) and is what Sensing refers to as "thick description" (Sensing 195). Qualitative analysis is the process of searching for the hidden meaning that exists in the qualitative data that is presented to the researcher by finding reoccurring themes and categories (Sensing 195–96; Geertz).

Two types of thematic analysis exist: 'small q' and 'Big Q'. 'Small q' uses qualitative techniques within a quantitative framework. 'Big Q' is more subjective in nature and more fluid in coding, providing some flexibility in analysis (Clarke and Braun 85–86). One issue with 'Big Q' is too much into subjectivity can be placed on the researcher; therefore, this project will work more within the framework of 'small q'.

The quantitative sections of the survey allow for the two districts to be compared to each other as well as for different categories to be examined against each other. The comparison of categories helped find relations and demonstrate that certain elements exist within specific categories (Bell 14).

Summary of Literature

The transformation of Elijah through his relationship with Elisha (1 Kings 19:19ff) is a helpful biblical paradigm to see through the lens of Kram's four phases in a mentoring relationship (Kathy E. Kram). In the life of Elijah, you can see the transformation of one fleeing for his life from Jezebel (1 Kings 19:1-9) to no longer fleeing in the attempts to seize him by Ahaziah (2 Kings 1:9ff). Elijah's transformation happens as a result of his mentoring relationship with Elisha, a relationship that God arranged (1 Kings 19:16; Kram)

Kram's phases are in largely based off of Erikson's theories on generativity and his ideas on how they are connected to productivity and creativity (E. H. Erikson, *Insight and Responsibility*; E. Erikson; E. H. Erikson, *Childhood and Society*). Kram's phases fit within the scope of the project in examining satisfaction with ministry among more experienced pastors and in what ways being a mentor (like Elijah) has rejuvenated them in their ministry making them ready for the next challenge.

Discipleship is key to understanding how mentoring works in ministry and often the discipleship that lasts is organic in nature and resembles a close kinship (Newton 19–22). Within the context of the Bluegrass and Lexington Districts, discipleship is typically done through covenant groups that should resemble Wesleyan covenant groups (Henderson, *A Model for Making Disciples – John Wesley's Class Meeting*; Henderson, *A Model for Making Disciples: John Wesley's Class Meeting*; Watson). These groups will represent more pee/near-peer relationships (Nolan et al.; Fine and Pullins; Wagner and du Toit) and perhaps reverse mentoring paradigms because of the mix between experiences in ministry (Newton; Creps).

While there is research in discipleship within the church and research with generativity theories in workplace mentorships and its effects particularly on the mentor, there seems to be very little research on how this works with more experienced pastors and what they experience as they mentor other pastors. With this in mind, the research sought to bring the process of exploring ways in which mentors experience generative attitudes through the mentoring relationship.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY FOR THE PROJECT

Overview of the Chapter

The research methodology is discussed in this chapter. The chapter starts with a review of the nature and purpose of the project, as well as a restating the research questions. The context and participants of this project are presented as well as the instrumentation used. The chapter concludes with the procedure of how the data was analyzed.

Nature and Purpose of the Project

The Kentucky Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church has many ministry settings from urban to very rural. However, the Kentucky Annual Conference is comprised of primary rural and small-town ministry appointments several hours away from major urban centers. Kentucky is primarily a state of small towns, and this makes the Kentucky Annual Conference a conference mostly composed of small-town churches.

Small-town church ministry can often leave a pastor feeling isolated or alone, particularly those who are called into ordained ministry. An ordained elder in the United Methodist Church has gone through a rigorous process of seminary and followed by a residency program with assigned mentors. Through the process of seminary and residency, one is in constant contact with other peers going through similar experiences and similar educational background. However, once this process is over, often times the ordained clergy may find that they are now in an appointment where they feel isolated or alone. While there may be other United Methodist clergy within a close distance to the

appointed elder, often they are bi-vocational and do not have the time nor shared experience with the ordained clergy.

The purpose of the research was to evaluate the effectiveness of mentoring on clergy satisfaction in two districts (Bluegrass and Lexington) of the Kentucky Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church.

Research Questions

RQ #1. How does being in a clergy mentoring relationship affect one's own satisfaction in ministry?

This research question addresses the issue of whether or not a mentoring relationship improves one's satisfaction in ministry in general. The literature review demonstrated a connection between mentoring and an improved sense of personal accomplishment. While personal accomplishment is not necessarily the same as satisfaction, a correlation seems to exist. This research question seeks to find out if there is a connection between mentoring and satisfaction in pastoral ministry. Questions 8, 12, 13, and 18 address this research question in the Ministry Mentoring Survey. Questions 8 and l2 use a Likert Scale; question 13 is a force answer yes/no response but also has a place to add comments while question 18 is an open-ended response and qualitative in nature.

RQ #2. How is one's own spiritual relationship affected by being in a mentoring relationship?

The research question addresses a component of the Biblical Foundations within the literature review. It appears that within Elijah's life, his relationship with God improved as he started into a mentoring relationship. The struggles of pastoral ministry

can be complicated, but the irony is that while ministering to people, the pastor often feels distant from God. This question seeks to address a pastor's spiritual health and explore any differences between those pastors who are in a mentoring relationship and those who are not in a mentoring relationship. Ministry Mentoring Survey addresses this research question with questions 11, 15, and 18. A Likert Scale is used for questions 11 and 15. Question 18 is qualitative and is an open-ended response.

RQ #3. What effect can serving as a clergy mentor have upon mentor's feelings for future generations of pastoral leadership?

The research question connects to the purpose of the project because mentoring is about influencing and passing on leadership to future generations. The literature review discusses generativity theory and its connection to mentoring. This question seeks to see if there are connections between how one feels about the future and satisfaction in one's ministry as it relates to future generations. Questions 14, 16, and 20 relate to this research question in the Ministry Mentoring Survey. Questions 14 and 16 use a Likert Scale, and Question 20 is an open-ended response

<center>**Ministry Context(s)**</center>

The context of this study are two districts (Bluegrass and Lexington) of the Kentucky Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church. These districts primarily encompass much of central Kentucky. The Lexington District includes the cities of Lexington, Winchester, and Richmond with other small towns and rural areas. The variety of ministry settings range from urban to very rural. A small portion of the Lexington District located in Appalachia.

The Bluegrass District is just west of Lexington and it includes several bedroom communities to Lexington. While it does not have a significant urban center, it does have several larger cites: Danville, Frankfort, and Georgetown. There are also very rural sections of this district as well.

Another factor that must be considered in this ministry setting is the current state of the United Methodist Church. The United Methodist Church was created in 1968 through a merger of The Methodist Church and the Evangelical United Brethren Church. Since 1972 the issue of human sexuality has been dividing in the denomination's General Conference. However, recently, it has reached a boiling point. There is a current impasse within the denomination, and several clergy and conferences have violated our covenant to live under our Book of Discipline. The division that once was primarily maintained at General Conference every four years has now filtered down at the Annual Conference (regional) level.

A Special General Conference was called in February 2019 to deal with the issue of human sexuality. The more traditional and current doctrine on human sexuality was maintained but at great expense. There are plans on all sides of this issue to dissolve the United Methodist Church and establish two or three new denominations at the next General Conference (May 2020). This situation can have a significant effect on clergy satisfaction and view of the future.

Participants

Criteria for Selection

The criteria for the participants in this study are limited to being in two similar districts in the Kentucky Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church. The participants will

only be ordained ministers serving as pastors. Pastors serving in extension ministries

beyond the local church do exist within the context being studied, their ministry

experience is substantially different than pastoral ministry and, therefore, do not fall

within the scope of this project. Participants will also be ordained ministers because they

serve at a full-time capacity and have the same educational background. Within both

districts are licensed local pastors who do serve part-time and full-time ministry

appointments; however, they typically do not have a seminary degree. Limiting the

participants to ordained clergy creates a more cohesive group for this study.

Description of Participants

The participants of this study are all in pastoral ministry, and all are ordained as a

deacon or an elder. Within the United Methodist context, deacons are ordained ministers

that serve in a specialized capacity. They are often extension ministers serving outside the

local church, but they can also serve within the local church as associate pastors dealing

with a specific area of ministry like youth ministry or Christian education. Elders can serve

in extension ministries outside the local church but are more typically appointed as pastors.

Both deacons and elders have similar education and have gone through the same ordination

process.

The Bluegrass District has twenty-two ordained clergy serving in pastoral ministry.

This group is comprised of seventeen elders, three deacons, one retired deacon, and one

retired elder. There are three females and nineteen males serving as ordained clergy within

the local church in this district.

The Lexington District is very similar in its breakdown of ordained clergy serving in

pastoral ministry. This district has twenty-two elders, three deacons, and two retired elders

serving local churches. The ordained clergy serving in pastoral ministry is comprised of four females and twenty-three males in the Lexington District.

Ethical Considerations

Participants received informed consent instructions as a part of the introduction to the Ministry Mentoring survey. After the participant read the purpose of the study, instructions, and informed consent, the participant was then asked a question if they agreed to participate and to be involved with the study. If they agreed, they responded with a "yes" on the survey and then would proceed with the rest of the Ministry Mentoring Survey.

This study maintained confidentiality by sending surveys online via SurveyMonkey. Each participant was contacted via email with a link to the survey. Responses were kept anonymous through the online service providers privacy policy. This policy can be located at https://www.surveymonkey.com/mp/policy/privacy-policy/. The results of the survey were saved in a password-protected file on the researcher's password-protected personal laptop to further ensure confidentiality. The researcher only knows passwords. Data will be maintained for twelve months after the study, and then the data will be removed online and deleted from the researcher's personal laptop.

<div align="center">

Instrumentation

</div>

The researcher developed the Ministry Mentoring Survey that contained both qualitative and quantitative components. The nature of the instrumentation was to help identify trends as they relate to the research questions (See Appendix A, Ministry Mentoring Survey).

The instrumentation consists of seventeen questions, including a demographic section asking for gender, age, and ministry settings. Questions relating to the research question

use a force choice Likert Scale with open-ended questions to allow for elaboration by the participant. The goal of these questions was to find trends as they connect mentoring relationships with clergy satisfaction.

Expert Review

The Ministry Mentoring Survey was sent to five people for a review of the questions and suggestions for clarification of the survey as they related to the research questions. Two of the people who reviewed the Ministry Mentoring Survey are faculty of Asbury Theological Seminary: my dissertation coach, Dr. Anthony Headley who is a psychologist and Professor of Counseling and Dr. Chris Kiesling, Professor of Discipleship and Human Development. Dr. Michael Powers, Director of Discipleship at the Francis Asbury Society also reviewed the instrumentation. Dr. Powers is focused on helping pastors engage in spiritual practices and forming covenant small groups in the parachurch ministry setting of the Francis Asbury Society. Rev. Courtney Spear, a certified psychiatrist and United Methodist Deacon that has a concern for clergy mental health, was also consulted in reviewing the MMS instrumentation. Rev. Willard Knipp (United Methodist Elder) also reviewed the survey to provide feedback on how a participant might view the survey. Rev. Knipp has also been involved in training and identifying future clergy leaders in the Kentucky Annual Conference.

Through these experts' reviews, modifications were made to ensure that the survey questions aligned with the research questions. A few questions have been rewritten for needed clarification. The reviewers were selected based on their area of expertise and scope of ministry (Sensing).

Reliability & Validity of Project Design

The Ministry Mentoring Survey gives a snapshot of two districts in the Kentucky Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church and is a sample of the other seven districts in the annual conference.

The survey instrumentation has been reviewed by three experts who deal with clergy health and mentoring issues among clergy. The survey questions relate back to the research questions and looks for identifiable trends within those responses. The open-ended questions allow for an expanded view of the responses beyond a force answered Likert scale question. Each respondent was given the survey in the same manner, and care was taken with the expert reviews to ensure that the Ministry Mentoring Survey questions aligned with the research questions.

This study could be repeated in other districts within the Kentucky Annual Conference because ordained clergy are appointed in every district, and most districts have similar balances between urban and rural locations.

Data Collection

The design of the project uses a pre-intervention survey with both qualitative and quantitative questions. This study does not have a post-intervention component. The Ministry Mentoring Survey was sent through SurveyMonkey to every ordained clergy serving in a pastoral appointment in the Bluegrass and Lexington Districts via email. Ordained clergy serving as extension minsters beyond the local church were excluded.

The Ministry Mentoring Survey contained open-ended questions to allow the researcher to "construct answers" from the participants' responses without prodding and

forcing the data to fit a specific agenda (Riessman 54). The other questions in the survey are fixed answer questions pertaining to demographic categories and forced answer questions using a Likert Scale—this type of survey with open-ended questions functions similar to an interview (Sensing 113, 114). However, unlike an interview, the open-ended questions in the Ministry Mentoring Survey create another level of anonymity and confidentiality for the participant. Since the researcher will not know who responded in what way, this may allow for a better response than through an interview (Bell 14).

The survey will be available online for three weeks. Reminders were sent to participants inviting them to participate each of the three weeks. Typically, surveys have a response rate of less than 50 percent. However, following up with two reminders in weeks two and three of the survey can increase participation by an additional 13-17 percent (Miller 157).

Data Analysis

Quantitative data from the Ministry Mentoring Survey was received online via SurveyMonkey. Data was collected in Microsoft Excel. Once in Excel, the quantitative data was analyzed through. Using the sample size of the two districts, inferences and predictions were made based from a t-distribution.

Qualitative data was provided through the open-ended questions. Responses were read and coded according to certain reoccurring themes. This data was saved in a Word Document. Each response was connected with its corresponding theme to see if patterns emerged.

CHAPTER 4

EVIDENCE FOR THE PROJECT

Overview of the Chapter

The purpose of the research was to evaluate the effectiveness of mentoring on clergy satisfaction in the life and ministry of the mentor. This chapter describes those who participated in the Ministry Mentor Survey and their results from the survey both as a group and also separated by the Bluegrass and the Lexington Districts. Quantitative data is explained as well as the qualitative data college in the MMS. The chapter identifies six major findings from the data collected.

Participants

The participants in this study were ordained clergy serving in pastoral appointments in the Bluegrass and Lexington Districts of the Kentucky Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church. From those invited to take the survey, nineteen participated in this study.

This study group is comprised of eighteen males. The age range of the participants vary but are predominately comprised of Generation X and Baby Boomers. The age breakdown is as follows: twenty-five to thirty-four: one, thirty-five to forty-four: one, forty-five to fifty-four: seven, fifty-five to sixty-four: nine, sixty-five or greater: one (Table 4.1).

Table 4.1: Participant Age

Age	Group as a Whole	Bluegrass	Lexington
25-34	1	0	1
35-44	1	0	1
45-54	7	2	5
55-64	9	7	2
65 or more	1	0	1

All respondents are married. Nine are from the Bluegrass District and ten serve in the Lexington District (Table 4.2).

Table 4.2: District Where Participants Serve

District

Bluegrass	9
Lexington	10

The predominate pastoral ministry setting is Small Town/City (52.63 percent) followed by Urban/Suburban (31.58 percent) and the lowest setting is Rural (15.79 percent). When comparing the two districts, the Bluegrass District has the majority of pastors serving in Small Town/City (77.78 percent) and Urban/Suburban pastors comprise the largest group in the Lexington District (Table 4.3).

Table 4.3: Ministry Setting of Participants

Ministry Setting

Rural	3
Small Town/City	10
Urban/Suburban	6

Table 4.4: Participants' Years in Appointed Ministry

Years

4-7	4
8-15	5
16-25	5
25 or more	5

The vast majority of pastors are senior pastors with a staff (83.33 percent) and 16.67 percent are pastors with no staff. The number of years in appointed ministry are fairly evenly distributed between four to seven years (21.05 percent), eight to fifteen years (26.32 percent), sixteen to twenty-five years (26.32 percent), and more than twenty-five years (26.32 percent) (Table 4.4).

The majority of pastors are in a Wesleyan Covenant Band. Twelve participants responded yes (63.16 percent).   The difference between districts is stark. Only 33.33 percent of the Bluegrass District participate in a Wesleyan Covenant Band while 90 percent of the Lexington District participate. The Lexington District does require, or at the very least, expects of all their pastors to participate in a Wesleyan Covenant Band (Table 4.5).

Table 4.5: Participation in Wesleyan Covenant Group/Band

	Group as a Whole	Bluegrass	Lexington
Yes	12	3	9
No	7	6	1

The primary participants of this survey are very experienced clergy serving within the last ten to fifteen years of "active" ministry before retirement. Several of the churches served by these pastors in the Bluegrass and Lexington Districts are in the top twenty in congregation size of the Kentucky Annual Conference.

Research Question #1:

How does being in a clergy mentoring relationship affect one's one satisfaction in ministry? Questions 8, 12, 13, and 18 in the Ministry Mentoring Survey related with to this question. Question 8 asked about the level of satisfaction in the pastor's current ministry appointment. The overwhelming majority of pastors surveyed reported that they were "very satisfied" (73.68 percent) in their current ministry setting. Another 15.77 percent said they were "satisfied" (Table 4.6).

Table 4.6: Level of Satisfaction in Current Appointment

Question 8	Group as a Whole	Bluegrass	Lexington
Very Satisfied	73.68%	66.67%	80%
Satisfied	15.79%	22.22%	10%
Somewhat Satisfied	5.26%	11.11%	0
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	5.26%	0%	10%

In the comment section of question 8, respondents in the Bluegrass District mentioned how their congregations were reaching out in mission to the community. One pastor said, "The church has become very mission minded. They are loving and caring for people. They love us and we love them" (B8). Four other pastors in the Bluegrass District had similar comments about the care of the congregation for the community (B1, B2, B3, B6). Within this group, three identified as not currently being in a mentoring relationship. Two identified as being "very satisfied" and one identified as being "somewhat satisfied."

The Bluegrass District (66.67 percent) did not have as high of a response for those who are "satisfied" or "very satisfied" as the Lexington District pastors (80 percent) (Table 4.6). This difference was also expressed in the open comment section: "I feel like my gifts are being used well and my current appointment offers many healthy challenges" (L3). This was the sentiment of most Lexington pastors. No one from the Lexington District expressed any negative comments. Two Bluegrass District pastors, while still positive overall, mentioned "frustrations". "Frustrations with serving a county seat church that lacks solid discipleship ministries, but very blessed with opportunities to minister…" (B1) Another Bluegrass District pastor also commented on the current situation in the United Methodist Church as affecting the level of satisfaction (B5).

There is a very small segment of Lexington District pastors (10 percent) who are not satisfied with their ministry appointment but responded "Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied" (Table 4.6) There is little negative response in the open comments but one pastor said they are extremely busy and feel great pressure from time constraints (L4). Prayer, visitation, sermon preparations, while they are important aspects of pastoral

ministry, can seem like just another item on an agenda to check off. Particularly, this may be the case in a larger church with more structured committees and meetings.

Another question asked of the pastors was how often they thought about leaving ministry (Question 12, MMS). While the vast majority of pastor were "very satisfied" and "satisfied" within their current ministry context, many pastors still think "very often" and "often" about transitioning away from pastoral ministry (42.1 percent) (Table 4.7). When comparing districts, over half of the pastors in the Bluegrass District contemplate transitioning (55.55 percent) with only a third of the Lexington District pastors considering it (30 percent) (Table 4.7). The three pastors who are not in a mentoring relationship all responded that they "often" think about transitioning away from ministry.

Table 4.7: Frequency of Thinking About Leaving/Transitioning from Pastoral Ministry

Question 12	*Group as a Whole*	*Bluegrass*	*Lexington*
Very Often	5.26%	11.11%	0%
Often	36.84%	44.44%	30%
Not at All	10.53%	11.11%	10
Rarely	31.58%	22.22%	40%
Very Rarely	15.79%	11.11%	20%

This difference is reflected in the open response comments. Retirement is on the minds of several in the Bluegrass District (B4, B5, B7). In the Bluegrass District, the predominate age of the pastors are fifty-five to sixty-four years (77.78 percent). Respondents B4, B5, and B7 fit in this age group giving some rationale for concern about retirement. Some pastors mentioned thinking about leaving ministry more in past

appointments that created issues with their family than transitioning from their current congregation (B1, B2). The Lexington District pastors still considered transitioning from pastoral ministry, but they did not rate it as high. Three out of six open responses in the Lexington District talked about contemplating transitioning while seven out of nine open responses in the Bluegrass District mentioned contemplating transitioning from pastoral ministry. Most responded similarly with L6, "Occasionally I want to do something easier. Usually I think I'm in the right vocation."

Surprisingly, even with most pastors thinking about transitioning away from pastoral ministry, most respondents would not move into another career even for the same compensation (89.47 percent). One of the most conflicting pieces of data is that all of the pastors in the Bluegrass District would remain in ministry even though they had greater numbers thinking more often about transitioning from ministry. In response to Question 13 of the MMS, 100 percent of the Bluegrass District pastors said they would remain in ministry given an opportunity to leave for at least the same compensation. A significant majority (80 percent) in the Lexington District would remain as well. The open comment section for both districts demonstrated a unifying theme of being "called" into ministry. All the Bluegrass District pastors' responses mentioned calling as the primary motivation for remaining in ministry. In the Lexington District L2 simply said, "Called," which was similar to two other responses (L1 and L3).

A two-sample t-test was conducted comparing the data sets between the Bluegrass District and the Lexington District for each question. This resulted in no statistical significance because p was > 0.05.

Table 4.8: Statistical Significance of Questions 8 and 12

	VALUE OF P
QUESTION 8	0.91
QUESTION 12	0.833

Research Question #2: Mentoring and Ministers' Spiritual Relationship

How is one's own spiritual relationship affected by being in a mentoring relationship? MMS questions 11, 15, 19 related to this research question. The respondents' description of their relationship with God is compelling: 94.73 percent responded with a relationship as "Very Close" and "Somewhat Close". The data was very similar to each other between both districts: Bluegrass District (88.89 percent) and Lexington District (90 percent) when "Very Close and "Somewhat Close" were both combined (Table 4.9).

Table 4.9: Description of Your Current Relationship with God

Question 11	Group as a Whole	Bluegrass	Lexington
Very Close	57.89%	55.56%	60%
Somewhat Close	36.84%	33.33%	40%
Neither Close nor Distant	5.26%	11.11%	

The open comments gave a clearer picture that while the pastors have a close relationship with God, the relationship is not without work. The general themes in the Bluegrass District focus around "struggling" (B1, B4, B5, B6) and "working/daily practice" in the Lexington District (L1, L2, L3).

Regular spiritual/religious practices are a part of the respondents' life. All engage in this practice at least weekly with the majority having some form of daily practice (63.16

percent). The district breakdown shows that the Bluegrass District is fairly distributed between "Daily" (five pastors) and "Several Times a Week" (four pastors). Seven participants in the Lexington District have a daily practice, two practice "several times a week," and one has a weekly practice (Table 4.10).

Table 4.10: Frequency of Spiritual/Religious Practices

Question 15	Group as a Whole	Bluegrass	Lexington
Daily	63.16%	55.56%	70%
Several Times a Week	31.58%	44.44%	20%
Weekly	5.26%		10%

In the open response, Question 19, all the pastors in the Bluegrass District speak about different mentoring relationships being positive in their spiritual growth and development. However, five specifically (B1, B2, B3, B4, B6) say they experienced significant spiritual growth through these relationships. "Being in a mentoring relationship deepens my spiritual life, in part because I witness that what the Lord is working in my life and the life of others" (B2). B4 even mentions the benefits of reverse mentoring: "I have learned much and have grown significantly by listening to younger, less experienced clergy talk about their own lives, so it has been a positive experience."

Four pastors in the Lexington District connect mentoring relationships with their spiritual growth (L1, L3, L5, L8) but interestingly four also connect this question to how a mentoring relationship improved their leadership skills (L2, L3, L6, L8)

A two-sample t-test was conducted comparing the data sets between the Bluegrass District and the Lexington District for each question. This resulted in no statistical significance because p was > 0.05.

Table 4.11: Statistical Significance of Questions 11 and 15

	VALUE OF P
QUESTION 11	0.904
QUESTION 15	0.910

Research Question #3: Clergy Mentors and Future Generations of Pastors

What effect can serving as a clergy mentor have upon a mentor's feeling for future generations of pastoral leadership? Questions 14, 16, 17, and 20 are related to this research question in the MMS.

The majority of all survey participants are "Very Concerned" or "Concerned" with future generations of clergy leadership in the Kentucky Annual Conference (63.16 percent). There are some differences in how respondents in the Bluegrass District and the Lexington District perceive future leadership. A larger percentage of clergy in the Bluegrass are "Very Concerned or "Concerned" (77.78 percent) than in the Lexington District (50 percent) (Table 4.12).

Table 4.12: View of Future Generations of Pastoral Leadership

Question 14	Groups as a Whole	Bluegrass	Lexington
I am very concerned	31.58%	22.22%	40%
I am concerned	31.58%	55.56%	10%
I am neither concerned nor encouraged	21.05%	11.11%	30%
I am encouraged	15.79%	11.11%	20%

The high level of concern in Question 14 seems proportional in the open response section of the question. All but one pastor in the Bluegrass District mentioned the primary cause for their concern towards future pastoral leadership was connected to the

concerns over the future of the United Methodist Church in general. Two in Lexington expressed this concern as well. "I am concerned for the future of the UMC, period. I am also concerned for the younger clergy who are orthodox. I think the pressures on them to conform to the secular culture's ethics is strong and if they do, the denomination will downward spiral" (B1).

In the open response section, both districts also expressed concern for future generations regarding their lack of spiritual/biblical leadership. "We seem to be struggling to attract quality young clergy to whom congregations will be able to relate. I also don't see real strong work ethics or a sense of living sacrificially" (L5).

More clergy seek to meet one another in a non-required meeting than do not: "Very Often" and "Often" (47.13 percent) and only 26.31 percent meet "Seldom" or "Not at All." However, nearly that same percentage fall in the middle of the continuum (26.32 percent). Over half of the Bluegrass District meets often with clergy in non-required meetings (55.56 percent), while only 40 percent of the Lexington District meets other clergy in non-required meetings. The majority of those in the Lexington District (60 percent) do not engage with other clergy in non-required meetings (Table 4.13).

Table 4.13: Frequency of Clergy Engagement

Question 16	Group as a Whole	Bluegrass	Lexington
Very often	15.79%	0	30%
Often	31.58%	55.56%	10%
Neither often nor seldom	26.32%	22.22%	30%
Seldom	21.05%	11.11%	30
Not at all	5.26%	11.11%	0

Question 17 looks at how clergy are meeting in mentoring relationships. Most pastors are in a peer/near peer mentoring group (68.42 percent). Only one-third of the pastors mentor someone with less experience (Table 4.14).

Table 4.14: Most Common Types of Clergy Engagement

Question 17	Group as a Whole	Bluegrass	Lexington
Less experienced	31.58%	22.22%	30%
More Experienced	5.26%	11.11%	0
Peers	68.42%	66.667%	70%

When comparing districts, less than one-fifth of Bluegrass district pastors engage with clergy who have less experience as their primary type of clergy engagement. (Table 4.14).

The open-ended comment section demonstrates this difference as well. The Bluegrass District pastors made more comments about mentoring relationships being "less formal" (B1, B2, B3, B4, B5, B8) but also used words like "actively modeling" and "encouraging" with less experienced pastors. Time constraints seem to be an issue in the Bluegrass District as well (B5, B6).

The Lexington District talked more about multiple layers of mentoring working together. They were mentoring and being mentored (L1, L2, L4) and mentioning "less experienced while in peer/near pear relationships simultaneously" (L1, L3, L4, L5, L6). Many spoke of their "Covenant Band for the District" (L2, L4, L5, L6, L7, L8) as being their primary group and primary contact with other clergy in a peer/near peer relationship.

The open response question 21 in the MMS provided several answers, but the majority were overall encouraged in their mentoring relationships as it relates to future generations (B1, B4, B6, B8, L1, L2, L4, L6). However, some were also troubled by "seeing fewer young clergy who self-describe as traditional" (B3). Several in the Bluegrass District thought these relationships are important but should be more organic and not mandated. B4 said, "You can't make them do by policy or threat, but needs to be stressed by Conference leadership." Leadership development seemed to be a reoccurring theme in the Lexington District, particularly with L2, "Kind of the 'circle of life' scenario—people mentored me—I attempt to mentor others—etc." Perhaps the most telling and honest comment in this question that summarizes most attitudes in the Lexington District was: "Working with young pastors is a two edge sword. On some level it gives me hope that they can be molded into rock solid church leaders, but on the other I get discouraged and think, is this the best we have to offer to the Kingdom of God?"

A two-sample t-test was conducted comparing the data sets between the Bluegrass District and the Lexington District for each question. This resulted in no statistical significance because p was > 0.05.

Table 4.15: Statistical Significance of Questions 14, 16, and 17

	VALUE OF P
QUESTION 14	0.91
QUESTION 16	0.696
QUESTION 17	0.81

Summary of Major Findings

The data resulting from the Ministry Mentor Survey demonstrated a need for further exploration and study. The pre-intervention study began to show that there many aspects to mentoring relationships and how they can impact our spiritual growth and perception of future generations. The following are major findings that will be discussed in Chapter 5.

1.) The majority of pastors define their primary clergy relationship as being with peers.

2.) The majority of the Bluegrass District Pastors think about transitioning away from pastoral ministry.

3.) Calling is a primary reason why pastors remain in ministry.

4.) More pastors in the Lexington District have a daily religious practice than in the Bluegrass District.

5.) Bluegrass District pastors seem more concerned about the direction of future generations of pastoral leadership than the Lexington District.

6.) The Bluegrass District pastors are primarily Boomers and the Lexington District pastors are primarily Generation X and younger leading to preferences of different mentoring models.

CHAPTER 5

LEARNING REPORT FOR THE PROJECT

Overview of the Chapter

This project addressed the problem of the need to be in a mentoring relationship in order to promote clergy satisfaction and resiliency. The purpose of the research was to evaluate the effectiveness of mentoring on clergy satisfaction in two districts (Bluegrass and Lexington) of the Kentucky Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church

This chapter will outline the major findings from the data of the Ministry Mentor Survey. First, it will discuss reasons pastors may be thinking about transitioning away from ministry. Second, the spiritual growth of the pastors will be explored. Third, the connection of calling and its correlation to clergy satisfaction and clergy resiliency is investigated. Fourth, concerns about future leadership and generational differences between the Bluegrass and Lexington Districts are examined. Fifth, recommendations for ministry and limitations of the study will be discussed. The chapter concludes with the personal journey and reflections of the researcher through the process of this study and academic program.

Major Findings

Primary Clergy Engagement is with Peers

Pastors tend to keep with their own peer group. This result is not surprising but definitely one that needs to be addressed. Staying within our own generational cohort or with pastors of similar experiences is easy. Near peer/Peer relationships provide great support and are vitally needed. When exploring the attitudes of the pastors toward future generations, the ones who seem more concerned about future generations in the open

response sections also tended to say they were not actively mentoring the younger generations. The wisdom from previous generations and opportunities to grow from the struggles of those in ministry with less experience is missed when not in relationship with each other. Peer/near peer mentoring relationships are important, but care must be given to make sure our relationships are broadened. As a generation of pastors age, they need to see the role to come along side of those with less experience to help mentor, disciple, and guide as important.

There is a level of "mutuality" in ministry that is needed for clergy health and satisfaction in peer relationships which is met by creating dyads in ministry (Fine and Pullins 89). These dyads are evident in the Lexington District with the mandated Wesleyan Covenant Bands functioning as the catalyst for these relationships. Pastors mentioned in the opening comments of the Ministry Mentor Survey that it helped them feel connected. Ultimately, this would help pastors feel connected back to the larger ministry of the Kentucky Annual Conference than just within their own congregations (Fine and Pullins 91).   The connections that these relationship dyads create could also be a significant factor in explaining why more pastors in the Lexington District are satisfied with ministry than those in the Bluegrass District. However, other factors may influence ministry satisfaction within the Lexington District. Many of these pastors lead larger congregations within the city of Lexington. This area provides a lot of economic and recreational opportunities for families. While not a question in the survey, one cannot help but wonder if this has some influence as well. Also, with larger churches come staff and broader ministries that may also contribute to a sense of satisfaction.

Often the relationships within peer dyads lead to very close friendships which would contribute to pastor satisfaction. Intimate relationships within the context of Christian community, like a Wesleyan Covenant Band, demonstrated a model of discipleship that Jesus used. Jesus' relationship method eventually moved The Twelve to friendship (John 15:15). Christ invested in close personal relationships with his disciples (Krallman 55; Newton). Other examples of close friendships in near/peer and peer relationships can be seen in scripture. A primary example would be Paul and Barnabas working together for the common mission of evangelization (Acts 11:19-30).

Clergy peer relationships are important. One of the key components to strengthening a pastors satisfaction in ministry is being a part of a strong community of clergy (*The State of Pastors* 90). Peer Mentoring relationships seem to be best suited and adaptable to most pastoral ministry situations. Both districts may have more pastors participate in this type of mentoring ministry simply because it is the easiest to start and to maintain.

Transitions Away from Ministry

The Bluegrass District pastors are largely nearing retirement and this means the issue is more complex than just dealing with mentoring. Retirement is a strong factor for their concern about transitioning away from pastoral ministry more so than those pastors in the Lexington District. Surprisingly, that there seems to be a disproportional number of those nearing retirement in the Bluegrass District than in the Lexington District. The reason behind this could simply be that the appointments were open at the time to that generational cohort as previous generations retired. Typically, some of these

appointments are longer tenured pastoral appointments. As older pastors retired, those

were the position that were available for that generation.

Even though Bluegrass District pastors demonstrate thinking about transitioning

away from pastoral ministry, all of them would remain in pastoral ministry (100 percent)

and 80 percent of the Lexington District pastors would remain. Another consideration is

that a significant majority of the pastors in the Bluegrass District were "Very Satisfied"

or "Satisfied" (88.89 percent) in their current position. This means that thinking about

transitioning away from pastoral ministry is not necessarily a function of dissatisfaction;

other factors need to be considered as to why pastors think about transitioning from

pastoral ministry.

Retirement is a matter that many pastors will face as they transition from "full-

time ministry." This seems to be part of the process of discerning what ministry will look

like in retirement.   Several agreed with B5 when he said, "Retirement is close!"

Retirement is also a broader concern for the United Methodist Church (as a

whole) and for the Kentucky Annual Conference. The median age of United Methodist

clergy is fifty-six (Irwin; *Clergy-Age-Report-2018*). The median age in the Kentucky

Conference is fifty-five, but the mode is sixty-one (*Clergy-Age-Report-2018*). This

means that retirement will be numerous in a few years. A little over half of all Elders in

the Kentucky Conference are between fifty-five and seventy-two years old. The survey

of participants in the Bluegrass District resemble in large part the age demographics of

the Kentucky Annual Conference (*Clergy-Age-Report-2018*).

Concerns about how the pastors will navigate retirement and about future

generations of pastoral leaders, as demonstrated in the data, could be addressed by

providing space for Bluegrass District pastor to develop a program of succession

planning. Succession planning provides an opportunity for both the retiring pastor and

the new pastor to work together giving space for the congregation, retiring pastor, and the

new pastor to adjust to their new relationships without major upheaval. This type of

planning is important particularly with longer tenured pastors. At times, an interim

pastor maybe be used to bridge the gap between a long tenured pastor and the new pastor.

Interim pastors help manage the transition between the retired pastor with the goal of the

replacement being another long tenured pastor (Irwin).

Another way that congregations and pastors can prepare for retirement for longer

tenured pastors is through succession interims. Succession interims are pastors who

remain in a pastoral appointment for one to two years after retirement working with the

pastor who will eventually be the successor for that congregation. During this time of

transition the retired pastor steadily releases leadership to the successor while mentoring

and helping the new pastor navigate ministry with the congregation (Irwin).

Jesus' model of discipleship would also help with the Bluegrass District pastors in

this time of transitioning in ministry. At the beginning phase of being a succession

interim, it would be like when Christ selected the disciples. This is the equivalent of

what Kram called the Initial stage of a mentoring relationship. The development of the

relationship would really take shape in the Kram's Cultivation stage which is the

equivalent of when Jesus demonstrated to his disciples what ministry was supposed to

look like. Christ then transitioned into delegating ministry to the disciples (Kram's

Separation stage). Finally, the succession interim leaves just as Christ molded through

this discipleship of the Twelve. Christ left the disciples to multiple and replicate his

ministry. The final stage is a Redefinition of roles. In this final stage, the mentor

becomes a peer and the mentee essentially graduates from the tutelage of the mentor.

The relationship dynamic changes significantly. The long tenured pastor completely

steps away into retirement. The congregation sees the succession interim as the pastor in

a more seamless fashion than being abruptly inserted into the role. The new pastor

continues the ministry and multiplies the efforts of both pastors and the congregation

(Coleman; Kathy E. Kram; Irwin).

Calling is the Primary Reason Pastors Remain in ministry

Calling is important to the pastors in both districts. All the pastors in the

Bluegrass District would remain in ministry and 80 percent of the pastors in the

Lexington District would remain even if they could leave. In fact, calling is the primary

motivation for remaining in pastoral ministry for the pastors in the Bluegrass and

Lexington Districts. From the open responses, all of the participants from the Bluegrass

District said the reason they remain in ministry is because they are called. The majority

of the Lexington District also talked about calling as the primary motivation for remain in

pastoral ministry. L3 said, "I stay in ministry because of my calling not for money. I am

a second career pastor and after a decade and a half of ministry I have not gotten back to

my secular salary level and probably never will, so money is not a factor."

Calling is important for clergy as a whole. In a recent study, 31 percent of pastors

say that they are "just as confident" in their calling as when they started ministry and a

greater number (66 percent) say they are "more confident" in their calling than when they

started (*The State of Pastors* 58). Simon Sinek says leaders should reflect on the "why"

of being in any leadership position (Sinek). The "why" for pastors is because they have been called by God into ministry.

A clear calling is one of three main factors that help strengthen and give satisfaction to a pastor's ministry (*The State of Pastors* 89). A strong pastoral calling helps a pastor through negative feelings and stimuli. Going through the hard experiences with a strong pastoral calling often allows the pastor to retool and reinvent their own pastoral identity (Chng).

Many examples of calling are in scripture: Elijah calls Elisha (1 Kings 19), Jesus calls his Disciples (Matt. 4.18-22; Mark 1.16-34; Luke 5.1-11), Moses was called from the burning bush (Exod. 3), and Jesus calls Paul on the road to Damascus (Acts 9). Through each of these callings God is transforming and reshaping lives. Many experience hard trials, but they endure through their calling.

While mentoring can be a factor in clergy satisfaction and longevity in ministry, the results of this study indicate that calling plays a stronger role. Calling would also connect to generativity because it gives a sense of being a part of something greater (the *Missio Dei)*. "The notion that a person is called simply to be a professional in the life of the church does not exist in Scripture. The biblical call is not profession but to purpose. Only people who know their calling and purpose can say whether they achieve it or not…People are the happiest and the healthiest when living for a purpose beyond themselves" (Simpson).

This concept of calling also seem closely related to Erikson's understanding of generativity and Stages of Life (also known as "Stages of Man") in dealing with aspects of one's own personal growth and development and their successful resolution (E. H.

Erikson, *Insight and Responsibility*; E. Erikson). Generativity is "primarily the concern

in establishing and guiding the next generation" (E. H. Erikson, *Childhood and Society*).

Generativity connects deeply to aspects of one's personal development and helps with an

overall general sense of wellbeing (Hulta and Zuroff; Rossi).

Just as there is satisfaction and dissatisfaction, there is generativity and

stagnation. If one does not resolve the conflict of generativity by middle adulthood,

Erikson suggests that one regresses to self-indulgence and turns inward; however, a

successful resolution results in more care and empathy, particularly in reaching beyond

one's self (E. H. Erikson, *Childhood and Society*). McAdams goes further and connects

generativity to how one sees their true selves through generative scripts. These narratives

help influence and form our identity (McAdams and de St. Aubin; McAdams et al.).

Calling is generative as it is connected to the pastor's identity and gives the pastor

purpose and passion to serve others.

Mentoring and Pastors' Connection to God

The Lexington District pastors seem to be more engaged in their relationship with

God and more active in daily spiritual practices based on their responses to the MMS.

These pastors are also more engaged in peer mentoring groups (Wesleyan Covenant

Bands). One Lexington pastor said, "I've grown deeper in my faith and spiritual

leadership. I have come to know Christ more deeply because of the authentic

relationships I've developed through mentoring" (L3). Several other Lexington pastors

agree with the sentiments of L3 (L1, L2, L5, L6, and L8). The open comment responses

of the Lexington District pastors suggest that there is a connection between their

mentoring relationship and how they view their own spiritual journey and relationship with God.

Wesleyan Covenant Bands typically are aimed at changing one's affect (Henderson, *A Model for Making Disciples: John Wesley's Class Meeting* 112) and promote accountability with each member of the band (Watson). This level of individual accountability may explain why more pastors in the Lexington District connect their daily religious practice and spiritual journey with their mentoring group. These peer/near pear mentoring groups appear to contribute significantly to their spirituality (not to say that the pastors in the Bluegrass District do not have a relationship with God or not doing daily religious practices). However, the accountability that can be found in a mentoring relationship may help add another dynamic to one's spirituality, particular when ministry and life situations get hard for the individual. The mutual support found in peer/near peer mentoring relationships creates peer dyads (Wilson and Elman 89).

The concept of mutuality and support plays out in the relationship between Elijah and Elisha. Elijah's confidence changes from before and after he starts his mentoring ministry with Elisha (1 Kings 19; 1 Kings 21) . This change in confidence is connected to generative concern as one moves from stagnation into generative concern and activity as it is found in community (McAdams and de St. Aubin; Mansfield and McAdams), thus creating a transactive and transformative component in the relationships (Burns, *Leadership*; W. B. Johnson et al.). This transformative component seems to not only be connected to the peers but also with God. This mutual support and spiritual growth is seen in the early church (Acts 2.42-47; Newton 20).

Concerns with Future Pastoral Leadership

The difference in how generational cohorts view work and the world can lead to some mistrust or concern between cohorts (Brînzea).   This seems true with some of the pastors' views about work ethic and concerns with the future generations of pastoral leadership. One reason that pastors are apprehensive about future leadership is that some clergy have failed to really make connections beyond their comfort levels focusing more on peer clergy relationships than reaching out to less experienced clergy. Looking at the data, one can see that the Bluegrass District has more pastors who are "very concerned"/ "concerned" with future generations of pastoral leadership (77.78 percent) in contrast to the Lexington District (50 percent). Three quarters of the pastors in the Bluegrass District are concerned but slightly less than one-quarter engage with pastors of less experience as a primary relationship. However, 40 percent of the of the Lexington District pastors say they engage with clergy of less experience as their primary clergy relationship. The more connected pastors are to pastors with less experience (i.e.: mentoring relationships), the less negative concern there seems to be for future leadership.

The majority of mentoring relationships form on what Johnson calls the Mentoring Relationship Continuum (MRC). At one end of the continuum are transactional relationships and at the other end are transformational relationships. Both types can be beneficial, but the transformational relationships often become reciprocal relationships with both the mentor and the mentee receiving mutual benefits (W. Brad Johnson et al.; W. B. Johnson et al.). Johnson's concept is based off of James MacGregor Burns' work on transactional and transformational leadership (Burns, *Leadership*; Burns,

Transforming Leadership: A New Pursuit of Happiness). Most mentoring relationships come down to personal gain and personal growth (transactional dynamics) and both are needed. A longer-term relationship that moves from personal gain to personal growth typically becomes transformational (W. B. Johnson et al.). Transformational mentoring relationships composed of the traditional paradigm of a clear mentor and a clear mentee may help improve attitudes toward young/less experienced clergy.

This transformational mentoring relationship may be able to break down the barriers between less experienced clergy and more experienced clergy. The pastors of the Bluegrass District may then have a better outlook by building these relationships with younger clergy and also create reverse mentoring relationships (Creps 76).

The uncertain future of the United Methodist Church is another contributing factor causing concern among the pastors toward future leaders. Both districts talked about the future viability of the United Methodist Church as one of their reasons for concern. This concern has to weigh very heavy on the future outlook of pastors and future generation of pastor leaders.

The Bluegrass District pastors also seemed concerned with the theology and spiritual depth of some future pastors. These ideas are prevalent in both districts, but the Bluegrass District pastors are not making themselves as readily available to mentor less experienced pastors and, therefore, seem to have more of a concern. A traditional mentoring relationship and a reverse-mentoring relationship may help improve the perspective of the pastors toward future generations of pastoral leadership.

The lack of mentor/mentee relationships may be leading to lower percentages of pastors who are "very satisfied/satisfied" with ministry as opposed to the high

percentages found in the Lexington District. Mentoring relationships can also create a

positive view of the organization, in this case pastoral ministry, and increase a greater

sense of generativity, personal development, and work satisfaction in replicating

themselves in future generations (Suffrin et al.; E. Erikson; E. H. Erikson, *Childhood and

Society*; Hulta and Zuroff; Rossi).

The concept of generativity and personal development can be seen in the life of

Elijah. Elijah's transformation appears to happen after he begins his relationship with

Elisha, enabling him to finish in some ways stronger than when he started (1 Kings 19).

Elijah passes the mantel onto Elisha with some expectation that Elisha will do greater

things than he has done (2 Kings 2). Elijah believes Elisha is ready to take his place as

prophet. Other biblical examples of transferring leadership are Moses and Joshua (Deut.

34-35) and Jesus commissioning the Disciples (Matt. 28; Acts 1). Mentors seek to

replicate their own life into the lives of others and eventually passing their leadership to

the next generations (Newton 23).

The open responses from both districts, particularly the Bluegrass District,

demonstrate the possibility that they have missed opportunities to "pass on the mantle" of

leadership. One pastor said, "I see little courage or biblical integrity in why we are

equipping and deploying leaders. Pastors are no longer encouraged to be shepherds. The

prevailing models of pastoral leadership are driven by secular culture norms and trendy

megachurch models. Churches need pastors who are spiritually deep, Spirit-filled and

grounded in ancient church traditions not CEOs" (B4). In a similar tone, B6 said: "I'm

mostly concerned about the future of the denomination and the long term [sic] effect of

the General Conference decisions over the next year or so. Morale seems very low as I

analyze the last Annual Conference and talk to colleagues throughout the SE

Jurisdiction." Similar statements were also made by B2 and B8.

Both the unsettled future of the United Methodist Church and pastors not

personally investing as much as they could in future generations contribute to the "very

concerned/concerned" for future pastoral leadership.

Mentoring and Generational Difference

When looking at generalized differences between Boomers and Gen Xers,

Brînzea says that Gen Xers typically work in teams and Boomers typically prefer

individual work settings and more traditional mentoring relationships (Brînzea). This

difference fits well with the data relating to peer mentoring and Wesleyan Covenant

Bands in the Lexington District and may explain why there seems to be some hesitation

for the Bluegrass District pastors to embrace this type of mentoring relationship.

The Bluegrass District pastors are primarily Boomers (77.78 percent) and 70

percent of the Lexington District pastors are less than fifty-five years old and 50 percent

of the pastors are Generation X. The generational cohort age is based on the ages of

generational cohorts for 2019 (at the time of the survey). Each generation is broken

down as: Millennials (age twenty-three to thirty-eight); Generation X (age thirty-nine to

fifty-four); Boomers (age fifty-three to seventy-threee), Silent (age seventy-four to

ninety-onee) (NW et al.).

The work values of Generation X and Millennials are different than the work

ethic of the Boomers. Pew Research Center found that most Gen Xers and Millennials

were more confident in their own individual abilities and strengths than previous

generations (Meister and Willyerd). Boomers value traditional mentoring models where

the mentor demonstrates and models appropriate behaviors, skills, and expectations while Gen Xers and Millennials prefer a more collaborative environment (*Reverse Mentoring at Work).* This difference in work value could be one of the reasons that several pastors in the Bluegrass District seemed weary of the work ethics of future pastoral leadership.

Boomers also want to feel very connected to their organization/workplace (Brînzea). If they let go of leadership, they may feel that they are no longer connected and lose a part of their identity. This connection between their role as a pastor and their identity could also explain some of the hesitation of Boomers in the Bluegrass District to "pass the mantel."

Generational clashes can be seen within the Bible. John Mark left Paul and Barnabas (Acts 13:13) leaving Paul not wanting to deal with him any longer (Acts 15:36-41). Perhaps Paul felt he could not trust John Mark's "work ethic" (a comment made by a few Bluegrass District pastors towards future leaders).

From a Methodist theological framework, the structure of Methodist Classes and Band meetings could demonstrate the best of both Boomers and Gen Xers preferred mentoring model. The Class Meeting would typically have one leader asking questions and would fit much more with a traditional mentoring paradigm. A Band Meeting, on the other hand, is much more collaborative in nature which appeals to Gen Xers.

Ministry Implications of the Findings

1.) When pastors start nearing retirement, they need to be used more strategically in a mentoring process with younger clergy either one on one in or in a Class Meeting structure. The mentoring relationship will help more experienced pastors retool and learn new skills through reverse mentoring, giving younger clergy space to share their gifts.

The mentoring relationship will also provide a sense of generativity and legacy to those pastors nearing retirement. Using more experienced pastors to mentor younger pastors may allow more space for the more experienced pastors to want to pass on the mantel of leadership to the next generation with joy and hope.

2.) Succession interim pastors need to be utilized particularly in some of the larger congregations in the Kentucky Annual Conference. This ministry will benefit those congregations with longer tenured pastors. Succession interim pastorships will aid in the retiring pastor passing leadership from one generation to the next. This process would allow both the retiring pastor and the incoming pastor more ownership in the future ministry of the congregation.

3.) Encouraging a culture that emphasizes a calling into ministry needs to be emphasized. Ministry is filled with administration, education, polity, organizational leadership, and professional ethics; while all these areas are important, little emphasis seems to be spent on calling and exploring one's calling later on in ministry. Remembering why one entered ministry is important and seems to be more of an indication of clergy longevity and resiliency than other influences.

Limitations of the Study

One limitation to this study was the response of clergy. Out of forty-nine clergy selected for this study, only nineteen responded to the survey, and no women responded. The small sample size may over emphasize some of the differences between the districts. Having one or two more responses could have possibly changed the outcome of the current responses significantly. Not having any women respond to the survey was also very disappointing . Unfortunately, only four women met the qualifications to be invited

to participate. Given these limitations, this study is not generalizable for female clergy.

Some issues and concerns about the availability of ordained women clergy and their

ministry placement in the Kentucky Annual Conference is also raised through the results

of this study and could be explored in another study. The small sample size and lack of

female participants limits some of the scope that this study can provide.

Another limitation of the study is that the study only surveyed ordained clergy

serving pastoral appointments. Only half of the clergy in the Kentucky Annual

Conference of the United Methodist Church are ordained; the other half are Licensed

Local Pastors (*Clergy-Age-Report-2018*). Including Licensed Local Pastors into the

study would broaden the scope.

Unexpected Observations

One major surprise was the emphasis on "calling" as it relates to ministry.

Calling is still important to the individual lives of most of the pastors in the study but

seems to rarely be a focus that is mentioned within the context and culture of the

Kentucky Annual Conference. Calling may be the main drive in clergy satisfaction and

resiliency. The relationship between satisfaction and calling seems to be implicit.

Barna's study demonstrates a correlation between how satisfied pastors are with ministry,

their current congregation, and the confidence a pastor has in her or his calling (*The State

of Pastors)*.   Those pastors who are less confident in their calling feel more inadequate

and less energized by ministry than those pastors who are confident in their calling (*The

State of Pastors* 58).

Another surprise is that the majority of clergy who say that they contemplate

transitioning away from pastoral ministry would not leave over the issue of

compensation. This affect goes back to the influence of calling in the individual's life.

Even though some have thoughts about transitioning from ministry, calling keeps them

committed to ministry. In fact, a few said they make less money now than in previous

careers.

Recommendations

This study was a preintervention to start the exploration of the influence of

mentoring on clergy satisfaction. The issue becomes what is causation and what is

correlation. One could more precisely assess the value of mentoring if the Bluegrass

District pastors started a mentoring program, were then given the Ministry Mentor

Survey post-intervention, and the responses of the preintervention and the post-

intervention responses were compared. The comparison could illuminate the connection

between clergy satisfaction and mentoring.

Additionally, more exploration in mentoring is needed as it relates to women and

minorities. Unfortunately, the results of this study did not include women (although they

were invited to participate) and minorities. This presents another issue: many female and

most minority clergy seem to be Licensed Local Pastors and not ordained clergy.

Exploring mentoring with both ordained and licensed clergy would be beneficial and

broaden the scope.

Another area of focus could be around GenX pastors. As stated earlier, this

generational cohort prefers to work in teams and does not prefer the traditional

mentor/mentee relationship as much. Instead, it seems they would prefer peer mentoring

situations. The collaborative nature of GenX may change the paradigm of mentoring in

the future.

Further study on the importance of calling and its implications on ministry satisfaction and longevity would also be beneficial. The exploratory data of this study demonstrates that calling is a unifying theme for clergy resiliency with or without a mentoring relationship. Through this study, the influence and the importance of calling on ministry satisfaction is uncovered.

Postscript

The journey through this project and the Doctor of Ministry program has been challenging both personally and professionally in many ways. This journey lasted longer than expected and many family and ministry situations have happened during this time.

I started this journey right before the birth of my second son. He was premature and developed a brain hemorrhage within the first 10 days of his life. Through God's grace and mercy, he overcame these obstacles. Then 10 months later, several circumstances transpired which caused me to take a leave of absence from ministry, not knowing if I would ever return to pastoral ministry. Fortunately, another ministry opportunity opened up after the first two months of this leave.

Another few years and I found another transition to another ministry appointment in order to help my wife be closer to campus to finish her seminary degree and explore her own calling into pastoral ministry. In the meantime, due to unforeseen situations, we also began an incredible journey of homeschooling our two sons.

This has been a long, hard six-year journey, but through it I have seen the importance of calling. I have seen my wife struggle and discern her own calling into pastoral ministry. I have realized how my calling into ministry has allowed me to persevere through some of the lowest points I have every experienced in sixteen years of

being a pastor. Mentors and peer relationships have been significant, but looking back I can see that is my calling into ministry that sustained me to remain in pastoral ministry instead of leaving when other opportunities made more sense.

I hope that in the future I can demonstrate how mentoring and calling can fit together in a holistic approach to pastoral ministry.

APPENDIXES

A.   Ministry Mentoring Survey

B.   Informed Consent Letter

APPENDIX A

Ministry Mentoring Survey

Please select ONE answer for the following.

1.	Gender Male [ ] Female [ ]

2.	Age
	[ ] 25 to 34 [ ] 35 to 44 [ ] 45 to 54 [ ] 55 to 64 [ ] 65 to 75
	[ ] 75 or older

3.	Marital Status
	[ ] Single [ ] Married [ ] Divorce

4.	District presently served.
	[ ] Bluegrass [ ] Lexington

5.	Ministry setting
	[ ] rural [ ] small town/city [ ] urban/suburban

6.	Position title
	[ ] Pastor (no other staff) [ ] Senior pastor [ ] Associate Pastor

7.	Years in appointed ministry.
	[ ] less than one year [ ] 1-3 years [ ] 4-7 years

	[ ] 8-15 years [ ] 16-25 years [ ] more than 25 years

8.	Level of Satisfaction with your current congregation/ministry appointment?
		[ ] Very satisfied
		[ ] Satisfied
		[ ] Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
		[ ] Dissatisfied
		[ ] Very dissatisfied

	Can you please explain your answer in a few sentences?

9.   Do you currently participate in a Wesleyan style class meeting or band?
         [ ] Yes   [ ] No

10.   Description of your mentoring relationship:
       [ ] I am mentoring/helping a pastor with less experience than myself
       [ ] I am mentoring/helping more than one pastor with less experience than
            myself
       [ ] A pastor with more experience is mentoring/helping me.
       [ ] More than one pastor with more experience is mentoring/helping me.
       [ ] I am in a group of peer/near peer pastors; we mentor/help each other
       [ ] I am not currently in a mentoring relationship

       Can you please explain your answer in a few sentences?

11.   Description of your current relationship with God?
       [ ] Very close
       [ ] Somewhat close
       [ ] Neither close nor distant
       [ ] Somewhat distant
       [ ] Very distant

       Can you please explain your answer in a few sentences?

12.   How often do you think about leaving ministry/transitioning away from pastoral
       ministry?

       [ ] Very Often
       [ ] Often
       [ ] Not at all
       [ ] Rarely
       [ ] Very Rarely

       Can you please explain your answer in a few sentences?

13.   If you could make a move into another career for the same level of compensation, would you?

[   ] Yes   [   ] No

Can you please explain your answer in a few sentences?

14.   What is your view of future generations of church pastoral leadership in the Kentucky Annual Conference?

[   ] I am very concerned
[   ] I am concerned
[   ] I am neither concerned nor encouraged
[   ] I am encouraged
[   ] I am very encouraged.

Can you please explain your answer in a few sentences?

15.   How often do you engage in spiritual/religious practices for your own personal growth?
[ ] Daily   [ ] Several times a week   [ ] Weekly   [ ] Seldom/Rarely

[ ] Not at all

16. How often do you try to engage with other clergy (not required)?

[   ] Very often
[   ] Often
[   ] Neither often nor Seldom
[   ] Seldom
[   ] Not at all

17. I meet with clergy who are: [   ] less experienced   [   ] more experienced [   ] peers

Please explain your answer in a few sentences for the following questions:

18. If you are in a mentoring relationship, how has this affected your satisfaction with ministry?

19. How has being in a mentoring relationship affected your spirituality?

20. How has being in a mentoring relationship affected your perspective and feelings regarding future generations of pastoral leadership?

21. Do you have any additional comments?

APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT LETTER

You are invited to be in a research study being done by Charles Shoemaker a doctoral student from the Asbury Theological Seminary. You are invited because you are an ordained clergy serving in a local church appointment.

If you agree to be in the study, you will be asked to fill out the following questionnaire comprised of multiple choice and open response answer questions. There will be no compensation for participation. If anyone else is given information about you, they will not know your name. A number or initials will be used instead of your name. All surveys will be confidential. Open response questions will be edited to make sure you will not be identified. If something makes you feel uncomfortable in any way while you are in the study, please tell Charles Shoemaker who can be reached at charles.shoemaker@asburyseminary.edu. You can refuse to respond to any or all of the questions, and you will be able to withdrawal from the process at any time without penalty.

If you have any questions about the research study please contact Charles Shoemaker at charles.shoemaker@asburyseminary.edu.

Clicking YES means that you have read this or had it read to you, and that you want to be in the study. If you do not want to be in the study, click NO. Being in the study is up to you, and no one will be mad if you do not click YES or even if you change your mind later. You agree that you have been told about this study and why it is being done and what to do.

WORKS CITED

Ackerman, S., et al. "Generativity in Midlife and Young Adults: Links to Agency, Communion, and Subjective Well-Being." *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 2000.

Adams, Christopher, et al. "Clergy Burnout: A Comparison Study with Other Helping Professions." *Pastoral Psychology*, vol. 66, no. 2, Apr. 2017, pp. 147–75. *EBSCOhost*, doi:10.1007/s11089-016-0722-4.

Allen, Tammy D., et al. "Career Benefits Associated With Mentoring for Proteges: A Meta-Analysis." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 89, no. 1, Feb. 2004, pp. 127–36. 2004-10572-010, *EBSCOhost*, doi:10.1037/0021-9010.89.1.127.

Bakan, D. *The Duality of Human Existence*. Rand McNally & Co., 1966.

Bell, Judith. *Doing Your Research Project: A Guide for First-Time Researchers in Education and Social Science.* 3rd ed., Open University Press, 1999.

Bock, Darrell. *Luke*. Baker.

Brînzea, Victoria-Mihaela. *REVERSE MENTORING – WHEN GENERATION Y BECOMES THE TRAINER WITHIN A MULTI-GENERATIONAL WORKFORCE*. p. 6.

Bronfenbrenner, U. *The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design*. Harvard University Press, 1979.

Bruce, F. F. *The Epistles to the Colossians to Philemon and to Ephesians*. Eerdmans, 1984.

Brueggemann, Walter. *Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary: 1 & 2 Kings*. Smyth & Helwys Publishing, 2000.

Burns, James MacGregor. *Leadership*. Harper & Row Publishers, 1978.

---. *Transforming Leadership: A New Pursuit of Happiness*. Atlantic Monthly Press, 2003.

Chng, Alex Peng Liam. *The Impact of Burnout and Spiritual Well-Being on the Job Satisfaction of Pastors within the Methodist Church in Singapore*. Asbury Theological Seminary Dissertation, 2011.

Clarke, Victoria, and Virginia Braun. "Thematic Analysis." *Analysing Qualitative Data in Psychology*, 2nd ed., Sage.

Clergy-Age-Report-2018.Pdf. https://www.churchleadership.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Clergy-Age-Report-2018.pdf. Accessed 3 Feb. 2020.

Cobb, Cory L., et al. "From Advising to Mentoring: Toward Proactive Mentoring in Health Service Psychology Doctoral Training Programs." *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, vol. 12, no. 1, Feb. 2018, pp. 38–45. 2017-54859-001, *EBSCOhost*, doi:10.1037/tep0000187.

Coleman, Robert E. *The Master Plan of Evangelism*. Revell, 1963.

Collins, Gary R. *Christian Coaching: Helping Others Turn Potential into Reality*. Second, NavPress, 2009.

Crandall, Ron. *Turnaround Strategies for the Small Church*. Abingdon, 1995.

Creps, Earl. *Reverse Mentoring*. Josey-Bass, 2008.

Creswell, John W. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design*. Sage, 2007.

d' Aubigne', Jean Henri Merle. *For God and His People: Ulrich Zwingli and the Swiss Reformation*. BJU Press, 2000.

Davis, Stephen F., and Randolph A. Smith. *An Introduction to Statistics and Research Methods: Becoming a Pyschological Detective*. Pearson Education, 2005.

DeLong, Thomas J., et al. "Why Mentoring Matters in a Hypercompetitive World." *Harvard Business Review*, vol. 86, no. Januay, 2008, pp. 115–22.

Egeler, Daniel. *Mentoring Millenials: Shaping the Next Generation*. NavPress, 2003.

Engstrom, Ted, and Ron Jenson. *The Making of a Mentor: Nine Essential Characteristics of Influential Christians Leaders*. Authentic Media, WorldVision, 2005.

Erikson, E. H. *Childhood and Society*. Norton, 1950.

---. *Insight and Responsibility*. Norton, 1964.

Erikson, Erik. *Identity, Youth, and Crisis*. Norton, 1968.

Fine, Leslie M., and Ellen Bolman Pullins. "Peer Mentoring in the Industrial Sales Force: An Exploratory Investigation of Men and Women in Developmental Relationships." *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, vol. 18, no. 4, Fall 1998, pp. 89–103. *EBSCOhost*, http://ezproxy.asburyseminary.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=buh&AN=1343548&site=eds-live.

Fischer, Constance T. *Qualitative Research Methods for Psychologists*. Academic Press/Elsevier, 2006.

Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. Basic Books, 2000.

Gotian, Ruth. "Mentoring the Mentors: Just Because You Have the Title Doesn't Mean You Know What You Are Doing." *College Student Journal*, vol. 50, no. 1, Spring 2016, p. 1. *EBSCOhost*, http://ezproxy.asburyseminary.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=f5h&AN=114159638&site=eds-live.

Greenleaf, Robert K. *Severant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness--25th Anniversary Edition*. Kindle Edition, Paulist Press/Amazon Digital Services.

Henderson, Michael. *A Model for Making Disciples – John Wesley's Class Meeting*. p. 4.

---. *A Model for Making Disciples: John Wesley's Class Meeting*. Francis Asbury Press, 1997.

Hobbs, T. R. *World Biblical Commentary: 2 Kings*. Word Books, 1985.

---. *World Biblical Commentary: 2 Kings*. Edited by David Hubbard and Glenn Barker, Word

    Books, 1985.

Hodge, D. R., and J. E. Wenger. *Experiences of Protestant Ministers Who Left Local Church

    Ministry*. Relgious Research Association, 2003.

House, Paul R. *The New American Commentary: 1 & 2 Kings*. Broadman & Holman, 1995.

Hulta, V., and D. C. Zuroff. "Examining Mediations of the Link Between Generativity and

    Well-Being." *Journal of Adult Development*, 2007.

Irwin, L. Gail. "Blurring the Lines: CAN RETIRING PASTORS MENTOR THEIR OWN

    SUCCESSORS?" *The Christian Century*, vol. 134, no. 3, Feb. 2017, pp. 20–24.

    EBSCOhost,

    http://ezproxy.asburyseminary.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.a

    spx?direct=true&db=rfh&AN=ATLAiG0V170213001633&site=eds-live.

Johnson, W. B., et al. "Relational Mentoring in Clinical Supervision: The Transformational

    Supervisor." *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, vol. 70, 2014.

Johnson, W. Brad, et al. "Ethics and Relational Dialectics in Mentoring Relationships."

    Training and Education in Professional Psychology, vol. 12, no. 1, Feb. 2018, pp. 14–

    21. 2017-30687-001, *EBSCOhost*, doi:10.1037/tep0000166.

Jones, Gwilyn H. *New Century Bible Commentary: 1 & 2 King*. Eerdmans, 1984.

Jung, C. J. *Pscyche and Symbol*. Doulbeday, 1958.

Keller, Tim. *Center Church: Doing Balance, Gospel Center Ministry in Your City*. Zondervan,

    2012.

Knopik, Nick. *Generativity Development of College Students Who Mentor*. p. 111.

Kotre, J. *Outliving the Self: Generativity and the Interpretation of Lives*. Johns Hopkins

    University Press, 1984.

Krallman, Gunter. *Mentoring for Mission: A Handbook on Leadership Principles Exemplified by Christ*. Gabriel Publishing, 2002.

Kram, K. E. *Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life*. Scott Foresman, 1985.

Kram, Kathy E. "Phases of the Mentor Relationship." *The Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 26, no. 4, 1983, p. 608. *EBSCOhost*,

http://ezproxy.asburyseminary.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsjsr&AN=edsjsr.255910&site=eds-live.

Kreider, Larry. *Authentic Spiritual Mentoring*. Regal, 2008.

Levinson, D. J., et al. *Seasons of a Man's Life*. Knopf, 1978.

Long, Jesse C., Jr. *The College Press NIV Commentary: 1 & 2 Kings*. College Press, 2002.

Mansfield, E., and D. McAdams. "Generativity and Themes of Agency and Communion in Adult Autobiogrophies." *Society for Personal and Social Psychology*, 1986.

Maslach, Christina. *Burnout, the Cost of Caring*. Prentice Hall, 1982.

May, Herbert G., and Bruce M. Metzger. *"Note on 2 Kings 2:12." The New Oxford Annotated Bible*. Oxford University Press, 1977.

McAdams, D. P., et al. "Complexity and Generativity at Midlife: Relations Among Social Motives, Ego Development, and Adults' Plans for the Future." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1986.

McAdams, D. P., and E. de St. Aubin. "A Theory of Generativity and Its Assessement Through Self-Report, Behavior Acts, and Narrative Themese in Autobiography." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1992.

McKinsey, Elizabeth. "Faculty Mentoring Undergraduates: The Nature, Development, and Benefits of Mentoring Relationships." *Teaching & Learning Inquiry: The ISSOTL Journal, Vol 4, Iss 1, Pp 1-15 (2016)*, no. 1, 2016, p. 1. *EBSCOhost*, doi:10.20343/teachlearninqu.4.1.5.

Meister, J. C., and K. Willyerd. "Mentoring Millennials." *Harvard Business Review*, 2010.

Mentoring: Definitions and Principles - University of Reading.

> https://www.reading.ac.uk/engageinmentoring/what-is-mentoring/eim-
>
> definitions.aspx. Accessed 21 Sept. 2019.

Miller, Delbert C. *Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement*. Sage, 1991.

Morris, Bestsy. "So You're a Player, Do You Need a Coach?" *Fortune*.

Mullholland, M. Robert. "Acts." *Asbury Bible Commentary*, Zondervan, 1992.

Newton, Phil A. *The Mentoring Church : How Pastors and Congregations Cultivate Leaders*.

> Grand Rapids, MI : Kregel Publications, [2017], 2017.

Nolan, Jessica M., et al. "She Who Teaches Learns: Performance Benefits of a Jigsaw Activity

> in a College Classroom." *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology*, vol. 4,
>
> no. 2, June 2018, pp. 93–104. 2018-34247-003, *EBSCOhost*, doi:10.1037/stl0000110.

NW, 1615 L. St, et al. "Defining Generations: Where Millennials End and Generation Z

> Begins." *Pew Research Center*, https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-
>
> tank/2019/01/17/where-millennials-end-and-generation-z-begins/. Accessed 4
>
> Feb. 2020.

Oakes, Charles G. *Mentoring for an Audience of One: A Call for Purity of Motive and Practice*.

> Providence House.

Peer, Near-Peer, and Mentor Support | DO-IT. https://www.washington.edu/doit/peer-near-

> peer-and-mentor-support. Accessed 21 Sept. 2019.

Ransbottom-Stallons, Judith L. *Following Our Rabbi: Discovering an Apprentice Model of

> Discipleship*. Asbury Theological Seminary Dissertation, 2017.

*Reverse Mentoring at Work: Fostering Cross-generational Learning and Developing Millennial

> Leaders - Marcinkus Murphy - 2012 - Human Resource Management - Wiley Online*

Library. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/hrm.21489. Accessed 21 Sept. 2019.

Riessman, Catherine Kohler. *Narrative Analysis*. Sage, 1993.

Robinson, Natasha. *Mentor for Life: Finding Purpose Throuhg Intentional Discipleship*. Zondervan, 2016.

Rossi, A. S. "Developmental Roots of Adult Social Responsibility." *Domians of Family , Work, and Community*, University of Chicago, 2001.

Sensing, Tim. *Qualitative Research: A Multi-Methods Apporach to Projects for Doctor of Ministry Theses*. Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2011.

Simpson, Charles. *Challenge to Care*. Servan Publications, 1996.

Sinek, Simon. *Start With Why: How Great Leaders Insprire Everyone to Take Action*. Portfolio, 2009.

Spector, Paul E. *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessement, Cause, and Consequences*. Sage, 1997.

Spencer, R. "It's Not What I Expected: A Qualitative Study of Youth Mentoring Relationship Failures." *Journal of Adolesence*, vol. 22, 2007, pp. 331–54.

Stanley, Paul D., and J. Robert Clinton. *Connecting: The Mentoring Relationship You Need to Suceed in Life*. NavPress, 1992.

Suffrin, Rachael L., et al. "An Ecological Perspective of Mentor Satisfaction with Their Youth Mentoring Relationships." *Journal of Community Psychology*, vol. 44, no. 5, July 2016, pp. 553–68. *EBSCOhost*, doi:10.1002/jcop.21785.

Sweeney, Marvin A. *I & II Kings*. Westminister John Knox Press, 2007.

Taherian, Kasra, and Mina Shekarchian. "Mentoring for Doctors. Do Its Benefits Outweigh Its Disadvantages?" *Medical Teacher*, vol. 30, no. 4, May 2008, pp. 95–99. *EBSCOhost*, doi:10.1080/01421590801929968.

The State of Pastors: How Today's Faith Leaders Are Navigating Life and Leadership in a Age

    of Complexity. Barna Group, 2017.

Wagner, Claire, and Jacques du Toit. "A Qualitative Study of Interdisciplinary Near-Peer

    Research Mentoring in Professional Training." *Training and Education in*

    Professional Psychology, Oct. 2018. 2018-49343-001, *EBSCOhost*,

    doi:10.1037/tep0000213.

Watson, David. *Accountable Discipleship: Handbook for Covenant Discipleship Groups in the*

    Congregatoin. Revised, Discpleship Resources, 1984.

"What Does It Mean to Be a Disciple and to Disciple Others?" *The Good Book Blog - Biola*

    University Blogs, https://www.biola.edu/blogs/good-book-blog/2016/what-does-

    it-mean-to-be-a-disciple-and-to-disciple-others. Accessed 21 Sept. 2019.

Wilson, James A., and Nancy S. Elman. "Organizational Benefits of Mentoring." *Executive*

    (19389779), vol. 4, no. 4, Nov. 1990, pp. 88–94. *EBSCOhost*,

    doi:10.5465/AME.1990.4277215.

Wright, Elizabeth A. "Survey Says…Mentors Reap Benefits of Mentoring." *Utah Bar Journal*,

    vol. 25, no. 4, Aug. 2012, pp. 35–38. *EBSCOhost*,

    http://ezproxy.asburyseminary.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.a

    spx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=78295651&site=eds-live.

Wright, Walter C. *Mentoring: The Promise of Relational Leadership*. Pasternoster, 2004.