



NO FAVORITISM: PASTORS AND COLLABORATIVE LEADERSHIP IN MULTICULTURAL PARISHES

**Brett C. Hoover, Ph.D., Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles, CA
INSIRE Milestone Conference, Loyola University Chicago, October 2013**

It's an honor to be back here in Chicago and at Loyola speaking about one of my best loves, that is, parish research. As you heard, I was a visiting professor here in 2010-2011 researching the quality of collaborative leadership in Chicago parishes involved in the INSPIRE Project. But many of you also know that the majority of my own academic research into Catholic parishes has centered on parishes with multiple cultural groups. So much of my talk today will be a marriage of these two related concerns—collaborative pastoral leadership and multicultural parishes. Specifically, I will try to answer the question, “What kind of leadership is most effective at multicultural Catholic parishes and why?” After some preliminary remarks about multicultural parishes in the Archdiocese of Chicago and elsewhere, I will examine insights from two different case studies, one a multicultural parish here in Chicago we studied for INSPIRE and another in Los Angeles that I have been looking at as part of a multi-parish study funded by the Congregational Studies Team called The Shared Parish Project.¹ The parishes are quite different, but the pastors of both parishes engaged in similar practices that proved effective. I think this may help us get at the vexing question of why some pastors are effective and collaborative leaders in multicultural parishes, and why others are not.

Multicultural parishes are not a recent innovation. American Catholicism has nearly always boasted a significant number of parishes with multiple cultural groups. In 1785, the pastor of the first Catholic parish in New York City, Charles Whelan, described his parish as home to English, Irish, French, Spanish, Dutch, and Portuguese speaking people.² The first priest assigned to Chicago, Fr. John Mary St. Cyr, wrote in 1833 about preaching and teaching in English and French, and about ministry among the Potawatomi.³ Of course, the monocultural national parish dominated much of nineteenth century American Catholicism, and the long lull in immigration from the 1920s into the postwar period translated to a more Americanized parochial landscape. Nevertheless, multicultural parishes never completely disappeared, and the late twentieth century surge in immigration from Latin America and Asia has created more than ever. While some of these parishes have all groups integrated together at mass and in parish ministries—what might be called the blended or integrated parish—others host masses and

¹ The Congregational Studies Team is a decades-old group of theologians and sociologists of religion who study and fund the study of local faith communities. They are funded by the Lilly Endowment.

² Charles M. Whelan to papal nuncio at Paris, New York, 28 January 1785, quoted in James Hennessey, *American Catholics: A History of the Roman Catholic Community in the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), 75.

³ John Mary St. Cyr to Bishop Joseph Rosati of St. Louis, June 1833, quoted in Gilbert Joseph Garraghan, *The Catholic Church in Chicago, 1673-1871: An Historical Sketch* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1921), 49-56.

ministries in different languages and according to the customs of distinct groups. I call these *shared parishes*; many sociologists of religion call them *parallel congregations*.

In the INSPIRE process itself, 47.5% of the parishes involved were multicultural parishes of one or another of these types. 45% had mass in more than one language. Reading between the lines, of course, this means that a majority were monocultural and had mass in only one language—usually English but sometimes Spanish. According to the Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate (CARA) and the Emerging Models Project, 38% of United States parishes are multicultural—multicultural for CARA meaning that they have masses in languages other than English, have less than 40% non-Hispanic whites, or have a diversity index of 33% or higher.⁴ CARA also found that 71% of parishes have mass only in English, and 88% of the registered parishioners in those parishes are non-Hispanic whites.⁵ Tellingly, Black, Asian, and Hispanic parishioners are much more likely to pass by their local parish in route to attendance at another parish.⁶ All this confirms a national picture where a minority of Catholic parishes do the heavy lifting in terms of addressing cultural diversity while others focus more or less exclusively on Catholics of European descent. At the same time, the Latino Catholic population continues to grow as the white Catholic population shrinks, especially among the young. According to the Pew Research Center, 47% of Catholics between from 18 to 29 years of age are Hispanic while 44% are white.⁷

Most of us can see the outcome of such patterns; indeed, the pattern has already become visible in many parishes. Crowded masses serve a young, mostly Latino and Asian Catholic population in select parishes while other masses and other parishes serve a very committed but aging white population. Here in Chicago, archdiocesan figures show that while two thirds of Catholics attend mass in English, over three quarters of the masses are in English. While close to a quarter of Catholics here attend mass in Spanish, only 15% of the masses are in that language.⁸ The implications are clear. Parish life in this country will increasingly require a shift of resources from Anglo to Latino and multicultural parishes, even as we try to find some way to honor the contributions of Catholics of European descent as their influence wanes.

Now, INSPIRE as a project and process did not focus its attention on this great demographic transformation going on in our midst. We did not produce a strong body of research addressing the specific challenges of multicultural parishes. True, INSPIRE's primary focus from the beginning was on the practice of effective, collaborative leadership. Unfortunately, we did not always heed the signs of the times and probe more deeply into the crucial question of effective, collaborative pastoral leadership in the context of culturally diverse communities. At this milestone conference, we are asked to swing the pendulum a bit in the other direction. Thus, I will spend my time reflecting on this vital question of effective and collaborative leadership in multicultural parishes. Because our INSPIRE research data did not focus on multicultural

⁴ Mark M. Gray, "Special Report: Multicultural Findings," (Washington, DC: Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate, 2012), 4.

⁵ Gray, "Special Report: Multicultural Findings," 6-10.

⁶ Gray, "Special Report: Multicultural Findings," 35-36.

⁷ Pew Research Center, "U.S. Catholics: Key Data from Pew Research," (Washington, DC: Pew Research Center, 2013).

⁸ Office of Research and Planning, "Data Composite: Facts and Figures for the Year Ending 2009," (Chicago: Archdiocese of Chicago, 2009), 68.

parishes (although it included many), in this paper I will be supplementing INSPIRE data with another case study. In addition to an INSPIRE parish, we will look at a parish I studied in Southern California as part of a different project.

However, I must add that neither did INSPIRE ignore the phenomenon of multicultural parishes. In fact, we made some important observations about the nature of collaborative pastoral leadership at multicultural parishes. For example, INSPIRE adopted the term *pastoral leadership team* as a generic term to describe the group within a parish that gathered and worked on collaborative leadership practices under the auspices (and with the financial support) of the INSPIRE Project. This was an intentional shift away from the term *parish staff*, a shift made primarily because INSPIRE staff realized that many urban parishes—including many multicultural parishes—served working class or poor communities. Such parishes could not usually afford to employ multiple professional lay ecclesial ministers as staff members, and the people who understood these contexts best often did not possess the educational qualifications typically expected of parish staff members in middle class parishes. Of course, these parishes still had pastoral leadership beyond the priest pastor. But most pastoral leaders were volunteers; others were permanent deacons working part time. Using the term *pastoral leadership team* was a way of recognizing their leadership in these parishes and avoiding too much middle class bias in our work (middle class bias being a frequent problem in pastoral planning and research, I am afraid).

I should also point out as well that INSPIRE collected a fair bit of data on the tensions and opportunities that negotiating multiple language groups can create within a parish, an issue near and dear to my heart. For example, two INSPIRE parishes found that the promotion of bilingualism helped build bridges between such groups—either through habituating people to the use of two languages in worship and meetings, or through opportunities for people to learn one another’s languages, at least in a rudimentary way.

Now I would like to move on to the specific issue of effective collaborative leadership in multicultural parishes. I will focus on the priest pastor’s role in promoting collaborative parish leadership. This will seem counterintuitive. Since *Lumen Gentium* reminded us that the Church is the gathering (*ekklesia*) of all the baptized, many have endeavored to get past the clerical hangovers of yesteryear and avoid exclusive focus on the clergy. INSPIRE’s particular mission has been to emphasize the *collaborative* leadership of lay people and clergy together. Nevertheless, during my tenure as INSPIRE researcher, we observed some dynamics operative in Chicago parishes that I believe will justify such this focus on the pastor. I turn to those dynamics now.

I served as chief INSPIRE researcher from 2010 to 2011, several years into the project. At that time it was already clear to INSPIRE staff and consultants that the project had done a great deal to promote responsible and intentional collaborative leadership in many parishes in the Archdiocese of Chicago, including in several multicultural parishes. But those of us on the research end of INSPIRE also had to admit that sometimes we had trouble saying in any detail how and why the INSPIRE approach worked. Many people here know that INSPIRE has its roots in organizational development theory (or OD, as practitioners call it). OD’s substantial contribution to parish leadership in INSPIRE came primarily through the practice of parish

consulting. Indeed, my own research on the process found that parish consultants gave pastoral leadership teams a needed opportunity to reflect intentionally and communally on the purpose and spirituality of their work in ministry.

Part of the reason such reflection became necessary was that pastoral leadership teams are heavily influenced by the dominant secular culture's attitudes regarding work. The sociologist Steve Derné argues that cultures shape human life by providing us with social frameworks that make some things imaginable and other things unimaginable.⁹ In the United States, we find it difficult to imagine work as anything but a series of discrete tasks performed by individuals within a specified time frame. Intercultural communications theorists refer to this as operational thinking: "The American approach is functional and emphasizes solving problems and accomplishing tasks."¹⁰ In researching the INSPIRE process, I found that pastoral leadership teams had a hard time escaping thinking of their ministry exclusively in terms of tasks. I also found that they suffered because of this, with pastoral leadership teams feeling busy, burnt out, overworked, and often unable to make spiritual connections to their ministry or even remember why they were doing what they were doing in the first place. To my own surprise, I found that this was as true for Latino and multicultural parishes as it was for Anglo parishes. Perhaps I should not have been surprised. Migration scholars have long noted—and theologian colleagues like Gary Riebe-Estrella have reported in their own work¹¹—that work patterns are one of the first things to be altered in immigrant cultures by the influence of the dominant culture.

This acute case of task orientation in parish work cultures created an environment ripe for the services of INSPIRE. INSPIRE succeeded in parishes because it incentivized—through the targeted investment of money—reflection on the deeper spiritual and pastoral reasons why a pastor and his leadership team engage in the discrete tasks of parish ministry. Pastoral leadership teams found themselves completing tasks for what they perceived as a greater purpose, not just because that is what work is. INSPIRE consultants often talked about this in terms of a parish pastor communicating a strong *pastoral vision* to the parish. By pastoral vision, I mean to describe 1) the way in which parishioners are invited to imagine the future of their community in the light of faith 2) in order to inspire and guide today's activities and programs 3) so that such activities and programs feel purposeful and consonant with the community's understanding of God's presence among them. Such a vision has to be a response to the questions and challenges experience by a particular community in its particular social, cultural, and ecclesial context. Thus, in INPSIRE we saw a Hispanic parish focus on the holistic health of the people in its poor, immigrant neighborhood, a Polish parish commit to the evangelization of a second generation born and raised in a new culture, and an Anglo parish without much cultural diversity challenge themselves to be more attentive to global needs. As practical theologian Helen Cameron puts it, "Local churches that see mission as the essence of what they are about are willing to be changing

⁹ Steve Derné, *Culture in Action: Family Life, Emotion, and Male Dominance in Banaras, India* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1994), vii-viii.

¹⁰ Edward C. Stewart and Milton Bennett, *American Cultural Patterns: A Cross-Cultural Perspective* (Boston: Intercultural Press, 1991), 32.

¹¹ Gary Riebe-Estrella, SVD, "A Youthful Community: Theological and Ministerial Challenges," *Theological Studies* 65 (2004): 302-304.

in response to their context, the surrounding culture and their dialogue with the Bible and tradition.”¹²

In all of these different cases I mentioned, INSPIRE consultants would say that pastoral vision mattered. Examination of INSPIRE data concurred with their conclusion. We found that successful parishes had strong pastoral visions, often expressed in guiding images and pithy phrases. Thus, we heard talk of a parish “sharing Christ with love,” a parish as a “people of the plaza,” or a parish determined not to just be a spiritual service station. (The latter was a metaphor that I subsequently had to explain to younger graduate students who did not know what a service station was.) Consultants also insisted that the way in which a pastor uncovered and communicated a pastoral vision mattered a great deal. A consultant said of a Hispanic parish, “The pastor was outstanding. He was—well, he was a tremendous leader...had a great vision for the parish. The parish really grew and developed under his leadership.” An INSPIRE application from an African American parish read, “With the new pastor, [we see] the beginning of open and honest dialogue around crucial parish issues, and a willingness to be creative in finding new forms and styles of ministry for this community. [He is a] pastor with a vision who sees the pastoral team as important to overall parish development.”

Hearing all this while researching INSPIRE, I realized that how much effective, collaborative pastoral leadership depended on the pastor (or on an equivalent key leader, in some cases). I became interested in what makes a pastor effective in uncovering a pastoral vision that spoke to a particular community, communicating that vision, and inspiring others to work with him on a team guiding the parish toward that vision. We made some headway on that question while I was researching INSPIRE. We realized, for example, that successful parishes almost always had an assertive pastor with good interpersonal skills who shared power rather than hoarding it. Conversely, a pastor with weak interpersonal skills or one that guarded his authority jealously had great trouble leading a parish. But I wanted to know more. A colleague and mentor of mine, sociologist Gerardo Marti, most famous for his study of a multicultural Evangelical church in Southern California, pushed me to say something more than just that good pastors have a vision. Especially in the context of multicultural communities, he wanted to know why specifically certain pastors remain effective in pastoring. So in the following pages, I would like to profile the successful, collaborative pastoral leadership of two pastors in multicultural parishes and then unpack why they were successful.

One of them was an INSPIRE pastor—I call him Father Paul—and his parish here in Chicago was a small, urban multicultural parish that I am giving the pseudonym St. Rose of Lima. I would like to supplement Fr. Paul’s story at St. Rose of Lima with a comparable set of data that is more targeted and a little more systematically collected than we were able to accomplish with INSPIRE. Such a set of data involves the story of the pastoral leadership of Fr. Joe, the pastor of a multicultural mega-parish in an inner suburb of Los Angeles—here I will call that parish Queen of Heaven. A research assistant and I had the opportunity to tour the parish with a representative from each of the three distinct cultural groups at the parish and then to interview a small group of parishioners from each group. We also interviewed Fr. Joe, two parish staff

¹² Helen Cameron, *Resourcing for Mission: Practical Theology for Changing Churches* (London: SCM Press, 2010), 1.

members, and a parish secretary. All that yielded a multi-dimensioned portrait of Fr. Joe's leadership. But first let me turn to Father Paul in Chicago.

Father Paul was the pastor of St. Rose of Lima parish, a relatively small parish in what was originally a white working class neighborhood. About twenty-five years ago, the area transitioned demographically, and within a decade St. Rose had become majority Hispanic, though its Anglo community remained committed and present. The pastor, Fr. Paul, who is Euro-American but Spanish speaking, came later on at a precarious time for the parish. Political and ecclesial winds blowing through Chicago persuaded some parishioners that the parish was on the archdiocesan chopping block, though no such decision had actually been made. In addition, the parish had lacked a pastor for an interval. In short, people were worried about the future of their parish and looked to their new pastor for help.

The data we collected for INSPIRE during Father Paul's tenure at St. Rose confirmed the "vision matters" argument of the INSPIRE consultants. Fr. Paul had spent time developing and promoting a pastoral vision for the parish centering on partnership between its two major cultural groups. As one parish report noted, "The future will be to have people work together experiencing both cultures and languages." Fr. Paul wanted parishioners to see cultural diversity as an opportunity rather than as a problem. While this may sound rather obvious, such an imagining of the parish as a partnership between cultural communities reads as distinctive and creative to many American churchgoers. In part, this is because of what sociologists term *homophily*. Homophily is the social fact that in practice most people prefer the company of people who are like them. As Queen of Heaven's youth minister observed, "As humans we're drawn to a specific group of people, or a specific groups is drawn to a particular priest, for that matter...I guess I've never understood why that's a factor, but we're human." Because faith communities in a nation without an established religion are in some sense voluntarily chosen, homophily often translates to racially or culturally segregated faith communities. Thus, Martin Luther King, Jr. famously noted that 11 am on Sunday morning was the most segregated hour of the week.¹³

For this reason, a pastoral vision of multicultural partnership can seem fresh, even exciting. But at St. Rose, Fr. Paul's vision was persuasive not simply because it felt unusual or compelling, but also because he showed parishioners how and why it could work. He did a number of things to put his pastoral vision of partnership between cultural communities into practice. First, he discussed this view of parish mission in pastoral leadership team meetings, carefully gathering their input. He and that team ran a series of town hall meetings for parishioners to do the same. This dynamic of structured and inclusive listening practices—setting times for gathering feedback at meetings in which all participants are invited to speak—seems to be crucial to successful parish leadership not just in multicultural but in all parishes. Fr. Paul was good enough at it that other parish leaders would observe and imitate his approach, making a point to go around and make sure that all participants had a chance to speak, even if they were initially nervous to do so. Such an approach to listening persuades people that the pastor and other leaders are really interested in their perspectives.

¹³ On homophily in American churches, see Korie Edwards, *The Elusive Dream: The Power of Race in Interracial Churches* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 118-119.

In Fr. Paul's case, the listening strategies were accompanied by conscious efforts to ensure that the pastoral leadership team, originally mostly Anglos, reflected the actual demographic makeup of the parish (Anglo and Latino). This is sometimes referred to as *representation*. Representation demonstrates that leadership is listening, paying attention, and truly recognizing what sorts of people make up the parish community. Representation serves as almost a minimum requirement for making a common vision of partnership across diverse groups seem credible. Fr. Paul also participated in the push toward bilingualism in INSPIRE parishes I noted earlier. He created and taught a bilingual Bible study for the pastoral leadership team. Next, he shepherded the creation of a small faith communities (or base communities) structure within the parish. The groups were language specific, but they gathered together periodically for bilingual backyard masses and potluck dinners. As one parishioner put it, at these events "the divide between Hispanics and Anglos disappears."

Fr. Paul's story begins to help us see more clearly what makes a pastor an effective, collaborative leader at a multicultural parish. A leader, especially a pastor or administrator, has to present an inclusive vision for the parish, but he also has to make sure different cultural groups are all well represented on the pastoral leadership team. If they are not, his vision loses credibility. And he has to find concrete ways of bringing the groups together periodically—not always—for a common experience of church. And he has to be seen as listening to people, even modeling listening for other parish leaders. This collection of leadership practices tells us a great deal, but requires confirmation and nuance if we are to really understand effective leadership in a multicultural parish. Otherwise, it is vulnerable to being dismissed as *sui generis*, the peculiar but non-replicable practices of an extraordinary parish. So I turn to Queen of Heaven parish in Southern California to see if the story of Father Joe there might not confirm or nuance what we observed at St. Rose of Lima.

Queen of Heaven is very different from St. Rose of Lima. It is what some call a mega-parish.¹⁴ Over seven thousand people attend eleven weekend masses in Spanish and English with liturgical music in Tagalog (Filipino) at one mass. Queen of Heaven lies in an inner suburb of Los Angeles made up of working class and middle class families, and it is a majority Latino city. The parish attracts Spanish speaking immigrants from Mexico and Central America, English speaking U.S.-born Latinos, Filipino immigrants and their children, and a very small number of elderly whites who have remained in the parish since the 1950s. Father Joe himself is a U.S.-born Latino and a fast-talking, energetic priest in his early 40s. He will be the first to tell you that he did not grow up speaking Spanish. Nevertheless, he is now fluent after many years of experience in Hispanic ministry and pastoring Hispanic dominant parishes.

As happened with Father Paul at St. Rose of Lima, at Queen of Heaven parish many people described Father Joe as a good pastor with a strong pastoral vision of the different cultural groups operating together in partnership. One of the parish secretaries at Queen of Heaven summed up Fr. Joe's vision in a way that suggests again how unique it seemed to people in a nation of ecclesial homophily, "Father's really good at inviting everyone and making everyone,

¹⁴ There is no widely accepted definition of a mega-parish. The term comes from mega-church, a mostly Evangelical phenomenon usually defined by churches that have more than 2000 worshippers on a typical Sunday. See Warren Bird and Scott Thumma, "A New Decade of Megachurches: 2011 Profile of Large Attendance Churches in the United States," (Hartford Institute for Religion Research, 2011), 3.

um, he doesn't like separation at all. Our previous pastor was like that, but Fr. Joe, he acts a little more than our past pastor. He always wants all of us to be involved." But whether such a pastoral vision seems unique or compelling or not, again a deeper question might concern why it becomes credible to parishioners. This is a particularly important question in today's ecclesial environment, where Catholic clergy suffer from reduced credibility since the sex abuse crisis became public in 2002. How do people know that a pastoral vision like that of Father Joe is something more than just pious words? Why should they trust him and his vision of cultural groups in partnership?

The data from Queen of Heaven suggests that part of the reason people did trust Father Joe is that they perceived him as a pastor for all the groups of the parish. As the aforementioned youth minister said, "I think Father is really good at integrating himself into all cultures...I've always heard that before there was like, well one priest favors this community better or one priest favors *this* community better." In part this perspective stemmed from reports, fair or unfair, that Fr. Joe's predecessor was mainly interested only in the LifeTeen youth ministry program, and was thought to be particularly inattentive to the concerns of the Filipino community. "People didn't feel respected by him," said one Filipina parishioner. Fr. Joe admitted that, perhaps because he is a Latino, it took a while for the Filipino community to see him as, as he put it, "pro-Filipino." But Fr. Joe managed to project just such an image, not only to the Filipinos but to many different groups. A parish secretary noted, "And there's not really any favoritism played like where people are like, 'Oh, the pastor is paying more attention to us or this or that.'" We might say that Fr. Joe succeeded in being seen as pastor to all groups because they could not identify him definitively with any particular faction or group. They found no favoritism in him (see Acts 10:34). In fact, he told me that he consciously worked to confuse those who might want to pigeonhole him into a particular category.

But how *exactly* did Fr. Joe project this image of a trustworthy person who truly served as pastor of all the cultural groups? Some of this impression emerged from his high energy level, informality and accessibility, and hands-on approach. He often dressed informally and roamed the parish groups. A Filipino parishioner noted how, the first time she met him, he was stacking bulletins in the church. Another related how people see him putting his own donation envelope into the collection on Sundays. An English-speaking Cuban-American parishioner talked about how his accessibility and energy brought people to church. Of course, such charismatic leadership can backfire, and one of the lessons of the INSPIRE research project was about how charismatic pastors sometimes cultivate such dependence among parishioners that their successors fail. But Fr. Joe did not use his charisma to ensure that parish events drew attention to him but to his vision of the parish. A Filipina parishioner noted, "The energy that he puts into the activities in the church that he wants, you can feel how much he wants to unify both cultures."

His high energy also enabled him to go around authorizing and blessing the diverse events of the various groups and ministries. He made sure to attend events of all the different communities. He emphasized different kinds of ministries and groups, depending on the cultural group. For example, even though he himself was more progressive, Fr. Joe brought representatives of the

more conservative Neo-catechumenal Way para-ecclesial movement to the parish.¹⁵ A Spanish speaking parishioner noted that when someone asked for permission to conduct an event or celebration at the parish, he almost always said yes. When members of the Filipino community wanted to erect a statue in honor of the Virgin Mary, he enthusiastically got behind their efforts. One man from Mexico noted how, when his group would scatter out to the neighborhoods to invite people to church, he would come and offer a blessing before they left. Fr. Joe seemed almost universally present to bless and authorize a proliferation of ministries and activities at Queen of Heaven. As a result, it *felt* like a place where many things could happen for many different kinds of people.

And like Fr. Paul at St. Rose of Lima in Chicago, Fr. Joe was intentional about listening to parishioners and assessing the parish's needs based on what he heard. This program of listening, for example, persuaded him that he should start his work as pastor focusing on building up leadership among Spanish-speaking parishioners, since they were the largest group. Fr. Joe listened both informally and also in more disciplined and structured ways. The parish's Director of Social Services described him as someone who was always out talking with people. A trio of Latino parishioners took my research assistant on a tour of the parish, and along the way one of them told her that Father Joe really wanted the good of the parish. Another chimed in that even when he was busy, he would always stop and take a few minutes to listen to you, and that in those few minutes he was fully present. But Fr. Joe also conducted formal listening sessions and facilitated groups that put together timelines of the history of the parish. A Filipino parishioner described his arrival at Queen of Heaven thus: "The first thing he did was put all the Filipino, invite all the Filipinos in the Parish hall and did a dialogue. He asked everybody, 'What are your concerns? What are your needs? And how do you want the parish to come along?'" There were several sessions that we had for that particular meeting." Fr. Joe did not simply listen to people personally; he also insisted that other pastoral leaders listen in an intentional and structured way as well. For example, he required the Director of Social Services to keep detailed records on whom the parish's social services programs served and how.

Indeed, part of the dynamic of parish life in a mega-parish like Queen of Heaven was that no one person—including the pastor—could conduct the lion's share of pastoral outreach. Fr. Joe frequently worked with what I call his lieutenants—his assistant priests, lay staff members, and other pastoral leaders in the parish. Upon arriving at the parish as a new pastor, after listening to the Filipino community, he set out to recruit a Filipino priest for the parish. He managed to recruit two, one of them Spanish speaking, and he had another priest in residence who was a hospital chaplain. By the time my team arrived for research in the summer of 2012, he said of the priests: "I think... that our priest house is very united right now. We've had a very good house... We don't—it's not one of these houses where they try to play us off on each other. Everybody knows what's going on. And I think that's what's caught everybody by surprise." Fr. Joe contrasted that with parishes where each priest did his own thing, often at cross purposes. But at Queen of Heaven, this team approach was also institutionalized. Each priest or lay ecclesial minister served as liaison for particular parish groups, and he or she had primary

¹⁵ The Neo-catechumenal Way is an ecclesial movement founded in Spain in the 1960s. In the United States, it is now largely Spanish speaking and passionately devoted to evangelizing. It has sometimes been known for operating in tension with traditional parish structures. See John Thornhill, "Influential 'New Ecclesial Movements' Face the Challenge of Inculturation," *Australasian Catholic Record* 84, no. 1 (Jan. 2007): 67-79.

responsibility for communicating with the group. Parishioners could not easily, as Fr. Joe put it, play one staff member off against another. The effect was that parishioners from all the different groups received consistent messages about the trajectory of parish life. And consistency breeds trust, as the lack of it breaks down trust. By way of counterexample, I echo the report of an INSPIRE consultant about one Chicago pastor: “He says the right things, and doesn’t follow through. A major frustration for the team.”

Consistency also emerged from the way in which Fr. Joe or members of his team would intervene when members of different parish groups veered away from the pastoral vision of partnership between cultural groups. The parish secretary told us, “People’s pride get[s] in the way of like them being on, you know, board with unity. It’s like, no, I want to do it my way. And they’ll start to try to get people in with them... but I mean Fr. Joe’s been doing pretty good at like nipping those right away...when something is happening or whatever, he just calls them in. And once you get confronted face to face, it’s hard to be like, I’m not talking about you; we’re not doing this. So, he’ll be like what’s the issue? What’s happening?” Both Fr. Joe and the secretary noted how much of that work of intervention was actually conducted not by him but by other staff members. Fr. Joe spoke of his two Filipino assistant priests performing the difficult and somewhat counter-cultural work of intervening with the elders in their own community.

All these practices—from authorizing and blessing meetings and activities to formal listening sessions to timely interventions—helped people perceive that their pastor and staff were shepherds for all cultural groups without favoritism. But as we found with Father Paul at St. Rose of Lima, establishing trust in the pastor and articulating a vision of partnership between cultural groups is not sufficient to actually bring about such partnership. Pastors have to find concrete ways of bringing members of different groups together for a common experience of parish life, even if only periodically or chiefly among parish leaders. At a shared parish, the majority of pastoral activity—worship, ministry, faith sharing, religious education—necessarily takes place in language-and-culture-specific groups. People need to pray in the language of their hearts, and parishioners can only share faith and make complex decisions together when they can communicate clearly and in considerable depth. This is why, for example, the small faith communities at St. Rose of Lima had to be language specific. And this system of parallel worship and ministry ends up being both the strength and weakness of a shared parish. It creates safe space for different groups to live their faith. But co-existence in the same parish depends on some kind of common reference, a minimally common experience of parish life. Given the ordinary presence of language and culture barriers, such shared experiences have to be orchestrated and planned. People need ways and means of coming together for some common experience of parish life, and good pastors create and shape those opportunities.

In fact, creating such opportunities was the most frequently noted leadership practice of Fr. Joe at Queen of Heaven in Los Angeles, and the same practice received substantial attention in INSPIRE documents about St. Rose of Lima. As already noted, at St. Rose Fr. Paul invited both English and Spanish speaking pastoral leadership team members to be part of a seven-month bilingual scripture study. He made a habit out of closing important parish events with a bilingual mass with alternating English and Spanish parts but where nothing was repeated to avoid prolonging people’s worship experience. The small faith community program also held periodic bilingual masses and potluck dinners.

Also at Queen of Heaven, communal meals provided people from different cultural groups with the opportunity to share an experience even if they could not understand one another or communicate directly. Fr. Joe had organized a Saturday morning breakfast each month, with food provided by different groups for everyone. But Fr. Joe's efforts at Queen of Heaven went far beyond that. He persuaded the Spanish and English speaking groups who carried out separate Divine Mercy devotions to combine their efforts under the leadership of his assistant priests. He invited families from all the communities to bring their Thanksgiving foods to the trilingual Thanksgiving mass (English-Spanish-Tagalog) to be blessed. His efforts went beyond just different language groups. When he found out that two groups were planning festivities for the Feast of Our Lady of Guadalupe—one young Latinas and the other older women—he pushed them to work together. And even as he pushed such joint practices, others in the parish seemed to catch on. For example, the separate language groups for the RCIA—Rite of Christian Initiation for Adults—decided to host a retreat together.

Even though Catholics often ultimately appreciate these common experiences of parish life across cultural (and language) groups, they generally do not seek them out. Neither pastoral leadership teams nor parishioners themselves are likely to collaborate in a multicultural parish simply because multiple groups are there. Indeed, intercultural communication theorists routinely note that mere contact between cultural groups does not necessarily lead to improved relationships.¹⁶ Pastors have to create and structure opportunities for that contact to flower into collaborative relationships, both on the parish staff or pastoral leadership team and in the parish in general. Creating such opportunities is what you might call the capstone of leadership practices that form part of an effective portfolio for a collaboratively minded pastor of a multicultural parish. Other practices include informal and formal practices of listening and assessment across all cultural groups, consistent presence blessing and authorizing a plurality of activities and groups, targeted interventions when parishioners—especially group leaders—veer from a vision of cultural groups in partnership, and team practices of leadership where “lieutenants” also listen, bless and authorize, and intervene on their own. I would argue that these leadership practices are what really matter in initiating effective and collaborative pastoral leadership at a multicultural parish.

In fact, I would argue they matter more than factors often cited in conventional wisdom, such as personal charisma. Listening to the narratives in this paper, it might be easy to imagine that I have simply presented the case of two charismatic priests whose leadership styles could never be emulated. On the contrary, while both men were generally well regarded by both pastoral leadership team members and parishioners, their personal style was not universally effective nor welcomed by everyone. Fr. Paul sometimes lacked assertiveness, so much so that difficult people could hijack meetings. Fr. Joe spoke so quickly and so loudly that his intensity alienated people. In reality, there was no hidden genius here or unseen grace of ordination. The leadership practices I have described can be learned and replicated.

¹⁶ See, for example, Robert D. Putnam, “E. Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-First Century,” The 2006 Johan Skye Prize Lecture, *Scandinavian Political Studies* 30, no. 2 (2007): 141-142; and Milton J. Bennett, “Toward Ethnorelativism: A Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity,” in *Education for the Intercultural Experience*, ed. R. Michael Paige, (Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press, 1993), 21.

I close by acknowledging, once again, how strange it must seem to find a paper focused almost exclusively on clerical leadership amidst a project whose purpose was promoting and highlighting collaboration between lay and clerical leaders for the good of the parish. Indeed, I would hope that my next effort on the subject of leadership in multicultural parishes would focus more on the leadership *around* the pastor. But another of the important but difficult findings of my own research with the INSPIRE Project was the near complete nature of a priest pastor's authority in Roman Catholic parishes in the Archdiocese of Chicago. It is no different in other parts of the country. In the past, I have referred to this as the pastor's "canonical monopoly" on parish authority. After all, the 1983 Code of Canon Law implicates a pastor in the very definition of a parish: "A parish is a certain community of the Christian faithful stably constituted in a particular church, whose pastoral care is entrusted to a pastor (*parochus*) as its proper pastor (*pastor*) under the authority of the diocesan bishop" (canon 515 §1). Once a pastor is placed "in possession" of a parish by the diocesan bishop (c. 527), church law gives solely the pastor the function of governing the parish (c. 519). According to canon 532, the pastor has full responsibility for the administration and material good of the parish. As canon law scholar John Renken puts it, "The pastor is not simply the delegate of the diocesan bishop. Within his parish, he functions with ordinary power, given him in law by reason of the office he holds. His power is proper [that is, belonging to him by right], exercised in his own name."¹⁷

In practice, this means that the involvement of other pastoral leadership team members in the shared governance of the parish community depends entirely on the pastor's permission and encouragement. Both parish employees and volunteers—even curates assigned by the bishop—effectively collaborate in pastoral leadership only as long as the pastor remains willing to encourage or countenance them doing so. In parishes where professional employees constitute the pastoral leadership team, this state of affairs creates significant worry about preserving one's livelihood when pastors are transferred. That is an entirely different topic that requires more just and expansive treatment than I can provide here and now. But this also means that, at least as far as parish life and leadership are currently administered, the priest pastor's leadership practices matter more than almost any other factor. My guess is that all of us—perhaps priests more than anyone—look forward to a time when effective and collaborative pastoral leadership does not depend so heavily on the priest pastor's authorizing it and pressing for it. Until then, we had best look to how we might train and equip the present and future pastors of multicultural parishes with the skills to engage in the kinds of practices I have described.

¹⁷ John A. Renken, "Parishes, Pastors, and Parochial Vicars," in *New Commentary on the Code of Canon Law*, ed. John P. Beal, James A. Coriden, and Thomas J. Green, study edition (New York: Paulist, 2000), 690.