

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

## Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

---

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

---

3-1-1971

### The Multiple Pastor Ministry: Profile of a Psychological View Towards Initial Adjustment Dynamics

Douglas Lenser

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, [ir\\_lenserd@csl.edu](mailto:ir_lenserd@csl.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>

Digital Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)  
Commons

---

Network

#### Recommended Citation

Logo

Lenser, Douglas, "The Multiple Pastor Ministry: Profile of a Psychological View Towards Initial Adjustment Dynamics" (1971). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 785.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/785>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

THE MULTIPLE PASTOR MINISTRY:  
PROFILE OF A PSYCHOLOGICAL VIEW TOWARDS  
INITIAL ADJUSTMENT DYNAMICS

---

A Research Paper Presented to the Faculty  
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for elective  
P-200

---

by  
Douglas P. Lenser  
March 1971

  
Adviser

4-5-71

Dr. Rapp  
Research Paper

BV  
675  
L4

84947

CONCORDIA SEMINARY LIBRARY  
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	iii
<b>Chapter</b>	
I. A PROFILE OF DYNAMICS . . . . .	1
II. A PSYCHOLOGICAL VIEWPOINT . . . . .	6
III. BASIC IMPLICATIONS FOR BEHAVIOR . . . . .	19
IV. THE INDIVIDUAL FIELD . . . . .	22
V. THE GROUP FIELD . . . . .	26
VI. THE SENIOR PASTOR . . . . .	33
VII. THE ASSISTANT PASTOR . . . . .	38
VIII. INITIAL ADJUSTMENT . . . . .	41
IX. THE APPLICABILITY OF THESE DYNAMICS-- SELECTED FIELD FEEDBACK . . . . .	46
APPENDIX . . . . .	51
FOOTNOTES . . . . .	53
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	57

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Pastoral Divisions of Labor . . . . .	29

## CHAPTER I

### A PROFILE OF DYNAMICS

In March, 1963, "Pastoral Psychology" dedicated its entire issue to the multiple ministry. The multiple ministry it referred to was that of having two or more pastors in the same congregation. The main thrust of this issue was to explore the results of some of the experiments which were trying to improve the multiple ministry. Some of these experiments also tried a co-pastor, or a team, ministry in which all pastors are supposed to be entirely equal in all respects. These experiments meet with varying degrees of success. Since that time, however, there has been no follow-up discussion of team, or multiple, ministries. Several books have come out which deal with various aspects of the multiple ministry. The mere fact that four major books have been published in this area from 1963 to 1969 is an indication of the need for information concerning the multiple ministry. This need is a result of the large numbers of multiple ministries being tried and the limited information about their character. The approach which is taken when evaluating the multiple ministry has definite implications for the perspective from which the multiple ministry is viewed, as can easily be seen from the different perspectives of these four major books. Moreover, because of the nature of the concerns of these books, there has been no work done on a real practical basis to describe

what should be considered in the initial phases of adjustment to the multiple ministry. The authors of these books, however, should not be condemned for this failure as their purpose was to explore the nature of the multiple ministry and not to give advice on the best ways to adjust to the multiple ministry. Each of these authors did make some suggestions as how to improve the nature of the multiple ministry but adjustment to this ministry was not treated as a special concern.

In this study the multiple ministry to be considered is the multiple pastor ministry in the typical arrangement of senior pastor and assistant pastor, or assistant pastors. Although many of the dynamics of the situation are the same, this study will not deal explicitly with the team ministry or the co-pastor ministry where an attempt is made to make each pastor equal in the eyes of the members of the congregation. Since the primary concern is that of the relationship of the pastors, other aspects of the multiple staff ministry including relationships with non-clergy staff will not be considered. This research paper is a profile of a psychological view because psychology is too large of a field of study to discuss all of the various theories and their relationship to the multiple pastoral ministry. The best study of this nature is Kenneth Mitchell's book: Psychological and Theological Relationships in the Multiple Staff Ministry. Even a full discussion of one of the psychologi-

cal view of the dynamics of working towards an initial adjustment to the multiple pastoral ministry. As implied by the word "dynamics" the psychological view of this paper is primarily that of Kurt Lewin's currently popular "field theory," although there are some references to other views, especially some aspects of the Freudian model. A complete discussion of the major psychological implications for group behavior, including that of the multiple pastoral ministry, can be found in Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander's book: Group Dynamics. Their book clearly presents the current status of psychological investigations and theories on group behavior. It also reminds the reader that there is not as yet a complete understanding of all aspects of group dynamics. Enough data has been compiled and interpreted, however, that some guidelines can be given for an interpretation of the psychological relationships in the multiple pastor ministry. These guidelines must be considered dated and subject to review by the findings of further research in the area of group dynamics. The primary sources of this paper's view of the multiple pastoral ministry are Cartwright and Zander's Group Dynamics and Mitchell's Psychological and Theological Relationships . . . for the field theory view and Goerge Lehner and Ella Kube's The Dynamics of Personal Adjustment for some views from the Freudian model. This general psychological view was then used to evaluate the three general works on the multiple ministry: Herman Sweet's



The Multiple Staff in the Local Church, Martin Anderson's Multiple Ministries, and Marvin Judy's The Multiple Staff.

This report on research follows a similar approach as it first considers the perspective from which the multiple pastor ministry is to be viewed. The possible psychological orientations are listed along with this papers' primary emphasis on the field theory model, which is carefully described. Field coherence and field functioning are explained relative to the multiple pastor ministry. The conceptions of "needs," "defense mechanisms," and "compensation" are taken from the Freudian model to fill in some of the pre-suppositions of the field theory model. This perspective is then used to consider the implications for behavioral response in the areas of authority of the minister and the definition of the field in which the minister operates. The field of the minister is considered from the individual and group perspectives. The individual field is considered on the basis of orientation and disruptive influences. The group field is considered on the basis of the group organism and the relations within the group. The position of the senior pastor is, then, considered in relationship to field clarity and field diffusion. These various viewpoints are then united in the explicit focusing on the dynamics of initial adjustment to the shared ministry in the multiple pastor ministry situation. Particular attention is paid to consideration of pre-field contact structuring, field contact,

joint field development, and field clarification. There is also some consideration of feedback from various fields. Finally, the question of the applicability of these dynamics to those about to enter the multiple pastor ministry is considered, with consideration of research still required.

## CHAPTER II

### A PSYCHOLOGICAL VIEWPOINT

The ministry by its very nature is primarily concerned with the theological aspects of the relationships of men to men and of men to God. Some ministers in an attempt to take care of the people under their direction occasionally take the time to consider these members in their relationship to the church life. When these people are considered, it is deemed important to consider the theological framework from which their lives are considered. Yet when these same ministers consider the "practical" aspects of the congregation's life, they seldom consider it important to consider the psychological framework of their "practical" view. Yet such a framework is important because of the many different orientations possible for the psychological framework. These orientations are not the same as schools of thought as they do not necessarily contradict with one another. It is possible to do as this paper does, that is, to hold two of the orientations at the same time. Cartwright and Zander list eight different theoretical approaches to group behavior. The group being considered theoretically in these approaches could be either the congregation as a group or the pastors as a group. The first of these approaches is Kurt Lewin's approach of "field theory" which sees the group behavior as being a result of different forces or vectors on the

group. The area in which the group operates is called the "life space" or the "social space" of the group. "The structural properties of this field are represented by concepts from topology and set theory, and the dynamic properties by means of concepts of psychological and social forces."<sup>1</sup> The second approach is the "interaction theory." It "conceives of a group as a system of interacting individuals. The basic concepts . . . are activity, interaction, and sentiment."<sup>2</sup> The third approach considers the group as a system and thus is referred to as "system theories." This approach is similar to the field theory approach in that it is concerned with the equilibrium of the group but the major emphasis is on the "input" and "output" of the system.<sup>3</sup> The fourth approach "sociometric orientation . . . is concerned primarily with the interpersonal choices which bind groups of people together."<sup>4</sup> The fifth approach is the Freudian approach or the approach of "psychoanalytic theory." The major emphasis of Freud was on motivation based on needs and on defense mechanisms which were used by the individual of group. Many of these concepts have permeated general understandings of groups thus they will be briefly treated later. Although there has been little experimentation under this approach, some concepts have often been used in group work, in particular, the concepts of "identification, regression, defense mechanisms, and the unconscious."<sup>5</sup> Erikson and his developmental idea that individuals must pass through

developmental stages is related to the psychoanalytic approach. He says that the mature person passes through the three crises of identity, intimacy and generativity in late adolescence and early adulthood. Successful resolution of these crises will improve the individual and thus his process in the group while failure will create difficulties for the group. Some major suggestions are:

If the adolescent fails to establish at least the rudiments of an identity, the unfortunate consequence is role confusion; he is uncertain of himself, his work and his goals.

. . . With adequate ego strength a person is able to commit himself to, and abide by, an intimate relation.

. . . Inherent in such generativity is the openness to adaption, the objectivity which permits evaluation and correction, and the perseverance which carries a task to its completion, satisfying work encourages the chosen identity. Without such generativity a man will stagnate.

The sixth theoretical approach referred to is called "cognitive theory." Technically speaking it is not really a theory but rather a general point of view which sees importance in understanding the individual himself in order to understand how he acts in groups. Thus this approach uses as a basis the major theories of motivation, learning and perception.<sup>6</sup> The seventh approach is the "empiricistic-statistical orientation" which, as the name implies, emphasizes concepts of group dynamics which are discovered by statistical analysis of data, rather than on concepts formulated "a priori" by theorists. An area especially used in

this orientation is that of personality testing.<sup>7</sup> The eighth and last orientation is that of some writers who have attempted to construct "formal models" in order to deal rigorously with a few limited aspects of groups. Usually these models contain some assumptions drawn from the social sciences, but the emphasis is more on the formal discipline than on a comprehensive and substantial theory.<sup>8</sup>

Using a combination of the psychoanalytic and field theory approaches, David Krech and Richard Crutchfield made the following list of fourteen leadership functions:

These functions may perhaps be exercised singly or, more often, in combination with each other. The choice which a leader makes from among these functions . . . is a determinative factor in the orientation and morale of the group. The leader as executive. The function of an executive is that of seeing to it that the work of the group is actually accomplished. . . . The leader as planner. Once a group has settled upon its goals, there is an intermediate step between this decision and the actual carrying out of the goals--planning. . . . The leader as policy maker. The making of policy may come from a source entirely outside the group. But if neither of these two alternatives holds true, it may be the leader himself who determines policy. . . . The leader as expert. The possession of necessary information tends to make of a person one around whom authority centers. . . . The leader as external group representative. . . . The leader as controller of internal relationships. This function may be exercised in a number of ways. The leader who uses this function may be the "switchboard" through which all items of information between group members must pass. He may determine, in terms of field theory, the position and locomotion of group members. . . . The leader as purveyor of rewards and punishments. . . . The leader as arbitrator and mediator. . . . The leader as exemplar. . . . The leader as symbol of the group. . . . The leader as surrogate for individual responsibility. . . . The leader as ideologist. . . . The leader<sup>10</sup> as father figure. . . . The leader as scapegoat.

According to Krech and Crutchfield, a leader does not take on all of these functions at one time. In fact, they point out that a good leader, that is, a leader who moves a group, delegates some of these functions or else never assumes them. Before significant observations about these leadership functions can be made, it is first necessary to understand the field theory model better.

In the field theory model the term "life space" is used to signify the basis setting of the group. This concept has been well explained as:

life space consists of the individual and the psychological environment as it exists for him. . . . One may speak of the field in which a group or institution exists with precisely the same meaning as one speaks of the individual life space in individual psychology. The life space of a group, therefore, consists of the group and its environment as it exists for the group.<sup>11</sup>

Another basic concept of the field theory model is "interdependence," which means as the term implies, that the parts of a life space are interdependent on each other. Without this concept, the model would not be as useful because it would be harder to use the ideas from physics. "Contemporaneity" is yet another basic concept. This idea means that the past and future do not effect the life space in the present, the life space which is under consideration. This idea, however, does not mean that the past and future have no bearing on the present, for there is a psychological past and a psychological future, that is, a past and future which exist as present concepts in an individual's mind and thus

are a part of the psychological fields which exist for him at a given time. So then the type of behavior exhibited depends on the total field at that time but not on a past field or on a future field. While the concepts of interdependence and contemporaneity ensure the existence of a group life space, the effect of one's behavior upon that life space may be seen in relation to his position in the life space, in common terms this effect would be called his influence on others.

Within a group, a person may have a fixed position he may be capable of locomotion. The possibility of locomotion, so long as it is not exercised, is referred to as force. . . . Structure refers to the relatedness of a variety of positions, viewed as a whole. Without force or locomotion, a field may be static; with either force or locomotion or both, a field may be dynamic.<sup>12</sup>

A particularly vital concept is that of power which is defined as "the possibility of inducing forces."<sup>13</sup> This means that in any given field there is the possibility of changing the forces on the field and thereby changing the positions in the field. The person who would hold power over a given field could be said to be a person with authority as he has the capability of altering the structure of the field and thus changing the field.

Using these basic concepts of field theory it becomes apparent that there are three possible fields towards which a minister might be orientated. The possible fields are:

The field that focuses upon the minister's own personal developmental needs, the field that centers



around the organization and maintenance of the staff and its relationships, and the field that centers around the work of the staff. Each of these fields exerts a profound influence on the individual minister.<sup>14</sup>

The primary concern of this paper is the second field, the field which deals with the relationships between staff. The multiple pastor staff belongs to two different life spaces. One is the small life space of group leaders, where one pastor fulfills the leadership functions. The other is the life space of the congregation where all the ministers fulfill, in varying degrees, the leadership functions. Regardless of which of these groups is to be examined, there are two basic needs which are met by leadership functions. The most basic need of a group is that it maintains its existence, that is, that it cohere. Mitchell calls functions that meet this need maintenance functions, and he calls the principles that lead to the successful performance of the maintenance functions principles of coherence. The second need which is met by leadership in a group is the need of the group to orient itself toward meaningful tasks and to perform these tasks. Leadership functions meeting this need could be called enabling functions, while the principles that lead to successful completion of meaningful tasks can be called principles of functioning. Incidentally, there is some group behavior which is not orientated toward either of these needs.<sup>15</sup> Since so much of the group behavior is determined by the needs for coherence and good functioning,

these field characteristics will be examined more closely.

There are five major principles of coherence. Each of these principles is related to the multiple ministry and is important for group coherence but no one is sufficient by itself to give enough coherence to enable a group to perform successful maintenance functions. The first principle is: "A multiple staff will tend to remain more stable and coherent if . . . each member . . . finds an opportunity to work out the meaning of his relationship to Jesus Christ . . ." <sup>16</sup> and his relationship to the rest of the staff. In psychological terms, we could say, a multiple pastor field will tend to cohere if each pastor is aware of his identity as it relates to his fellow pastor and as it relates to the overall motivating force in his life--Jesus Christ. The second principle of group coherence is that the group will tend to be more coherent if open and free communication between the group members, the pastors, is encouraged. The cohesive force of this principle has been demonstrated for democratically structured groups; thus it is vital to a strong field. In Erikson terms, the development of a personal identity would be describes as dependent upon communication of values. The very communication with another is one answer to the threat of nonbeing. <sup>17</sup> The third principle of group coherence is that the group will tend to be more coherent if the value of each pastor's contribution to the ministry of the group is appreciated. <sup>18</sup> This principle is related to

the member's identity. The previous principle dealt with the necessity of communication for value formation. This principle deals with the source of that value formation. The implication is that if the individual pastors cannot make their perception of themselves in this field congruent with the perception of others, then the group coherence will be weakened as the pastor seeks mutual congruence perceptions outside of this field. The fourth principle of group coherence is that each group will tend to be more coherent if the negative aspects of the pastor's relations are appropriately dealt with. The negative aspects would be any signs which would indicate some lack in the group or individual pastor functioning. The appropriate dealing referred to here would mean "open acknowledgment, clear delineation of issues, and attempts at repair or reconciliation at the least."<sup>19</sup> The fifth, and last, principle of group coherence is that each group will tend to be more coherent if it regularly redefines its goals and the methods of developing its ministry.<sup>20</sup> In field theory terms, this principle would be explained by saying that the orientation of the group must be regularly redefined because of changes in the direction and impact of forces influencing the behavior of the group. Some of these directional and impact changes are due to changes within the life space of the group. Other changes are due to changes in forces outside of the control of the group. The ability of a group to maintain a "we feeling"

in the face of these changes, which is accomplished primarily through clear perception of goals and methods of achieving these goals, is a positive factor in maintaining the cohesiveness of the group.

The principles of functioning are closely related to those of coherence. The principles of coherence deal with the present status of the group, whereas the principles of functioning deal with the operation of the group with direct implications on the future status. The first principle of functioning is that the multiple pastoral staff will tend to perform the functions of its ministry more effectively if the pastors have agreed on clearly defined goals.<sup>21</sup> If there is not agreement on clear goals, the pastors may have different orientations as to the direction in which their ministry is proceeding. Different directions in a dynamic group life space will be a negative factor in group functioning and eventually a negative factor in group cohesion. Agreement on the same direction, or goal, of a group life space will be a positive factor in group functioning. The second principle of functioning is that the multiple pastor ministry will tend to function more effectively if the pastors realize pastoral life space is a model for the congregational life space. In other words, the pastoral life space has the power to change the forces and locomotion in the congregational life space. This power and the application of it generate a direction in the congregational life space parallel to that followed in the

pastoral life space. Once this power is recognized, the pastors become more aware of the forces impinging on them.

Once we perceive our actions and our relationships are significant to others, we become more self-conscious about the meaning and the nature of our actions and relationships. . . . The norms for congregational relationships as defined in church standards may become norms for relationships among minister.<sup>22</sup>

The third principle of functioning is that the multiple pastor ministry will tend to function more effectively if the pastors provide for the regular exercise by one or more of its members of the necessary leadership functions. Generally leadership as position, that is leadership conferred by some authority, is the same as leadership functions, the actual leadership behavior; however, Mitchell argues that groups function best when leadership behaviors are accomplished without formal regard to the leadership position of the person performing them.<sup>23</sup> The basic idea behind this principle is that there are certain leadership functions that must be carried out under the direction of the pastors, but if they are not carried out under their direction, they will be carried out by someone outside of their direction. Thus the performance of these non-directed leadership functions could easily be in a direction different from that of the pastors and thereby be a negative influence on group effectiveness. The fourth and last principle of functioning is that the multiple pastor ministry will tend to function more effectively if adequate provision is made for each pastor to have

authority, responsibility, and accountability.

It is important that each member of the staff have clearly defined functions and tasks for which he is: a) provided with sufficient authority to insure performance of the functions; b) responsible to that staff, the governing bodies of the church, and the congregation; and c) accountable to the senior pastor or some other person with the authority of supervision and review.<sup>24</sup>

In field theory terms, each member of the pastoral life space will tend to be more effective if he has reliable feedback on the effect of his uses of power as he deals with the congregational life space.

The field theory in general and these principles in particular form one useful way of looking at the dynamics of a group. Some of the concepts from Freud's model are also useful. Freud postulated the existence of various needs in an individual and group. Frustration would result if these needs were not met. The three main sources of frustration are: 1) aspects of our physical environment which act as obstacles, 2) our biological limitations, and 3) the complexity of our psychological make-up.<sup>25</sup> When needs are inadequately satisfied, or frustrated, then the individual or group has a secondary need to explain its failure or to develop a defense to obscure the failure. The mechanisms by which explanations for failure or defenses from failure are constructed by a group or individuals are called defense mechanisms. The general characteristics of defense mechanisms are:

1. An individual uses defense mechanisms to cope with frustrations he encounters in the course of his development. They are learned forms of behavior.

2. Defense mechanisms serve to protect the individual from threats to his security.

3. Everyone has suffered frustration at some point in his life. Whether defense mechanisms are adjustive or maladjustive depends on the extent to which the individual utilizes them.

4. The individual who can maintain some flexibility in his approach to problems will be able, in general, to deal more adequately with frustration and conflict than the person who tries to solve all his problems on the basis of a single approach.

5. Defense mechanisms cease to be adjustive when: a) our imagined world becomes consistently more satisfying than our real world, b) they obscure the real nature of the problem confronting us and the source of our conflicts, and c) they lead to cumulative maladaptions.<sup>26</sup>

These same general principles of defense mechanisms have been applied to groups as well as to individuals as the note listed above indicates.

## CHAPTER III

### BASIC IMPLICATIONS FOR BEHAVIOR

Fitzgerald combines the Fruedian model and the Erikson framework when he deals with the concept of identity and the defense mechanism of projection, which mechanism is often used by congregations.

I would also like to suggest a congregational complicity in this moratorium: cf., the common and understandable longing for a "father-figure" as a pastor. . . . The young pastor has to be (or look to be) close to 35 before he surmounts this hurdle; possibly the prime years of pastoral performance are between 40 and 60. In effect, the pastor is confronted with an extended moratorium which, in turn, serves to prolong the identity crisis. And it may be assumed that instability at this stage will disrupt the complementary stages of intimacy and generativity. . . . Consequently, if the identity has not yet been accorded adequate recognition, various attempt may be made to compensate for the deprivation. One strategem is for the pastor to resolve steadfastly that he will not get close to any member of his congregation. Such a position may be predicated upon a questionable understanding of intimacy: e.g., "if you express the way you really feel about a person the relationship will be broken"--i.e., "my job will be in jeopardy." From another perspective, this may partially explain a universal congregational peculiarity: the demand for a married pastor. Such a status may be enough to satisfy the membership that their pastor does have an identity, and he is capable of expressing at least one acceptable form of intimacy.<sup>27</sup>

In a pastoral situation the identity of a pastor is related to the authority which he has. Niebuhr has postulated six sources of the authority of the minister. In the multiple pastor ministry there are three main sources of authority for each pastor. These sources are the ordinal, the charismatic, and the functional. The ordinal source of authority



refers to the authority given to a pastor because of his position. Thus, by his position, the senior pastor has more authority than other pastors. The charismatic source of authority refers to the ability of a pastor to have authority over other pastors because of his ability, his personality or his enthusiasm. Functionally derived authority comes from the particular function the pastor is performing without any necessary confirmation by ordinal or charismatic authority. The ordinal authority is primarily administrative as it is largely related to the church structures and their rules. Charismatic authority is primarily pastoral authority as it is based on personal abilities rather than on structural formulations. Some administrative authority may have a charismatic source. "Functionally derived authority speaks neither of structures nor of qualities of character, but of opportunities; it may turn out to be pastoral or administrative, depending upon the needs of the situation."<sup>28</sup>

Identity and authority are just two of the factors involved in the field or life space of the multiple pastor ministry. Another factor in the development of an understanding of the nature of the field of the multiple pastor ministry is that of the leadership approach. If one pastor has an assertive directive leadership approach and the other pastor uses a more non-directive approach, it is important that the implications for functioning are understood by the pastors. If the implications are understood, then their ministry can

be a vital dynamic one. If, however, the implications of these different approaches are not understood, then the ministerial functioning may be negatively affected.<sup>29</sup>

Another factor very important in the life space of the multiple pastor ministry is the view each pastor has of the other, that is, if he considers the other pastor as being centrally located in his life space and thus a significant other or if he considers the other pastor as being peripherally located in his life space and thus a much less important force. A pastor becomes a significant other to the other members of the pastoral staff when:

- 1) his style of life and his values are aspects of himself that he is willing to share openly with us;
- 2) when he permits and encourages us to share these same personal matters with him;
- 3) when he appears to value us as individuals;
- 4) when his relationship to his own values appears to us to be meaningful, personally valuable, and not-threatening; and
- 5) when our relationships with each other seem to hold the promise of deeper sharing.<sup>30</sup>

The factors of identity, authority and relativeness to significant others are some of the basic factors in the construction and maintenance of the individual and group fields, or life spaces. These factors and the concepts of field theory will be applied to the individual and group fields separately.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE INDIVIDUAL FIELD

Some of the determinants of the individual field are established by the choice of words utilized to describe the group field in the multiple pastor ministry. The individual field of the pastor is particularly established by the terms employed to refer to the individual pastor. The term "senior pastor" determines the life space of one of the pastors. It is very significant what other terms are used to refer to the other pastors in the multiple pastor staff. The most commonly used terms are "assistant," "associate" and "co-pastor." The choice of name used usually indicates the position of the other pastor. The term "assistant" implies a secondary position. It is generally acceptable to the congregation when it is applied to a pastor just out of the seminary or who is young. However, its secondary inferred position is not generally acceptable when it is applied to an older, mature pastor. In such a case, the terms "associate" or "co-pastor" are more preferred because they presume some equality in position between the pastors.

Perhaps even more important than the terms employed to indicate position of the pastors, is the pastor's own conception of his life space and the direction he sees it going. When the field of the individual is considered relative to its direction, it should be noted that most individual fields

are orientated toward important goals in the future and the present goals are seen by the individual more as means to achieve these goals than as ends in themselves. Part of the reason for the emphasis on field orientation toward the future is that the middle class society in general thinks of progress as a virtue and the pastor in his individual field orientation is not immune to this force coming as an external pressure on his life space. The reason for the emphasis on orientation toward a future goal is that these future goals are ones that require a concerted effort before these goals are achieved. Often when this view is followed, "there is a tendency for man . . . to see work as the barrier that separates him from the things he really wants."<sup>31</sup> Whether the pastor is satisfied with his field is largely determined by the goals he has set for himself and the way he has channeled his resources to move in the direction of these goals.<sup>32</sup> A good, or responsible, life space is one which takes into account the effects of behavior upon the field and also takes into account the consequences of behavior of others as they react to our behavior attempting to move our field closer to our future goal.<sup>33</sup>

Once the individual pastor has a general conception of his own life space, he is usually content. But there are two main disruptive influences which can easily force restructuring of the field; they are threats of change in the field which are not desired by the pastor and the pastor's

emotional reactions to these threats.

How we deal with "threat--that is, situations involving danger, frustration, or attack--depends on the kind of persons we are (our self-structure), and upon the kinds of solutions we have learned to apply to our life problems.<sup>34</sup>

Some persons habitually react to threats by utilizing various defense mechanisms. The effects of the threats which cause anxiety is adjustment through the defense mechanisms falling in the general categories of 1) substitution, 2) self-deception, and 3) retreat. The types of defense mechanisms used in each category are:

1. Substitution: compensation, sublimation, substitution of socially approved goals for ones less likely to be approved, substitute activity--over eating, over sleeping, drinking, etc., conformity, phantasy or day-dreaming, regression, compulsiveness, obsessions and phobias, psychosomatic symptoms, accident-proneness, suicide.

2. Self-deception: repression, rationalization, logic tight compartments, perceptual rigidity, projection, displaced hostility, scapegoating, reaction formation (over reaction).

3. Adjustment through retreat: depression, shyness, hyperactivity, drugs and alcohol, psychosis, "flight from reality" and thus incompetent to manage their own affairs.<sup>35</sup>

On the other hand, the mature approach to threatening situations is:

to view them as occasions calling for skill and intelligence--that is, as problems to be solved. The individual who reacts to threat in this manner may decide that he should flee, fight or conform. Or he may be able to avoid the situation or reduce its threatening potential. The chief difference between emotional and problem-solving approaches is that the former is impulsive and the latter is more deliberate. One of the difficulties in adopting a rational approach to threatening situations is that the unconscious nature of

emotions often makes them difficult to identify and to cope with; an individual may take many pains to work out what he feels is a rational plan or procedure, only to discover that he was duped by his emotions into taking a distorted view of the realities of the situation.<sup>36</sup>

If a pastor is taking a distorted view of his life space, he is apt to feel insecure and be afraid to use force to modify the boundaries of his field and the direction in which it is heading. Some people have thought a pastor's insecure feelings are based on insufficient money and have not taken account of other aspects of the pastor's field dynamics. As Lindgren points out:

Money is not the cure-all for feelings of insecurity. The idea that increased income will solve our problems is not only fallacious and unrealistic, but it serves the purpose of diverting attention away from the real issue--why we live beyond our incomes, what the real reasons are for our worry about the future, etc. The chief shortcoming in these attitudes toward work is that they lead us to see work as a source of frustration rather than as a normal, natural, and healthy means of meeting our basic needs.<sup>37</sup>

Thus, the most efficient way of meeting the basic life space needs of the individual pastor is to see his life space as being orientated to his individual forces, resist the influences which would disrupt his field and to have his field moving the same general direction as the group field of which he is a part.

## CHAPTER V

### THE GROUP FIELD

The pastor in his individual field has no problem with coherence as he is one person, but the pastor in his group field has to be concerned with coherence and with group functioning. This implies that the pastor as he is a force in the group field should maintain an orientation to the dynamics of the congregational life space and not just an orientation to the dynamics of one segment of the congregational field. As Sweet puts it, "No one can ultimately sustain a fruitful ministry in a particular phase of church life apart from a vital relationships to all other phases."<sup>38</sup> If a pastor in a multiple pastor life space does not maintain an adequate orientation to the group life space, it is almost certain that coherence and functioning dynamics will be strongly effected negatively. In Sweet's words, "Corporate strength in the life of the congregation is even more important for a successful multiple staff operation than for a single pastor."<sup>39</sup>

The orientation of a pastor to the group is stressed because each pastor has an individual aim in adjustment and tends to be more effective when his group involvement is a result of an agreement of individual aims and group aims. A variety of methodology tends to be a positive factor in group cohesiveness and functioning when the pastors agree on the same aims. If there is not this agreement, then variety of

method tends to be a negative factor in group cohesiveness and functioning. It is extremely unusual for there to be complete agreement between pastors in all areas. Naturally where there is a difference in aims between pastors there will be a problem in their relationship to one another; the greater the difference is in aims, the greater the problem. These problems can not be adequately solved by focusing on one of the pastors by saying that the assistant is a troublemaker or that the senior does not allow any freedom. The problems are usually too large for this limited approach to work. It is the total dynamics of the pastors which must be examined rather than the life space of one of the pastors apart from the other. The problem is not with the individual pastor's life space but rather with his life space when his life space is expected to be similar to that of another pastor's in the group life space. Thus any attempt at problem solving must focus on the group life space rather than on the individual's life spaces. In more typical language we might say as Sweet does:

. . . problems can best be solved by shifting our focus to the overall nature of the church and the functions of the ministry as a whole. The prescription is a multiple one. First the church as a whole must clearly understand why it wants a multiple staff and what it expects from one. Secondly, the pastor must come to terms with the kind of administrator he really is. Third, there must be some clear structure within which the staff operates. Fourth, the pastor must review his own ministry. Fifth, the church must spend a year of study and preparation. Sixth, attention must be paid to the staff family relationships. Seventh, the jobs of all staff members must have job descriptions. Finally, distinct efforts to keep communications open must continually be made.<sup>40</sup>



The nature of the problem under consideration in this paper is what should be the nature of the individual life spaces of the pastors prior to their orientation within the same group life space and how should these different individual life spaces best meet the challenge of adjustment during their initial phases of contact and field structuring. One of the most popular ways of dealing with the individual life spaces of the pastors is to speak of their meaningful roles, such as Judy does when he speaks of the most satisfactory relationship between the individual fields as: ". . . that of complete acceptance on the part of the senior minister and associate that both are ministers with equal responsibilities and rights."<sup>41</sup> One of the advantages of speaking of meaningful roles is that it is somewhat easier for the average person to think in terms of the pastor's roles in the congregation than to think of the pastor's fields in the congregational life space. Yet the mention of meaningful roles, or even of fields and life spaces, is not helpful unless these concepts are related to the group dynamics. One of the more helpful ways of having the congregation think through the implications of the new group dynamics is to use the following table, Table I, so the congregation can begin to appreciate some of the forces acting on the individual ministers. One of the most common misunderstandings of the congregational members is that of the role the new pastor will have. They will often feel that since the church is getting some new help, ". . .

it will be calling someone who will immediately take up the slack in the area of that person's particular interest and concern."<sup>42</sup> When this misconception is not corrected, the field of the individual pastors will have many various forces directed at it in attempts to move the pastor's life space so that it is more in agreement with these congregational member's own life space rather than trying to see that the pastor's life space is in agreement with the total congregational life space. Another negative factor in the development of the group life space is that many unexpected forces develop because some church leaders may feel they have carried a large load in the congregation for a long enough time and now that they can afford some new "help" this help should take over part of their work.<sup>43</sup>

TABLE I

PASTORAL DIVISIONS OF LABOR\*  
 \*Sweet, ibid, p. 70 (diagram modified).

Corporate worship	
Preaching	
Pastoral services	-special calling -counseling
General calling	-on members -on "prospects"
Administration	-Boards -Committees -Office, management, etc.
Adult groups	-women -men -couples classes
Youth	-groups -choirs -counseling -camping
Church school	-parent participation -recruitment and training -VBS

What about the job analysis? Will they provide sufficient field definition? The need for some job analysis is generally conceded. Tead makes a good case for the need of a job analysis in his book when he says:

In general the need is for a careful job analysis of the assistant's functions and for an explicit delegation of duties and authority which is clear to the assistant and equally clear to those working under both of them. Confusion frequently arises because members of a group find that the assistant has given orders which the leader presently changes. Resentment also occurs when the assistant has become so experienced that he is competent to take over much of the leader's work if only he had the chance.<sup>44</sup>

What then about a job description? Judy says, "A job description is necessary for clarifying the role of an individual on the staff."<sup>45</sup> Sweet says, "If job descriptions are to be worked out for new staff members, they are generally more or less unsatisfactory unless properly related to similar job descriptions for all . . . of the staff."<sup>46</sup> A job description as understood by Judy would not provide sufficient field not provide sufficient field definition. Sweet's understanding, however, would provide for sufficient field definition. If job descriptions are to be used, they should be of all the pastoral jobs so that the basic forces in the pastor's field could be identified. After the general job description for each pastor has been worked out, then it would be well for the pastors to view these descriptions as general guides thus taking into account the different forces a new pastor with his different life space will put in motion and

thus modify their group life space. The extent of group field modification will depend on many factors of which the most important is group integration into its field or group non-integration. The group which wishes to have its pastors working effectively for the congregation must not fail to realize the importance of group dynamics. It might be well if all multiple pastoral staff were to follow the example of Concordia Seminary as it deals with job descriptions and synthesis into the group life space. According to Dr. Repp, each man receives a description of his possible role, a job analysis, which he later rewrites so that it more adequately describes the way his individual life space has made changes in the group life space.<sup>47</sup> This procedure does adequately take into account the particular contributions of each new individual field which is added to the group field. An ideal procedure would also take into account the changes in direction which individual and group fields take as they are influenced in time by different forces to change their direction or orientation.

One powerful force often overlooked in job analysis and in discussions of group fields is the power and influence of the pastor's wife. The power the pastor's wife has on the group life space is often the "hidden power" which is never considered in proportion to her influence on the group field. In some cases the pastor's wife will see the assistant as a rival and will try to find ways to cut down his power. In

other cases the assistant's wife will be overly protective and will seek to decrease the amount of time her husband spends in the congregational life space. Sweet reports, "In more than one case, the director or an assistant has had to reckon with the fact that the pastor's wife maintained relationships with key leaders and always outranked him in influence."<sup>48</sup> In summary, a good set of job analyses should define the boundaries of the group field and describe all forces at work in the congregational field, regardless of whether the congregational field is static or dynamic.

## CHAPTER VI

### THE SENIOR PASTOR

In most cases the direction of the general ministry to the congregation and to the community is the sole property of the senior minister. He can use his power to determine whether the congregational field will be static or dynamic. If the field is dynamic, his orientation toward the direction in which the congregational field will move will be the orientation the congregational field will follow most often, even though other pastors may have different orientations. The power to determine the field direction is in the hands of the senior pastor primarily because of the nature of his role, that is the central location of his life space in relation to the congregational life space, and because of the way in which the congregational field is developed.

The influence of the senior pastor's role is noted by Judy when he says:

What I have discovered to be almost universally true --namely, the congregation and church assign to the senior minister the leadership responsibility to be the director of the staff and congregation. How the minister accepts the leadership role and how he performs as leader is determined by his concepts of leadership and his personality.<sup>49</sup>

The extent to which the senior pastor is willing to share and distribute leadership functions is largely dependent on the way he perceives the congregational power of expectation of certain behavior. Either the senior pastor can see the

congregation as expecting him to give direction to a group of co-workers who are specialists in their ministerial field so that all the pastors can work together to achieve the basic goals of the church. If he sees the congregation as expecting him to direct the total activities of the church, the senior pastor tends to be more authoritarian and reserve more leadership functions to himself. If, on the other hand, the senior pastor sees the congregation as expecting him to give direction to the other pastors, he tends to be more democratic and to disperse leadership functions.<sup>50</sup>

The roles which are most important for the senior pastor to adopt are unknown at this time because there has not been enough research done; however, some general observations can be made. Judy in his book sees the roles of "enabler," "co-ordinator for responsibilities," "truster and supporter," "communicator," and "an example" as being the most important for a good level of congregational activity.<sup>51</sup> In Krech and Crutchfield's discussion of leadership functions these roles would be explained as serving the functions of executive, policy maker, controller of internal relationships and exemplar. In a discussion of leadership roles and the level of functioning of a congregation, Mitchell makes the following observation:

We see that certain roles taken by senior pastors seem to facilitate group function better than other roles. The senior pastor may take the role of policy maker, ideologist, executive, and planner, at least in part, without seriously injuring the democratic character or functional effectiveness of the group.

Other roles--purveyor of rewards and punishments in particular--seem to be taken by the senior pastor in churches where the staff relationships is unstable and the functioning minimal. The role of controller of internal relationships seems particularly useful, if carefully used, in promoting functioning.<sup>52</sup>

On the negative side, if the senior pastor takes on the leadership functions of planner, expert, purveyor of rewards and punishments, and exemplar because he views the assistant either an apprentice or as a man who just does not have what it takes to hold a church of his own, then the adoption of those leadership roles will be a strong negative factor in the functioning of the pastoral staff life space.<sup>53</sup> As Sweet says of the adoption of these roles,

This pastor . . . has firmly fixed in his mind the idea that he had a mission to train these young men so that they would become successful pastors. This "one-way street" approach simply does not work.<sup>54</sup>

The reasons for the possibility of problems becomes apparent when we see the principles of coherence and functioning which are ignored when the senior pastor takes on these leadership roles. The principles of coherence which are violated by the incorporation of these leadership functions into the life space of the senior pastor are the principle which calls for recognition of each pastor's contribution to the group ministry, the principle which calls for all negative aspects of the pastor's relationships to be dealt with, and the principle which calls for redefining of goals until the members agree on the field's goals and methods of reaching those goals. Besides these principles, the fourth principle of functioning



which calls for authority, responsibility and accountability is also violated.

Although the exact characteristics and effectiveness of various roles of the senior pastor is unknown at this time, it is known that he is the one who determines the development of the field of the pastoral staff. His guidance of the development is so important that it is commonly recognized that the success or failure of the ministry is up to the senior pastor. But failure does not necessarily mean that the senior pastor will be forced to find new ways of structuring the field as he may have enough influence in the congregation to remove the reminder of failure--the assistant pastor. The successful senior pastor seems to be the one who can feel pride rather than threat when another pastor is praised. Anderson tells of the following case which is a good example of a well developed field. "From an assistant: 'My senior pastor said to me, I want a partner and a critic.' The assistant adds: 'There will be gains only in this kind of relationship.'"<sup>55</sup>

Sweet lists two motives which are frequently the reasons for calling additional staff but which are also going to eventually produce problems in the development of the field of the senior pastor and of the pastoral staff. The first motive which leads to difficulties is where the pastor is inadequate in some of his functioning and perhaps is under some criticism from the congregation but has enough of a base of support that he is not likely to seek a change, so he calls

additional staff to silence the criticism. The problem with this solution is that more often than not additional staff will expose the senior pastor's weaknesses rather than enhance his strengths. Often before there is more than one pastor, the dissatisfactions in the congregation had not been expressed.

The pastor had not heard it because he was protected or because he did not choose to hear it. When an assistant comes, two things happen: the people voice their concerns to the assistant and they now express to the pastor these same concerns except that now they have a scapegoat--they criticize the assistant. It is an unusual pastor indeed who can discern deeper causes and put blame where it belongs; he likes the scapegoat idea also.<sup>56</sup>

The second motive for calling additional pastors which leads to difficulties is where the pastor sees the additional staff as a mark of his success or his prestige. A possible problem with this motive is that if the senior pastor is not using his time and his resources well it is very unlikely that he will be able to utilize extra staff well. At any rate the additional of more staff will add a considerable burden to his responsibilities, that is if he is functioning well. Often the congregation does not realize that the mere addition of "help" will give the senior pastor more to do and thus they expect a great deal more from him than he is able to accomplish.<sup>57</sup> If these motives have been the basis for the calling of additional staff, it is the task of the senior minister to structure the field so that congregational expectations will be in line with the actual life space of the pastoral staff.

## CHAPTER VII

### THE ASSISTANT PASTOR

Whereas the main task for the senior pastor is that of field development and direction, the main task for the assistant pastor is that of field clarity and resisting attempts at field diffusion. Typically the clear field for the assistant pastor is one which gives him a sense of being accepted as just as much a called and ordained minister as the senior pastor. Typically the establishment of this clear field demands that the assistant use the senior pastor as one to bounce off his ideas of his field boundaries. Many assistants tend to underrate the continual force which their life space has on the structure of the staff's life space and tend to see only those forces on their life space which do not move in the same direction as they would like to move.

One of the main diffusive influences on the structuring of the assistant pastor's life space is that his authority to work as a pastor is not openly denied or discredited but may be clouded over. Mitchell describes this situation as being similar to the double bind.

In the multiple staff, authority is seldom openly withheld, but is more often clouded by . . . the double bind. . . . Since, as we have seen, identity is closely identified with and dependent upon a sense of one's own internal consistency and one's phenomenological consistency, and since this in turn depends upon the perceived consistency of the significant other persons in one's world, the double bind is essentially destructive of identity. It is also true that the double bind essentially

devalues and depersonalizes the double bound person, treating him as an individual one moment and as an extension of the personality of another the next moment; the double bind is the antithesis of the desired relationship of the church fellowship. It goes almost without saying that, on the purely pragmatic level, such a restriction of the ability of an individual to function is an automatic restriction of the functioning of the group. . . . The major instance of clouded responsibility is actually a situation similar to the double bind, in which responsibilities that may conflict--say, the responsibilities to one's ordination vows and the responsibilities to the senior pastor--are held to be of equal weight. Once again, such a situation constitutes a challenge to the identity and integrity of the minister; if he sees his vocational identity as partly in the hands of his senior pastor, and yet sees his identity as a minister in terms of his faithfulness to his vows, a confused sense of task and vocation will be the probable result if the demands conflict.<sup>58</sup>

Often because of double bind pressures, the assistant feels he is a second class citizen. This is quite a disruptive influence because most assistant pastors do not want to be second class citizens. Thus Sweet warns pastors who are going an assistantship position of certain signs to look for as indications that the pastor's wife may cloud his authority and diffuse the clarity of his life space as a pastor in that congregation.

One sign is the frequency with which a pastor may quote his wife or refer to her opinion. Another is her tendency when they are together to "explain" her husband or to interpret what he is saying. Another is any evidence that she considers herself an expert in any one phase of program, such as teaching, or youth work, or music. Given any of these signs, I would want the more carefully to evaluate the situation. The increasing number of cases in which a minister leaves a pastorate to become an associate or an assistant calls for the warning that this is often an severe test for wife and family.<sup>59</sup>

Often compounding the problem of field clarity and forces

which might diffuse it, is that problem of the pastor's reaction that the assistant is not really accepted by him until the assistant has proved himself. Although the pastor's attitude may seem normal, the adoption of this attitude comes at a time when the assistant is trying to clarify his life space in the congregation; the consequences of an assistant who has perceived that he does not have a clear life space in that congregation may be felt as influences in the congregational for some time after the new assistant has arrived at a congregation.<sup>60</sup>

## CHAPTER VIII

### INITIAL ADJUSTMENT

The best way to make the restructuring of the congregational life space easier and with least difficulty is to plan for the inclusion of new "help" prior to that help appearing in the congregational field. Good relationships within the congregational field demand that the pastor and the leaders of the congregation, in particular but not exclusively, examine the nature of the shared ministry. If some of the persons who have "force" in the congregational life space have not made successful adjustment to life in general, there are sure to be difficulties present in the congregational life space and all must be prepared to deal with these difficulties. If a person has made a successful adjustment to life, we can also expect him to make a successful adjustment to his position in the congregational field. Thus congregations should also consider as assistants people who have shown themselves to be successful, that is, mature men.<sup>61</sup> It is usually less disruptive if the congregation clarifies who acts in a given official capacity than if the senior pastor makes this decision.<sup>62</sup>

Typically prior to field contact of the pastors who will be in a shared ministry, they both hope that their relationship will have companionship and a deepening of spiritual awareness and feeling.<sup>63</sup> From Mitchell's research it would

seem safe to assume that the ability of the new field structuring to meet the desire for companionship will be related to the ability of the new field structuring to meet the individual field needs of appreciation and recognition. Mitchell discovered the importance of these needs in his research.

This appeared to be a major factor, so much so that I attempted to correlate the good-bad judgment on the assistant's part with a statement of whether or not he was valued and appreciated. The positive correlation worked out, 0.79, was ample evidence that this was indeed a significant factor in judgment. A frequent report from assistant pastors was that senior pastors did not devalue them as persons so much as they devalued the tasks that were given to the assistant. Occasionally, pastors revealed in an off-the-cuff comment that they had wanted to secure an assistant in order to do the work they themselves did not want to do or did not find important. This argues that senior pastors frequently structured the assistant's job so that the value of the assistant could not easily be appreciated or recognized.<sup>64</sup>

Thus a shared ministry which would meet the companionship hopes of the pastors would have the life spaces of the pastors structured so that the value of each could be appreciated and recognized.

When the older pastor, usually the senior, and the younger, usually the assistant, first come together and meet each other they start talking. They start communicating because they realize how important it is to have some communication. They realize communication is important for adjustment of their fields and for efficient operation in their newly modified life space. This importance of communication does not diminish later after they have a better idea of their

roles. Some senior pastors as they see the importance of communication have made the control of communication into a powerful tool.<sup>65</sup> Communication is essential for the development of the unity which the congregational members expect from the pastors. This desire for unity is similar to the desire of children to see unity in their parents. If the people in a congregation can sense unity in the pastors, then the congregational field will tend to be more stable as these people orientate the congregational field parallel to the pastors' field. If, conversely, the people sense disunity and instability in the congregational field as the people in the congregation orientate themselves parallel to forces in the pastors' field which is moving in different directions, they will tend to be disunited and instable.

The need for unity is more easily recognized than the means which may achieve this unity. As pastor Williams says, "To say that 'the minister who has a clear picture of his role will be able to reduce role confusion' is to point to the wound, not to heal it. Where does this clear picture come from?"<sup>66</sup> This has not been clearly established as yet. In general we can say common study can help. More helpful should be good communication. The other principles of coherence and functioning would also seem to help. Whether other things would help also or not has not been established as yet.

In the first workings together of the pastors as they



strive to develop a joint field and later on as they seek to maintain this development, it is helpful to remember that the field which is developed is usually a dynamic one. In a dynamic field tensions will eventually develop as different forces work in different directions. The tension itself is not to be resented or regretted. It is a necessary consequence of the dynamic character of the field. What is regrettable is that many pastors lack the Christian grace to deal constructively with these tensions and to change them into a joint direction.<sup>67</sup>

After the pastors have worked out a common understanding of their joint field development, it is necessary to clarify the field relationships. This clarification is especially important because of the different ways people often judge the effectiveness and value of a pastor as he works within the congregation's field. The existence of diverse standards is made clear by Sweet when he says,

It is interesting to observe that an assistant pastor will be criticized quickly for lack of ability to accomplish skillfully certain functions for which the pastor has never been held accountable. I have known of instance after instance in which the assistant or director was severely criticized for inability to recruit sufficient teachers and leaders for church school and youth work, often within a few months of coming to the position, whereas the pastor had never assumed responsibility for his function even though he was well established and well acquainted with the congregation.<sup>68</sup>

The clarification of the field may be made more easily if there is a job description for each pastor and this job description is used as a work guide.

It indicates the skills required for a given position, and summarizes the responsibilities and the tasks to be performed. It is not sufficient that such a blueprint for the position exists in the mind of the pastor and the official board; it should be reduced to writing. Without this a staff member may be unsure of his assignments, some tasks may be overlooked and misunderstanding may result.<sup>69</sup>

Job description alone, however, should not be viewed as the answer to field clarification. Most people do favor job descriptions, yet most of them are too general to be of real value because they show very little thought or careful analysis.<sup>70</sup> The clarification of the field must be accomplished by joint pastoral direction. The single criteria which will always indicate insufficient field clarification is the number and nature of difficulties which arise as the pastors work to give direction to the congregational field.

## CHAPTER IX

### THE APPLICABILITY OF THESE DYNAMICS--

#### SELECTED FIELD FEEDBACK

In this chapter, random expressions of desirable and undesirable characteristics of the multiple pastor ministry have been compared with the psychological framework under which we have approached the nature of the multiple pastor ministry.

Perhaps a basic consideration for good staff relationships would be the recognition of the need for each minister to be a minister, a priest if you will, to his fellow minister. How often it appears that members of a staff have not thought seriously about serving and supporting each other, about learning from each other. . . . Sharing in multiple staff is a two-way street. This is often not recognized.<sup>71</sup>

In field theory terms, Sweet is pointing out the importance of the first and third principles of coherence, that is, the importance of free and open communication and of a meaningful relationship to the staff. Sweet also pointed out the importance of the fourth principle of functioning, of adequate authority, responsibility and accountability, and he said, "It is surprising . . . to note that in some ways the better the pastor is as a pastor, the harder it is to develop a satisfactory staff situation."<sup>72</sup> Nykamp points out the importance of fulfilling four leadership needs when he says, "Supervision in ministry is experienced as persons within the redeemed community establish through mutual consent a

dynamic relationship which provides for effectiveness, development, and control."<sup>73</sup> The four needs are: first, the coherence principle of regularly redefining goals and methods; secondly, the functional principle of clearly defined goals; thirdly, the functional principle of performing all leadership functions; and fourthly, the functional principle of allowing for sufficient authority, responsibility, and accountability. In another section Nykamp points up two more needs when he says,

This relationship must be experienced by each person. Since each individual is unique and has developed in his own specific interaction with his environment, his experiencing of the same relationship may be very different from that of another person with whom he has contact. Each uses his own unique personality, attitudes, images, and notions to perceive his particular relationships. When the perceptive of the relationship differs greatly, a breaking of the connection takes place. This is what happens in divorce.<sup>74</sup>

These needs are summarized under coherence principles one and three, meaningful relationship to other staff and appreciation of each member's contribution. Sweet recognized the importance of these last two needs as well as the coherence principle of open and free communication when he said:

Whatever the cause, it should be obvious that lack of candor and openness is to be deplored. Yet often growing discontent is allowed to smolder, with both pastor and assistant pastor confiding in friends while allowing communication between them to deteriorate and to grow more restrained and embarrassed.<sup>75</sup>

Sweet had recognized these same three needs earlier as well as the functional need of pastors serving as a model when he

said, "Dividing up the total job and staying out of each other's way, each listening to complaints about the other from members of the congregation, is no way to a shared ministry."<sup>76</sup>

There is yet another need in the congregational field which was often brought up and which does not fit as neatly under a need of leadership functions of coherence and functioning, except maybe under the coherence principle of regularly redefining goals and methods, but which is better explained on the basis of the direction of the pastoral and congregational field. This need is the need for unity. It should be obvious that the pastors should be of the same denomination. Many people also think the well functioning congregational field will also need pastors who have a compatible theological view, that is, not having a strong liberal and a strong conservative pastor in the same congregation.<sup>77</sup> If a congregational field would have two pastors applying force to try and move it in differing directions, it is obvious that the stability of the congregational field will be greatly effected.

In his discussion of his survey, the results of which are listed in the appendix, Mitchell also talks about the importance of unity in the congregation. He found in his questioning of what makes for a good relationship a strong correspondence between the principles of coherence and the pastor's answers.

At least three of the principles of coherence are strongly reflected in the statements: . . . the

principles of communication, religious development, and individual recognition. In addition, the principle of definition and redefinition of goals and methods is at least implicit in the statements about job analyses, similar theological positions, and presenting a united front to the congregation.<sup>78</sup>

He also made some comparison between the most common complaints made by pastors in a multiple pastor ministry and the leadership principles of coherence and functioning.

Of the six most common complaints by senior pastors of assistants, at least three have to do with functions that have misfired in some significant sense. To say that an assistant will not take responsibility or that he is lazy is to say that he does not function well; to say that he focuses on too small a portion of church members is to say that his functioning is too restricted. In addition, the idea that the assistant cannot accept correction suggests that both coherence and functioning are at stake.

Of the six most common complaints by assistants, only one is clearly related to functioning (structures of responsibility are unclear) . . . This offers the possibility of one interesting speculation, namely, that senior pastors have more central concern for functioning than do assistants.<sup>79</sup>

Although there is a great need for more research on the multiple pastor ministry and the problems which are encountered during the initial adjustment phase in which one or more pastors is added to a congregation, there is enough data to conditionally say that the theory of there being leadership needs which must be fulfilled in the areas of coherence and functioning of a congregation is in agreement with the conception of the multiple pastoral staff. There are, admittedly, some difficulties of practical utilization of these principles which still must be worked out. It seems like the position of the field theory view of a multiple pastor staff is in roughly

the same position as the natural sciences were after the theories were formed and the practical implications had not been worked out yet. There is a need for a lot more research in understanding the implications of the theory for the multiple pastor ministry in general and for the initial adjustment phase in particular.

APPENDIX

Statistical Summaries and Tables\*  
\*Mitchell, Psychological and  
Theological Relationships . . . , pp. 261-264.

Total number of churches surveyed: 88  
Total number of ministers interviewed: 216  
    senior pastors: 80  
    assistant pastors: 136

Questions

Either formally, on paper, or during the interviews, questions were asked that can be summarized statistically.

Question 1: Using your definitions of the words, would you say that your overall relationship with the other minister(s) was basically good or basically poor?

Basically Good:  
    Pastors, 49 (61.2%); Assistant pastors, 34 (38.8%);  
total 83.

Basically Poor:  
    Pastors, 31 (25%); Assistant pastors, 102 (75%); total  
133.

The difference of opinion between pastors and assistant pastors on this question is statistically significant. (By the chi-square test, which shows the difference to be significant at the .995 level.)

Question 2: If the best possible staff relationships were graded as 5, and the worst possible as 1, what grade from 1 to 5 would you give the relationships you have in this church?

	1	2	3	4	5
Pastors	4	13	21	32	10
Assistants	71	24	19	12	10

These differences were also significant at the .995 level.

Question 3: What is wrong with the relationship, if anything? This question was largely answered without being asked but if the interview produced no negative sentiments naturally, the question was asked. Answers that occurred frequently are given here, followed by the number of persons making this response. (order of responses rearranged)



## Pastors' answers:

- Assistant does not know his place, 38
- Assistant cannot talk to me, 36
- Assistant cannot accept correction, 35
- Assistant will not take responsibility, 34
- Assistant focuses on too small a portion of church members, 26
- Assistant is lazy, 20
- Our theological positions are too different, 18
- Assistant is too ambitious, 17
- Assistant works well with me but not with boards and congregation, 13
- Assistant is poorly trained, 12
- I do not spend enough time with assistant, 9
- Assistant is incompetent, 5

## Assistant pastors' answers:

- Pastor cannot understand my concerns, 89
- We do not communicate, 81
- Pastor is authoritarian, 79
- Pastor is a prima donna, 74
- Structures of responsibility are unclear, 66
- Pastor is not a pastor to me, 65
- I am not allowed to be a "full minister", 59
- Pastor is lazy, 42
- I do not have enough preaching, 36
- I have no autonomy, 33
- There is theological conflict, 31
- My responsibilities do not match my skills, 26
- Pastor is incompetent, 26
- Pastor is emotionally (mentally) ill, 19
- Other assistants are incompetent, 14
- Other assistants are favorites, 12

Question 4: What are the marks of a good relationship? Answers were gathered in essentially the same way as in Question 3, and are recorded in the same way.

- Communication, 156
- Pastoral relationships between ministers, 137
- Pastor educates assistant, 130
- Presenting a united front to congregation, 122
- Assistant has an area that is his own, 101
- Pastor supports assistant, 99
- Equality of skill and training, 89
- Democratic structure of staff, 77
- Clear job analyses, 68
- Similar theological positions, 49
- Assistant may educate pastor, 36

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>Cartwright, Dorwin and Alvin Zander, Group Dynamics (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1960), p. 40.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., pp. 40-41.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 41.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., pp. 41-42.

<sup>9</sup>Fitzgerald, C.G., "Ordination Plus Six; a Utilization of Erik Erikson's Developmental Framework to Examine the Early Years of Pastoral Functioning", Journal of Pastoral Care, 21 (March 67), pp. 16-17. Hereafter referred to as "OPS".

<sup>10</sup>Mitchell, Kenneth R., Psychological and Theological Relationships in the Multiple Staff Ministry (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1966), pp. 67-69. Hereafter referred to as PTR.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 71.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 72.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 73.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., p. 115.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 92.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 161.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., p. 162.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., p. 163.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 164.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., p. 165.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., p. 166.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., p. 169.

- <sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 170.
- <sup>24</sup>Ibid., p. 173.
- <sup>25</sup>Lehner, George F.J. and Ella Kube, The Dynamics of Personal Adjustment (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955), pp. 95-96.
- <sup>26</sup>Ibid., pp. 136-137.
- <sup>27</sup>"OPS", p. 20.
- <sup>28</sup>PTR, pp. 241-243.
- <sup>29</sup>Sweet, Herman J. The Multiple Staff in the Local Church (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963), p. 80.
- <sup>30</sup>PTR, p. 114.
- <sup>31</sup>Havighurst, Robert James, Developmental Tasks and Education (New York: Longmans, Green, 1960), p. 261.
- <sup>32</sup>Lehner, p. 427.
- <sup>33</sup>Ibid., pp. 426-427.
- <sup>34</sup>Havighurst, p. 67.
- <sup>35</sup>Ibid., pp. 89-111.
- <sup>36</sup>Ibid., p. 67.
- <sup>37</sup>Ibid., p. 263.
- <sup>38</sup>Sweet, p. 107.
- <sup>39</sup>Ibid., p. 31.
- <sup>40</sup>PTR, pp. 23-24.
- <sup>41</sup>Judy, Marvin T., The Multiple Staff Ministry (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1969), p. 129.
- <sup>42</sup>Sweet, p. 72.
- <sup>43</sup>Ibid., p. 61.
- <sup>44</sup>Tead, Ordway, The Art of Leadership (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1935), p. 200.
- <sup>45</sup>Judy, p. 68.

- 46 Sweet, p. 121.
- 47 Repp, Arthur C., Ph. D., Interview February 15, 1971.
- 48 Sweet, p. 85.
- 49 Judy, p. 50.
- 50 Ibid., p. 52.
- 51 Ibid., pp. 98-110.
- 52 PTR, p. 197.
- 53 Sweet, pp. 23-24.
- 54 Ibid., p. 24
- 55 Anderson, Martin, Multiple Ministries (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1965), p. 60.
- 56 Sweet, p. 26.
- 57 Ibid., pp. 63,64,73.
- 58 PTR, pp. 174-175.
- 59 Sweet, p. 86.
- 60 Ibid., p. 22.
- 61 Havighurst, p. 274.
- 62 Anderson, p. 28.
- 63 PTR, p. 113.
- 64 PTR, p. 202.
- 65 Ibid., p. 201.
- 66 Williams, D.D. "Ministerial Responsibility and Tension Reduction", Journal of Pastoral Care 20 (June 1966), p. 97.
- 67 Sweet, p. 14.
- 68 Ibid., p. 18.
- 69 Anderson, p. 65.
- 70 Sweet, p. 74.

<sup>71</sup>Ibid., p. 110.

<sup>72</sup>Ibid., p. 19.

<sup>73</sup>Nykamp, R.A. "Supervision in Ministry", Reformed Review  
21 (March 1968), p. 55.

<sup>74</sup>Ibid., p. 56.

<sup>75</sup>Sweet, p. 53.

<sup>76</sup>Ibid., p. 47.

<sup>77</sup>Anderson, p. 26.

<sup>78</sup>PTR, p. 198.

<sup>79</sup>Ibid., p. 200.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### A. Primary Sources

- Anderson, Martin. Multiple Ministries. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1965.
- Cartwright, Dorwin, and Alvin Zander. Group Dynamics. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1960.
- Cromie, Richard. "Some Hopes for Two Men Sharing in the Ministry of the Church . . .," The Christian Ministry, I (November 1970), 20-22.
- Fitzgerald, C.G. "Ordination Plus Six; a Utilization of Erik Erikson's Developmental Framework to Examine the Early Years of Pastoral Functioning," Journal of Pastoral Care, XXI (March 1967), 15-23.
- Havighurst, R.J. Human Development and Education. New York: Longmans, Green, 1960.
- Judy, Marvin T. The Multiple Staff Ministry. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1969.
- Lehner, George F.J., and Ella Kube. The Dynamics of Personal Adjustment. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955.
- Mitchell, Kenneth R. Psychological and Theological Relationships in the Multiple Staff Ministry. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1966.
- Nykamp, R.A. "Supervision in Ministry," Reformed Review, XXI (March 1968), 54-62.
- Sweet, Herman J. The Multiple Staff in the Local Church. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963.
- Tead, Ordway. The Art of Leadership. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1935.

## B. Secondary Sources

- Ashbrook, James B. "Discussion of Hadden Paper," Ministry Studies, II (December 1968), 30-36.
- Ashbrook, James B. "Ministerial Leadership in Church Organization," Ministry Studies, I (May 1967), 5-32.
- Becker, R.J. "Ministry Reconsidered," Pastoral Psychology, XIV (March 1963), 14-18.
- Becker, Russel. "Some Doubts About the Theory . . .," The Christian Ministry, I (November 1970), 17-19.
- Bennett, II, Thomas R., Ph.D. "Can the Minister Risk Role Change?" Ministry Studies, II (February 1968), 27-29.
- Brown, Thomas E. "Interest Satisfaction in the Minister's Search for Personal Integration," Ministry Studies, II (November 1968), 25-29..
- Colbey, R.D., and J.E. Spicer. "Co-Ministry as a Team, an Experiment," Pastoral Psychology, XIV (March 1963), 35-42.
- Cowles, B.T. "Multiple Ministries: Problems and Possibilities," Pastoral Psychology, XIV (March 1963), 9-13.
- Cullens, P.A. "Co-Ministry as a Partnership," Pastoral Psychology, XIV (March 1963), 31-34.
- D'Any, Paul F. "A Summary of Discussion," Ministry Studies, II (December 1968), 52-54.
- Dearing, Richard N.. "A Theory About Why Problems Develop . . .," The Christian Ministry, I (November 1970), 13-16.
- Dittes, James E. "To Accept and to Celebrate Conflict," Ministry Studies, II (December 1968), 43-46.
- Fichtner, Joseph H., S.J. "Corollaries of Crisis," Ministry Studies, II (December 1968), 47-49.
- Glasse, James D. "Implications for Ministry--Interpretive Comments," Ministry Studies, I (May 1967), 33-36.
- Greene, T.A. "Experiment in History (Role of Minister)," Pastoral Psychology, XIV (March 1963), 45-49.

- Hadden, J.K. "Role Conflict and the Crisis of the Churches," Ministry Studies, II (December 1968), 16-29.
- Higgins, P.S., and J.E. Dittes. "Changes in Laymen's Expectations of the Minister's Role," Ministry Studies, II (February 1968), 5-23.
- Kennedy, Eugene C. "Psychological Consequences," Ministry Studies, II (December 1968), 50-51.
- Kilgore, L.W. "Ministry as a Team [Reader's Forum]," Pastoral Psychology, XIV (September 1963), 54-56.
- Menges, R.J. "Studies of Clergymen; Abstracts of Research, Supplement 1 (Bibliographical Supplement to Psychological Studies of Clergymen)," Ministry Studies, I (October 1967), 5-79.
- Mills, E.W. "Types of Role Conflict Among Clergymen," Ministry Studies, II (December 1968), 13-15.
- Neal, Marie Augusta, S.N.D. "Discussion of Hadden Paper," Ministry Studies, II (December 1968), 37-40.
- Post, A., and R.J. Baker. "Group Ministry and the Group Style Ministry," Pastoral Psychology, XIV (March 1963), 50-54.
- Scherer, Ross P. "Summary of Discussion," Ministry Studies, II (December 1968), 41-42.
- Sevetson, Donald J. "What Can Happen When Two Ministers Work Together . . .," The Christian Ministry, I (November 1970), 9-12.
- Simpson, J.H. "Reducing Conflicts and Tensions in the Parish Ministry; An Interpersonal Approach," Journal of Pastoral Care, XX (June 1966), 81-89.
- Stone, Michael. "How Two Minister's Can Work Together . . .," The Christian Ministry, I (November 1970), 7-8.
- Van Wyk, K.W. "New Style Multiple Ministry," Reformed Review, XXIII (Fall 1969), 17-22
- Webber, G.W. "Group Ministry in the Inner City," Pastoral Psychology, XIV (March 1963), 25-28.



Williams, D.D. "Ministerial Responsibility and Tension  
Reduction," Journal of Pastoral Care, XX (June 1966),  
97-98.