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ABSTRACT

Mentoring has been associated with retention in many professions, yet little is known about retention in ministry and any possible link to the mentoring that is occurring. This study investigated the link between retention and mentoring in the ministry.

Individuals from a randomly chosen sample from a population of ministers in one denominational organization were surveyed concerning their experiences with mentoring during their first year of ministry. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data. In addition, logistic regression was used to determine how well the independent variables predicted patterns of retention in ministers.

Varying relationships were found between the independent variables (a past relationship with a mentor, mentor characteristics, and mentor functions) and the dependent variable (retention). The findings in this study suggest that, for the total sample, there was no statistically significant relationship between mentoring and retention.

However, for the mentored ministers, there was a statistically significant relationship between retention and the mentor functions. Specifically, the mentor functions of relationship emphasis, facilitation focus, and ministerial modeling were linked to retention in ministers.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Introduction to the Study

Mentoring as an educational activity and as an adult development method has been used to train and equip new workers and leaders. Mentoring has been defined as a one-to-one interactive process of guided developmental learning (Galbraith & Cohen, 1995) through social interaction by which persons of experience and achievement in a field or profession by mutual agreement guide, counsel, model, and facilitate the personal and professional growth of less skilled and experienced persons in that profession that are identified as protégés (Kram, 1988).

Mentoring is also described as a relationship between an experienced person (the mentor) and a less experienced person (the protégé) in which the mentor provides guidance, advice, support, and feedback to the protégé (Haney, 1997; Galbraith & Cohen, 1995) on a regular basis and over an extended period of time (U.S. Congress, 1995). Mentoring is directed to intellectual, personal, and social maturation as well as occupational development (U.S. Congress, 1995; Daloz, 1999).

Professions are defined as various fields of study and work that include the following: possession of a body of specialized knowledge, requirement of a period of
intensive training for practitioners, rigorous standards of licensure leading to a title
signifying specialized competence, efforts to satisfy a social need, sharing of a group
identity and obligations to the group, and a sense of public accountability (Courtney,
1989; Wilson, 1942).

In the professions, mentoring is a way to help new employees learn about
organizational and professional work, techniques, values, and culture (Bierema,
1996), to facilitate personal and career growth and development (Murray, 1991), and
to provide training and opportunities for individuals who have not been afforded the
privilege of receiving relevant training for a career (Lankard, 1996). However, the
benefits of mentoring are not only work-related; mentoring can provide individuals
with opportunities to improve cultural awareness, promote a wider view of the world,
and enhance self-actualization (Galbraith & Cohen, 1995).

Mentoring as an educational tool focuses on immersion in real-world situations for
the purposes of training and intellectual development (Zachary, 2002), and has been
useful for professionals in erasing the gap between theoretically acquired knowledge
and actual practice situations. Mentoring has been helpful in raising retention rates in
teaching (Boe, 1997; Martin, 2000; Odell & Ferraro, 1992; Whitaker, 2001), social
work (Collins, 1994; Samantrai, 1992; Schuster, 1998), law practice (Higgins &
Thomas 2001), and business (Dockery & Sahl, 1998; Hequet, 1993; Macauley, 1998;
Murray, 1991). Thus, mentoring has been shown to be a common learning method for
new members of the professions, providing many benefits including higher rates of
retention. However, the literature is lacking in studies linking mentoring and retention in the profession of interest for this study: ministry.

**Background of the Problem**

As in other professions, high rates of turnover have been a factor in the Christian ministry (Robinson, 2001; Barna, 1993; London, 1993). Some researchers believe that there is a gap between theoretically acquired knowledge and "clinical experience" in the ministerial profession (Barna, 1993; Brainerd, 1996), and this deficiency contributes to the attrition rate. One significant report on ministerial education expresses the difficulty: theological education is not adequately preparing ministers for active ministry (Pusey, 1967); according to the ministers interviewed, they would like to have received more practical training. Research findings indicate that ministers do not feel that their pre-service training prepared them for the real world experiences that they encounter as a minister (Barna, 1993; London, 1993; Moeller, 1995).

Ministers suffer the same training deficiencies as other solo practitioners in helping professions (Moeller, 1995; Koessler, 1995; Vawter, 1995; Richardson & Hernon, 2002). Research has supported the contention that mentoring has increased retention in other professions (Whitaker, 2000; Higgins & Thomas, 2001; Dockery & Sahl, 1998; Macauley, 1998); research may show that mentoring can increase retention in ministry.
In the Church of God (Headquarters: Cleveland, TN), there is a perception of a problem concerning retention of ministers. In an interview with Rev. Julian Robinson, head of the Department of Business and Records (Robinson, 2001), Robinson stated that the Church of God is suffering a loss of ministers averaging 20% a year. In subsequent analysis of licensing records, the 20% figure is supported (Figure 3.1). Church of God officials are concerned about the number of new ministers who are retained (Vest, 2004; Hess, 2003). They feel that the Church of God is licensing a great number of new ministers every year, but is losing too large a percentage of new ministers.

There is much interest in mentoring for ministry, as evidenced by the large amount of popular literature concerning mentoring in Christian ministry. Most of the writing is anecdotal, conceptual, prescriptive, instrumental, and advocative, and is motivated by the assumption that mentoring can positively affect ministry in many ways, including retention (Biehl, 1996; Clinton, 1991; Crabb, 1997; Davis, 1991; Engstrom, 1989; Neighbour, 1995; Stanley & Clinton, 1992).

Mentoring may be related to retention rates in the ministerial field (Hambrick, 1993; Lankin, 1997). However, the literature is lacking in studies that specifically examine how mentoring has affected the retention rates of ministers. Studies have not been located that explore whether mentoring has a direct effect on attrition in the population of the profession of ministry; no in-depth articles reporting academic, scholarly research studies of a link between mentoring and retention in ministry have been located.
Statement of the Problem

There is an extensive body of literature concerning the concept, functions, and outcomes of mentoring in professions such as business, nursing, social work, and in teacher training. There is also literature concerning the effects of mentoring on retention in professions. However, there is little research literature concerning mentoring for ministry. Moreover, even less has been written on the subject of retention in ministry, and no studies have been found that address the relationship between mentoring and retention in ministry.

Studies have not shown a link between mentoring, described as a relationship between an experienced person (the mentor) and less experienced person (the protégé) in which the mentor provides guidance, advice, support, and feedback to the protégé, and retention in ministry, described as persistence in the profession of Christian ministry. There is a lack of empirical studies that investigate the existence of a link between mentoring and retention in ministry.

Therefore, the problem to which this research is directed is to determine the relationship between mentoring and retention in Christian ministry. This study will explore and investigate the components of mentoring that may have contributed to the decision to remain in ministry. The objective of this study is to identify among a set of ministers who entered the profession in the same year the components of mentoring that may or may not be responsible for the decision to remain in ministry, and describe the strength of each component.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between mentoring and retention in the profession of Christian ministry, specifically ministers in the Church of God (Cleveland, TN), using association research. The ministers surveyed will have been in professional service for ten years.

The independent variables were: the presence of a relationship with a mentor, the perceived status of the mentor, and the components of mentoring. The dependent variable was retention (remaining in ministry for the ten year period, as marked by possession of a Church of God ministerial license).

Context of the Study

This study involved a sample of ministers who have been randomly chosen from the general population of Church of God (Cleveland, TN) ministers who were licensed during the reporting year of 9/93-8/94. That particular year was chosen through examination of the records of attrition rates for the various reporting years. The rate of attrition was found to increase from the most recent years of inception of service until nine or ten years into the service regime, and then the rate levels off to approximately 20% attrition per year (figure 3.1). The class of 93-94 has reported an attrition rate (as of 1/12/04) of 19.77%. A questionnaire was developed to investigate any link between mentoring and retention in this cohort of ministers.
Theoretical Framework for the Study

The theoretical framework that undergirds, guides and bounds this study includes the socially constructed nature of learning and the importance of experiential, situated learning experiences to adult learners.

According to constructivist theory, learning is most effective when situated in a context in which new knowledge and skills will be used and individuals construct meaning for themselves but within the context of interaction with others (Kaye & Jacobson, 1996). Social learning theory also provides a theoretical basis for understanding mentoring (Bandura, 1971; Zagumny, 1993). Social constructivism acknowledges the important contribution of the context and of other individuals, and views knowledge as jointly and socially created through interaction with others (Williams & Burden, 1997).

Mentoring is a methodology of teaching/learning that illustrates and utilizes social constructivism methods, by providing a relationship that affords the protégé a safe place to try out ideas, skills, and roles, provides feedback and guidance, and allows the protégé to develop understanding and knowledge (Kaye & Jacobson, 1996).

The concept of experiential learning is especially relevant to mentoring in an adult setting (Galbraith & Cohen, 1995). The responsibility of the mentor is to facilitate learning by creating experiences for the protégé through guided experiential learning. Meaning making through active reflection transforms experience into experiential learning. (Washbourne, 1996; Mezirow, 1991; Schon, 1983). The responsibility of the mentor also is to facilitate that process of reflection and meaning making (Galbraith & Cohen, 1995).
The mentoring relationship, utilizing authentic experiential learning opportunities, has been successful in elevating retention rates in other professions (Zachary, 2002; Murray, 1991). The protégés more readily adapt to the life and work of the profession, and more quickly achieve a feeling of satisfaction and accomplishment, thus increasing the number of new professionals who maintain active status in the profession (Higgins & Thomas, 2001; Whitaker, 2001). In ministry, mentoring might influence retention in the same way.

Figure 1.1 illustrates the researcher’s theoretical mentoring model before beginning research.

Figure 1.1: Theoretical model for the relationship of mentoring to retention in ministry
Research Questions

The overall research question for this study is:

What is the relationship between mentoring and retention of ministers?

The specific research questions investigated are:

1. Of the ministers licensed in 1993-1994 by the Church of God, what is the difference in frequency of mentoring relationships between the retained ministers and the non-retained ministers?

2. What is the relationship between retention and presence of a mentor?

3. What is the relationship between retention and mentor characteristics & mentor functions?

Significance of the Study

This study explores and describes the ministerial mentoring relationships, processes, and behaviors that may be related to retention in ministerial professional activity. The study's objective was to identify from a survey of ministers how the mentoring variable might have affected their decision to stay in ministry. This study also helped to identify the desired mentoring functions that have played a role in these ministers' decisions to remain in ministry.

This study attempts to contribute to the knowledge base of mentoring by exploring the relationship between mentoring and retention in a specific profession. This study hopefully will assist trainers for other professions, and also training program designers in developing methodologies that might affect the retention rate of ministers.
This study is important for several reasons. The understanding and future application of mentoring principles and practices, and understanding of the link between mentoring and retention in ministry, might improve career progression and practice for ministers and other professionals. This study will attempt to identify mentoring activities and actions and mentor attributes and attitudes that are associated with retention. Ministers might receive benefit through more effective training techniques for mentors who have a relationship with a protégé in the early years of the protégé’s ministry. Improving career longevity for ministers will increase efficiency in utilization of ministerial forces.

Understanding this link can contribute to understanding of retention in all professions. Knowledge of this link can aid trainers and managers of professionals in choosing training methods for new professionals.

This study can contribute to the knowledge base of mentoring for educators and researchers. By reviewing the results of this study, mentors may be able to significantly improve their practice. This research might also provide the Church of God with valuable data with which to make informed decisions and planning strategies.

Definition of Terms

Retention:

Constitutive definition: Retention is defined as persistence in functioning as a professional, and the desire and willingness to remain in the position and
activities of a profession. The antithesis is characterized by the word attrition, which is the loss of professionals to a profession (Scandura & Viator, 1994; Odell & Ferraro, 1992).

Operational definition: For this study, retention will be defined as persistence in the position and activities of ministry in the Church of God, as measured by continued possession of a ministerial license for ten years.

**Mentoring:**

Constitutive definition: Mentoring is described as a one-to-one interactive process of guided developmental learning (Galbraith & Cohen, 1995) through social interaction by which persons of experience and achievement in a field or profession by mutual agreement guide, counsel, model, and facilitate the personal and professional growth of less skilled and experienced persons in that profession who are identified as protégés (Kram, 1988).

Operational definition: For this study, mentoring will be defined as the scores on the assessment of Principles of Adult Mentoring Scale (Cohen, 1995b), as reported by the respondents.

**Mentoring functions:**

Constitutive definition: Mentoring functions are defined as aspects, actions, approaches, and activities of a developmental mentoring relationship provided
by the mentor that are designed to advance the professional and personal growth of the protégé (Kram, 1988).

Operational definition: For this study, mentoring functions are defined as relational emphasis, information emphasis, facilitative focus, confrontive focus, mentor model, and ministerial vision, as measured by the scores on the instrument (Cohen, 1995b).

Minister:
Constitutive definition: A minister is a person self-identified with the profession of ministry, and dedicated to service in the Christian Church. Said service normally defined as teaching, preaching, counseling, administrating, and pastoring (Jones, 1980; Williams, 2001).

Operational definition: For this study, minister is defined as a person holding minister's license with the Church of God (Headquarters: Cleveland, TN).

Ministry:
Constitutive definition: Ministry is the profession of ministering within the Christian church, as defined as teaching, preaching, counseling, administrating, and pastoring.

Operational definition: For this study, licensure with the Church of God and regular reporting to Church of God headquarters fulfills the phrase "in the ministry".
Educational level:
Constitutive definition: Educational level means the extent of educational attainment, as measured by degrees or certificates earned from educational institutions.

Operational definition: For this study, educational level is defined as degrees earned in higher education, as defined by the question "What was the education level of your mentor at the time of your mentoring: high school graduate, some college, college graduate, graduate school?"

Ministerial rank attained:
Constitutive definition: Ministerial rank refers to the possession of one of several categories of ministerial license, generally earned in hierarchical fashion.

Operational definition: For this study, ministerial rank attained is defined as attainment of an exhorter's, ordained minister's, or ordained bishop's license with the Church of God.

Length of service:
Constitutive definition: Length of service means the time, measured in years, that an individual has been involved with the profession of ministry.

Operational definition: For this study, length of service refers to the mentor's number of years of licensure with the Church of God.
Positions of leadership:

Constitutive definition: Positions of leadership refers to an individual serving in various levels of leadership and administration within an organization.

Operational definition: For this study, position of leadership is defined as appointment or election to committees or boards, or administrative positions; this election or appointment shows perception of the individual's leadership ability by denominational executives with appointive power or by the minister's peer group of voting ministers.

Size of congregation:

Constitutive definition: Size of congregation is measured either by membership or by Sunday morning attendance.

For this study, size of congregation is defined as an average number of Sunday morning worship attenders.

Assumptions and limitations

This study confined itself to the population of Church of God ministers (International headquarters: Cleveland, TN). An assumption is that all of these persons have willingly chosen to pursue the profession of ministry; further, an assumption is that all of these persons have exhibited a belief in a divine call to ministry. The findings of this study can only be generalized to the unique population of the participants. However, similar ministerial mentoring retention patterns may
exist in other denominational organizations, or other professions. This study may not be generalizable to populations that contain members who have not entered ministry as a personal choice or who view ministry as simply another profession.

The sample was drawn from the list of active ministers who regularly report to headquarters (the working definition of "in the ministry") and from available addresses and phone numbers of ministers who are no longer active ("surrendered their license"). The portion of the sample that consists of inactive ministers who have surrendered their licenses were contacted based on availability of addresses, and were involved based on willingness to participate in the survey.

There may be reluctance to participate from some of the ex-ministers; the decision to suspend ministry is often an emotionally painful experience, and the person may feel rejected, or harbor bitterness. Therefore, the rate of participation by this segment of the sample may be affected.

**Summary**

The focus of this study was to explore the relationship of mentoring and retention in ministry. While other professions have exhibited a link between mentoring and retention, little was known about the effect of mentoring on the retention of ministers.

Chapter 2 is a review of mentoring literature on mentoring, ministry, and mentoring in ministry. The literature on the benefits of mentoring, especially retention, is also discussed. How this study added to the mentoring body of knowledge is also explained.
Chapter 3 describes the methodology and design of the study. A quantitative approach, associational research, was used. Descriptive statistics and logistic regression were used for data analysis and prediction purposes.

Chapter 4 presents the results of the study.

Chapter 5 presents the summary of the study, conclusions of the researcher, and recommendations of the researcher for adult educators, mentoring advocates, and ministerial trainers and administrators.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents and critiques relevant literature on mentoring, on ministry, and on mentoring in ministry. The literature search was conducted using multiple resources. The most helpful sources included electronic databases (ERIC – Educational Resources Information Center, Expanded Academic ASAP, and OSCAR – The Ohio State on-line catalog). The electronic search was conducted numerous times, the most recent being spring 2004. The key words of mentoring, mentor, mentors, protégé, protégés, retention, attrition, persistence, minister, ministry, clergy, and professional were used to search the literature.

Articles from peer-reviewed academic journals that report research were located first. Adult Education Quarterly, Journal of Vocational Behavior, Journal of Research and Development in Education, and the International Journal of Lifelong Education were the prominent journals that were manually searched. The electronic and manual searches resulted in hundreds of articles.

Afterward, books and book chapters were browsed, then conference papers and dissertations were read. The pertinent literature was located through browsing of journals and books, through consultation of references such as Review of Educational Research,
Review of Research in Education, Education Index, ERIC's Current Index to Journals in Education, ERIC's Resources in Education, and through further search of databases such as Academic Search Premier, Dissertation Abstracts International, Psychological Abstracts, and Sociological Abstracts.

This chapter will first define and explain mentoring, then establish mentoring as a learning method. Next, this chapter will compare mentoring to other developmental alliances, highlighting differences between these other forms of learning assistance, and mentoring. This review will look at the elements of mentoring, will compare single mentoring models with multiple mentor models, and will compare formal versus informal mentoring. A short review of potential problems in mentoring will follow. An exploration of mentoring in the professions will follow, with a review of outcomes of mentoring, and a special focus on retention. Then, research on mentoring in ministry will be addressed, showing the lack of retention studies.

Outline of literature review

A. Definition of mentoring
B. Theory base of mentoring
   1. Social construction of knowledge
   2. Experiential learning + guided reflection/praxis
C. Negatives and positives of mentoring
D. Comparison to other developmental alliances
E. Multiple mentor models
F. Functions
G. Formal and informal mentoring
H. Mentoring for training professions
I. Outcomes of mentoring in training of professions
J. Outcome - retention (in professions)
K. Mentoring and ministry
L. No studies of mentoring and retention in ministry
What is mentoring?

Mentoring is a form of a developmental alliance, used as a method of preparing less experienced members of a society, family, or profession, through a relationship with a more experienced member of the same group. The concept of mentoring as a developmental alliance (Hay, 1995) has also been described as a developmental relationship (Kram, 1988) and a learning partnership (Zachary, 2000). Adult learner mentoring, as defined by Zachary (2002) is a "reciprocal and collaborative learning responsibility and accountability for helping a mentee work toward achieving clear and mutually defined learning goals" (Zachary, 2002, 28). The mentor and protégé usually negotiate what each will bring to the relationship; however, the protégé informs the mentor of the protégé's needs. The maintenance of the relationship becomes the responsibility of both partners (Stein & Glazer, 2003).

For this study, mentoring is defined as a one-to-one interactive process of guided developmental learning (Galbraith & Cohen, 1995) through social interaction by which persons of experience and achievement in a field or profession, identified as mentors, by mutual agreement guide, counsel, model, and facilitate the personal and professional growth of less skilled and experienced persons in that profession, identified as protégés (Kram, 1988).
What is a mentor?

The application of the word 'mentor' has evolved into a description of a particularly distinctive developmental relationship: typically, an older, wiser, more experienced person, usually not a relative, who systematically and willfully provides guidance, support, knowledge, and opportunities for a (usually) younger, less experienced person, and helps the less experienced person address major life transitions and learn new behavioral patterns and skills (Meggison, 1994; Burlew, 1991).

Mentoring as a learning method

Mentoring supports much of what is currently known about how individuals learn, including the socially constructed nature of learning and the importance of experiential, situated learning experiences. According to constructivist theory, learning is most effective when situated in a context in which new knowledge and skills will be used and individuals construct meaning for themselves but within the context of interaction with others (Billett, 1996; Johnson & Thomas, 1994). Input from books, people, experience, or practice is not seen as information to be added to a store of knowledge but rather as new perspectives to be considered, and possibly to be used to reconstruct the learner's existing knowledge. The objective is not a store of transmitted information but a personally constructed schemata of understandings, which can later be taken apart and reassembled again and again (Malderez & Bodoczky, 1999). Social constructivism acknowledges the important contribution of the context and of other individuals, and views knowledge as jointly and socially created through interaction with others (Williams & Burden, 1997; Johnson & Thomas, 1994).
Experts facilitate learning by modeling problem-solving strategies, guiding learners in approximating the strategies while learners articulate their thought processes. Experts coach learners with appropriate scaffolds or aids, gradually decreasing assistance as learners internalize the process and construct their own knowledge and understanding (Farmer, Buckmaster & LeGrand, 1992). These processes are reflected in the mentor's roles of guide, advisor, coach, motivator, facilitator, and role model within a contextual setting. (Galbraith & Cohen, 1995; Haney, 1997; Kaye and Jacobson, 1996).

Social learning theory also provides a theoretical basis for understanding mentoring. Described by A. J. Bandura (1971), social learning theory hypothesizes that an important source of learning for individuals is through vicarious reinforcement and punishment. Individuals learn how to behave by observing another's behavior and the resulting consequences (such as reward and punishment). In effect, mentors serve as role models for behavior (Zagumny 1993). Bandura also stresses the role of reinforcement and feedback for learning; the mentor may not only provide the protégé with a model to observe and to pattern after, but also may provide the protégé with specific reinforcement and feedback. The mentor acts as a model and as a guide (Bandura, 1971, p.24).

Functioning as experts, mentors provide authentic, experiential learning opportunities as well as an intense interpersonal relationship through which social learning takes place. Although learning is a matter of individual interpretation of experiences, it takes place within the social context. Therefore, the interpersonal relationship of mentor and protégé is recognized as essential. Learning is a transaction, involving an interactive and evolving process between mentors and their adult learners. (Galbraith and Cohen, 1995).
Participation in the construction of knowledge is an important issue. Learning "to see that all knowledge is a construction and that truth is a matter of the context in which it is embedded…" (Belenky, 1986, p.139) is also a task of adulthood and a way of thinking critically (Reber & Roberts, 2000). It is a process of constant experimentation in a community of exchange, a process that involves learning to share control and to think critically with others. "When truth is seen as a process of construction in which the knower participates, a passion for learning is unleashed." (Belenkey, 1986, p.140).

The concept of experiential learning is especially relevant to mentoring in an adult setting. Adult learning theorists posit that adults have a rich resource of experience to draw from, and indeed are more prone to connect any new learning and experience to previous learning and experience (Knowles, 1980; Draper, 1998; Titmus, 1999). In a typical mentoring relationship, the responsibility of the mentor is to facilitate this process by creating experience for the protégé through guided experiential learning. With trust as the foundation of the relationship, mentors give protégés a safe place to try out ideas, skills, and roles with minimal risk (Kaye & Jacobsen, 1996).

Experience, however, does not always result in learning. The learner must reflect on experiences in a continuous process of "meaning making" so that these experiences may contribute to development. Meaning making through active reflection transforms experience into experiential learning (Washbourne, 1996; Mezirow, 1991; Schon, 1983). "There is a difference between 'doing' an internship and 'learning' from an internship" (Ryan & Cassidy, 1996, p.18); an integration of theory and practice must provide an analytical framework to transform experience into learning. In a classical mentoring
relationship, the responsibility of the mentor is to facilitate the process of reflection and meaning making; it is the responsibility of the protégé to integrate that new meaning into behavioral, and attitudinal change.

A study by Reiman & Theis-Sprinthall (1993) explored guided reflection relates to a protégé's cognitive development of mentors in a teacher induction program. The purpose of this study was to identify growth in reasoning ability and conceptual complexity because of guided reflection. A first study involved an experimental group ($N=17$) who received guided reflection intervention, and a control group ($N=17$) without the treatment. Several verified instruments were used to measure positive gains in cognitive development. Later, the study was replicated with another experimental group ($N=12$), with stronger gains reported. Thus, guided reflection after experience appears to increase cognitive development, confirming the connection between mentoring and experiential learning theory (Galbraith & Cohen, 1995).

This study (Reiman & Theis-Sprinthall, 1993) recommended several steps in the deliberate transformation of experience into learning through the framework of mentoring:

1. Significant experience - placing protégés in complex new helping roles
2. Reflection on experience - guided examination of experience to make new meaning
3. Balance between reflection and experience - discourages overreliance on either experience or self-analysis
4. Support and challenge - high levels of positive regard and empathy encourage risk taking in relinquishing old patterns of thinking and valuing
5. Continuity - time for psychological growth to occur (6 mo to 1 yr minimum) and providing these conditions for the duration of the in-depth experience (Reiman & Thies-Sprinthall, 1993)
To further elucidate the need for guided reflection, we look at learning theory described by Boydell (1994). This writer identified three primary types of learning as:

- Learning to implement: doing things well
- Learning to improve: doing things better
- Learning to integrate: doing better things (Boydell, 1994)

Boydell (1994) identifies the first as adherence to, followed by adaptation of rules and procedures, and the establishment of acceptable explanations of why things are as they are. The second primary type of learning is associated with the learner drawing their own conclusions on experience and the beginning of experimentation; in this phase/style/type of learning, new ideas are generated from within as a result of experience and reflection. The third type of learning involves holistic thinking, uses initiative, recognizes unacknowledged assumptions, and embraces diversity. It involves trying different perspectives, and reflecting on action, dealing with issues, themes and relationships, and identification of purpose, meaning, values, and goals.

All three types of learning described by Boydell (1994) are supported by mentoring. The first relates to the induction of the protégé, the initial coaching of skills and dispensing of information, and the establishing the setting for a new job or skill in an organization or profession. The second type of learning is facilitated by the mentor through serving as a sounding board or reflective agent. The third type of learning is facilitated through insightful and challenging questioning, and in-depth reflection (Woodd, 1997).

This third level of mentoring also is a tool to lead learners beyond cognition (understanding how to perform a task) to metacognition (understanding how and why the
task was chosen and performed) (Imel, 2002; Schraw, 1998). Metacognition also refers to the ability of learners to be aware of and monitor, adjust, and enhance their own learning processes (Peters, 2000). These skills are generally divided into two types: self-assessment (the ability to assess one's own cognition) and self-management (the ability to manage one's further cognitive development) (Imel, 2002; Rivers, 2001).

In-depth classical mentoring, which goes beyond simple coaching or counseling, may help protégés to develop the ability to think about thinking and learn about learning, to look beyond the what to the why and how, to discover strengths and weaknesses in personal thinking habits and learning styles, and to develop strategies for success and survival as a professional (Imel, 2002; Cromley, 2000; Language Australia, 2000), thus tending to raise the retention rates.

Comparison of mentoring to other developmental alliances

It may be important to draw distinctions between mentoring and other forms of developmental alliances, since this research is focused on classical, traditional mentoring, rather than other forms of experiential learning partnerships. The inquiry will be concerning traditional mentoring received by ministers in the first year of ministry. In the classical, traditional form of mentoring:

1) There is an understanding that this is a teaching-learning relationship, between a superior (more experienced person) and a subordinate (less-experienced person), to facilitate the learning, growth, and development of either or both of them (Murray, 2001).
2) The mentor and protégé enter into a relationship that involves time together, either in physical proximity or through other forms of communication.

3) The mentor and protégé experience conversations and exchanges concerning profession-related or personal interests.

4) The mentor and protégé ideally negotiate an implicit or explicit contract binding both parties to a mutually-agreed set of expectations.

5) There is a role model component in which the protégé observes and emulates behavior and actions of the mentor.

6) There is a desire on both parties for the protégé to develop and increase in personal and professional competencies.

7) In most cases, there is a natural evolving of the superior-subordinate hierarchy to a mutuality of respect and peer consideration (Levinson, 1978; Kram, 1983; Hay, 1995; Murray, 1991).

Two elements that distinguish mentoring from any other superior/subordinate teaching/learning relationship are the concepts of reciprocity and identity transformation. Reciprocity, or mutual exchange between mentor and protégé, means that both partners benefit; there is development of the mentor as well as the protégé. Identity transformation means that both partners, mentor and protégé, change and grow (Healy & Welchert, 1990).
In the following descriptions of other developmental alliances, the concepts of reciprocity and identity transformation are not usually part of the outcomes. Ministers may have experienced several of these forms of developmental alliances during their growth in ministry, but not experienced mentoring in the truest sense of the word.

Role modeling, often mistaken for mentoring, involves emulation of the actions and behavior of the mentor by the protégé, but in simple role modeling there is no contact, no mutual exchange of ideas and information, no concern and care by the parties for each other (Tice, 1997). At a basic level, mentors may provide a concrete explication of professional behavior and attitude; the mentor can display professional skills which the protégé presumably lacks. An effective way in which these skills can be acquired is through observation of the professional model, then comparison of one's own performance with the model, and then emulation of the model (Collins, 1993). However, mentoring is more than showing the protégé how to perform; a protégé needs more than simple exposure to an exhibition of skills and ideas. The mentor's task is not just to serve as a role model, but to engage the protégé in a process of careful reflection, to develop an active relationship that creates opportunity for guided reflection (Cohen, J., 2001).

Role modeling is one phase of the mentoring process, but is incomplete without the direct involvement of the mentor in feedback, course correction, and goal assignment, even if the model articulates the thought processes and explains the rationale of the actions (Merriam & Caffarella 1999). If there is no personal contact and conversation, and no 'contract' or understanding (spoken or unspoken, explicit or implicit) between the two participants concerning responsibilities and goals of both partners, then mentoring as
defined has not occurred. Some authors mention 'mentoring' by literary figures, or long-dead examples (Stanley & Clinton, 1992; Davis, 1991; Wickham & Sjodin, 1997). This is not classical mentoring, but role modeling.

The contract or understanding, whether expressed or implied, is a compact in which the mentor agrees to do more than show and tell, and the protégé agrees to do more than watch and copy. A role model might share valuable insights, but a mentor often will create assignments around those insights that promote clearer understanding in the protégé and involve the protégé in the process itself (Cohen, J., 2001).

Coaching is another developmental alliance that is often mistaken for mentoring. Practitioners who have been trained in the professional or business coaching model seem to view coaching as transcendent and all-encompassing, while mentoring is viewed as limited and instrumental and focused on position enhancement within an organization. In contrast, practitioners who have been initiated into mentoring by and through educational and psychological processes often view coaching as limited and instrumental, and focused on job skills and performance, while mentoring is seen as transcendent and all-encompassing (Collins 2001).

Zeus & Skiffington (2002) compare coaching to mentoring by stating that a mentor is an advisor/guide who assists learners through honest and authentic dialogue, by passing on skills and experience, and by advice and counsel to a protégé within a supportive environment(10-12). These authors believe that a coach follows a formal plan, a process of setting goals and action plans for/with a client. A mentor may give advice and be directive as a coach would, yet can couch the language so that the client receives the
advice as a suggestion or question. Mentorship ideally is a partnership: both individuals work together to develop and enhance the full potential of the protégé. These writers say that a coach might adopt a mentoring role after the formal coaching role has ended, and become an advisor to the protégé, using support and encouragement, and professional and tactical advice (Zeus & Skiffington, 2002, 10-12).

Coaching in many references refers solely to instrumental, functional assistance with the actions and techniques of the profession, while mentoring is more broadly applied to many psychological aspects of personal behavior, which include functional aspects of professional behavior (Phillips-Jones, 2001). Coaching is one of the activities carried out by a mentor, as are guiding, guarding, and giving feedback; mentoring is the all-encompassing role that is accepted by the mentor (Murray, 2001). Again, the issues of reciprocity, mutual exchange, and identity transformation (Healy & Welchert, 1990) might be found missing in coaching.

Advising is another learning relationship or developmental alliance that is often mistaken for mentoring. Advising may be a component of mentoring, but mentoring is more than advising. An advisor gives direction, usually concerning one concentrated area of life, but a mentor is normally more indirect than directive. A mentor sets the stage for the protégé to self-discover answers, thus learning how to personally find answers and choose direction, rather than always being on the receiving end of advice from an expert. A mentor is also often involved with a wider span of life issues than an advisor (Kram, 1988; Wickham & Sjodin, 1997).
Counseling, another developmental alliance, may be a component of mentoring, but mentoring is more than counseling. A mentor may occasionally function in the role of a counselor, by giving direction or listening to the story of the protégé, but this activity should not be considered the sum total of the mentoring experience.

Counseling is based on problems: the search for “what’s wrong.”
Mentoring is based on possibilities: the search for “what’s right.”

Counseling focuses on needs and deficiencies.
Mentoring focuses on strengths and abilities.

Counseling is past-oriented: what have you become, and why?
Mentoring is future-oriented: what can you become, and how?
(Hay, 1995)

In the case of counseling, there is a large level of psychosocial support, but not usually a large amount of career or instrumental training. In the technique called advising, there is normally a level of instrumental career support, but usually no great amount of emotional, psychosocial support for the protégé.

Internship is another developmental alliance, and is often compared to mentoring. Internship as a method of teaching adult learners can be traced back to the medical profession of the late 1800's. Today internship is widely used in many disciplines. The emphasis is not just on job skills and instrumental emphases, but also on professional standards and practices. Other names that have been used for internship are field study and practicum (Premont, 1990). Internships often are sponsored by an academic/educational institution and are part of the curriculum. Also, an employer may sponsor internships for the express purpose of employee development. Unlike mentoring, internships are not usually protégé-initiated or concerned about personal growth.
Externship, like internship, is an observational technique, used for development of professionals and workers alike; the students do not do any actual work. Examples of externship are student teacher observations and "shadowing" assignments where students follow and observe a competent professional at work (Premont 1990, 331). This is a form of organized, structured role modeling, but is not mentoring, which is marked by more whole-life involvement.

Apprenticeship is often mistaken for the mentoring relationship. Prior to the 19th century, informal apprenticeships and internships were a way of life between generations. In societies around the world today, apprenticeship is still the dominant form of education (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Brown, Collins, & Diguid, 1989).

Apprenticeships may seem similar to internship to the casual observer; however, apprenticeship is almost exclusively career guidance and craft/trade/skill instruction for development of new members of a profession (Premont 1990, 330; Merriam & Caffarella 1999, 243). The sponsoring or authorizing agency is often the professional society or regulatory board, with the purpose of transmitting the culture and skills of the profession. Likewise, an employer may sponsor apprenticeships to promote job skills for the express purpose of developing a new labor pool. The distinguishing characteristic that separate mentoring from apprenticeship or internship is that mentoring is usually focused on personal as well as professional growth.

Discipleship, in the Christian church, is often confused with mentoring. Discipleship concerns itself with Christian character formation and with adherence to Christian morals, values, norms, and doctrines; discipleship seeks to encourage Christlikeness
Classical mentoring concerns itself with a less narrow view of personal development in that the protégé is allowed to choose personal goals and direction.

Discipleship and mentoring are not the same process. While there are aspects of both concepts that overlap, there are sufficient differences to label them different concepts. The term spiritual mentoring (Anderson & Reese, 1999) seeks to combine both terms into one process. However, discipleship is more directive and prescriptive than mentoring. In discipleship, we are directed what to believe and to become; in mentoring, the mentor is more likely to ask, "What do you want to become? I'll help you achieve that goal."

Teaching and mentoring are not the same process. "Teachers tell; mentors demonstrate. Teachers relay facts, theories, and conclusions; mentors show the way." (Holmes, 1998, p.6) Teachers typically pass on knowledge of subjects to improve educational achievement of students; mentors facilitate personal development in protégés by providing information, and encouraging the protégé to make wise choices. The concepts of mentoring and teaching are not exclusive of each other but are usually intertwined. However, some teachers gravitate quite naturally toward mentoring, while others are uncomfortable with the personal contact necessary for mentoring. Some teachers are well suited for hierarchical transfer of knowledge, while other teachers enjoy the process of assisting protégés with knowledge acquisition, application, and critical reflection (Zachary, 2002). Likewise, not all students will not want a one-on-one relationship with every teacher (Enerson, 2001). In mentoring, the focus is placed on the student instead of the teacher, and "the sage on the stage becomes the guide on the side" (King, 1993).
Supervision has often been compared to, or even combined with, mentoring. However, the focus of supervision is primarily task-oriented: who a person is and how they function is less important than what they do - job completion, not learning or growth. The focus of mentoring is primarily the growth of the person who is mentored: who a person is and how they function is considered more important than what they do (Hay, 1995).

Supervisors usually have administrative power and evaluative, assessment authority over the employee; thus, the relationship of power may hamper the free sharing of ideas and discussion of differing viewpoints.

"A mentor proactively seeks to enhance the development and education of a protégé while a traditional supervisor or advisor only promotes the development and education of a supervisee to the extent demanded by their position." (Atkinson et al, 1994, p.39)

This review of developmental alliances allows the reader to focus on traditional mentoring as the subject of research.

Elements of mentoring

The discussion now turns to the elements of mentoring that may impact retention: the functions, activities, and behaviors of mentoring, and the form, style, and organization of mentoring. Some attention will be paid to the negative elements of mentoring.

Functions of mentoring

As definitions of mentoring in the literature are varied and diverse, the activities, roles, functions, and actions of mentoring described in the literature are varied and diverse. For this study, a function is an activity/behavior/role by the mentor intended to produce an outcome/benefit for the protégé (Kram, 1988).
A number of researchers (Kram, 1983; Schockett & Haring-Hidore, 1985; Noe, 1988; Olian, Carroll, Giannantonia, & Feren, 1988) have grouped mentoring functions into two broad categories. Kram's (1983) content analysis of in-depth interviews with both protégés and mentors in a large business organization differentiated career from psychosocial functions. From the viewpoint of the protégé, there are two primary dimensions to benefits derived from participation in mentoring: job and career benefits derived through information sharing and external power brokering, and psychological benefits appropriated from the emotional support and friendship of the mentor (Olian et al., 1988).

This elemental bifurcation of the categories of functions of mentoring has been supported or replicated several times by researchers. A factor analysis of survey responses provided by college students indicated a psychosocial and a vocational function (Schockett & Haring-Hidore, 1985). A quantitative analysis of survey responses from business managers collected by Olian et al. (1988) suggested two categories similar to Kram's (1985) which were labeled instrumental and intrinsic. Noe's (1988) factor analysis of data provided by school teachers and administrators also yielded two factors, labeled career function and psychosocial function. In Noe's (1988) analysis, the instrumental, career function is the external value of the relationship; protégés benefit from their mentor's knowledge, contacts, support, and guidance. The intrinsic, psychosocial function is the internal value of the ongoing interpersonal dialogue, collaborative critical thinking, planning reflection, and feedback (Galbraith & Cohen, 1995).
These studies supported a conclusion that there are two classes of mentoring functions: a personal (more emotional, right-brain), psychosocial role and an instrumental (more intellectual, left-brain), career-focused role (Kram, 1988). In some mentoring relationships, career functions are paramount, while in other relationships the emphasis is on the psychosocial functions. In an ideal mentoring relationship, the two categories will be balanced.

However, Burke's (1984) exploratory factor analysis of survey responses provided by 80 managers in a professional development course yielded three distinct factors: a career development function, a psychosocial function, and a role model function. Jacobi (1991) posits that, in the absence of convergent results, it may be appropriate to consider role modeling as a discrete third component of mentoring (Scandura & Ragins, 1993). This disparity between the viewpoints of researchers concerning the formation of the number and makeup of functions of mentoring has been compounded by further research.

In an independent review of the literature, Blackwell (1989) also identified 15 mentoring functions. In a literature review article building on the assumption of three components of the mentoring relationship: (a) emotional and psychological support, (b) direct assistance with career and professional development, and (c) role modeling, and outlining an attempt to identify the basic elements of a definition of mentoring, Jacobi (1991) provided an overview of 15 functions or roles that have been ascribed to mentors. The authors selected for inclusion in Jacobi's analysis are cited frequently in articles and reports about mentoring.
There is also a multiplicity of opinions concerning the roles of mentors. Zey (1984) lists the roles of a mentor to include overseer, teacher, counselor, provider of psychological support, promoter, and sponsor. Words such as advocate, expert, trainer, alternatives identifier, collaborator, and learning process specialist have been used (Woodd, 1997). Other roles have been identified as partner (Fisher, 1994), confidant (Zimpher & Howey, 1989), coach, networker, facilitator and challenger (Kram, 1983; Levinson, 1978), and monitor, problem solver, assessor (McIntyre & Haggar, 1993). Kirk (1992) posited six roles for a mentor: advisor, coach, explainer, protector, sponsor, validator.

Into this mixture of concepts and constructs, Cohen (1993, 1995a, 1995b, 1998) introduced a unifying, clarifying construct that attempted to draw all of the disparate threads of thought together. Cohen (1995a) derived from an analysis of relevant literature six behavioral functions of a mentor:

**Relationship emphasis** - mentor creates an atmosphere of trust, encouraging sharing and reflection by the protégé
  * responsive, empathetic listening, open-ended questions, descriptive feedback

**Information emphasis** - mentor assures that any future advice is relevant by checking accuracy and sufficiency of facts
  * questions requiring concrete, factual answers, restatement of answers to monitor accuracy, directive comments and advice concerning present facts and future actions

**Facilitative focus** - mentor guides protégé through an exploration of personal ideas and beliefs, assists protégés in considering alternatives, and helps protégés reach their own decisions
  * presentation of multiple viewpoints and different information, hypothetical questions to expand views, analysis of reasons for current views

**Confrontive focus** - mentor respectfully challenges protégé's reasons and actions, to help protégé understand unproductive behavior, and see need for change
  * selective focus on likely changes, carefully stated feedback, acknowledgment of concerns, confrontation to promote self-assessment followed by positive encouragement and trust
**Mentor model** - mentor self-discloses personal experiences, successes and failures, to motivate protégé to take necessary risks and overcome difficulties toward goals *offering of personal thoughts and feelings, actions and examples, as encouragement for risk-taking, growth through trial and error learning, and development through failure (not in spite of)*

**Protégé vision** - mentor encourages reflection on future goals and personal potential *statements and questions that require reflection by protégé on future attainment and perception about personal ability to manage change, review of choices and assessment of options, expressions of confidence and encouragement for protégé*

Because of the unifying nature and clarifying characteristic of Cohen's synopsis of research (1993), the Principles of Adult Mentoring Scale (Cohen, 1995a, 1998) has been chosen as the instrument to be used in this study. The Scale uses the construct of six behavioral functions that produce six mentor role competencies: a relationship emphasis (to engender protégé trust), an information emphasis (to disclose protégé qualities), a facilitative focus (to explore protégé options), a confrontive focus (to challenge protégé decisions), a mentor model (to guide protégé growth), and a protégé vision model (to encourage protégé goals). This model is well able to explain the functioning of successful mentoring.

**Single mentor models versus multiple mentor/constellation models**

A prominent area of thought and research in mentoring studies is the distinction between the concept of a single primary mentor versus the idea of a span or constellation of mentors, with differing roles and responsibilities, operating in different arenas and differing time frames (Baugh & Scandura, 1999; Burlew, 1991; Dockery & Sahl, 1998; Higgins & Thomas, 2001). This distinction will be critical to this research, because the subjects will be asked to consider a single, primary mentor, or to mention the different mentors and their styles of assistance to the protégé. Classical or traditional mentoring
models usually involve one mentor and one protégé in a relationship, usually for an extended period of time.

Results of studies (Baugh & Scandura, 1999; Higgins & Thomas, 2001; Jipson & Paley, 2000) indicate that having one or more mentoring relationships may result in greater commitment to the organization, greater job satisfaction, and enhanced career expectations. The enhanced network provided by multiple mentors should provide the protégé with additional avenues for resolving role conflicts, additional career options and possibilities, and socialization into the professional or organizational network (Baugh et al, 1996; Dreher & Ash, 1990; Fagenson, 1994). All of these positive results may tend to increase retention and halt attrition in professions.

However, the respondents to this survey will be asked about a single, primary mentor.

**Formal vs informal mentoring**

One of the distinctions in the various forms of mentoring is found in the perceived difference between formal and informal mentoring. Zey (1991) favors a formal approach in which the mentoring is recognized, or even planned, implemented, and encouraged by the organization or profession. Some proponents of mentoring posit that only informal mentoring is effective; the descriptive terms include classical or natural (Kram, 1985; Clawson, 1985). However, Odysseus asked Mentor (archetypal role model of mentoring) to protect, advise, guide, and train his son; therefore, the mentoring was initiated by the sponsoring organization (the family unit, or the father). Mentor planned his work; he had specific mentoring goals. His mentoring was neither informal nor haphazard and it was frequently supplemented by multiple mentors (Wunsch, 1994).
Some of the terms used for the conceptual framework for formal mentoring relationships are planned, organized, structured, assigned, targeted, developed, defined, coordinated, designed, facilitated, systematic, supported, comprehensive, reinforced, housed in a stable supportive unit. Murray's (1991) term is 'facilitated'; Cohen's (1995a) term is 'sponsored'; Gray's (1998) term is 'systematic assistance.'

It is true that there must be mutual attraction and agreement and a level of spontaneity for the relationship to be successful; a forced mentoring relationship is an unwieldy pairing. However, mentoring is more than a relationship; it is a process. As a growth process, it can be defined, planned, and evaluated (Wunsch, in Wunsch, p. 29, 1994).

In a study by Chao, Walz, & Gardner (1993), protégés seemed to prefer informal mentoring over formal mentoring. Likewise, in a study by Ragins & Cotton (1999), informal mentoring was shown to be superior to formal mentoring in producing positive career outcomes (career satisfaction, compensation, and promotion) and producing more positive reports from protégés (reported provision of career development functions and psychosocial functions, and satisfaction with mentors).

Nemanick (2000) outlined several reasons why informal mentoring might be more effective than formal mentoring, using Ragins and Cotton's (1999) study:

1. Mentors and protégés may identify more readily with each other in an informally convened relationship.
2. Mentors and protégés can be more selective in choosing a partner.
3. Informal mentoring relationships tend to be longer lasting than formal relationships.
4. Mentors in a formal relationship may agree to participate out of loyalty or duty to the organization, rather than a personal connection with the protégé.
5. Formal programs may tend to focus on short term goals, rather than a long term focus.
Informal mentoring has been described as "classical" mentoring (Healy & Welchert, 1990) in which the relationship occurs spontaneously, is often long term, and can greatly impact both protégé and mentor; conversely these researchers felt that formal mentoring was often perceived as negative, short-term, and utilized as a cost-effective strategy for training new professionals.

**Potential problems of mentoring**

Even though much of the literature concerning mentoring is overwhelmingly positive, there are potentially negative elements and outcomes to the process of mentoring that have been reported (Feldman, 1999; Scandura, 1998). The unpleasant components of human relationships are often underrepresented in theory and research that explores new relationship forms, especially developmental helping relationships (Duck, 1994). Because mentoring is a relatively new field of study, it has been mainly been portrayed with optimism and positive regard of proponents (Johnson & Huwe, 2002).

However, even some of the earliest researchers (Levinson et al, 1978; Merriam, 1983; Fury, 1980) suggest potential problems. Levinson et al (1978) noted that mentorships can be unhealthy, and in some cases, clearly destructive. The mentor could become exploitative, egocentric, or too stifling and protective. The mentor could lose power and influence in the organization if the protégé fails; the protégé may become limited to one person's influence; if the mentor leaves the organization before the training is completed, the protégé's growth suffers; the possibility of emotional/sexual entanglements are a distinct danger; and incompetence of the mentor or the program would cause negative outcomes in the protégé's experience (Fury 1980, 42-47).
More recent writers suggest that at least half of all protégés have experienced at least one problematic mentor relationship (Kalbfleisch, 1997; Eby, McManus, Simon, & Russell, 2000). Negative experiences in mentorship are neither aberrant nor uncommon (Johnson & Huwe, 2002). Phillips-Jones (2001) listed several negative potentialities, such as disillusionment or unrealistic expectations for either the mentor or protégé, excessive time and energy commitments, inappropriate pairing, manipulation issues, feelings of inferiority or inevitable failure, jealousy on the part of the protégé, the mentor, or onlookers, and dysfunctional issues such as overdependence or romantic involvement.

Mentoring does not replace other forms of training, and is not the universal panacea; if the cultures, practices, and procedures (accumulated knowledge and wisdom) of the organization or profession are not shared equally with all junior members, protégés or not, the organization or profession eventually suffers. Also, the organization may run the risk of supporting a program of mentoring as an attempted means of correcting deficiencies within the organization, which makes mentoring a convenient but potentially hazardous compensatory mechanism rather than a developmental tool for the next generation of leaders (Harris, 1993).

Even strong proponents of mentoring admit negative elements exist. Some other problems identified in the literature include charges of favoritism and rivalry among protégés, desertion by the mentor, excessive emotional dependence by either party, differing ethics, and a vulnerability to hero worship which may restrict the growth of either party (Daloz, 1991).
Sometimes power issues develop. The mentor might become enamored of any authority, and resent the inevitable challenges to the mentor's conceptions and constructs; these challenges are a natural progression of the mentoring process, and are a byproduct and evidence of the growth of the protégé. At other times, the mentor or protégé may desire more time or attention than the other party is willing to provide; likewise, either party may have unrealistic expectations concerning the relationship. At other points in the relationship, one or the other party simply "drifts away"; the relationship loses its urgency and perceived usefulness. This development is easily explained -- mentoring serves a temporary need during a transition in the life of either party, and when the transition is completed, the perceived need for the partnership is lessened (Daloz 1991, 220).

Formal mentoring programs have a unique set of potential drawbacks. The mentor program may fail:

1) if the coupling is forced
2) if the mentors are not trained
3) if the expectations of each party are not outlined adequately
4) if the protégé becomes too identified with the mentor
5) if the expected term of the relationship is not clarified
6) if the mentoring program is not supported by organizational powers
7) if the personal chemistry never develops
8) if the mentor is also a supervisor
9) if the organization does not have a mentoring "atmosphere" of approval
10) if the mentoring program is seen as a replacement for needed formal training programs

11) if the mentoring program is seen as a "quick fix" (Kizilos 1990).

Clark, Harden, & Johnson (2000) surveyed 800 clinical psychology doctorates concerning protégé dissatisfaction; 17% of the responding former protégés described clearly negative components of their experience. The most common problems included mentor unavailability, difficulty with termination of the relationship, feeling unable to meet the mentor's expectations, exploitation by the mentor, negative mentor personality traits or behavior patterns, and unpleasant or undesired activities.

Johnson and Huwe (2002), by examining numerous reports of mentorship dysfunction, have prepared a typology of mentorship dysfunction. The list includes:

- faulty pair matching, mentor relational incompetence, mentor personal aberrations, mentor neglect, relational conflict, boundary violations, exploitation (by either party), improper attraction, unethical behavior, abandonment (death, job change, unclear termination of the relationship), cross-gender and cross-race mentoring issues, and protégé misbehavior (44-55).

Even with the lists of possible malfunctions in the mentoring relationship, the preponderance of research points to the positive results of mentoring in the professions and the possibilities of increased utilization of mentoring. Further, the positive results greatly outweigh the negative aspects of mentoring.
Mentoring as an accepted developmental tool and method has entered nearly every level of western society in the third millennium: government, business, education, even sports. However, mentoring has a long and illustrious history.

For centuries, mentoring has been used as a training model for handing down knowledge, maintaining culture, supporting new talent, and securing future leadership for organizations, professions, and society (Darwin 2000; Davis 1991); protégés learned not only the skills and crafts of their trade, but psychosocial dimensions such as integrity, honesty, diligence, commitment to excellence (Davis 1991), and the "way of life" that surrounded the trade or craft (MacDonald, 1989). Mentoring was practiced in the European craft guilds of the Middle Ages which relied on and mentor-like training for future craftsmen (Murray, 1991). Mentoring also flourished in the Middle Ages in the English feudal system as favored pages and squires became knights (Darwin 2000). The Confucian tradition of the sixth century B. C. used a form of mentoring as a means of developing academic and bureaucratic leaders (Wunsch, 1994, p.1). In many societies across the world today, mentorship is still the dominant form of education (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Brown, Collins, & Diguid, 1989).

In industry and business, there has been a decrease in the use of off-the-job formal training courses, and an increase in mentoring, coaching, and forms of structured on-the-job training (ASTD 1996). In many organizations, trainers have been transformed into learning advisers and consultants, whose function is to advise the organization in the delivery of learning at work. A range of refocused skills required for this role include:
facilitating the process of learning; systems thinking; consulting for organizational
development; and advising in operational development. Mentoring is involved in the idea
of conceptualizing skill formation as a continuous process through time, in which
learning at work is central, rather than training being seen as a series of discontinuous
educational activities (Ashton, 2002).

This section of the review underscores the effort by organizational leadership to
emphasize and incorporate mentoring as an effort to improve organizational efficiency,
teach skills, and develop new leadership in the professions.

**Outcomes of mentoring in the professions**

Much of the early research and seminal articles concerning mentoring and the
professions has centered around the outcomes, results, and effects of mentoring programs
in the professions (Levinson, 1978; Zey, 1984, 1985; Kram, 1985; Kanter, 1977; Roche,
1979; Noe, 1988). Does mentoring have a differential impact on the professional's career
or development? What are the eventual changes in the psychosocial functioning and
career development of the protégé? Of the mentor? Of the profession?

More current studies of the professional career outcomes of mentoring have focused on
several measures of outcomes. There seems to be consistency across the literature in
reporting that mentor relationships are facilitative of, if not essential to, the career
development of professionals (Eastman & Williams, 1993; Aryee & Chay, 1994). The
general findings of these more current studies are that protégés with mentors working on
their behalf are reported to be happier in their work, more productive in their
careers, rated higher by supervisors, earn higher salaries, and are promoted more quickly than non-mentored persons (Brinson & Kottler, 1993).

The current literature consistently points to direct benefits derived from mentoring relationships that accrue to the protégé, the mentor, and the organization (Zey 1991; Murray 1991; Galbraith & Cohen 1995). The list of perceived positive outcomes for the protégé can include enhanced salary, increased status within the organization, social acceptance, perceived satisfaction (Scandura, 1992; Scandura, 1994), enhanced knowledge, emotional stability, problem-solving and decision-making ability, creativity, leadership, generativity in individuals, morale and production enhancement in organizations and professions, rate of advancement in organizational hierarchies, perceptions of fairness in organizational issues (Scandura, 1997); and an ease of the socialization process (Whitley, Dougherty, & Dreher, 1988).

For the mentors, positive outcomes for serving as mentors include a sense of self-worth, a sense of giving back to the profession, increased status in the profession, fulfillment of a desire to pass along any wisdom gained through experience to the next generation of professionals, the enhancement of the mentor's personal learning and creativity, and new knowledge (Wickham & Sjodin, 1997).

For the professions or organizations, the reported positive outcomes include increased productivity, cost-effective training of employees, improved recruitment efforts, increased organizational or professional commitment, preservation of and distribution to a new generation of members the accumulated wisdom and history of the organization or profession, and increased retention of members (Murray, 1991; Kerr, Schulze, &
Woodward, 1995). Organizations increasingly will be developing and sponsoring mentoring programs to address both recruitment and retention of members (Kerr, Schulze, & Woodward, 1995).

Some writers and researchers insist that not enough well-designed evaluations exist from which to draw conclusions concerning the efficacy of mentoring. Criticisms include:

1) The bulk of evaluation research focuses on input measures, not outcomes

2) Difficulty in isolating and attributing outcomes to mentoring (often difficulty exists in controlling for other relationships and intervening variables)

3) Most evaluations can't capture long-range potential outcomes (Johnson & Sullivan 1995, p.45-46).

**Mentoring and retention in the professions**

Studies have shown that mentoring has been helpful in raising retention rates in teaching (Boe, 1997; Martin, 2000; Odell & Ferraro, 1992; Whitaker, 2001), social work (Samantrai, 1992; Schuster, 1998), law practice (Higgins & Thomas, 2001), military service (Johnson et al, 1999), and business (Dockery & Sahl, 1998; Hequet, 1993; Macauley, 1998; Murray, 1991).

Mentoring was found to have a positive impact towards reducing turnover intentions for accountants (Viator & Scandura, 1991), which normally leads to increased retention rates for employees (Scandura & Viator, 1994).

Turban & Dougherty (1994) stated that recent evidences indicate that mentoring experiences are related to career success in business management, which can lead to
retention (Dreher & Ash, 1990; Scandura, 1992). Therefore, they sought to investigate the relationship between mentoring, career attainment defined as salary and promotions, and career success, such as an individual's perception of career success. They found positive relationships between mentoring received and career attainment; and between perceived career success and mentoring received (Turban & Dougherty, 1994).

Organizational socialization is the term for the process of becoming a member of an organization or profession. The new member comes to appreciate the values, expected behaviors, and social knowledge essential for assuming a role in the organization and for participating as a member (Albrecht & Bach 1997). Some organizations have chosen mentoring programs in order to alleviate the difficulties involved in the socialization process, which tends to increase retention (Kirk 1992).

Nursing has been the focus of retention studies; 61% of newly graduated nurses leave or change employment during their first year of practice (Cronin-Stubbs 1977). Munro (1983) reported that employee turnover was largely dependent on job satisfaction. Studies report decreased turnover rates after the use of preceptors (a form of mentor) in orientation programs (Kasprisin & Young 1985; McLean 1987). Mackey (1988) reported that ongoing active staff involvement in retention efforts was effective. Mentoring was associated with increased job satisfaction and decreased work alienation, which may tend to decrease attrition, in a hospital setting for employees (Koberg et al, 1994).

Hamilton, Murray, Lindholm, & Myers (1989) noted statistics that indicated a 55% turnover rate in graduate nurses and a desire by professional nursing administrators to develop creative means to address specifically the retention of professional nurses. This
quasi-experimental investigation evaluated the effects of a hospital orientation program for new graduate nurses in which new graduate nurses were paired with mentors (an experienced professional nurse who not only served as a role model but also provided a nurturing experience beyond the twelve month orientation period).

Significant differences in job satisfaction and in perceived leadership behaviors were evident between new graduate nurses in the experimental and control groups. After 12 months, nurses in the experimental group were generally more satisfied with their jobs; the level of satisfaction decreased in the control group. Job retention was also improved.

In the Hamilton et al study (1989), retention rates were positively influenced, and promotions were increased. It appears that desirable qualities of an employee are fostered when a mentorship program attends to professional role development and skill acquisition by providing feedback by mentors over a longer period. The researchers state that such programs may contribute significantly toward reducing the turnover rate of hospital nurses.

Mentoring has been reported as a significant factor in retention of school teachers in a study (Whitaker, 2001) of special education teachers in their first year of practice. These teachers were surveyed for self-reporting of mentoring experiences, and were asked about plans to leave the profession. The results revealed a significant relationship between the overall effectiveness of the mentoring and the first-year teacher's plan to remain in special education. The degree of job satisfaction was also examined, and significant relationships between job satisfaction and retention were established, and between perceived overall mentoring effectiveness and job satisfaction. The linear regressions
revealed that mentoring effectiveness accounted for approximately 6% of the variance in job satisfaction and job satisfaction accounted for approximately 18% of the variance in retention.

Data were gathered solely through self-reported perceptions, especially about plans to remain with the profession. No information was gathered concerning actual outcomes, as from a longitudinal study, concerning job retention. Also, only one type of teacher in only one state was examined, thus limiting the generalizability of the findings. Other factors that might be involved in the beginning special education teacher's decision to stay were not addressed in this study (Whitaker, 2001).

Higgins & Thomas (2001) examined the effects of mentoring on the careers of attorneys. Their primary research focus was the comparison of the effects of a single 'primary' mentor with the effects of a 'constellation' of developmental relationships. They found that the quality of a primary 'developer' affected short-term career outcomes such as work satisfaction and intention to remain, while the composition and quality of an individual's set of developmental relationships accounted for the long-range protégé career outcomes such as actual retention and promotion.

In other words, they found that the primary mentor gave the protégé the will to stay, but the entire team of mentors was necessary to continue the encouragement over the length of the career of the protégé. The Higgins & Thomas (2001) article is useful because it points out one effect of mentoring by senior attorneys for junior attorneys early in their career: higher rates of retention (Higgins & Thomas, 2001).
Job retention issues have become an object of concern and items for research in military organizations (Gade, Tiggle, & Schumm, 2003; Harrington, Dean, Pintello, & Mathews, 2001; Savell, Teague, & Trimble Jr., 1995). Likewise, mentoring practices and outcomes have been researched in military circles (Maggart & James, 1999; Steinberg & Foley, 1999).

Mentoring has been cited as being useful in raising the retention rates of military personnel. A survey of retired naval officers pointed to the value of informal mentoring in career development (Johnson et al, 1999). In the article, the authors cite two surveys of military personnel that directly link mentoring in the early phases of the professional career of junior officers. In the first survey (U.S. Navy, 1997), junior naval officers ranked access to mentoring as one of the strongest factors influencing professional development and retention. In the second study (Schwerin & Bourne, 1998), Medical Service Corps officers who were mentored by a superior reported greater intention to remain on active duty.

Research on life insurance agents provides evidence that mentoring during the first year of employment in an insurance agency increases the "survival rate" of new agents from 64% to 74% (Silverhart, 1994), as well as the productivity rate, and the positive attitudes (confidence in job success) of the new agents (Dalessio, 1993; Berube, 1996).

This section of the review has examined literature reporting studies of mentoring in the professions of business management, nursing, academics (college student and beginning elementary school teacher), law practice, military, and insurance sales, concerning the perceived or statistically supported relationship between mentoring and retention. These
different studies suggest that there is a positive effect produced by mentoring on the retention levels in these different professions. The inference is that mentoring should be shown to have a positive effect for retention in the profession of ministry.

Mentoring and ministry

Following is a brief review of important Christian mentoring literature, and then a focus on the few research studies relevant to mentoring for ministerial training.

Christian mentoring literature

In the Christian educational and ministerial preparation literature base, there are many articles and books espousing mentoring as the answer for religious guidance of young people, spiritual growth of church members, and development of professional ministers (Stanley & Clinton, 1992; Anthony, 1993; Anderson & Reese, 1999; Schnittjer, 1994). The span of literature on mentoring in Christian contexts has popularized the terminology without precisely bounding the definition of mentoring, promoting proper understanding of the intent, processes, and outcomes of mentoring, or academically supporting the concept of mentoring (Engstrom, 1989; Thistlethwaite & Cairns, 1994; Crabb, 1997; Matthaei, 1991; Davis, 1991). Different concepts loosely gathered under the flagship of Christian “mentoring” (Stanley & Clinton, 1992) are discipleship (Davis, 1991; Biehl, 1996), spiritual friendship (Crabb, 1997; Benner, 2002), spiritual direction (Benner, 2002; Anderson & Reese, 1999), and spiritual accompaniment (Biehl, 1996; Benner, 2002).

While very helpful in applying mentoring skills and initiating mentoring programs for the Christian church (Neighbour, 1995; George & Ward, 1998; Biehl, 1996; Clinton, 1991; Stanley & Clinton, 1992), the great majority of the material is inspirational,
anecdotal, advocative, prescriptive, instrumental, and encourages participation by emotional persuasion (Smallbones, 1995; Daloz, 1989). Also, very little of the material available deals with preparation of and support of professional ministers (Connor, 1994; Elmore, 1995; Jones, 1980; Clinton & Leavenworth 1994).

Matthaei's (1991) version of "faith-mentoring" closely resembles discipleship, rather than classical mentoring, in that it focuses solely on psychosocial issues (spiritual, mental, emotional, character issues). Assistance with vocational/educational issues were almost nonexistent. Matthaei describes a spiritual director: a mediator of spiritual growth who supports the process of developing a deeper relationship with God through a one-to-one relationship. However, she sees the role of faith-mentor as more broadly conceived than the commonly shared image of spiritual director because of the momentary encounters that she marks as faith mentoring.

In fact, much of the Christian literature on mentoring confuses the roles of mentor, discipler, and spiritual director. One of the widely-read books, by Ron Lee Davis (1991), is named *Mentoring*. But, in his description of a mentor (p.50-51), Davis enumerates qualities of a psychosocial spiritual director, instead of the generally accepted qualities of a classical mentor. A spiritual father, a player-coach, is being described, even though a 'dictionary' definition of mentor is quoted: a trusted counselor or guide, a teacher or coach (p.15).

Another popular book by Benner (2002) directly compares mentoring to discipling, and then proceeds to draw distinctions between this understanding and spiritual direction. He
allocates discipling/mentoring to the first phases of the Christian life, and then reserves spiritual direction for the later, more intensive stages of Christian growth. In his construct, discipling involves more accountability to the mentor and more direction from the mentor; it usually involves some sort of structure, and curriculum of instruction for new believers. Spiritual direction is mainly relegated to the advancement of more developed Christians, and is a ministry of accompaniment, of spiritual friendship, rather than accountability.

Larry Crabb (1997) uses the terminology of mentoring in his work on building community in churches and religious groups. He speaks of healing communities: a group of people who place connecting at the center of their purpose and passion, and use the involvement of friends (people committed to the art of caring engagement), shepherds (people committed to the art of mentoring or passing along hope), and spiritual directors (people committed to the art of offering one's presence to another, while that person goes through phases of development) (p.206-207).

Again, there is confusion of definitions/functions/outcomes concerning the role of mentoring, and confusion with different models of involvement of mentoring. And, as with the other Christian writers, mentoring is applied to all ages, all phases of Christian growth, and is not reserved for ministerial preparation.

Other authors have considered the difference between discipling and mentoring:

At the risk of oversimplification, discipling deals more with transfer of knowledge whereas mentoring concentrates on the application of that knowledge, commonly considered as wisdom. We might also add that mentoring is considered by many to be less structured than traditional discipling. The mentor doesn’t try to give all the answers or solve all the problems his protégé may be facing, but instead, challenges the learner to seek answers on his own. (Gibson, 1994, p.121-122).
Engstrom (1989) argues that mentoring is more holistic than discipleship. He sees the difference as discipleship centering on…

A rather narrow segment of personal spirituality: Bible study, spiritual growth, and the enhancement of the spiritual gifts. Mentoring sculptures people, their values, the shaping of response patterns to crisis and opportunity, the acquisition of habits of work, the enlargement of one's hunger for God, and the expansion of our view of creation. And much more! (Engstrom, 1989, p.4).

Ministerial mentoring literature

Several studies have focused on the perceived inadequacy of formal theological training and the perceived usefulness of an "in-service" mentoring program to remedy the shortcomings of the formal training (Brainerd, 1996; Howard, 1998; LeValley, 1998), but did not specifically link mentoring to retention. Other studies focused on the impact of mentoring during the early service of ministers (Williams, 2001; Shelly, 1996; Boyd, 1999), but did not specifically link early mentoring to retention. Several studies were located that dealt with the relationship of mentoring and job satisfaction in ministry (Brannagan, 1997; Boersma, 1994; Bustrum, 1995). Job satisfaction may be linked to longevity of career in ministers, but these studies did not address that specific proposition. One dissertation was located that examined common logical times for ministers to leave the ministry (Runkel, 1982), and the author offered an opinion that the reception of mentoring in the early stages of ministry could lower the attrition rate, but there was no further investigation of the link between mentoring and retention.
Summary

From this short review of Christian and ministerial preparation mentoring literature, it is clear that there is a deficiency of research literature on mentoring in ministerial preparation, and a decided lack of academic research concerning the outcomes of mentoring, especially retention. We simply do not know about a link between mentoring and retention in ministry. This study addresses that problem.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter outlines the design and methods that were employed in this study. This study investigated the relationship between mentoring in the first year of ministry, as defined by possessing a minister’s license in the Church of God, and retention, as defined by retaining that license into the tenth year of service. This chapter presents the purpose of this study, the research questions, research design, study population, sampling techniques, instrumentation, data collection procedures, and data analyses procedures.

Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between mentoring and retention in ministry. The study was a quantitative associational research design. The objective was to identify, based on the presence of a mentor during the first year of the minister’s service, mentor characteristics, and mentor functions, any association between mentoring and retention. If there is any association, then the retention rates for ministers who received mentoring should be higher than ministers who were not mentored. This study measured selected variables that describe characteristics of a
mentor. This study also measured the functions of a mentor that have been previously identified as being associated with successful mentoring (Cohen, 1995a), to investigate whether or not these variables were correlated with the decision to remain in ministry.

Research Method

This study employed associational research techniques to determine the relationship of mentoring and retention in ministry. Correlational research is a method of associational research (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996).

This study analyzed data from a mail survey to investigate differences and determine relationships that already existed among variables that could not be manipulated. Using logistic regression, an analysis was also undertaken to determine which independent variables had the greatest impact on retention.

Research questions

The overall research question for this study is:

What is the relationship between mentoring and retention of ministers?

The specific research questions investigated are:

1. Of the ministers licensed in 1993-1994 by the Church of God, what is the difference in frequency of mentoring relationships between the retained ministers and the non-retain ministers?

2. What is the relationship between retention and presence of a mentor?

3. What is the relationship between retention and mentor characteristics & mentor functions?
Variables

The operational definitions for the independent variables are:

**Mentoring relationship**: The participant's response to the following question determined participation in a mentoring relationship: I had a relationship with a mentor in the first year of my ministry. (The answer was *Yes* or *No*)

**Mentor Characteristics**: the composite score with a possible range of 5-25 was based on the sum of the responses to the following five categories: educational level, length of service, ministry rank, size of congregation, positions of leadership. The five sub-variables that constituted the variable mentor characteristics were treated as continuous variables for analysis purposes.

- Educational level: The participant's response to the following question determined the educational level of the mentor: What was the educational level of your mentor at the time of mentoring?
- Length of service: The participant's response to the following question determined the length of service of the mentor: What was the length of service of your mentor at the time of mentoring?
- Ministry rank: The participant's response to the following question determined the ministry rank of the mentor: What was the ministry rank achieved by your mentor at the time of mentoring?
- Size of congregation: The participant's response to the following question determined the size of congregation pastored by the mentor: What was the
size of congregation pastored by your mentor at the time of mentoring?

- Positions of leadership: The participant's response to the following question determined the positions of leadership attained by the mentor:
  What were the positions of leadership attained by your mentor at the time of mentoring?

Mentor Functions: the scores of each mentoring function (relational emphasis, information emphasis, facilitative focus, confrontive focus, mentor model, and ministerial vision) represented the independent variables.

The operational definition of the dependent variable was as follows:

Retention: The present ministerial status of the participant (marked by current possession of a ministerial license) will be determined by a review of the records provided by the Department of Business and Records of the Church of God.

Study population and sampling technique

The target population (sampling frame) for this study was limited to ministers who received their first license for ministry in the Church of God, the Exhorter’s license, during the year of September 1993-August 1994; this group numbered 1492 individuals. This information was supplied by the Office of Business and Records, Church of God International Offices, in Cleveland, Tennessee.
After consultation with Reverend Julian B. Robinson, Director of the Office of Business and Records, Church of God International Offices, Cleveland, Tennessee, this particular cohort of ministers was chosen as representative of the attrition rate of a typical year's group. In review of the records, this researcher and Reverend Robinson determined that the attrition rate for each cohort (class) increases each year from the first year of licensing to approximately the eighth year, and then the attrition rate is consistent with a rounded figure of approximately 20% (see figure 3.1). Through examination of the records, it was determined that 19.71% of the class of 1993-1994 ministers were no longer in the ministry.

After examination of the register of names and addresses, it was decided by this researcher to survey only U.S and Canadian ministers. There were several reasons. Many of the foreign addresses were incomplete. Typical delays in international mail schedules would have extended the research schedule. Varying amounts of ability to read and write English would have hampered the effectiveness of the research. Limiting the list to U.S. and Canadian ministers yielded 721 names and addresses. Of these, 462 were active in the ministry (64.1%) and 259 (35.9%) were inactive.

The participants were asked about the presence of a mentor during the new minister’s first year of licensure. The literature supports the effectiveness of a mentor’s assistance during the first year of professional life (Bustrum, 1995; Collins, 1994; Hamilton et al, 1989; Samantrai, 1992; Whittaker, 2001).
Attrition of Ministers Credentialed Sept-Aug by Year (as of 12/11/2003)

1989-1990 - 1157 licensed: 20.57% terminated
1990-1991 - 1311 licensed: 26.16% terminated
1992-1993 - 977 licensed: 27.33% terminated
1993-1994 - 1492 licensed: 19.77% terminated
1994-1995 - 1287 licensed: 22.37% terminated
1995-1996 - 1404 licensed: 17.38% terminated
1996-1997 - 1150 licensed: 18.35% terminated
1997-1998 - 1593 licensed: 12.75% terminated
1998-1999 - 1172 licensed: 10% terminated

Figure 3.1: Attrition of Church of God Ministers
The names and addresses were listed in the records according to the minister’s file number. On May 21, 2004, a simple single-stage random sample \((n = 366)\), using a random number table (Gay, 1996, p.602-605), was drawn from the list of names and addresses provided by the Office of Business and Records \((n = 721)\). The sample size was set at 50 cases per independent variable, meaning that a random sample of 350 cases would be ideal (Hair et al, 1998, p.258). If alpha was set at .05 and power was set at .90, and the effect size was set at .5, the recommended number of returns to seek was 166.

There were two stages of sampling from the population. First, the random sample was drawn, and then a portion of the sample, the retained ministers, was selected for statistical analysis.

Ultimately, six names were dropped from the list of names that were to be research subjects. These potential subjects were close friends with the researcher, and this familiarity might have affected the subject’s ability to answer the questions honestly. Therefore, a total of 360 names and addresses were utilized.

**Instrumentation**

An instrument was designed to measure the independent variables. The dependent variable, retention, was assessed through an examination of records at the Church of God International Offices. For this study, retention was defined as persistence in the position and activities of ministry in the Church of God, as measured by continued possession of ministerial license after 10 years of service. Data for this study were collected from a sample of ministers drawn from the class of ministers licensed by the Church of God during 1993-1994.
The instrument used was in the form of a self-administered mailed questionnaire. The apparent advantages of a self-administered questionnaire, such as economy of the design, rapid turnaround for data collection, minimal staffing needs, complete coverage of the sample set, and ability to properly randomize the sample, are the reasons for the choice of research instrument (Schaeffer et al, 1996). An additional advantage of a mailed survey form is privacy; no interviewer would be present for any possible interference or embarrassment. Another advantage to a mailed survey is that respondents have time to give thoughtful answers (Fowler, 1993).

One possible disadvantage of a self-administered questionnaire, that of the need for good reading and writing skills, was not a pressing concern. Ministers are usually adept at reading and writing. Another disadvantage, that of not having an interviewer present to ensure that all questions are answered, was a concern (Fowler, 1993).

To measure the effect of other interrelated variables that may influence retention and the effectiveness of the mentoring, the protégés were asked for demographic information concerning the mentor. The information given by the protégés about their mentors was listed for size of congregation, educational level attained, ministry rank, positions of leadership attained, and length of service, and was collated into a factor called mentor characteristics. The examination of these demographic data concerning the mentors is important because it was anticipated that it would be possible to identify elements that contribute to differences in the relationship of mentoring to retention. These five factors were combined into one numerical score: mentor characteristics at the time of mentoring.

These mentor characteristics did not include ethnic distinctions; the records provided by
the Department of Business and Records of the Church of God do not provide information on ethnic differences. These characteristics also did not factor in gender differences. The number of female ministers was small in 1993-1994, and thus was not be enough to provide sufficient information for proper analysis. Also, to avoid the complications of cross-gender mentoring issues, all mentors and protégés were male.

The survey form first asked about the presence of a ministerial mentor in the first year of the subject’s ministry. A working definition of mentor preceded this question.

In your first year of licensed ministry, did you have an informal relationship with an experienced minister who regularly offered advice, counsel, information, challenge, and direction to you, in a one-to-one relationship of trust? This mentor may have served as a role model for ministry, as a guide for advancement in ministry, as a support for decision-making in ministry.

If the subject responded no, then no further responses were necessary. The subject was thanked, and asked to return the survey form in the enclosed envelope (See Instrument – Appendix C). If the subject responded yes, then the survey form asked for two categories of information about the mentor at the time of mentoring: mentor characteristics and mentor function.

The first section of the instrument solicited characteristics, previously discussed, concerning the mentor at the time of mentoring:

- size of congregation
- educational level
- ministry rank
- positions of leadership
- length of service.
These characteristics may be mediators of the effectiveness of mentoring (Cohen, 1995a). These five characteristics were reported as summated scores, and were treated as a cluster variable, called mentor characteristics. The characteristics of the protégé might affect the mentoring relationship, but for this research only the characteristics of the mentor are being investigated.

The second section of the instrument contained a modified version of the Principles of Adult Mentoring Scale, or PAMS (Cohen, 1988). Mentoring is a multi-faceted interpersonal interaction which involve a complex combination of behaviors; these behavioral aspects may have affected their decision to remain in ministry. The Scale proposes that a core of mentor competencies constitute the complete mentor role; these are interpersonal behavioral skills that appear essential for productive interaction. An instrument previously designed to measure selected independent variables listed in a business and government mentoring setting, the PAMS (Cohen, 1998) was adapted to properly measure the characteristics of the study sample of previously chosen predictors of retention in ministry. There have been a number of studies that utilized the PAMS (Coffman, 1998; Jones, 1999; Stoner, 1996), and there have been studies that used a contextualized version of the PAMS as this study did (Hallesky, 2001; Teja, 2003). Dr. Norman Cohen offered permission for the use of the PAMS on December 22, 2003 (Appendix A).

Cohen's (1998) scale follows the six subscales that were outlined in the functions of mentoring section of the literature review. The instrument referred to behaviors in the following areas:
relationship emphasis – to establish trust
information emphasis – to offer information
facilitative focus – to introduce alternatives
confrontive focus – to challenge assumptions
mentor model – to motivate action
ministerial vision – to encourage initiative

The 45 statements in the modified PAMS instrument cover the six subscales in this fashion: ten items for relationship emphasis, six items for information emphasis, six items for facilitative focus, nine items for confrontive focus, six items for mentor model, and eight items for ministerial vision (see Appendix B). The participants were instructed to choose the response on the Likert-type scale which they deemed to be most representative of their mentor's behavior. The five possible responses are never, infrequently, sometimes, frequently, and always. Each response had a point value.

This modified version of the PAMS reflected the ministerial focus of this study. Also, this modified version always substituted the word protégé for the word employee. Further, the statements were modified to represent the minister's perception of the mentor's behavior for each of the 45 statements. For instance, the statement in the PAMS (Cohen, 1998), "I try to schedule my meetings with employees for times when I am not likely to be interrupted" was modified to read "My mentor tried to schedule meetings for times when we were not likely to be interrupted." The statement, "I encourage employees to consider nontraditional learning, such as television and correspondence-based courses, as well as more formal educational opportunities, in order to develop their career
interests" was modified to read "My mentor encouraged me to consider non-traditional learning opportunities, such as distance learning or correspondence courses, as well as more formal educational opportunities, in order to develop my ministry interests." The statement, "I express my personal confidence in the ability of employees to succeed if they persevere in the pursuit of their career goals" was modified to read "My mentor expressed personal confidence in my ability to succeed if I would persevere in the pursuit of my ministerial career goals."

The answers for the questions were coded, for facilitation of scoring. For the first question concerning presence of a mentor, the answer code was a simple 1) or 2), representing yes or no. For the demographic questions, the answers for each of the questions were coded numerically (1, 2, 3, 4, 5), and each respondent received a cumulative score for mentor characteristics. For the PAMS scores, the answers were coded alphabetically (A, B, C, D, E), and converted to numerical scores during the data analysis procedures.

Validity of the study and reliability of the instrument

A panel of ministerial training experts, who were not in the population frame, was chosen by the researcher from the faculty of Lee University and the Church of God Seminary (See Appendix C); these faculty members were asked to preview the instrument on May 24, 2004. They commented on clarity of directions, wording of specific questions, and response format.

Secondly, the instrument was pretested for face validity and content validity by a panel of fourteen ministerial trainers on May 27, 2004, in Cleveland, TN. These persons (See
Appendix D) are pastors, and also state administrative personnel of the Church of God Ministerial Internship Program. The researcher was present with the participants during the pretest to record the average amount of time needed to complete the instrument (12 minutes). As with the preview, all participants in the field test were asked to identify confusing and difficult questions. At the suggestion of the faculty members and ministerial trainers, several questions were slightly reworded, and the instructions were enhanced.

This served as the pretest for further refinement of the survey questions and procedures by the researcher and his advisor, and for establishing content and face validity of the modified instrument. According to Merriam and Simpson (1989, p.131), “Pretesting an instrument works out problems that may arise after the data has been collected. Also, previewing the instrument for leading or threatening items will guard against bias and weak reliability of results.” Cohen’s PAMS has already demonstrated reliability (Cohen, 1995a; 1995b; 1993), and this instrument is a modified version of Cohen’s Scale.

The validity and reliability of the Principles of Mentoring Inventory has been previously established and reported in the literature (Cohen, 1995a). Reliability analysis for the Principles of Adult Mentoring Scale have been established which show an alpha of .9490 for the postsecondary education version, and an alpha of .9606 for the business and government version (Cohen, 1995a). The researcher applied the Scale to a ministerial population, so there may be reliability factors, because an instrument may not necessarily receive a similar level of reliability in a different population (Rudestam & Newton, 1992, p.67). Again, a solution to this problem is to pre-test the instrument with a team of
experienced ministers (Merriam & Simpson, 1995). The reliability of this instrument was calculated at an alpha of .8872.

**Threats to external validity and reliability**

Validity is defined as the “appropriateness, meaningfulness, and usefulness of the specific inferences researchers make based on the data they collect” (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996). External validity of a study is determined by the extent to which the findings of the study can be generalized (Frankel & Wallen, 1996).

Reliability is defined as “the consistency of the scores obtained – how consistent are they for each individual from…one set of items to another” (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996). Reliability refers to the consistency of the instrument used.

If reliability refers to the ability of a measure to produce consistent results, and validity indicates that a measure in fact measures what it purports to measure (Hair et al, 1998, p.67; Rudestam & Newton, 1992, p.67), then we must assess threats to the validity of the study and reliability of the instrument.

There are threats to the external validity of this study. First, not all ministers were surveyed, so the sample size might have decreased the generalizability of this study. The solution: choose sample sizes according to accepted statistical procedures (Hair et al, 1998). This was done.

Another possible threat to the external validity of this study is the instrument developed for and employed in this study. Sources such as type of questions, wording of the questions, length of the instrument, sponsor of the instrument, method of administration, and respondent errors all could have affected the validity of this study (Merriam &
Simpson, 1995). The response to this threat was to arrange for the instrument to be piloted for face validity and content validity by a team of experienced ministers.

Another threat to external validity is nonresponse (Scheaffer et al, 1996); efforts to contact nonrespondents and to elicit compliance protect the validity of the instrument (Merriam & Simpson, 1995, p.146). Nonresponse arises in one of three ways: inability to contact the person, inability of the person to answer the survey, or refusal to answer (Fowler, 1993). Careful design of mailing list choices, precise procedures of sample selection and strict collection of data from the selected subjects can reduce sampling errors of coverage due to inability to contact the subject (Scheaffer et al, 1996). With this survey, there were few questions that could not be answered by the selected sample members, based on good design of the instrument and good selection of questions through input of the pilot test panel members.

The problem of refusal to answer might have been a threat to validity. This study used careful planning to lower refusal rates (Scheaffer, Mendenhall III, & Ott, 1996). The respondents were alerted in advance by a letter to help improve the response rate. Ministers are normally helpful to each other and are willing to participate, based on brotherhood. Also, the prestige of being chosen for an important survey, the explanation of the beneficial nature of this research to the profession of ministry, and the name recognition on the letterhead of the researcher and his job title assisted in encouraging participation. Persons who are most interested in the research problem tend to be most likely to return questionnaires (Fowler, 1993); ministers, from the experience of the researcher, are generally interested in the health and growth of the ministerial profession.
For follow-up contact of the non-respondents, callbacks assisted in eliminating the bias introduced into the sample. The importance of making callbacks to correct for non-response is important to maintain a satisfactory effort to access all strata of the sample (Schaeffer et al, 1996). The researcher attempted to call every non-respondent. Repeated efforts to contact non-respondents hopefully induced higher rates of participation (Fowler, 1993).

Individuals who are no longer in the ministry (for this study, individuals who are no longer licensed with the Church of God), as well as active ministers (for this study, ministers who possess a current license), were included in the survey sample. However, availability of addresses and phone numbers for non-active ministers were difficult to obtain, and willingness to participate might have been different for the ex-ministers as for the active ministers. The researcher made diligent effort to locate addresses, and had several resources for obtaining missing addresses that were chosen for the random sample. The researcher called these sources to verify addresses for ministers who are no longer in the ministry.

The researcher acknowledges that there might have been reluctance on the part of ministers who have surrendered their license to participate in this survey. The decision to leave the ministry in most cases seems to be highly emotional. A sense of failure often comes with the decision to leave a profession that had most likely been the source of a sense of pride and fulfillment. Also, the circumstances that led to the decision may have been emotionally painful. There may be cases where individuals may have perceived themselves to have had a moral failure which led them to the eventual resignation. Also,
memories of hearing scriptural admonitions such as to fear "running from the call of the Lord" (Jonah 1:3) and "the gift and calling of God are without repentance" (Romans 11:29) may have induced a fearful attitude in the minister who has made the decision to leave the ministry. A self-administered questionnaire, with proper precautions concerning anonymity, might have led to higher rates of participation with these sensitive individuals than would a personal interview (Fowler, 1993, p.89).

The questions were carefully worded to avoid a sense of judgment, as were the introduction and instructions. Also, assurances of confidentiality in the advance letters, a numbering system to code the identity of the respondents, and signed commitments from the researcher were employed as assurances of confidentiality (Fowler, 1993, p.90).

**Data collection procedures**

The names and addresses were secured from the Office of Business and Records, Church of God International Offices, Cleveland, Tennessee. Approval for this research was secured from the Church of God General Overseer, Dr. Lamar Vest (Appendix E). A letter of introduction was sent, alerting the participants that they have been chosen to participate in a survey that will yield valuable information to improve the ministry. A small incentive was included in the initial introductory letter; a promise of a copy of the finished report, if desired, was included, and may have encouraged participation. Incentives to respond are particularly helpful for samples from groups that have a particular interest in the problem under study; ministers, from the experience of the researcher, are generally interested in the health and growth of the ministerial profession (Scheaffer et al, 1996). Informed consent was obtained in accordance with the
requirements of The Ohio State University Human Subjects Institutional Review Board on June 4, 2004 (Appendix F).

On the afternoon of Friday, June 4, 2004, an introductory letter was sent to each minister that was selected for this survey, informing them that they had been selected by random chance for this important research project (see Appendix G). On Friday, June 11, 2004, an envelope containing a cover letter, a survey form, a postcard, a small incentive (one dollar bill), and a stamped, self-addressed envelope was sent to each selected participant (see Appendix H). On Friday, June 18, 2004, a reminder letter was sent to each person who had not yet responded (see Appendix I).

A stamped, self-addressed return envelope was included, with a request that the questionnaire be returned within five days of its reception. Callbacks began at three weeks after initial mailing. Nonresponse can be reduced by having a carefully prepared plan for callbacks (Scheaffer et al, 1996). Each nonresponder received a call at two weeks, and then one week later. The information was retrieved from the completed questionnaires using a data entry protocol, Excel.

Data analysis procedures

The data were entered into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet as the returns were received. On Tuesday, July 18, 2004, the data were first analyzed using MiniTab. Statistical analysis of the data contained in the returned survey forms included descriptive statistics, correlations, and logistic regression. Frequencies, means, standard deviations, and ranges were reported for all of the independent variables. Correlation coefficients were calculated and reported, using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS),
Version 10.0 for Windows, to address question #3. Logistic regression was used to identify variables useful in predicting retention in ministry (dichotomous dependent variable) and addressed research question #3, and the major research question. The alpha level was set a priori at 0.05.

Logistic regression was selected as the method of analysis; this is a form of regression in which the dependent variable is a nonmetric, dichotomous (binary) variable (Hair et al, 1998), a categorical variable with two categories (either/or). Logistic regression creates estimates for the likelihood/probability that an event will occur. Logistic regression also offers a way of interpreting relationships by examining the relationship between a set of conditions and the probability of an event occurring. The linearity of the relationship between dependent and independent variables represents the degree to which the change in the dependent variable is associated with the independent variable. This method would indicate proportions, such as: for a one unit increase in mentoring, a one unit increase in retention is realized. Logistic regression is a viable statistical technique for analyzing the influence of independent variables since it correlates a dichotomous dependent variable (retained or not) with multiple independent variables that are continuous and categorical.

The general log-linear model does not distinguish between dependent and independent variables, but in the logit model, one variable is chosen as the dependent variable. This criterion to be analyzed is the expected odds as a function of the other, independent variables. Therefore, the logit model is closely analogous to ordinary regression (Knoke & Burke, 1980).
The formula that was used for the model is expressed as:

\[
\frac{Probability(event)}{Probability(no\ event)} = e^{(B_0 + B_1X_1 + B_2X_2 \ldots B_nX_n)}
\]

\(e\) represents the base of mutual logs, the natural logarithms. \(B_0\) represents the constant. \(B_1 \ldots B_n\) represents the logistic regression coefficient. \(X_1 \ldots X_n\) represents the independent variables: perceived status of mentor, relationship emphasis, information emphasis, facilitative focus, confrontive focus, mentor model, ministerial vision. (Hair et al, 1998, p.278)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probability of event = (e^{(B_0 + B_1X_1 + B_2X_2 \ldots B_kX_k)})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of event = 1 + (e^{(B_0 + B_1X_1 + B_2X_2 \ldots B_kX_k)})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- \(B_0\) = constant
- \(B_1\ldots B_k\) = logistic regression coefficients
- \(X_1\ldots X_k\) = Independent variables (Relationship with a mentor, mentor characteristics, mentor functions)
- \(e\) = Base of the natural logarithms

Probability of no event = 1 – probability of event

Figure 3.2: Logistic regression model (Gleim & Warmbrod, 2003)
Summary

Associational research was used in this study to determine relationships between the independent variables and the dependent variable and to predict patterns. The independent variables were the presence of a mentor in the first year of ministry, the characteristics of the mentor (educational level, length of service, ministry rank attained, size of congregation pastored, and positions of leadership obtained), and the functions of the mentoring relationship (relationship emphasis, information emphasis, facilitative focus, confrontive focus, mentor model behaviors, and ministerial vision behaviors). The dependent variable was retention (Was the minister still in possession of a minister’s license in the tenth year of service?). The population was all North American ministers in the Church of God (Cleveland, TN) who received their initial license in the church year 1993-1994; the sample was randomly chosen. The instrument was a mailed survey form. The data was analyzed using SPSS and Microsoft Excel spreadsheet, descriptive statistics, and logistic regression.
Question 1. Of the ministers licensed in 1993-1994 by the Church of God, what is the difference in frequency of mentoring relationships between the retained ministers and the non-retained ministers?

Variables: Difference in percentage of retention

Analysis: Percentages of retention between mentored and non-mentored ministers

Question 2. What is the relationship between retention and presence of a mentor?

Variables: Dependent variable – retention

Independent variable – Presence of a mentor

Analysis: Chi-square distribution

Question 3. What is the relationship between retention and mentor characteristics & mentor functions?

Variables: Dependent variable – retention

Independent variables – Mentor characteristics, mentor functions

Analysis: Calculation of Pearson product moment coefficients of correlation for correlations between and among the independent variables, logistic regression of independent variables against dependent variable, and boxplots, bar charts, and scatterplot to visually examine the relationships.

Table 3.1: Chart for Questions, Variables, and Analyses
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

This study was conducted to determine the relationship between mentoring and retention in ministry. Specifically, this study was conducted to measure the self-reported effects of the presence or absence of a mentoring relationship (during the first year of the protégé’s ministry) on the subsequent active status of the protégé (retained), or inactive status (not retained). Also, this study was conducted to further examine the characteristics of ministerial mentors and the relationship of those characteristics to retention, and the functions of the mentoring process and the relationship of those functions to retention.

A quantitative approach, associational research, was employed to investigate the strength and direction of associations between variables. Data were obtained through an instrument that was mailed to a random sample of ministers. This instrument asked about the presence of a ministerial mentor during the respondent’s first year of ministry. It also investigated the characteristics of the ministerial mentor and the functions of the mentoring relationship. Analysis of the acquired data was then completed to determine any relationship between these three elements and retention of the protégé minister.

In this chapter, the findings of the study are presented. Each of the research questions are addressed with the findings produced by the data analysis. A chi-square test for
independence was used to determine a relationship between mentoring and retention. Correlation analyses were undertaken to investigate relationships among and between the independent variables of mentor characteristics and mentor function. Logistic regression was used to examine whether the independent variables, and combinations of these independent variables, predicted the likelihood of retention.

The overall research question for this study was:

What is the relationship between mentoring and retention of ministers?

The specific research questions investigated were:

1. Of the ministers licensed in 1993-1994 by the Church of God, what is the difference in frequency of mentoring relationships between the retained ministers and the non-retained ministers?

2. What is the relationship between retention and presence of a mentor?

3. What is the relationship between retention and mentor characteristics & mentor functions?

Description of the Sample

Descriptive statistics describing the sample by independent variables (mentor relationship, mentor characteristics, and mentor functions) and by dependent variable (retention) are shown on tables 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retained</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentored</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not mentored</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Frequency Table for Responding Ministers \( (n = 125) \)

A total of 125 ministers returned the survey forms, a response rate of 35%. Ninety-four participants (75.2%) were still in the ministry, as marked by current possession of a Church of God minister’s license. Eighty-two ministers (65%) reported a relationship with a mentor in their first year of ministry. This means that a majority of ministers in this study experienced a relationship with a mentor.

Table 4.2 presents the data concerning the mentor characteristics.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Retained</th>
<th>Not retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>9 (14%)</td>
<td>2 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>7 (11%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>14 (22%)</td>
<td>6 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>17 (27%)</td>
<td>7 (41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>16 (25%)</td>
<td>2 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or less years</td>
<td>20 (31%)</td>
<td>6 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>19 (30%)</td>
<td>3 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 years</td>
<td>16 (25%)</td>
<td>6 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 years</td>
<td>9 (14%)</td>
<td>2 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 40 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ministry rank</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlicensed</td>
<td>1 (1.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>License from other organization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhorter</td>
<td>3 (4.5%)</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed</td>
<td>7 (11%)</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordained</td>
<td>54 (88%)</td>
<td>15 (88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of congregation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 100</td>
<td>20 (31%)</td>
<td>3 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-200</td>
<td>18 (27.5%)</td>
<td>5 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-400</td>
<td>18 (27.5%)</td>
<td>6 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-800</td>
<td>5 (8%)</td>
<td>3 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 800</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positions of leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local leadership</td>
<td>37 (57%)</td>
<td>11 (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State leadership</td>
<td>21 (32.5%)</td>
<td>3 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National leadership</td>
<td>3 (4.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State official</td>
<td>3 (4.5%)</td>
<td>2 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National official</td>
<td>1 (1.5%)</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Mentor Characteristics Scores for Mentored Ministers (n = 82)
In Table 4.2, five characteristics of the mentors, as reported by the respondents, were examined for possible differences between the mentors of retained ministers and the mentors of non-retained ministers. These characteristics were observed in the mentor by the minister at the time of mentoring. The characteristics were educational level of the mentor, length of service of the mentor (years of professional ministry), level of licensure of the mentor, size of congregation pastored by the mentor, and positions of leadership filled by the mentor.

A typical profile of a mentor for both retained and non-retained ministers, as reported by the survey respondents, would be a mentor that served in state leadership, was ordained, had attended college, had 11-20 years of experience, and was serving a church of 200 or less in attendance.

A category that revealed a difference in this sample between the mentors of retained ministers and the mentors of non-retained ministers is the educational level of the mentors: 25% of the mentors of retained ministers had advanced degrees, and 12% of the mentors of non-retained ministers had advanced degrees. A Chi-square analysis could determine whether this proportion was statistically significant. However, as seen in Table 4.2, the frequencies were too small for a Chi-square test for significance.

Table 4.3 presents the data for the mentor functions.
Table 4.3: Mean Mentor Functions Scores for Mentored Ministers (N = 82)

Table 4.3 presents the results of the survey questions concerning the functions of the mentor. The scores for mentors of retained ministers are higher than the scores for mentors of non-retained ministers. The mean of the means for the mentors of retained ministers was 3.375 (67.5%); the mean of the means for the mentors of non-retained ministers was 2.523 (50.5%). For every category of mentor function, the retained ministers indicated higher scores for mentor functions for their mentors than the non-retained ministers indicated for their mentors.
The descriptive statistics presented in Tables 4.2 and 4.3 reveal differences in mentoring characteristics and mentoring functions, as perceived by the participating ministers, that will be analyzed through investigating each research question.

Research Questions

Question #1 relates to the number of ministers that did or did not report the presence of a mentor during the first year of their ministry.

**Research Question #1**  Difference in Frequency of Mentoring Relationships

Of the sample of ministers licensed in 1993-1994 by the Church of God, what is the difference in frequency of mentoring relationships between the retained ministers and the non-retained ministers?

As reported on Table 4.1, the 82 mentored ministers had a rate of retention of 80%. The 43 ministers who had not been mentored had a retention rate of 67%. A higher percentage of retained ministers experienced a mentoring relationship than did the non-mentored ministers.

Question #2 relates to the relationship between presence of a mentor (independent variable) and retention (dependent variable).

**Research Question #2**  Relationship of Mentoring to Retention

What is the relationship between presence of a mentor and retention?
A chi-square test for independence examined the data for the relationship between retention and relationship with a mentor during the first year of ministry for all 125 ministers. This test compared the observed frequency distribution with an expected frequency distribution, to determine whether the results were by chance. The results are presented in Table 4.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retained</th>
<th>Not retained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentored</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not mentored</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Sq = 2.115, DF = 1, p-value = 0.146

Table 4.4: Chi Square Distribution for Relationship of Mentoring to Retention

The resulting chi-square statistic of 2.115 was smaller than the cutoff chi-square number found in the tables for one degree of freedom at the .05 significance level. Therefore, there was no statistical significance found at the .05 level ($p = 0.146$). There was a difference in frequencies but the difference was not statistically significant. These frequencies of mentoring could have occurred by chance. There is no significant association between the presence of a mentor and retention.

Question #3 relates only to the 82 mentored ministers, and explores the reported differences of the mentoring experience. Statistical exploration of mentor characteristics and mentor functions can only be performed on the portion of the sample that was
mentored, because the only respondents that could report on the mentoring experience were those ministers who experienced a relationship with a mentor.

**Research Question #3**  Relationship of Retention to Mentor Variables

What is the relationship between retention and mentor characteristics & mentor functions?

Correlation analyses were conducted for the mentor characteristics and mentor functions measures. Table 4.5 presents the Pearson product moment coefficients of correlation (Pearson r) and their associated p-values for the mentor characteristics measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Length of service</th>
<th>Ministry rank</th>
<th>Size of cong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
<td><strong>NR</strong></td>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
<td><strong>NR</strong></td>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of service</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>-0.194</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry rank</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of congregation</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positions of leadership</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Sig at p < .05

Table 4.5:  **Correlations for mentor characteristics (n = 82)**

Most of the correlations exhibited on Table 4.5 were not statistically significant and were negligible to weak in strength. The statistically significant correlation coefficients that were weak were ministry rank and education level (r = 0.26), ministry rank and
length of service \((r = 0.28)\), and size of congregation and ministry rank \((r = 0.28)\) The statistically significant correlation coefficients that were moderate were between size of congregation and education level \((r = 0.41)\), positions of leadership and education level \((r = 0.48)\), and position of leadership and size of congregation \((r = 0.49)\).

The statistically significant correlation coefficients that were strong were between size of congregation and positions of leadership \((r = .65)\) or size of congregation and ministry rank \((r = .53)\). Pastors of large congregations usually hold the highest rank of licensure and also are more likely to be chosen for available positions of leadership.

The two relationships that produced statistically significant correlation coefficients for both categories of retained and not retained were size of congregation and ministry rank \((r = 0.28 \text{ - retained}, \text{ and } r = 0.53 \text{ - not retained})\) and size of congregation and positions of leadership \((r = 0.49 \text{ - retained}, \text{ and } r = 0.65 \text{ - not retained})\). Again, these pastors of large congregations are usually chosen as leaders and usually hold ordained bishop ministerial licenses.

Only five out of twenty statistically significant correlations received more than a weak rating. Therefore, the mentor characteristics were not strongly related to each other. The characteristics of the mentors were widely varied, and none were significant. To explore a theory concerning characteristics of the mentor and retention would be impractical. There was an a priori decision to summate all of the mentor characteristics into one cluster variable.

Table 4.6 presents the Pearson product moment coefficients of correlation (Pearson \(r\)) and their associated p-values for the mentor functions measures.
As reported in Table 4.6, the correlations among the mentor functions were statistically significant and were very strong. This means that the six mentor functions were measuring the same perceived relationship phenomena. It can be safely concluded that there is only one measure of this relationship, rather than six discrete functions.

Therefore, the overall average score for all of the questions relating to mentor functions were combined into one variable, as the five mentor characteristics were combined into one variable.

The relationships between the individual mentor functions and the combined mentor characteristic variables were not statistically significant, except for ministerial model and relationship emphasis; even then, the correlations were very weak. Therefore, it is

Table 4.6: Correlations for mentor functions (n = 82)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Relation</th>
<th>Inform</th>
<th>Facilitate</th>
<th>Confront</th>
<th>Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentor characteristics</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship emphasis</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>-0.093</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information emphasis</td>
<td>0.017*</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitative focus</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontive focus</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministerial model</td>
<td>0.017*</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministerial vision</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Sig at p < .05
concluded that there is no relationship between the mentor function variables and the mentor characteristic variable.

A boxplot (Figure 4.1) was prepared to visually present the information concerning the relationship between mentor characteristics and retention, among the mentored ministers.

Figure 4.1:  **Boxplot of Mentor Characteristics by Retained? (Yes/No) (n = 82)**

From the boxplot (Figure 4.1), it is visibly apparent that there is no significant difference between the means of the scores of mentor characteristics as reported by retained and non-retained ministers. The mentor characteristics did not contribute to retention for these mentored ministers.

A boxplot (Figure 4.2) was prepared to visually present the information concerning the relationship between mentor functions and retention, among the mentored ministers.
The boxplot (Figure 4.2) seems to indicate that there is a difference between the means of the scores of mentor functions as reported by retained and non-retained ministers. The mentor functions might have contributed to retention for these mentored ministers.

Logistic regression was used to examine the data for relationships between mentor characteristics and mentor functions, and retention. The results are presented in Table 4.7.
Table 4.7: Logistic Regression: Retention vs mentor characteristics, mentor functions (n = 82)

In Table 4.7, the point biserial correlation coefficient for the mentor function variable is significant (p = 0.003) and positive (1.189), while the coefficient for the mentor characteristics is not significant (p = 0.332) and negative (-0.453). Mentor functions had a significant effect on retention, while mentor characteristics did not. Therefore we can conclude that, for the ministers who received mentoring, as the mentor function score increased, the likelihood of retention increased. The functions of the mentor did have a relationship with retention. There does not appear to be any significant relationship of the mentor characteristics on the likelihood of retention.

For every one-unit increase in mentor function, the odds of retention are increased by a factor of 3.28. The odds of retention if the mentor had scored 4.15 on the mentor function scale are 3.28 times what they are if the mentor had scored 3.15 on the scale.
In the Chi-square goodness-of-fit test, the degrees of freedom (79) are not very different than the Chi-square number (85.9). The model is not significant because the mentor characteristics scores were not statistically significant ($p = 0.332$).

Retained ministers reported that the mentoring functions had more influence on their retention than did the characteristics of the mentor. The implication is that it doesn’t seem to matter as much who the mentor is (education level, length of service, size of congregation, position of leadership, or rank of ordination) as much as it matters what the mentor does (relational emphasis, information emphasis, facilitative focus, confrontive focus, role model, vision caster). It seems that what the mentor does as pertaining to the interaction aspects of mentoring has more effect on the retention of the minister than who the mentor is (the characteristics of the mentor). The protégé must perceive that the mentor takes time, the mentor listens, the mentor cares.

Table 4.7 suggests that, for retained ministers who have been mentored, retention is positively associated with a higher level of mentor function than for those who have not been retained.

Figures 4.3 and 4.4 were created to visually present the relationships between mentor characteristics and retention, and mentor functions and retention.
From Figure 4.3, it can be seen that there are always higher mentor characteristics scores than lower mentor characteristics scores, whether the minister is retained or not retained. The suggestion is that there is no association between the mentor characteristics and retention.
Figure 4.4: **Bar chart for mentor functions versus retention** ($n = 82$)

From Figure 4.4, it can be seen that there are lower mentor function scores for non-retained ministers but higher mentor function scores for retained ministers. The suggestion is that there might be some association between the mentor function and retention.

Figures 4.3 and 4.4 further illustrate the suggestion that, in the perception of mentored, retained ministers, retention is positively linked to high mentor function, but is negatively correlated to mentor characteristics. Regardless of whether the mentor function is high or low, retention is always higher with lower measures of mentor characteristics.

These same data were then placed in a scatterplot (Figure 4.5), to visually represent the differing relationships of mentor characteristics and mentor functions, in the mentored ministers.
Figure 4.5: Scatterplot for Mentor Characteristics and Mentor Functions versus Retention ($n = 82$)

The scatterplot, or bivariate distribution, in Figure 4.5 visibly presents the regression for mentor function and mentor characteristics against retention. The relationship of mentor characteristics to retention was slightly negative, while the relationship of mentor functions to retention was slightly positive. This verifies the conclusion that was previously discussed that the mentor characteristics had no association with retention, but the mentor functions did have a positive association with retention. The lines cross, signifying a lack of correlation between mentor functions and mentor characteristics.

The distribution was characterized by an unorganized formation of the data points. This indicates that the scores had a wide range. The two variables of mentor functions and mentor characteristics were not related to each other.
Most of the non-retained scores registered in the lower half of the mentor function axis and most of the retained scores were found in the upper half of the mentor functions axis. This suggests that the majority of the non-retained ministers rated the mentoring functions poorly, while the retained ministers rated the mentoring functions more favorably. Also, more of the data points for the retained ministers were found in the lower half of the mentor characteristics axis, illustrating the lack of correlation between mentor characteristics and retention.

Figure 4.5 suggests, for the 82 mentored ministers, that no relationship existed between retention and mentor characteristics. However, a weak positive association between retention and mentor functions was indicated, further illustrating the ineffectiveness of mentor characteristics and the effectiveness of mentor function in explaining retention in retained ministers.
Summary

The findings from this study are summarized as follows:

The proportion of mentored ministers in the class of 1993-1994 in the Church of God was 65.6%. The proportion of retained ministers who reported a relationship with a mentor was 69%. The proportion of non-retained ministers who reported a relationship with a mentor was 55%.

There was no association between relationship with a mentor in the first year of ministry and retention. Ministers who did not have a relationship with a mentor during their first year of ministry were as likely to be retained as ministers who did have a relationship with a mentor.

For the mentored ministers, mentor characteristics did not contribute to retention. However, for the same ministers, the mentor functions seem to be associated with retention.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, and RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The retention of professionals has become a problem in many professions. In the Church of God, retention of ministers has become an urgent issue for administrators and Church officials. Mentoring has become associated with increased retention in many professions, yet little is known about retention in ministry, and any possible link between mentoring and retention in ministry.

The objective of this study was to investigate the existence of and the strength of any relationship between mentoring and retention in ministry. This study measured the self-reported effect of the presence of a mentor during the first year of the respondent’s professional ministry, and investigated the possible association of mentoring to retention. This study assessed the characteristics of the ministerial mentor and the relationship of those characteristics to retention. This study also assessed the functions of the mentoring relationship and the relationship of those functions to retention.

The dependent variable was retention. The independent variables were a relationship with a mentor, the characteristics of the mentor, and the functions of the mentor.
Research questions

1. Of the ministers licensed in 1993-1994 by the Church of God, what is the difference in frequency of mentoring relationships between the retained ministers and the non-retained ministers?

2. What is the relationship between retention and presence of a mentor?

3. What is the relationship between retention and mentor characteristics & mentor functions?

Study design

An associational research design was utilized for this study. Data was obtained through a questionnaire developed specifically for this project, and mailed to a random sample of 360 ministers. There were 125 useable responses. The data from these responses were measured using descriptive statistics and correlation coefficients, and analyzed by logistic regression.

Research findings.

- Of the 125 surveyed ministers, 82 (65.6%) reported a relationship with a mentor during the first year of their ministry.

- Of the 94 retained ministers, 65 (70%) reported a mentoring relationship. Of the 31 non-retained ministers, 17 (55%) reported a relationship with a mentor.

- For the 125 mentored and non-mentored ministers, there is no statistically significant association between presence of a mentor and retention.

- For the 82 mentored ministers, there is no association between mentor characteristics and retention.

- For the 82 mentored ministers, mentor function is associated with retention. For these ministers, as the mentor function scores increased, retention increased.

Conclusions
1. Mentoring does not always increase the retention rate of professionals. Studies of mentoring in other professions have linked mentoring to retention (Whitaker, 2001; Schuster, 1998; Higgins & Thomas, 2001). However, in this study, there was no statistically significant association of mentoring to retention.

There may be several reasons that mentoring was not associated with retention. The global definition of mentoring provided in the instrument may have caused the respondents to claim mentoring when in fact there was none, just a casual friendship (Biehl, 1996; Stanley & Clinton, 1992).

The lack of supervision and support of the mentoring may have limited the effectiveness of the mentoring (Gray & Smith, 2000; Williams, 2001).

The effectiveness of the mentoring may have been limited due to a possible lack of training of the mentors. Studies have shown (Gray & Smith, 2000; Ward, West, & Isaak, 2002) that mentoring is more effective with mentor training. The amount of mentor training that these mentors had received is unknown. The Church of God had no mentor training programs at that time, so any mentor training that these mentors might have received must have come from other sources.

2. Mentor characteristics do not have an association with retention, but mentor functions do have an association with retention. The retention rate increases proportionally to the increase of mentor functions.

A visual model of the association of mentor characteristics and mentor functions to
retention had been proposed (Figure 1.1). Now, based on the data from the study, a new model of mentoring influences on retention is proposed (Figure 5.1).

Figure 5.1: Model for the relationship of mentoring to retention in ministry

3. Mentors may be chosen from all levels of professional competence, and not limited to potential mentors who have achieved the highest levels of success in their field.

Mentors who fulfill a higher level of mentor characteristics may not be the best mentors. Likewise, a CEO of a large corporation who has been a successful professional may not be the ideal mentor for a beginning business professional. Persons who serve in multiple leadership positions, who have heavy responsibilities, who have high status in the organization or society, who manage large groups of workers, and who have served for many years may not be effective as a mentor to a beginning professional. Factors such as the age difference, the status difference, and the experience difference may make the relationship difficult or unprofitable.

Pastors of large congregations and ministers who serve in higher leadership positions normally have very busy schedules, and may not be able to commit the time and focus that it takes to properly develop a mentoring relationship. Also, the mentors who have served longer in the ministry or have achieved the highest level of licensure may not
clearly remember their beginning days, and thus cannot relate to the struggles of the beginning minister.

A mentor that is half a generation older than the protégé might more easily relate to the struggles of a beginning minister (Levinson et al, 1978; Kram, 1983). Mentors who are pastors of medium or small-sized churches, or who do not fill leadership positions, may have more available time to develop a mentoring relationship.

Recommendations

Recommendations for Future Research

Several questions concerning the relationship of mentoring to retention in ministry remain unanswered. How are mentoring relationships begun and developed in totally voluntary, unorganized settings? Are mentors chosen by the protégés, or do mentors seek out protégés to assist in personal and professional growth? What are the benefits for the organization and the mentor, as well as the protégé?

This study identified no statistically significant association between mentoring and retention, while other studies found a link between mentoring and retention. Why did this study achieve the results that it did? The underlying assumptions of the literature may have not accounted for the difference between ministry and the other professions. There might be other factors that could lead to attrition. Possibly this instrument designed for the study did not account for other reasons for attrition. The instrument could be examined by other researchers and mentoring experts, and then the instrument could be
modified for an additional study using a similar sample. Modifications might include a more focused wording of the definition of mentoring. And/or, the questions could be modified if the questions were considered too similar, or too general.

Additional research could include a qualitative study using interviews of professionals, including ministers, that would focus on identifying other variables that might be associated with retention. For ministers, this research could include other independent variables that might be proposed as predictors of retention, such as social interaction issues (Kirk, 1992), job satisfaction, (Whitaker, 2001; Higgins & Thomas, 2001), or career success (Turban & Dougherty, 1994). A quantitative study could then be designed to investigate a possible link between retention and these designated variables. Similarly, a case study of mentoring relationships could also identify important variables that were not included in this study but could later be included in a quantitative study.

A related area of inquiry might be a longitudinal experimental study on the effect of mentor training for the application of different functions of mentoring, and then investigating any difference in retention. Mentors could then be trained to accentuate the effective functions. Of course, the limitations of time would make that study very difficult; most researchers would be reluctant to wait the years necessary for results of a longitudinal study of that duration.

Many benefits for beginning professionals are identified in the literature. Some of these benefits are positional advancement within organizations, increased salary, and enhanced problem-solving and decision-making ability (Scandura, 1997). A qualitative
study could identify such benefits in ministerial mentoring, and an associational design study could explore similar benefits in mentoring relationships in ministry.

Recommendations to Mentoring Advocates and Adult Educators

The process of mentoring, as an interactive approach to adult development, is a constructivist, experiential model that utilizes modeling, relational activities, social learning techniques, and direct and indirect advising to achieve growth and development in the protégé. The benefits of mentoring for the protégé are many; enhanced knowledge, problem-solving and decision-making ability, perceived job satisfaction (Scandura, 1994; Scandura, 1997; Carden, 1990) are just a few of the benefits identified in the literature.

Possibly, these mentoring advocates should not promote retention as a goal of mentoring. This study suggests that an increase in retention is not an automatic outcome of mentoring. The literature concerning mentoring in the professions suggests that mentoring provides many other benefits for the organization, the mentor, and the protégé (Johnson et al, 1999; Higgins & Thomas, 2001; Whitaker, 2001), but for mentoring in ministry, retention for ministers has not proven to be one of those benefits. In fact, mentoring may help protégés in deciding that they have been pursuing the wrong profession. In that case, decreased rates of retention may be a positive benefit of mentoring.

Mentoring advocates and mentoring program planners also need to be aware that
mentors may be drawn from the entire span of possible mentors. A person of great accomplishment, multiple leadership positions, heavy responsibilities, or extensive experience may not be the best candidate as mentor to an inexperienced protégé. In fact, the mentor with only ten to twenty years of experience may be a good mentor, because the mentor is probably one-half generation older than the protégé.

In a training program for mentors in the ministry, the mentoring functions can be explained and developed in the mentors. The mentors can be encouraged to relate to the protégé in a supportive way, facilitating and coordinating their growth and development, and modeling the desired image of a fully matured person.

Mentoring administrators and program planners for mentoring programs for professionals can become aware of other variables that might affect the retention rate of protégés. Solely relying on a mentoring program to raise the retention rates of protégés will not address all of the factors that the literature has shown to have an association with retention. Other factors such as pay scales, skills training, or job satisfaction may need to be addressed.

Concluding remarks

The conclusions from this study are applicable only to the target population for this study. However, similar retention patterns may exist in different populations or different professions. This was a single study, limited to a single population, and was limited to a random sample of that population consisting of persons who were willing to participate.
Therefore, the results of research and the conclusions offered by the researcher should be accepted with caution, being aware of these limitations. Further, the subjects were limited to responding to questions on the instrument.

A limitation for this study is that the sample size seemed adequate, but the return rate was disappointingly inadequate. The sample size had been set at 50 cases per independent variable, meaning that a random sample of 350 cases would have been ideal (Hair et al, 1998, p.258). In fact, 360 instruments were mailed. The recommended number of returns to seek was 166, but only 125 usable instruments were returned (35%). As sample size increases, the sample becomes a better representation of the population. An inadequate sample may lack the power to properly predict the retention of the mentored ministers.

Another limitation for this study was the focus on the independent variables of presence of a mentor, mentor characteristics, and mentor functions as the predictors of retention. Other factors that might be associated with retention, such as job satisfaction, financial difficulties, institutional advancement, life circumstances, or relationships with denominational officials, were not included in the study.

Even with these limitations, this study hopefully adds to the body of knowledge concerning retention in the professions. The issue of retention is not settled for institutional administrators and adult educators; much more research will be required to explore other factors that are associated with retention. Likewise, adult educators and mentoring advocates can draw conclusions from this study that will assist them in assessing programs for mentoring relationships.

The results of this study are different than the results of similar studies in other
professions. In the profession of ministry, mentoring in this study is not associated with retention. Why are the results different for this profession? The answer might lie in the unique nature of ministry.

There is a discussion in the literature concerning the nature of the profession of ministry, and any difference from other professions. Several experienced ministers have written that ministry is unique (Golden, Piedmont, Ciarrocchi, & Rodgerson, 2004; Lunscombe, 2002; Davie, 1996; Lawson, 1995a; Lawson, 1995b; Lawson, 1994; Lamport, 1992; Hauerwas & Williamson, 1989; Robson, 1988; Carroll, 1985). Research (Zondag, 2000; Kagler, 1995) has shown that ministers do think about their call in a unique way. They often deal with the sense of a significant imperative, a feeling of being under divine guidance, a perception of receiving orders from heaven.

Ministers may be motivated to remain in service because of this unique factor. The ministers also may feel compelled to remain in ministry for fear of divine retribution, and so would remain in ministry regardless of mentoring input. If they chose to remove themselves from ministry, or if they were removed from ministry because of other circumstances, then mentoring would not have made a difference in retention.

Therefore, the fact that the retention rate of ministers is already higher than for other professions, and the fact that ministers may feel differently about their profession than other professionals, may help explain why the presence of a mentor was not associated with retention in ministers.

An interesting study might be to interview ministers who have not been retained, to
explore reasons for change of profession. Possibly a desirable result of mentoring might be that, as the protégés experience ministry firsthand, they find that they are not really suited for ministry, or that the call is not there, or ministry is greatly different that they had imagined. It might be a good thing to find early in professional life that you missed your calling.

Is ministry different? Does faith and sense of calling affect retention more than mentoring? Does the perception of a divine imperative mitigate any factors that might influence retention? This sense of divine call may be associated with retention more than any mentoring received. Only further research will ascertain the answer.


Lankard, B. (1996). Role of mentoring in career education. Trends and Issues Alert no. ???, Columbus, OH: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education. (ED ??? ???).


APPENDIX A

PERMISSION LETTER FROM DR. NORMAN COHEN
Hello Dwain:

I am pleased to offer permission for you to use *The Principles of Adult Mentoring Scale*.

There have been a substantial number of dissertations which have successfully utilized both versions of the self-assessment instrument.

At this point, there may be close to 100 doctoral dissertations. There have been numerous dissertations focused on the mentoring relationship within the religious training community. The Lancaster Mennonite Group (central office) has even added a 7th section to the original inventory on "pastoral mentoring."

I have not yet done an updated and detailed search of the dissertations in *Dissertation Abstracts International* because the work is somewhat labor-intensive, since not all of the abstracts include the name of the Inventory used in the study, which is the most efficient way to initially locate the relevant studies.

However, a new search should definitely pick up the latest dissertations that have used the Inventory, and then you could backtrack in the Bibliographies.

I do remember discussing with a divinity doctoral student the problematic experience many adult learners were having while working under well-respected minister/faculty advisors, and he offered an interesting observation. In summary, he suggested that in his particular field, many of the doctoral students were "older" because they had actually had successful careers in the secular world before "the call," and they were having some difficulty as seasoned "adult" learners with advisors who were apparently skilled orators but somewhat less proficient in the one-to-one interpersonal skills relevant to developing a productive advisor-advisee (mentor-mentee) relationship.

With regard to the Certification Course, I am a *GSA Advantage Contract Holder* (GS02F0027M), and my federal government contract is now the basis of the fees I charge for all training. However, the process of being selected for the list of "approved" government vendors was rigorous, and I am comfortable with the negotiated terms for my services as a consultant and trainer.

I can send you specific information on the basic course, then perhaps we could discuss how best to customize the approach to your organization's particular requirements.

Your dissertation topic will be a valuable contribution to the literature, and I will be glad to offer any assistance I can.

Regards,

Norman Cohen
610-664-2140

12/23/03
APPENDIX B
MENTORING FUNCTIONS ON THE INSTRUMENT

- Relational emphasis: The participant's score on the Principles of Adult Mentoring Inventory Scale, items 1, 5, 7, 12, 13, 23, 42, 44, 47, 53.

- Information emphasis: The participant's score on the Principles of Adult Mentoring Inventory Scale, items 3, 4, 9, 19, 24, 40.

- Facilitative focus: The participant's score on the Principles of Adult Mentoring Inventory Scale, items 15, 22, 25, 34, 39, 49.

- Confrontive focus: The participant's score on the Principles of Adult Mentoring Inventory Scale, items 16, 21, 31, 33, 37, 43, 46, 48, 51.

- Mentor model: the participant's score on the Principles of Adult Mentoring Inventory Scale, items 2, 28, 29, 32, 36, 41.

- Ministerial vision: the participant's score on the Principles of Adult Mentoring Inventory Scale, items 14, 17, 20, 26, 35, 45, 50, 54.
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MINISTERIAL TRAINING EXPERTS – FACULTY MEMBERS

From Lee University:

Dr. Jerome Boone, Chair of the Department of Christian Ministries and Professor of Old Testament and Christian Formation

Dr. Terry Cross, Dean, School of Religion and Professor of Theology

Dr. Jerald Daffe, Professor of Pastoral Ministry

Dr. John Lombard, Adjunct Professor of Pastoral Studies

From the Church of God Theological Seminary:

Dr. Oliver McMahan, Dean of Ministries

Dr. James Bowers, Academic Dean

Dr. Ron Cason, Executive Director of Institutional Advancement

From the School of Ministry:

Dr. Donald, Aultman, Director

Dr. Homer Rhea, Editor
APPENDIX D

MINISTERIAL TRAINERS - PASTORS

Donald Bennett, Florida
Dan Tomberlin, Georgia
Hubert McGarity, Alabama
Gregory Elkins, Indiana
Richard Ussery, Kentucky
Luchen Bailey, California
Jerry Elder, Maryland
Wayne Solomon, Rhode Island
Wayne Flora, North Carolina
Roland Pendley, Ohio
Marc Campbell, South Carolina
John Lombard, Tennessee
David Hagee, Virginia
Jesse Farley, West Virginia
APPENDIX E

PERMISSION LETTER FROM THE GENERAL OVERSEER
May 24, 2004

Gregory Ellen, Administrator
Behavioral and Social Sciences Institutional Review Board
Room 310, Research Foundation Building
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, OH 43210-1063

Dear Mr. Ellen

I hereby grant permission for research to be conducted within the ministerial ranks of the Church of God. The researchers, Dr. David Stein and Dwain Pyeatt, will choose a random sample of names and addresses from the list of ministers licensed in the year Sept. 1993 – Aug. 1994. The researchers will send a simple mail survey instrument, asking for information on mentoring. I have reviewed the contents of the instrument and find the questions acceptable. I have also reviewed the proposed research plan.

The researchers will comply with the directives of the Institutional Review Board concerning benefits, risks and confidentiality of the data.

The Relationship of Mentoring and Retention in Ministry
Dr. David Stein Dwain Pyeatt
College of Education Church of God School of Ministry
The Ohio State University Cleveland, Tennessee
Columbus, Ohio

Thank you for your cooperation

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

R. Lamar Vest
General Overseer, Church of God
Cleveland, Tennessee

RLV:wf
APPENDIX F

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTER
Research Involving Human Subjects

ACTION OF THE INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

- Full Committee Review  
- Expedited Review  
- Original Review  
- Continuing Review  
- Amendment

With regard to the employment of human subjects in the proposed research protocol

2004B0181  THE RELATIONSHIP OF MENTORING AND RETENTION IN THE MINISTRY, David Stein, M. Dwain Pyeatt, PAES

the Behavioral and Social Sciences IRB has taken the following action:

- APPROVED
- DISAPPROVED
- WAIVER OF WRITTEN CONSENT GRANTED
- EXPEDITED REVIEW CATEGORY (When applicable)

No procedural changes may be made without prior review and approval from the IRB.

You are reminded that you must promptly report any problems to the IRB.

You are also reminded that the identity of the research participants must be kept confidential.

It is the responsibility of the principal investigator to retain a copy of each signed consent form for at least three (3) years beyond the termination of the subject’s participation in the proposed activity. Should the principal investigator leave the University, signed consent forms are to be transferred to the Human Subjects IRB for the required retention period.

Date: June 4, 2004  Signed:  

Thomas E. Nygren, Chair
APPENDIX G

ADVANCE NOTICE LETTER
Ohio State University
(Church of God)

Date

Name
Address
City/State/Zip

Dear...:

The loss of qualified ministers is a burden and a problem for the Church of God in the United States. Cities are unchurched and congregations are suffering because of the lack of ministers. We need to utilize every method available to keep ministers on the job.

We want to uncover some of the reasons that ministers remain in the ministry, and use those techniques in the future to help keep new ministers. As a licensed minister (or former licensed minister), your experiences are important to share. What were some of the positive reasons that you remained in the ministry (or, what were some factors that would have influenced you to remain in the ministry?) I would like to ask your assistance with a project that is intended to assist in keeping more ministers on the job.

Within the next 15 days you will have the opportunity to influence a study on why ministers remain in the ministry. Your name was drawn by random sample from the ministers that were licensed by the Church of God in 1993-1994. You have a right not to participate in this study, but it is important to the future of the ministry in the Church of God that each survey form be completed and returned. Your participation will help Dwain Pyeatt, the researcher, in completing his Ph.D. research into the relationship of mentoring to retention in ministry. It is hoped that the findings will assist in keeping ministers active in the ministry.

At all times the responses that you make will be kept confidential. Each survey form has an identification number, and the master list will be known only to me. At no time will you be cited by name. The results will only be reported in the aggregate.

The results will be made available to Church of God officials and ministerial trainers. You may receive a summary of results. A good response rate is needed from those who receive the survey form in order to make this research as reliable as possible. Please look for the survey in the mail.

Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely yours,

Dwain Pyeatt
Cleveland, Tennessee
APPENDIX H

COVER LETTER
Ohio State University  
(Church of God)

Date

Name  
Address  
City/State/Zip

Dear...:

About two weeks ago, you received an advance notice that a survey on mentoring would be in the mail. You now have it in your hands. The form should only take 15 minutes to complete.

The survey is part of a doctoral research project on mentoring, and is of extreme interest to the researcher, a licensed minister and experienced ministerial trainer. Your participation is voluntary. This is a one-time participation; you will not be contacted for any further information.

At all times the responses that you make will be kept confidential. Each survey form has an identification number, and the master list will be known only to me, and will be destroyed at the end of the project. At no time will you be cited by name. All returned surveys will be kept in a secure location. The results will only be reported as group totals.

A self-addressed stamped envelope is provided for you to return the survey. Please return the completed survey within the next 10 days. You may receive a summary of results by writing "copy of results requested" on the back of the envelope, and print your name and address below it. Please do not place your name on the survey form.

I will be most happy to answer any questions. Please call or e-mail.  
423-473-0721  jpyeatt@yahoo.com

Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely yours,

Dwain Pyeatt
Cleveland, Tennessee
APPENDIX I

FOLLOW-UP CARD
Dear…:

You recently received a survey form in the mail concerning ministers, and retention. Your name was drawn by random sample. It is highly important to the future of the Church of God that your experiences be included in the study, to accurately reflect the experiences of Church of God ministers.

The due date has passed and a completed survey from you has not yet been received. In the event that you do want to participate, another copy of the survey is enclosed, along with a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

Please consider taking 15 minutes to complete this important survey. Thank you for your participation. You have shown your support and lent your assistance for the future generation of Church of God ministers.

Sincerely yours,

Dwain Pyeatt
Cleveland, Tennessee
APPENDIX J

SURVEY FORM AND INCLUDED LETTER
The Relationship of Mentoring and Retention in Ministry

An Exploration of Experiences

This survey will help us understand mentoring in the first year of ministry, and its relationship to retention of ministers. Please answer all of the questions. If you wish to comment on any questions or qualify your answers, please feel free to use the space in the margins. Also, there is space on the back page for your observations.

Thank you for your help.
Ministerial mentoring survey

June 11, 2004

Dear friend:

Thank you for your time and interest.

The goal of this survey is to gain an understanding of the relationship between mentoring and retention in ministry. The results hopefully will be used to develop programs that will assist development of ministers. This survey should take no more than 15 minutes to complete.

I will be asking questions that center around your relationship early in your ministry with a wise, experienced ministry friend who assisted you through example, counsel, and personal encouragement during your adjustment to the life and work of a minister. I will be using a modified form of The Principles of Adult Mentoring Scale, developed by Dr. Norman Cohen. Please respond truthfully and completely to all of the statements. There are no right or wrong answers, only your real experiences.

All of your answers will be held in strict confidence, and will be used only for the purposes of this study. A coding system will allow the answers to be separated from the listed names of participants; the results will be reported in group format.

For this study, mentoring refers to the deliberate process of social interaction whereby an experienced minister of achievement in the Church of God counsels, models, and facilitates the personal and professional developmental learning of a less experienced minister.

For this study, a mentor is a licensed minister in the Church of God who has engaged as a mentor in the activities of mentoring.

For this study, a protégé is a less-experienced licensed minister in the Church of God who has been mentored by a more experienced minister in the first year of the protégé’s ministry.

Thank you for your participation.

Dwain Pyeatt
Cleveland, Tennessee
Ministerial Mentoring Survey

**Mentor** - In your first year of licensed ministry, did you have an informal relationship with an experienced minister who regularly offered advice, counsel, information, challenge, and direction to you, in a one-to-one relationship of trust? This mentor may have served as a role model for ministry, as a guide for advancement in ministry, as a support for decision-making in ministry.

*Please circle the answer that most closely expresses your thoughts.*

**I. Did you have a mentor during the first year of your licensure?**
1) Yes  
2) No

*If you circle “Yes,” please continue. Circle the best answer to each question, then return the form.  
If you circle “No,” no other response is needed. Please return the survey form in the enclosed envelope.*

**II. Tell me about your mentor.**
1. What was the educational level of your mentor at the time of mentoring?  
   Please answer to the best of your memory.
   1) high school  
   2) some college courses  
   3) Bachelor  
   4) Master  
   5) Doctor

2. What was the length of service of your mentor at the time of mentoring?  
   You may estimate the years that your mentor had held license at the time of mentoring.
   1) 1-10 yrs  
   2) 11-20 yrs  
   3) 21-30 yrs  
   4) 31-40 yrs  
   5) above 40 yrs

3. What was the ministry rank achieved by your mentor at the time of mentoring?  
   *Please answer to the best of your memory.*
   1) Unlicensed  
   2) licensed with another organization  
   3) Exhorter  
   4) Licensed  
   5) Ordained

4. If your mentor was a pastor, what was the size of congregation at the time of mentoring?  
   *You may estimate Sunday morning worship attendance.*
   1) under 100  
   2) 100-200  
   3) 200-400  
   4) 400-800  
   5) above 800
5. What were the positions of leadership attained by your mentor at the time of mentoring? Please circle the highest position your mentor obtained.

1) local leadership - pastor, district overseer
2) state leadership - elected or appointed boards or committees
   e.g., State council, campground committee, task forces, state Y+CE board, etc.
3) national leadership - elected or appointed committees or boards
4) state officials - Overseer, State Evangelism Director, State Youth Director, Admin Asst
5) national officials - Department Director (Asst, Admin Asst), General official

III. Tell me what your mentor did. "My mentor..."

1. Encouraged me to express my honest feelings (positive or negative) about my ministry-related experiences. Never Seldom Sometimes Often Always

2. Asked for detailed information about my progress in learning all aspects of ministry in the Church of God. Never Seldom Sometimes Often Always

3. Encouraged me to consider informal learning opportunities as well as formal educational opportunities. Never Seldom Sometimes Often Always

4. Confronted me in a gentle, direct manner with likely negative consequences of failing to deal with serious ministerial problems. Never Seldom Sometimes Often Always

5. Discussed with me the importance of developing a realistic view of ministry that can include both success and disappointment. Never Seldom Sometimes Often Always

6. Stressed the importance of obtaining accurate information about ministry career options. Never Seldom Sometimes Often Always

7. Was verbally supportive (appropriately) if I was emotionally upset or excited. Never Seldom Sometimes Often Always

8. Referred me to other ministers and other information sources to obtain information relevant to pursuing my ministry goals. Never Seldom Sometimes Often Always

9. Offered alternative views for career options or educational opportunities. Never Seldom Sometimes Often Always
10. Informed me when my career plans were based on inaccurate or incomplete information concerning requirements.

11. Discussed his/her personal ministry-related experiences in order to help me think about my ministry options.

12. Encouraged me to think critically about long-range implications for career choices, such as time and energy commitments, additional training requirements, and life complexity issues.

13. Made a good deal of eye contact with me during our meetings.

14. Helped me to identify my ministry goals, and helped identify strategies for goal achievement.

15. Provided a reasonable amount of factual guidance in our discussions concerning career options and ministerial operations.

16. Pointed out inconsistencies in my explanations of why ministry performance goals or ministry goals were not achieved.

17. Shared with me several difficulties that had been overcome in his/her ministry.

18. Scheduled follow-up meetings to inquire about progress in pursuing ministry goals.

19. Asked about my honest thoughts on issues such as balancing career and family.

20. Offered specific advice to me about future training needs, based on my history, training, experience, and career goals.

21. Encouraged me to use him/her as a sounding board to explore ministry-related hopes, ideas, feelings, and plans.
22. Used personal examples as well as stories about other ministers that emphasized the point that ministry achievement is based more on effort, commitment and planning than just luck.

23. Expressed personal confidence in my ability to succeed if I would pursue ministry goals.

24. Warned me of changes in my personal and family life that may occur while I pursued my ministry goals.

25. Scheduled meetings when we would not be interrupted.

26. Discussed general reasons to seek further training, and then helped me identify sources.

27. Explored with me, when I expressed a lack of self-confidence, the ways my own life experiences could help me devise strategies to reach my ministry goals.

28. Offered constructive criticism if my reluctance to make decisions was limiting my potential.

29. Used personal experiences and experiences of other ministers to highlight that extraneous occurrences can often become valuable learning experiences for ministry.

30. Encouraged me to develop a positive attitude toward my ability to perform well as a minister.

31. Verbally communicated concern when I expressed negative attitudes, either verbally or through my body language and facial expression.

32. Assisted me to carefully map out realistic step-by-step strategies to achieve ministry goals.

33. Asked probing questions that required more than a "yes" or "no" answer.
34. Offered testimony concerning his/her past ineffective behaviors as an negative example.

35. Shared his/her personal views and feelings when they were relevant to the discussion.

36. Expressed confidence in my ability to achieve ministry-related goals, especially when I was undergoing pressures.

37. Listened to criticism from me about ministry-related issues without immediately offering a rebuttal or a justification.

38. Informed me that I could express and discuss negative emotions in our meetings without fear of retribution.

39. Questioned my decisions and actions concerning ministry-related issues when it appeared that I did not have appropriate solutions.

40. Explored my commitment to expending time and energy to achieve ministry goals.

41. Discussed the positive and negative feelings that ministers sometimes have about their abilities to meet their ministry goals.

42. Offered few criticisms when he/she was helping me understand the connection between my self-limiting behaviors and my inability to fulfill my ministerial goals.

43. Asked me to explore resources to help manage life stress while I pursued ministry goals.

44. Expressed his/her understanding of my feelings, and then asked about accuracy.

45. Based the timing of confrontational questions and comments on his/her knowledge of my readiness to accept them.
The Relationship of Mentoring and Retention in Ministry

Is there anything you would like to tell us about the experience of mentoring in ministry, and its effect on your decision to remain in the ministry, or leave the ministry? If so, please use this space for that purpose.

Also, any comments you wish to make that you think may help in future efforts to understand ways to retain and assist ministers, please feel free to list the information here.

Your contribution to this effort is very greatly appreciated. If you would like a copy of the results, please print your name and address on the back of the return envelope or on the post card enclosed (NOT on this questionnaire). We will mail this summary to you as soon as it is available.