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INTRODUCTION

Social Cost: A Hypothetical Construct

The frame of reference employed in the following thesis utilizes the recently coined concept of "social cost". Expressed in terms of the social-psychological factors which contribute to or detract from a sense of expectational fulfillment, social cost constitutes a derived measure which serves as the causal variable in explaining career adjustment among professionals (29, 30, 40). Basic to the theoretical application of the social cost concept is the notion that when an individual assumes an identity it follows that there is a concommitant adoption of a set of aspirations and commitments. However, whether or not an individual pursues and maintains that identity depends upon whether or not aspirations, regardless of their source, are met to some degree, such that the individual has a sense of social satisfaction sufficient to reinforce the earlier commitment. In its most abbreviated form, the theory suggests that if social cost is high, then the career pattern will be negatively evaluated and hence will lead to a form of social adjustment; if social cost is low or tolerable, then no adjustment is made in the
career pattern (40, pp. 20 & 21).

When submitted to a test of validity, the social cost career model, as applied to a study of elementary and secondary school teachers in northern Minnesota, demonstrated a predictive ability of about 85 per cent for anticipating which categories of professional educators would or would not renew their teaching contracts (40, p. 43). Hence, while not being in universal usage the social cost concept has established its pragmatic utility as an explanatory tool in the study of human behavior.

The Problem: Missing and Moving Manpower

In recent years the recruitment of manpower into the service professions has become an increasingly critical factor in the maintenance of professional services to broad segments of our population. Confronted with aggressive competition for available manpower from manufacturing, technological and commercial interests, institutions of medicine, education and religion have been hard pressed to meet the demand for personnel replacements let alone increments in the ranks of member professionals. Coupled with a growing demand for professional services, the relatively
constant number of member professionals has necessitated a reallocation of available manpower to serve ever increasing constituencies.

Among the proposals advanced to stem the ebbing tide of aspiring careerists have been intensive programs of cultivation and recruitment to enlist new personnel. One result of competitive bidding for occupational practitioners who are in short supply has been their distribution on the basis of comparative personal, social and professional advantages rather than existing demand for a given professional service. Thus, not only are member professionals in short supply in various vocations, tenure among practitioners tends to be relatively short in duration. The following thesis reports the findings of an application of the social cost career model in an empirical study of select social-psychological variables as possible causal determinants in the maintenance or rejection of given career patterns by a sample of Protestant clergymen in Iowa.
BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The choice of the clergy as the subject for this present sociological investigation occurred quite naturally. For over a decade the author has been both a student of and a practitioner in the ministerial vocation, during the course of which both personal experience and conversation with other member professionals has revealed a number of areas in which the role concepts of the clergy seem to stand diametrically opposed to the expectations of the laity. An illustration of this may be found in a discussion by a group of ministers regarding the efficacy and wisdom of adopting the clerical collar by members of their denomination. After weighing the pros and cons of adoption one of the ministers expressed the consensus of the group by stating, "My people (laymen) would be so opposed to the idea I wouldn't think of putting on a collar unless everyone (ministers) adopted them at once, or the Bishop said I had to do it." Two things seem evident in this remark: 1) to engage in deviant behavior produces an awareness of social cost due to a discrepancy between expectations and actual experience; and 2) the availability of a scapegoat is perceived as a mechanism for lessening the intensity of social cost resulting from social distance
created between the minister and the layman by the former's anti-social act of violating a sectarian tabu.

Religion has been broadly defined as a system of beliefs and practices by means of which a group of people struggles with the ultimate problems of human life. By virtue of the fact that a complete religion is an essentially social phenomenon via its shared expression and system of social relations, many of its most significant aspects are found primarily in the interaction of the group (51). Hence, the maintenance of at least minimal interaction between leader and follower, i.e., minister and layman, is necessary if the religious group, congregation, parish, denomination, etc., is to remain functional. In the face of this need for mutual expectations on the part of both the layman and minister it would appear that each is conscious of several more or less dysfunctional elements in their relationship to one-another.

Concern for the discontinuities in clergy-lay expectations is not new and has perhaps existed from the beginning of organized religion and the institutionalization of religious practitioner roles. However, attempts to scientifically observe and empirically measure these discontinuities seem to be of fairly recent origin. In the immediate
post World War II period, Murray H. Leiffer discovered more
than two dozen criteria by which 90 per cent or more of a
sample of 1,500 Methodist laymen measured the adequacy and
success of their ministers (31). The overwhelming majority
of these criteria had to do with personality factors rather
than matters of professional competence. Comparable results
were obtained by Widick W. Schroeder six years later using a
sample of both Protestant and Roman Catholic clergymen (46).
Various approaches to specific problems of the ministerial
profession have been undertaken to measure, among other
things, the effect of low salary (8), educational require­
ments (11, 12), occupational status (21), work load (28),
and socio-economic change (4).

Perhaps the most definitive research undertaken to date
has been in the area of role conflict in the clergy, notably
Waldo W. Burchard's study of military chaplains (7), and
Samuel W. Blizzard's exhaustive study of 1,111 Protestant
ministers in most major United States denominations (4, 5).
These and a host of other sources have been cited by David O.
Moberg as having identified six major types of role conflict:

1. Prophet versus institutional leader.

2. Working with individuals versus with groups.
3. Time allocation.
4. Material versus spiritual objectives.
5. Specialization versus "general practice".

In addition, Mr. Moberg enumerates nine further social problems of the clergy ranging from low income through family pressures, short tenure and personal isolation (36, pp. 505-509). Research cited by John B. Coburn (9) further corroborates the conclusion that today's clergyman is subject to a variety of inter- and intra-personal stresses and strains which, if not unique to the clergy, find peculiar intensity in the ministerial profession.

The basis for the present state of ambiguity regarding the identity of the minister and what is to be expected by occupants of that office, is, according to H. Richard Niebuhr, due to the fact that "neither ministers nor the schools that nurture them are guided today by a clear-cut, generally accepted conception of the office of the ministry, though such an idea may be emerging" (39, p. 50). He further attributes the temptation to sloth in the ministry to the "frustration a man experiences when he has no clear sense of his duties and no specific standard by means of which to
judge himself" (39, p. 54). According to Mr. Niebuhr, periods of certainty about the conception of the ministerial office had four things in common:

1. What its chief work was and what constituted the primary purpose of all its functions.
2. What constituted a call to the ministry.
3. What was the source of the minister's authority.

In brief, the contemporary clergyman is confronted by lay demands for charismatic leadership in the exercise of the ministerial office at a time when professional training tends to emphasize institutional authority. By identification with the professional dimensions of the ministerial vocation the clergyman's career tends to bring him into deeper contradiction and conflict with the expectations of his laymen until some form of accommodation or adjustment takes place. How the minister deals with the discrepancies between expectation and fulfillment (herein referred to as adjustment to social cost) with regard to social satisfaction, aspiration and several forms of commitment relative to his identity as a clergyman is the topic of this thesis.
DERIVATION OF THE THEORY

Review of Literature

Two major theoretical orientations were employed in the development of the social cost concept, namely: symbolic interaction with regard to reference groups, individual perception, values and adjustment; and conflict theory in terms of role definition, role expectation, and role behavior.

Symbolic interaction

Among the many pieces of literature dealing with this approach to an understanding of human behavior none has been more suggestive or definitive than the work of George Herbert Mead (32). From Mead's seminal thoughts have sprung numerous attempts to identify and integrate social-psychological factors as to their causal relationship to observable patterns of human thought, feeling and action. In this regard the theoretical formulations of Festinger (13, 14), Fromm (17), Heider (22), Homans (24), Parsons (42, 43, 44), and Stonequist (48) have been most fruitful in the delineation of the problem and the suggestion of possible determinants.

Indicative of the usefulness of the symbolic interaction frame of reference is the wealth of empirical research it has
Noteworthy in this regard is the work of Howard S. Becker and James Carper in their analysis of identifi-
cation with an occupation. They conclude that work identifica-
tion contains four major elements:

1. Occupational title and associated ideology.
2. Commitment to the task.
3. Commitment to particular organizations or institutional positions.
4. The significance of one's position in the larger society (2, p. 341).

These same researchers have also investigated the relationship between identity and interpersonal competence (1).

Nelson N. Foote has examined the motivational aspects of identification (15), and with Leonard A. Cottrell, Jr. its affect upon interpersonal competence (16). Specific applications of the social-psychological frame of reference have been made to the occupational classifications of school superintendents (19), business executives (23), clerical workers (25), rural school teachers (29), and migrants (30).

Conflict theory

Of particular value to the theoretical basis for this thesis has been the discussion by Reinhard Bendix of Max
Weber's views on charismatic versus institutional authority in the clergy and the conflict which ensues both within the minister and between him and his congregation when the source of his authority is challenged or unspecified (3, pp. 303-328). Lewis Coser's discussion of the functions of social conflict further clarifies the nature of discrepancies in role definitions and expectations for the clergy when he points out that the ordained, theologically trained ministry, as products of institutionalized mobility (from laity to clergy), are oriented toward interpreting the role of minister as an achieved status whereas the laity is oriented toward an ascribed status for him (10, p. 36). The tensions which result from a failure of ego (self) and alter (others) to be in agreement have been elucidated by the Gullahorns in both graphic and textual fashion in their discussion of role conflict and its resolution (20). The implications of conflict on social structure and role behavior have been discussed by Robert K. Merton (33) and David Riesman (45) respectively.

Quantitative research has been conducted in a variety of areas relative to the topic of this thesis such as the relationship between role conflict and effectiveness (18), status
contradictions and dilemmas (26), personality characteristics and role conflict resolution (34), development of role concepts (35), and the affect of conflict on leadership (47), norms (49) and decision-making (50). In addition, considerable research has been done in attempting to measure the affect of conflict upon specific vocations or status positions such as teacher-administrator (6), military chaplaincy (7), institutional office (27), academic role (37), and lay expectations of the ministerial role (46). Sufficient work has been done that Annabelle B. Motz has sought to correlate the results in developing a role conception inventory as a tool for further research (38).

Theoretical Frame of Reference

The following propositions detail a general frame of reference for a theoretical explanation of career adjustment. Primarily, they are derived from the rationale employed in the rural school teacher and migrant studies (29 and 30, respectively) referred to in the review of literature.

Axioms of condition

I. A professional career, such as the ministry is predicated upon the development and maintenance of motivation
and vocational commitment.

Motivation refers to the striving toward and anticipation of rewards or success, taking the form of social satisfaction as these reinforce commitment. Motives are not merely rationalizations for career activity. Thus, low salary schedules, preference for an area, etc., as reasons for leaving or staying in a given professional position are not accepted as motives per se for changes in a career, but are viewed as rationalizations.

Motives involved in the pursuit of a career may be analytically viewed as:

1. Professional motives which refer to commitments and their salience in support of attachment to a career as these reflect currently held codes, ethics or values defined as legitimate by other member professionals, e.g., seminary degree, denominational membership, ordination, etc.

2. Personal motives which refer to commitments and their salience made for personal or individual reasons, such reasons being frequently held implicitly by other member professionals with varying degrees of legitimacy, e.g., a divine call,
inner necessity, altruism, etc.

Postulate 1. Regardless of whether professional, personal or mixed motives underlie the pursuit of a career, some motivational source is required for the continuation of career activities and sustained commitment.

Postulate 2. Careers based exclusively or primarily upon professional motives engender greater attachment to the professional qua profession than to a specific organization or pastoral charge and the opportunities or positions they offer.

Postulate 3. Careers based exclusively or primarily upon personal motives foster greater attachment to a specific organization or pastoral charge and the opportunities or positions they offer than to the profession qua profession.

Vocational commitment refers to the strength of attachment to a given vocation in comparison to alternative vocations of which an individual is aware or to which he has given consideration.

Postulate 4. Careers based upon the virtual exclusion of all other vocational possibilities have a heightened sense of aspirational attainment and social satisfaction.

Postulate 5. Careers which acknowledge other
vocational possibilities have a heightened sense of aspirational frustration, dissatisfaction or ambivalence.

II. Professions vary in the degree to which they are permissive regarding commitment to a vocation, and hence, in the degree to which they tolerate a fusion of professional and personal motives in determining the course of career activities.

Postulate 1. A relatively high degree of departure from a profession signals a norm of relatively high permissiveness in terms of vocational commitment. The rate of departure from professional ranks is directly related to the commitment expected of member professionals and their total life involvement in the vocation.

Postulate 2. Mobility within professional ranks (non-departure) is indicative of commitment to the profession qua profession among such mobile members (controlling on perceived or known state of opportunities for such mobility) and not merely commitment to an organization or a given pastoral charge.

III. Personal reasons for entering a vocation may or may not correspond to professional reasons. Thus, motives may be in conflict, although one source of motives dominates
the other.

Postulate 1. Individual mobility within professional ranks may be stimulated by either personal or professional reasons or the source of commitment (for the clergymen this may mean moving at the behest of an ecclesiastical superior irrespective of either personal or professional motivation).

IV. Vocational commitments engender aspirations among member professionals, based upon the source(s), intensity and salience of motives for continuing in the vocation.

Postulate 1. Aspirations are professionally oriented when they express career objectives and related achievements sought by the professional relative to a given stage in career development. Such aspirations are regarded as legitimate, but peculiar to member professionals.

Postulate 2. Aspirations are personally oriented when they express extra-professional or generalized life goals which can be achieved or sought through career-related activities. Thus, careers are usually instrumentalized for the attainment of private or personal aspirations.

V. Professional aspirations can be modified by changes in personal aspirations, and personal aspirations can be modified by changes in professional aspirations. A change in
either instance alters the attachment to, and criterion value of, personal-professional aspirations.

**Postulate 1.** A careerist initially motivated by personal reasons may subsequently increase his professional motivation. Conversely, a decrease in professional motivation may instigate a substitution in vocational commitment or an increase in personal motivation for continuing the career. Such changes are functions of aspirational attainment and social satisfaction as these contribute to an evaluation of a career.

**Postulate 2.** An individual motivated by professional reasons may at a later time reduce professional aspirations and vocational commitment as a result of less than the desired attainment or inadequate social satisfaction. Both this and the previous postulate represent mechanisms whereby discrepancies between expectation and fulfillment may be reconciled and social cost reduced to a tolerable level.

VI. Inasmuch as the continued pursuit of a professional career is predicated upon the maintenance of some commitment to the locus of the career, e.g., a pastoral charge, the extent to which a given locus represents aspirational attainment is a function of career success. Thus, the intensity of
a minister's commitment to a given pastoral charge is affected by his evaluation of its ability to provide vocational, personal and professional aspirational-fulfillment together with sufficient social satisfaction to reckon the social cost of staying less than or preferable to the cost of leaving that charge for another, or to depart from the pastoral ministry entirely.

Postulate 1. Regardless of the source of commitment, the pursuit of a career involves an investment of time and energy. Since this effort is more or less focused in career activities and not in some other endeavor, the investment in service to a given pastoral charge may reasonably be expected to result in some short or long-term payoffs and rewards which exceed the expected returns from career activities abandoned or not pursued, or which approximate the anticipated returns from the present pastoral charge or career locus.

VII. Aspirational-fulfillment requires standards of comparison, i.e., criteria which a careerist may employ to evaluate the satisfaction and cost of career activities.

Postulate 1. Through preconceived notions of success, by social comparison or through objective standards, a
careerist obtains an implicit evaluation of his aspirational-fulfillment in terms of its cost and satisfaction to himself.

**Postulate 2.** Depending upon the outcome of this evaluation, an actor may have (a) high satisfaction, (b) low satisfaction, or (c) indifference or ambivalence to the career and its related activities.

By social satisfaction is meant the outcome of an evaluation of the positive, negative or neutral aspects of obtained payoffs as these induce (a) a change in commitments, (b) a change in aspirations, and (c) a change in behavior (search) or adjustment to less than or more than the expected social cost.

**VIII.** Relative to expected-obtained payoffs, social cost is the cognitive expenditure of time and energy directed into career activities relative to any excess of, or discrepancy between, expected and obtained rewards (and sense of social satisfaction), less the payoffs perceived in not having chosen and pursued an alternative course of action if the second alternative is or was available.

**Postulate 1.** Social cost is high when social satisfaction is low, vocational commitment is low, professional commitment is low, personal commitment is low, and aspirations
Postulate 2. Social cost is low when social satisfaction is high, vocational commitment is high, professional commitment is high, personal commitment is high, and aspirations are met.

**Axioms of response**

IX. Relative to less than the expected payoffs (high social cost) from a career, three general adjustment patterns are available to the clergyman:

A. **To leave**

1. To depart from the profession—to abandon one's commitment to it and the aspirations associated with the vocational identity.

2. To leave the present pastoral charge—to abandon a given career locus but not the commitments or aspirations appropriate to the vocational identity.

B. **To remain**

1. To continue serving a given pastoral charge but with weak commitment to it, low satisfaction, or a sense of aspirational frustration.

2. To attempt to correct any perceived imbalances
by compensating for less than the expected aspirational-fulfillment or personal aims sought through the career by (a) reducing professional commitment, but not changing personal commitment; (b) reducing personal commitment, but not changing professional commitment; (c) reducing aspirations, but not necessarily vocational commitment; or (d) substituting personal aims for professional aims to a greater degree than before, thereby reducing perceived discrepancies (social cost) to a tolerable level.

3. If social cost is low due to a sense of aspirational fulfillment and high social satisfaction, then vocational and career commitments and identity will be reinforced.

C. Ambivalence—indecision concerning the relative value of career payoffs and their effect upon career adjustment.

X. When there is a sense of aspirational-fulfillment or when social cost has been reduced to a tolerable level, then commitment will be reinforced and no adjustment or career change would be predicted.
Definition of Terms

On the basis of the preceding theoretical frame of reference the following concepts constitute the intervening variables to be submitted to empirical test:

1. **Vocational commitment**—commitments and their intensity made to a given identity, e.g., a professional career in the ministerial vocation, such identity providing norms, values, goals and aspirations consistent with and peculiar to that identity.

2. **Aspirations**—those career objectives and related achievements sought by the professional relative to given stages in career development, such aspirations being regarded as legitimate and peculiar to member professionals.

3. **Social satisfaction**—satisfactions and their intensity which result from the positive, negative or neutral assessment of obtained payoffs from career activities as these induce (a) a change in commitment, (b) a change in aspirations, and (c) a change in behavior (search) or adjustment to less than or more than the expected social cost (discrepancies between expected and obtained payoffs).
4. **Professional commitment**--career commitments and their intensity made for professional (career advancement or advantage) reasons to a given locus wherein to enact a career, such reasons reflecting currently held codes, ethics or values defined as legitimate by other member professionals.

5. **Personal commitment**--career commitments and their intensity made for personal (individual or family) reasons to a given locus wherein to enact a career, such reasons being frequently held implicitly by other member professionals with varying degrees of legitimacy.

6. **Social cost**--a derived measure based upon high or low social satisfaction, high or low vocational commitment, high or low professional commitment, high or low personal commitment, and met or un-met aspirations.

7. **Adjustment**--the projected return to, departure from or ambivalence toward the pastoral charge a minister is now serving, such decision resulting from an evaluation of expected-obtained career payoffs as these induce reinforcement, rejection or revision of
prior commitments, satisfactions and aspirations in determining the future course of a career.

The Social Cost Career Model

The relationship between the foregoing concepts is expressed in terms of the social cost career model (Figure 1) on the following page. Most simply stated, identity represents what and where a person is in social terms. In other words, it is an individual's perception of the rights, duties, and privileges appertaining to his status or position in a group. Hence, identity becomes the independent or conditional variable, e.g., membership in the ministerial vocation, and appears at the left-hand of the theoretical model. The dependent or response variable is adjustment, i.e., the outcome of an individual's assessment of the past, present and future prospects for his career, and thus appears at the right-hand of the model. Vocational commitment, aspirations, social satisfaction and professional and personal career commitments constitute the intervening variables and appear in the center of the model. Beneath these intervening variables is found the causal variable, i.e., social cost or the perceived discrepancies between expectations and
Intervening Variables

Independent (Conditional) Variable

Identity

Vocational Commitment

Career Commitment
a. Professional
b. Personal

Aspirations

Social Satisfaction

Social Cost (Causal Variable)

Adjustment

Dependent (Response) Variable

Figure 1. Social cost career model
fulfillment. The brackets around the intervening variables enclose the criteria from which social cost is derived and the arrows indicate the direction of causality between the several variables or categories thereof.

The several axioms and postulates presented in the theoretical frame of reference section apply to the model as follows: Axiom I constitutes the general basis for the conditional variable, identity, and the intervening variables of vocational commitment, aspirations, social satisfaction, professional commitment and personal commitment; Axioms II and III provide an explication of vocational commitment; Axioms IV and V, explicate aspirations; Axiom VI explicates the personal and professional dimensions of career commitment; Axiom VII explicates social satisfaction; Axiom VIII explicates social cost; and Axioms IX and X explicate the response variable, adjustment.
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Derivation of Hypotheses

A propositional matrix was employed to develop the hypotheses to be submitted to empirical test. Using the matrix the relationship of each intervening variable to every other intervening variable and the response variable was determined by inductive reasoning. As reproduced below, the matrix indicates by means of arrows the assumed causal relationship between the variables. Where double arrows appear an interaction is hypothesized.

By means of the propositional matrix fifteen sets of complementary hypotheses were generated. Sixteen additional sets were derived through pairing the intervening variables and inferring their causal relationship to both social satisfaction and adjustment.

Most simply stated, the hypotheses dealing with social cost may be expressed as follows: if social cost is high, then vocational commitment is low, aspirations are unmet, social satisfaction is low, profession career commitment is low, and personal career commitment is low; if social cost is low, then the intervening variables are high or met. Thirty-
Table 1. Propositional matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adj</th>
<th>Asp</th>
<th>PeC</th>
<th>PrC</th>
<th>VC</th>
<th>SS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adj</td>
<td>Asp-Adj</td>
<td>PeC-Adj</td>
<td>PrC-Adj</td>
<td>VC-Adj</td>
<td>SS-Adj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asp</td>
<td>Asp→PeC</td>
<td>Asp→PrC</td>
<td>VC→Asp</td>
<td>Asp→SS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PeC</td>
<td>PrC→PeC</td>
<td>VC→PeC</td>
<td>SS→PeC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PrC</td>
<td>VC→PrC</td>
<td>SS→PrC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC</td>
<td>SS→VC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>VC - Vocational commitment</td>
<td>PrC - Professional commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asp - Aspiration</td>
<td>PeC - Personal commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS - Social satisfaction</td>
<td>Adj - Adjustment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two combinations of high and low values for the intervening variables are possible and they fall into six categories of social cost ranging from least to greatest.

Throughout the remainder of this thesis hypotheses will be stated symbolically using the nomenclature presented in the legend for Table 1 on the preceding page. By means of this convention it is possible to present the data in a more concise and condensed fashion, e.g.,
Asp : Adj
if Asp(m), then Adj(S)
if Asp(u), then Adj(L)

would be read as follows: Aspirations are related to adjustment; if aspirations are met, then adjustment is to stay; and conversely, if aspirations are unmet, then adjustment is to leave. For all other intervening variables (h) represents high and (l) stands for low. An upper case (U) following the response variable, adjustment, means that the outcome is undecided, i.e., the response is marked by ambivalence or deferred evaluation.

Operationalizing of the Concepts

In previous applications of the social cost concept to empirical research difficulty has been encountered at the point of relying upon a single operator to measure the effect of each given intervening variable. The present research has sought to overcome this problem by the development of multiple operators and the submission of same to two pretests before incorporating the most valid ones into the actual research instrument. Upon completion of data collection these multiple operators were submitted to a chi square test of significance using the means for splitting the results and running these
data against the results from the several operators for all other intervening variables. By this method an operator was obtained for each intervening variable which is significantly related to all other intervening variables. Table 2 on the following page contains those operators selected by the aforementioned process.

Operationalization of the social cost concept was accomplished by distributing the data according to the thirty-two possible combinations of intervening variables. Weights were then arbitrarily assigned to the results with (h)s and (m)s being given a value of 1, and (l)s and (u)s being given a value of 2. Taking a summation of the designated values for the several combinations of high and low or met and unmet results produced six levels of social cost ranging from a low of five to a high of ten.

All intervening variables utilized a 0-10 scaled response for the purpose of assigning a quantitative value to otherwise subjective data thus making them amenable to statistical analysis. The dependent or response variable presented the respondent with three alternatives relative to his predicted adjustment.
Table 2. Operationalizing of the concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Vocational Commitment</td>
<td>To what extent do you feel your commitment to the pastoral ministry overrides any and all considerations (personal or professional) as to where your pastoral service is performed?</td>
<td>0-10 scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Aspirations</td>
<td>To what extent does your present charge correspond with your ideal charge?</td>
<td>0-10 scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Social Satisfaction</td>
<td>To what extent are you willing to stay and solve problems you have encountered on your present pastoral charge?</td>
<td>0-10 scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Professional Commitment</td>
<td>How strong are your professional reasons (projected plans, concept of the ministry, adequacy of facilities, etc.) for wanting to stay on your present pastoral charge?</td>
<td>0-10 scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Personal Commitment</td>
<td>How strong are your personal reasons (family wishes, weak community ties, few friends, etc.) for wanting to leave your present charge?</td>
<td>0-10 scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Social Cost</td>
<td>Results of the intervening variables were arbitrarily assigned weights of 1 for h's and m's, 2 for l's and u's, and summed for each possible combination</td>
<td>5-10 scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Adjustment</td>
<td>Do you wish to stay on your present charge in the coming Conference Year?</td>
<td>Yes, No, Undecided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Development of the Research Instrument

A mailed questionnaire was selected as the data collection method for the study. By this means it was possible to include a larger sample of the test population than could have been accommodated by the interview method due to limitations in research funds. Following the two pretests of intervening variables, those found to produce the most complete and meaningful data were incorporated into the final research instrument. A total of 118 questions were asked of the respondents which produced 49 measures of ministerial identity, 49 items of biographical information, five measures
of lay identity, and 24 measures on the intervening, causal and response variables. In most cases only a check mark or circle was necessary to record an answer, however, opportunity was given the respondent to reject the available alternatives and insert his own. Because of the difficulty in coding open ended questions only one was used as a cross-check against an earlier forced-choice question regarding the minister's role concepts.

Copies of the questionnaire were originally prepared in typewritten form and then photographically reduced and printed by the off-set process. This made possible condensing the final form of the questionnaire to less than one-half its bulk in typewritten original. As mailed to the respondents, the questionnaire consisted of an introductory letter followed by a blank page and then six pages of questions ending with a paragraph of appreciation from the study director. Both the letter and the question pages were printed on two sheets of 11" x 17" paper folded once and inserted to form an 8 1/2" x 11" booklet of eight pages in length. Each questionnaire was coded to correspond to a numerical designation on the mailing list by treating each of the first three lines in the opening paragraph of the covering letter as positions in a three digit
number. Thus, line one corresponded to the hundred column, line two denoted the ten column and line three accounted for the single digits. Counting 1 to 9 from the left-hand margin, an unobtrusive mark was placed above the letter in each line which corresponded to the numeral in each respective position of the three digit number. Care was then taken to see that the number-coded questionnaires were addressed to the correspondingly numbered respondents. This coding practice greatly facilitated the necessary follow-up required to assure an adequate return of completed questionnaires in terms of both numbers and the usefulness of the data.

Selection of the Sample

Two factors were operative in determining the choice of ministerial population to be sampled: (a) availability of a representative body of clergymen, and (b) access to that population of clergymen for the purpose of data collection.

A cursory survey of the major Protestant denominations indicated that The Methodist Church afforded a fairly representative pattern of pastoral assignment. While operating under a nominally episcopal system whereby the presiding
Bishop appoints men to their respective places of pastoral service, in practice, consultation between pastors, local congregations and their administrative and episcopal superiors regarding appointments makes possible individual initiative and personal selectivity regarding where and for what length of time a man engages in a given ministerial career, i.e., service to a particular pastoral charge. Hence, this particular denomination, by virtue of its size and pastoral tenure practices, covers a broad spectrum of Protestant behavioral patterns and includes pastoral charges of a few dozen to several thousand members located in open country, small towns, the inner-city and suburbia. Insofar as the several religious faiths and denominational bodies engage in varied forms of pastoral selection and assignment, The Methodist Church seems to fall between the extremes of congregational vs. ecclesiastical autonomy while incorporating some elements of both in regard to the tenure of pastoral leadership. The relative adequacy of Methodist clergymen to be representative of the Protestant ministry in general is further attested by the increasingly interdenominational character of faculty and student body in its schools of theology and the growing practice of autonomous congregations.
in other denominations to negotiate the "call" or appointment of their pastors through denominational executives or other bureaucratic channels.

Correspondence with the resident Bishop of the Iowa Area of The Methodist Church revealed the interest of that denomination in the proposed research and made available the names and addresses of men under pastoral appointment in the South Iowa Conference of The Methodist Church for the year 1963-64. In order to maximize control over the conditional variable, female clergy were excluded from the population. However, both conference members (nominally, ordained elders but including probationers) and supply pastors (unordained or non-conference member clergymen) were included. The total population thus derived amounted to 277 clergymen, 200 of whom were conference members and the remainder supply pastors.

The names of the clergy were randomized and assigned three digit numbers ranging from 001 to 277. Utilizing a table of random numbers a fifty per cent sample was drawn, plus an additional ten per cent to allow for attrition in the sample size due to nonresponse. By this method a sample of N = 166 was derived.
Data Collection

As mentioned earlier, a mailed questionnaire constituted the data collection method. Coded questionnaires were mailed with a postage-paid return envelope to each clergyman drawn in the sample. At the end of two weeks a follow-up letter was mailed in an effort to further legitimize the study and elicit a return from those not yet responding. Four weeks from the date of the initial mailing a second follow-up letter, a copy of the questionnaire minus the covering letter and a second postage-paid return envelope were sent to non-respondents. Data collection was terminated eight weeks following the initial mailing with responses from 90.3 per cent of the sample amounting to 150 returned questionnaires. Of this number 146 were sufficiently complete to be included in the study making a net or usable return of 87.9 per cent from the 166 clergymen drawn in the random sample. Data were thus amassed for an actual 52.7 per cent of the population being investigated. See Appendix A for a copy of the complete questionnaire.
Data Analysis

Six principle stages or levels were employed in the analysis of data. Essentially standard and established procedures were followed; however, they will be discussed here in sufficient detail to give the reader a view of the methodology utilized.

Stage 1

The entire questionnaire data were coded by converting the data into digital equivalents for use in automated data processing procedures. In most cases the schedule was pre-coded to conform to the 0 - 9 plus X and Y entries on an 80 column IBM punch card. Occupational data for both the pastor and his wife and each of their fathers were converted into digital form using the North-Hatt Occupational Scale as recently interpolated by Ward Bauder at Iowa State University of Science and Technology, Ames, Iowa. Each digit of the North-Hatt scale was coded for adjoining columns on the IBM card. In view of the small N of the sample these data were hand tabulated. For larger N's computer analysis would have been feasible and more economical. Community participation was derived by assigning a weight of one to having been an officer in the past, a weight of two to present officeholding,
and adding these weights to the years of organizational membership, the summation of which was coded into a scale of zero plus increments of four up to 33 or more. Where more than one church was served, total membership responsibility was estimated by taking a sum of the medians of the indicated church membership size categories and recoding this figure according to the original scale. Responses to open-ended question 117 were transferred to 3" x 5" file cards and sorted into six categories according to the themes or terms employed by the respondents. The schedules were then coded as to the frequency with which each category was mentioned by the respondent.

**Stage 2**

The coded data from the questionnaires were then recorded on eight-row, ten-column summary tables corresponding to the column entries on an IBM punch card. Three tables were necessary to record the data derived from each schedule. Cell number 1 in each table corresponded to the deck or card series. Cells number 2, 3 and 4 corresponded to the individual schedule number and were identical on all three tables and their respective punch cards. Cells 71 through 80 were left blank on the tables to provide space for the subsequent
entering of select variables from other tables for cross-runs against variables originally appearing on separate decks of a given numbered card.

**Stage 3**

At this point the data were transferred from the summary tables to three decks of IBM punch cards by personnel of the Iowa State University Computation Center. In consultation with the center a data processing program was developed and carried out as reported in the following two stages.

**Stage 4**

All data were initially summarized into frequency distribution tables from which statistical means and percentages were calculated where appropriate, depending upon the additivity of the data. By virtue of the means it was possible to split the data for the intervening variables into categories of high and low response as required for testing the hypotheses derived from the social cost career model.

**Stage 5**

Inasmuch as the majority of the intervening variables appeared on card two, all remaining intervening and response variables were transferred from cards one and three and punched into columns 71 through 80 of the second card in the
series. As mentioned earlier, each measure on an intervening variable was run against the measures on all other intervening variables and the response variable. Data were machine printed-out on continuous interfolded Moore Business Forms. By ruling in the means for each variable printed on these forms the data were distributed into tables of four to six cells each. The results were then submitted to chi square tests of probability for their frequencies and those intervening variables which were related to one another at a statistical significance level of .05 or greater were identified.

Stage 6

Intervening variables which were statistically significant in a one-to-one relationship were paired and sorted again controlling on all other intervening variables and the adjustment variable. No more than two-to-one relationships between the variables were submitted to chi square tests of probability due to the thinning out of the data with resulting small or zero n's in some cells. However, significant chi squares were obtained for all the assumed causal relationships between variables when controlling on selected conditional variables.
Controlling on all intervening variables, the data were then run against the response variable. As described in the section on operationalizing the concepts, this distribution produced 32 categories of high-low, met-unmet combinations of intervening variables which, when assigned weights of 1 for (h)s and (m)s and 2 for (l)s and (u)s, generated six levels of social cost. Social cost means were then computed for each of the three adjustment patterns of the response variable, and subsequently were submitted to t tests of significance of mean differences. The several categories of social cost were then run against select conditional variables for the purpose of obtaining a limited biographical and vocational profile of the respondents in each category.
FINDINGS

General Characteristics of the Sample

Biographical aspects

The study respondents ranged in age from a low of 22 years for a student supply pastor to a high of over eighty years for a retired conference member pastor still engaging in part-time service to a small congregation. More men fall in the 30 - 37 year age bracket than in any other and account for 26.0 per cent of the total. Their numbers exceed by over 40 per cent those falling in either of the next two higher eight-year age spans and by over 170 per cent those falling in the lowest eight-year age span. Over 28 per cent of the men are age 54 or over and hence are within approximately one decade of optional retirement at age 65. However, in view of their short supply, men frequently continue in a ministerial career up to and beyond the compulsory retirement age of 72 years, but beyond that point at a reduced work load consistent with health and stamina.

Marriage is highly normative for the minister with only 2.1 per cent indicating that they are single and 0.7 per cent that they are widowed. The unmarried are essentially
younger men either still in school or at an early stage in their ministry, or older men rather recently widowed and not yet remarried. By and large the Protestant minister is a family man with nearly three-fourths of the respondents' households containing progeny or other persons both related and non-related in addition to the spouse. Household sizes range from one to nine persons with approximately one-half the families having children of grade school age or younger. Of those households reporting the presence of children, nearly 12 per cent have raised them to 18 years of age or older and are thus comprised entirely of adults.

It is interesting to note that while the respondents come from families in which there were from one to ten siblings for an average of 3.3 children per home, fewer than one per cent of the ministers were first-born children. Most frequently, the child who ultimately becomes a clergyman is the second- or third-born at 35.4 and 23.6 per cents respectively.

The minister tends to have more education than his spouse. While 31.5 per cent of the ministers' wives have had some college, only 23.8 per cent have college degrees. This is in comparison to 55.5 per cent of the ministers who
presently hold graduate degrees (primarily the Bachelor of
Divinity or its equivalent) plus the 9.6 per cent who have
completed some graduate study. Only 15.8 per cent of the men
report less than a full college education while 59.1 per
cent of their wives terminated their formal educations short
of a college degree. Of these non-college wives, nearly
one-half completed only twelve grades or less.

It would appear that ministers come from somewhat more
stable families than do their wives as indicated by a 6.3
per cent incidence of parental divorce and separation for the
latter and a 3.5 per cent incidence for the former. This
factor is further corroborated by the 3.5 vs. 5.6 per cent
estimates of unhappy or very unhappy parental homes for
pastors and their wives respectively.

Nearly one-half of the ministers and their wives were
both reared in rural-farm backgrounds while 14.6 per cent of
the men, but only 8.4 per cent of the women, have a rural
non-farm heritage. With the exception of suburbia, which was
the childhood setting for 2.1 per cent of both ministers and
their wives, the wives come from urban and metropolitan areas
from 1.4 to 2.9 per cent more often than do their husbands.

In comparison with their fathers, 48.6 per cent of the
ministers have entered a vocation with an occupational status 16 - 20 points higher on the North-Hatt Occupational Scale. Only 2.1 per cent rate lower than their fathers and 7.5 per cent enjoy the same level of occupational attainment. For the remaining 41.8 per cent of the men, occupational status change was consistently upward from one to over 36 points higher than the level attained by their fathers. Within their own lifetimes 49.3 per cent of the men have entered the ministry from an occupation six to ten points below their clergy status. For the 4.1 per cent of the men whose occupational status was lowered by entering the ministry, the difference can be accounted for by their part-time supply pastor status which, as an untrained ministry, has a lower status rating than their principal occupation. Even more striking is the situation of the pastors' wives of whom 29.9 per cent married into an occupational status level lower than that ascribed to them by their fathers. However, 3.5 per cent of the wives enjoy a status in the parsonage home equal to the home in which they were reared and 41.0 per cent of them experienced a six to ten point status rise by virtue of their marriage. For the remaining 26.3 per cent of the wives, status increased from one to 36 points on the North-Hatt
Ministers tend to be considerably less active in their communities than the lay leadership of their churches. Some 53.5 per cent of the ministers, in comparison to 18.3 per cent of the laymen, scored eight or less out of a possible 33 on a scale of formal club and organization affiliations. Nearly one-half of the men estimated their level of participation to be about the same in their present community as it had been in their last. However, 22.9 per cent felt they were currently more active in more groups than they had been in the past.

**Vocational aspects**

The men had been on their present pastoral charges an average of 2.85 years at the time of the study and had served their previous charges an average of 4.01 years. During the past decade an average of 2.07 full-time and 0.67 part time charges have been served by the respondents. The pastoral records of the supply vs. the conference member pastors are virtually identical except for the fact that 36.4 per cent of the latter, as opposed to only 18.9 per cent of the former, have served only two pastoral charges in the past decade and that proportionally over four times as many supply pastors
as conference members are presently serving their first full-time pastoral charge.

For the majority of the men (59.6 per cent), the decision to enter the ministry was made between the ages of 14 and 21. By age 25 over 70 per cent of the men had made their decision, and by age 29 some 79.0 per cent of the men had entered the active ministry either as a college or graduate level divinity student or as a local parish pastor.

Churches in the 201 to 400 member category were the leading contributors of men to the pastoral ministry in the amount of 26.0 per cent of the total. Churches in smaller membership categories contributed a combined total of 35.0 per cent while churches in larger membership categories made a combined contribution of 38.4 per cent of the total.

Seminary degrees have been earned by 68.3 per cent of the men, and an additional 13.1 per cent have had some seminary work. Full membership in the Annual Conference (the ordaining and administrative body of the respondents' denomination) is highly correlated with having earned a seminary degree in that only 0.6 per cent of the men in full connection do not hold this academic accreditation, having been received prior to the adoption of a degree requirement for
Supply pastors tend to be slightly under-represented in the sample with 25.3 per cent having been drawn at random as compared to the 27.8 per cent they constitute of the population. Probationary conference members account for 4.8 per cent of the sample whereas 1.4 per cent of the sample holds the retired relationship though continuing to serve as local church pastors.

Well over one-third (37.7 per cent) of the sample reports having had a previous denominational affiliation other than their present one. This factor corresponds with the percentage of men reporting that neither of their parents were members of the denomination in which they are now serving. An even higher percentage (40.6 per cent) of the ministers' wives came from families in which neither parent was a member of the denomination their daughter is presently identified with.

In terms of their length of pastoral ministry, the respondents are relatively young careerists with 33.5 per cent having served less than ten years, 47.9 per cent less than fifteen years, and 65.0 per cent less than twenty years.

Well over one-half (56.9 per cent) of the men live in
rural areas with nearly three-fifths of their number located in farming communities. Of the churches served by these men, 31.0 per cent are located in the open country and 27.6 per cent in villages of less than 500 persons.

Fewer men serve single church charges (43.8 per cent at the time of the study) than serve in multiple-church charge categories, and little change is noted in the percentages for present vs. previous pastorates. However, men serving two-church charges are down from 39.3 per cent in the past to 32.2 in the present, those ministering to three-church charges have risen from 7.6 to 17.8 per cent and those in four and five-church charges have risen from 0.7 per cent to 4.2 and 2.1 per cent in each category respectively.

Respondents serve almost twice as many churches in the 51 to 100 member category (28.3 per cent) than in the next largest category of 101 to 150 members (15.2 per cent). Churches in the 501 to 1,000 member class are served by 14.5 per cent of the men while memberships of 1,001 or more and 50 or less are served by 11.1 and 11.7 per cent of the men respectively. Estimates of the total membership served by pastors in the sample range from the 1.4 per cent who serve 50 or less to the 2.1 per cent who serve 2,001 or
more. More men (35.9 per cent) serve total memberships in the 301 to 500 class than any other, and an additional 26.8 per cent of the men have pastorates of 501 to 1,000 members. In all but 2.8 per cent of the cases the respondent was the sole occupant of the ministerial office in his respective pastoral charge.

Table 3 on the following page provides a comparison of how the respondents evaluate their ministerial roles according to the three criteria of: the importance of the role, a self-estimate of effectiveness in the role, and the role most enjoyed. Also included is an indication of respondents' desires for additional role training. The six roles listed in the table correspond to the practitioner roles of the clergy identified in the Blizzard study cited in the review of literature (4 and 5). Respondents were asked to assign a rank order to the importance of these roles and their effectiveness in them, and to indicate which role they most enjoyed plus the one in which they desired more training. As seen in the table, the men in the sample conceive of the ministerial role as principally that of preacher closely followed by that of pastor. These are the only two roles which fall in the same order for all three criteria. For
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Importance Mean</th>
<th>Importance Order</th>
<th>Effectiveness Mean</th>
<th>Effectiveness Order</th>
<th>Most enjoyed %</th>
<th>Most enjoyed Order</th>
<th>Training desired %</th>
<th>Training desired Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preacher</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 141 129 138 130
the other roles: administrator, which is ranked third in order of importance and enjoyment drops to number four in effectiveness; organizer, number four in importance rates positions six and five in effectiveness and enjoyment respectively; teacher is accorded position five in the first two criteria but gets a three rating in enjoyment; and priest moves from last place in importance to number three in effectiveness and position four in enjoyment. In terms of desire for more training: preacher drops to fourth place, pastor moves from second to first; administrator and organizer rise to positions two and three respectively; and only teacher and priest retain the fifth and sixth order earlier assigned to their importance.

In contrast to lay conceptions of the ministerial office, clergymen interpret their role to be primarily that of giving nurture to their congregants while the man in the pew looks first to his pastor for an example of Christian living. Table 4 on the following page summarizes the self-concepts of ministers and the expectations of laymen as reported by the clergy and a random sample of male and female local church office-holders drawn for this purpose. As seen in the table, example has the lowest frequency for
Table 4. Ministerial self-concepts vs. lay expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept or expectation</th>
<th>Minister %</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Layman %</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nurture (pastor)</td>
<td>75.5a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proclamation (preacher-teacher)</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment (evangelist)</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service (community servant)</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration (institutional servant)</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example (model for others)</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 139 116

*Percentages exceed a total of 100.0 due to the mention of more than one criterion by most respondents.

any role concept mentioned by the clergy while the laity mentioned it more often than any other as a criterion of what a minister is and ought to do. In addition, laymen and ministers disagreed as to the frequency with which they mentioned the evangelistic role of clergyman in seeking new and renewed commitments to the faith. Laymen gave it least mention while clergymen gave it their third highest frequency
of mention.

As determined by the modal frequency for each criteria, respondents described a composite ideal pastoral charge consisting of a single church (82.2 per cent) in an urban community of under 10,000 population (38.3 per cent) with 400 to 799 members (45.4 per cent) to whom they were the sole pastor (69.7 per cent). Present pastoral charges were given a mean rating of 5.70 on a 0 - 10 scale with regard to how well they correspond to the ideal charge.

Respondents indicated that the most important non-material reward from their ministry is found in serving people in their total needs of body, mind and spirit. Occupying ranks two and three respectively are the rewards of seeing others grow spiritually and the satisfaction derived from personal obedience to a divine call into the ministry. Next in order of importance is personal spiritual growth and last in order is being a part of a dynamic and active denomination. The ability of non-material rewards to supplant financial rewards in excess of basic needs for food, shelter, clothing, etc. was given a mean response of 7.20 on a 0 - 10 scale.
Acceptance of Single Variable Hypotheses

As indicated earlier, hypotheses relative to the Social Cost Career Model were initially generated by use of a propositional matrix to determine the assumed nature of the relationship between the intervening variables themselves and with the response variable. The disposition of these hypotheses is summarized in Table 5 on pages 57 to 59 using the aforementioned nomenclature of VC = vocational commitment, Asp = aspirations, SS = social satisfaction, PrC = professional commitment, PeC = personal commitment, and Adj = adjustment. Other symbols employed include "+" to represent "in combination with" and ":=" to stand for "is related to". Letters enclosed in parentheses indicate the high (h) - low (l), met (m) - un-met (u), and stay (S) - leave (L) - undecided (U) attributes of the several variables. The symbol "$X^2$" heads the column of chi square values for the relationship between the variables and "df" indicates the degrees of freedom associated with the given chi square.

Hypotheses one through ten of Table 5 show the relationship between the intervening variables. With the exception of the vocational commitment - aspirations relationship, all intervening variable relationships are accepted as
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Accept</th>
<th>Reject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 VC : Asp</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(h), then Asp(m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(1), then Asp(u)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A Age + VC : Asp</td>
<td>17.44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if Age(h)+VC(h), then Asp(m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if Age(h)+VC(1), then Asp(u)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if Age(l)+VC(h), then Asp(u)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if Age(l)+VC(1), then Asp(u)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 VC : SS</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(h), then SS(h)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(1), then SS(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 VC : PrC</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(h), then PrC(h)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(1), then PrC(l)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 VC : PeC</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(h), then PeC(h)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(1), then PeC(l)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Asp : SS</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if Asp(m), then SS(h)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if Asp(u), then SS(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Asp : PrC</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if Asp(m), then PrC(h)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if Asp(u), then PrC(l)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Asp : PeC</td>
<td>10.41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if Asp(m), then PeC(h)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if Asp(u), then PeC(l)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
<th>Accept</th>
<th>Reject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 SS : PrC</td>
<td>19.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if SS(h), then PrC(h)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if SS(l), then PrC(l)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 SS : PeC</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if SS(h), then PeC(h)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if SS(l), then PeC(l)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 PrC : PeC</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if PrC(h), then PeC(h)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if PrC(l), then PeC(l)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 VC : Adj</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(h), then Adj(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(l), then Adj(U)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11A Number of churches (NC) + VC : Adj</td>
<td>15.78</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if NC(h)+VC(h), then Adj(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if NC(l)+VC(l), then Adj(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if NC(h)+VC(h), then Adj(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if NC(h)+VC(l), then Adj(U)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Asp : Adj</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if Asp(m), then Adj(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if Asp(u), then Adj(U)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 SS : Adj</td>
<td>28.12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if SS(h), then Adj(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if SS(l), then Adj(U)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
<th>Accept</th>
<th>Reject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 PrC : Adj</td>
<td>34.93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if PrC(h), then Adj(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if PrC(l), then Adj(U)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 PeC : Adj</td>
<td>22.13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if PeC(h), then Adj(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if PeC(l), then Adj(U)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

as hypothesized at a significance level of .02 or .01. This is to say, a high or met response on a given intervening variable is related to a high or met response on all other intervening variables with the converse or low - low, etc. relationship also being observed except for the specific relationship of vocational commitment to aspirations. For this latter relationship the data conform to the model but at n's too small for statistical significance at the .05 level. However, when age is taken into consideration by splitting this variable on the category containing the median age, statistical significance for the vocational commitment - aspirations relationship is achieved at the .01 level. The
data thus support the hypotheses regarding age (42 years and over vs. 41 and under) as a discriminating factor leading to model conformity for the senior clergymen and consistently unmet aspirations irrespective of vocational commitment for their junior colleagues.

Hypotheses 11 through 15 summarize the relationship of the several intervening variables to the response variable, adjustment. Underlying these hypotheses is the assumption that a high or met response on any of the intervening variables would be related to the adjustment (S), but that a low or unmet response on an individual intervening variable would involve social cost too low or tolerable to precipitate the adjustment (L). Hence, low responses are hypothesized to be related to the adjustment (U).

By reference to Table 5 it is evident that the data produced some unexpected results for the hypotheses in question. While the relationships of adjustment to aspirations, professional commitment and personal commitment achieve model conformity at the significance level of .02 or greater, those with vocational commitment and social satisfaction do not. These latter two variables produce data at a significance level too low for acceptance, not in the
expected direction, or both. Though conforming to the model for high vocational commitment at a chi square just .09 below the .05 significance level, low vocational commitment also produced adjustment (S) in contradiction to the expected adjustment (U). When the number of churches presently being served by each respondent is taken into consideration a chi square significance of .02 is obtained. Underlying the hypotheses relative to the affect of multiple-church charges on the relationship between vocational commitment and adjustment is the assumption that a single-church charge compensates for the adverse affects of low vocational commitment, and conversely, that high vocational commitment offsets the negative influence of serving several churches simultaneously. On this basis, the three hypotheses predicting adjustment (S) are accepted, but the fourth which predicted adjustment (U) is rejected. The data for this latter hypothesis produce equal n's for adjustments (S) and (L), both of which are greater than the n for adjustment (U). It is apparent then that the conditions of more than one church plus low vocational commitment interact to produce a diversity of adjustment inconsistent with model expectations.

Explanation for this phenomenon may be found in the fact
that the vocational commitment variable is dichotomized on
the second highest mean (7.79) obtained for any intervening
variable. This is to say, 62.6 per cent of the data fall
above the cutting point using the 7-8 interval which contains
the mean. In addition, the third highest frequency of re-
sponses falls in the category immediately below the cutting
point. Hence, many of the cases falling below the mean could
be considered to have sufficiently high enough vocational
commitment to account for the higher than expected fre-
quencies of adjustment (S). On the other hand, the effect of
multiple churches upon those cases of vocational commitment
otherwise expected to be sufficiently low enough to produce
adjustment (U) suggests that the difficulties encountered in
serving more than one church are rationalizations of social
cost-inducing factors operative in producing the greater
incidence of adjustment (L). In short, the majority of the
vocational commitment scores appear to be sufficiently high
irrespective of their relationship to the mean to render this
variable indiscriminate as a criterion for predicting re-
sponses other than adjustment (S).

This same rationale applies to the rejected hypothesis
concerning the relationship between the social satisfaction
variable and the adjustment variable. As in the previous case, a high value for this intervening variable is associated with the outcome predicted by the model, but for a low value the data are distributed in equal n's for adjustments (S) and (L). Inasmuch as social satisfaction has the highest mean (7.95) relative to all intervening variables the skewedness of the data appears to be even more operative in the present instance than in the prior one. Therefore, it may be said of the social satisfaction scores that they too appear to be sufficiently high irrespective of their relationship to the mean to render this variable indiscriminate as a criterion for predicting responses other than adjustment (S).

On the basis of the foregoing disposition of the data it is evident that the behavior of the respondents does in fact correspond to the expectations of the Social Cost Career Model from the standpoint of the hypothesized relationships between intervening variables. In addition, while the data demonstrate some evidence in support of the adjustment-predicting ability of social satisfaction and vocational commitment, the determinative quality of these relationships is sufficiently indiscriminate to invalidate them as substitutionary operators for the social cost concept. Indeed,
the distribution of the data into equal n's for adjustments (S) and (L) corroborates the hypothesized ambivalence resulting from low responses on the intervening variables. Noteworthy is the fact that a low response on either of these variables does relate to a definite outcome rather than the state of indecision associated with adjustment (U). Up to this point then, the data do not warrant any modification of the theoretical model.

Acceptance of Paired Variable Hypotheses

In order to provide a further check on the interrelationships of the intervening variables themselves and with the response variable, each variable was paired with another according to the direction of their assumed relationship with a third variable, as indicated in the excerpted portion of the theoretical model reproduced below in Figure 2.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Vocational Commitment} & \rightarrow \text{Aspirations} \\
\text{Career Commitment} & \rightarrow \text{Social Satisfaction} \\
\text{a. Professional} & \\
\text{b. Personal} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 2. Relationships of intervening variables
Direct relationships are hypothesized for the horizontal and vertical arrows, and indirect relationships by the diagonal arrows. The disposition of hypotheses relative to these paired intervening variable relations are found in sets one through sixteen in Table 6 on the following pages. Ten sets of hypotheses (17 - 26) dealing with intervening and response variable relationships are also included in Table 6 and will be discussed after accounting for the relationships between the intervening variables themselves.

**Intervening variable relationships**

It was assumed that both direct and indirect relationships would be obtained for the intervening variables. This is to say, while there is a sequential logic to the horizontal and vertical linking of these variables it cannot be assumed that this exhausts the possible or probable relationships between them. Hence, diagonal lines have been drawn in the model linking each variable with those not immediately adjacent to it. By so doing, a feedback effect is inferred which may tend to intensify and reinforce relationships between directly related variables, or tend to weaken them according to the social cost concept of a negative assessment produced by a discrepancy between expectation
Table 6. Hypotheses generated by pairing intervening variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>x²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
<th>Accept</th>
<th>Reject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 VC + Asp : SS</td>
<td>14.05</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(h)+Asp(m), then SS(h)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(h)+Asp(u), then SS(h)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(l)+Asp(m), then SS(h)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(l)+Asp(u), then SS(l)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2 VC + SS : PrC | 22.67 | 3 | .01 | | |
| if VC(h)+SS(h), then PrC(h) | * | | |
| if VC(h)+SS(l), then PrC(1) | * | | |
| if VC(l)+SS(h), then PrC(h) | * | | |
| if VC(l)+SS(l), then PrC(1) | * | | |

| 3 VC + SS : PeC | 12.75 | 3 | .01 | | |
| if VC(h)+SS(h), then PeC(h) | * | | |
| if VC(h)+SS(l), then PeC(1) | * | | |
| if VC(l)+SS(h), then PeC(h) | * | | |
| if VC(l)+SS(l), then PeC(1) | * | | |

| 4 Asp + SS : PrC | 28.42 | 3 | .01 | | |
| if Asp(m)+SS(h), then PrC(h) | * | | |
| if Asp(m)+SS(l), then PrC(1) | * | | |
| if Asp(u)+SS(h), then PrC(h) | * | | |
| if Asp(u)+SS(l), then PrC(1) | * | | |

| 5 Asp + SS : PeC | 18.85 | 3 | .01 | | |
| if Asp(m)+SS(h), then PeC(h) | * | | |
| if Asp(m)+SS(l), then PeC(1) | * | | |
| if Asp(u)+SS(h), then PeC(h) | * | | |
| if Asp(u)+SS(l), then PeC(1) | * | | |

| 6 SS + PrC : PeC | 16.08 | 3 | .01 | | |
| if SS(h)+PrC(h), then PeC(h) | * | | |
| if SS(h)+PrC(1), then PeC(h) | * | | |
| if SS(l)+PrC(h), then PeC(1) | * | | |
| if SS(l)+PrC(1), then PeC(1) | * | | |
Table 6 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>( X^2 )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
<th>Accept</th>
<th>Reject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 SS + PeC : PrC</td>
<td>24.74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if SS(h)+PeC(h), then PrC(h)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if SS(h)+PeC(l), then PrC(h)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if SS(l)+PeC(h), then PrC(l)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if SS(l)+PeC(l), then PrC(l)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 VC + PrC : PeC</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(h)+PrC(h), then PeC(h)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(h)+PrC(l), then PeC(h)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(l)+PrC(h), then PeC(h)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(l)+PrC(l), then PeC(l)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 VC + PeC : PrC</td>
<td>14.68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(h)+PeC(h), then PrC(h)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(h)+PeC(l), then PrC(h)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(l)+PeC(h), then PrC(h)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(l)+PeC(l), then PrC(l)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 VC + Asp : PrC</td>
<td>18.42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(h)+Asp(m), then PrC(h)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(h)+Asp(u), then PrC(h)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(l)+Asp(m), then PrC(h)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(l)+Asp(u), then PrC(l)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 VC + Asp : PeC</td>
<td>13.11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(h)+Asp(m), then PeC(h)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(h)+Asp(u), then PeC(h)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(l)+Asp(m), then PeC(h)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(l)+Asp(u), then PeC(l)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Asp + SS : VC</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if Asp(m)+SS(h), then VC(h)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if Asp(m)+SS(l), then VC(h)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if Asp(u)+SS(h), then VC(h)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if Asp(u)+SS(l), then VC(l)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
<th>Accept</th>
<th>Reject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 SS + VC : PeC</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if SS(h)+VC(h), then PeC(h)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if SS(h)+VC(l), then PeC(h)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if SS(l)+VC(h), then PeC(l)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if SS(l)+VC(l), then PeC(l)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 SS + VC : PrC</td>
<td>22.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if SS(h)+VC(h), then PrC(h)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if SS(h)+VC(l), then PrC(h)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if SS(l)+VC(h), then PrC(l)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if SS(l)+VC(l), then PrC(l)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 PrC + Asp : SS</td>
<td>20.82</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if PrC(h)+Asp(m), then SS(h)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if PrC(h)+Asp(u), then SS(h)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if PrC(l)+Asp(m), then SS(h)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if PrC(l)+Asp(u), then SS(l)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 PeC + Asp : SS</td>
<td>16.63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if PeC(h)+Asp(m), then SS(h)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if PeC(h)+Asp(u), then SS(h)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if PeC(l)+Asp(m), then SS(h)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if PeC(l)+Asp(u), then SS(l)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 VC + Asp : Adj</td>
<td>16.23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(h)+Asp(m), then Adj(S)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(h)+Asp(u), then Adj(S)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(l)+Asp(m), then Adj(S)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(l)+Asp(u), then Adj(U)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 VC + SS : Adj</td>
<td>37.29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(h)+SS(h), then Adj(S)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(h)+SS(l), then Adj(S)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(l)+SS(h), then Adj(S)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if VC(l)+SS(1), then Adj(U)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance level</th>
<th>Accept</th>
<th>Reject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VC + PrC : Adj</td>
<td>38.58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC(h)+PrC(h), then Adj(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC(h)+PrC(1), then Adj(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC(l)+PrC(h), then Adj(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC(l)+PrC(1), then Adj(U)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC + PeC : Adj</td>
<td>25.89</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC(h)+PeC(h), then Adj(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC(h)+PeC(1), then Adj(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC(l)+PeC(h), then Adj(S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC(l)+PeC(1), then Adj(U)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asp + SS : Adj</td>
<td>30.91</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Asp(m)+SS(h), then Adj(S) | | | | | *
| Asp(m)+SS(1), then Adj(S) | | | | | *
| Asp(u)+SS(h), then Adj(S) | | | | | *
| Asp(u)+SS(1), then Adj(U) | | | | | *
| Asp + PrC : Adj | 48.14 | 6 | .01 | * | |
| Asp(m)+PrC(h), then Adj(S) | | | | | *
| Asp(m)+PrC(1), then Adj(S) | | | | | *
| Asp(u)+PrC(h), then Adj(S) | | | | | *
| Asp(u)+PrC(1), then Adj(U) | | | | | *
| Asp + PeC : Adj | 33.62 | 6 | .01 | * | |
| Asp(m)+PeC(h), then Adj(S) | | | | | *
| Asp(m)+PeC(1), then Adj(S) | | | | | *
| Asp(u)+PeC(h), then Adj(S) | | | | | *
| Asp(u)+PeC(1), then Adj(U) | | | | | *
| SS + PrC : Adj | 50.10 | 6 | .01 | * | |
| SS(h)+PrC(h), then Adj(S) | | | | | *
| SS(h)+PrC(1), then Adj(S) | | | | | *
| SS(1)+PrC(h), then Adj(S) | | | | | *
| SS(1)+PrC(1), then Adj(U) | | | | | *
Table 6 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Accept</th>
<th>Reject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 $SS + PeC : Adj$</td>
<td>41.05</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if $SS(h)+PeC(h)$, then Adj(S)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if $SS(h)+PeC(1)$, then Adj(S)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if $SS(1)+PeC(h)$, then Adj(S)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if $SS(1)+PeC(1)$, then Adj(U)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 $PrC + PeC : Adj$</td>
<td>50.60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if $PrC(h)+PeC(h)$, then Adj(S)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if $PrC(h)+PeC(1)$, then Adj(S)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if $PrC(1)+PeC(h)$, then Adj(S)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if $PrC(1)+PeC(1)$, then Adj(U)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 6, all direct and indirect relationships between intervening variables were accepted at a statistical significance level of .05 or greater, with the majority occurring at the .01 level. Underlying these hypotheses is the assumption that in paired variables involving either vocational commitment or aspirations, high responses on these variables would offset low values on the other variable and vice versa to produce a positive or high value on a third variable. For paired variables involving social...
satisfaction this variable was assumed to be dominant and that responses on the third variable would correspond to the given values of social satisfaction with the single exception of combinations with aspirations where the compensation or offset effect would result in high values on the third variable.

Nine of the sixteen variable relationship sets (1, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, and 16) conform to model expectations in all respects. For the remaining seven relationship sets (2, 3, 6, 11, 13, 14, and 15) a single hypothesis is rejected. As discovered in the analysis of single variable hypotheses, ambivalence is associated with responses on the vocational commitment and social satisfaction variables. This is especially true for the interaction between high social satisfaction and low vocational commitment which resulted in equally divided high and low responses on both professional and personal commitment as seen in relationships two, three, thirteen and fourteen in Table 6.

The remaining variable relationships for which unexpected results were obtained involve two aspects of aspirations and one of social satisfaction. In the latter case, low social satisfaction interacted with high professional
commitment to produce high personal commitment (set 6) and in one of the former cases unmet aspirations proved to be dominant over high vocational commitment in producing low personal commitment (set 11), leading to the conclusion that personal commitment tends to be more closely related to aspirations while professional commitment tends to be more closely related to vocational commitment. The remaining incidence of failure of the data to verify model hypotheses consists of the apparently untenable situation in set fifteen where low professional commitment in combination with unmet aspirations is related to high social satisfaction. However, a look at the data suggests that the situation is actually one of ambivalence in which a difference of only one separates the n's for high and low values of social satisfaction. We thus derive further insight into the intervening variables to the effect that aspirations tend to have a relatively weak feedback to professional commitment and hence are indiscriminate in predicting the outcome of the social satisfaction variable. Adding to this situation is the aforementioned bias of the social satisfaction data in skewing the results in favor of high values for this variable irrespective of the values obtained for other variables.
In view of the foregoing events at this level of data analysis, a refinement of the model appears to be in order. This may be accomplished by redrawing the lines of relationship between the three kinds of commitment and aspirations according to the outcome of the data. Figure 3 below is now in closer conformity with the empirically measured relationships than is Figure 2. It can be noted that the model remains essentially the same except for the observed tendency for the feed-back from career commitment to split according to its professional and personal aspects with the former interacting most strongly with vocational commitment and the latter most strongly with aspirations.

![Diagram](attachment:image)

**Figure 3.** Modification of intervening variable feedback

**Intervening - response variable relationships**

Returning to Table 6, the remaining ten sets of relationships dealing with paired intervening variables in
relationship to the response variable will now be discussed. Underlying these hypotheses was the assumption that reciprocal values for the paired intervening variables would interact to produce adjustment (S) on the response variable, and that paired low or unmet responses on the intervening variables would result in indecision or ambivalence and, hence, adjustment (U). This is to say, low or unmet scores on only two intervening variables would indicate only minimal social cost and hence would not be discriminating enough to produce adjustment (L) as a consistent outcome on the response variable.

As shown in Table 6, a statistically significant relationship at the .01 level was established for nine of the variables tested and at the .02 level for the tenth. Of these ten sets of relationships, two achieved full conformity to model expectations (20 and 26), five had one hypothesis each rejected (17, 19, 21, 24, and 25), and three lacked empirical support for two hypotheses each (18, 22 and 23). Six of the eleven hypotheses were rejected due to ambivalence in the data, two due to unexpected positive responses and three because of negative responses where indecision had been anticipated.
It would appear, then, that due to their indiscriminate nature, when low vocational commitment interacts with unmet aspirations a "bird in the hand is worth two in the bush" kind of attitude is produced which results in a decision to stay (set 17) in spite of social cost-inducing discrepancies between vocational and aspirational expectations and attainments.

As evidenced before, ambivalence is associated with the vocational commitment and social satisfaction variables such as we find in sets 18 and 19. Where the former variable is high and the latter is low, the respondents demonstrate a tendency toward mobility within the profession with as many choosing to stay as to leave. However, when both social satisfaction and vocational commitment are low the split is between leave or undecided. From this it might be inferred that some of these careerists are considering the possibility of departure from the profession.

Ambivalence is also noted in the rejected hypotheses of sets 22 and 23. Here is seen the apparent frustration of having fulfilled one's aspirations only to find them less rewarding, both professionally and personally, than anticipated. It is conceivable that unmet aspirations coupled with
low professional commitment could evoke considerations of possible withdrawal from the profession by undecided careerists. However, when unmet aspirations are coupled with low personal commitment the attendant social cost is apparently tolerable and elicits willingness to stay, at least for a time, in a career which does not look like the end of the line.

Most indicative of a negative assessment for the outcome of a career are the combinations of low social satisfaction with unmet aspirations and both aspects of career commitment. However, even here ambivalence may be inferred due to the slim margin of one by which the leave response edges out undecided responses in all three instances, as seen in sets 21, 24 and 25.

As with the single variable hypotheses, we find that paired variables are also too indiscriminate to account for the outcome of the response variable and hence are incapable of substitution for the social cost concept as the causal determinant of adjustment. It does appear, however, that certain clarifications of the assumed relationships between intervening variables may be inferred from the data. These insights are expressed in Figure 4 below in terms of the
Vocational Commitment — Aspirations

Career Commitment
a. Professional
b. Personal

Social Satisfaction

--- --- = neutral—does not predict adjustment (L)
--- --- --- = ambivalent—occasionally predicts adjustment (L)
--- --- --- --- = negative—regularly predicts adjustment (L)

Figure 4. Neutral, ambivalent and negative interactions between paired intervening variables in relationship to the response variable

causal effect given pairs of intervening variables have upon the outcome of the response variable. It can be noted that the interactions follow the same pattern established for the interactions between the intervening variables themselves, but that certain combinations have a greater predictive value than others.

Were this same principle to be followed in assessing all the possible linkages or combinations of intervening variables in relationship to the response variable, we could expect adjustment (S) to be typified by mostly broken lines; adjust-
ment (U) to consist of a mixture of broken, dashed and solid lines; and for adjustment (L) to be primarily made up of solid lines.

The validity of model conformity for adjustments (S) and (U) has been demonstrated by the data, and it now remains to establish the validity of adjustment (L) by means of the derived measurement of social cost.

Acceptance of Social Cost Hypotheses

As indicated in the section on data analysis, the absence of data in an increasing number of cells precluded the possibility of running further combinations of multiple intervening variables against the response variable, and hence the conversion of intervening variable values into a scale of social cost. As indicated in the operationalizing of the variables, it was initially thought that these transformed data could be dichotomized by the mean of their scores and then run against the response variable. However, it was found that while a significant relationship between social cost and adjustment existed at the .01 level with the chi square test of probability, too many of the implications of the data were lost by this methodological procedure. This
being the case, the data were redistributed according to the
six categories of social cost ranging from scores of five to
ten. Intervals of two were selected and the data again run
against the response variable to test the following hypo­
theses:

A If social cost is low, then adjustment will be (S).

B If social cost is intermediate, then adjustment will
be (U).

C If social cost is high, then adjustment will be (L).

On the basis of this latter handling of the data,
greater model conformity was achieved. The chi square test
yielded a value indicating significance beyond the .01 level
with four degrees of freedom, and two of the above hypotheses
were accepted. Both high and low social cost are found to
be in their assumed relationship to the response variable
with the overwhelming majority of the low social cost
respondents wishing to return to their pastoral charges in
the coming year and the largest proportion of the high social
cost pastors desiring not to return. However, for those
respondents falling in the middle range of social cost a
decided majority also wish to continue in their present
careers. While this outcome causes the rejection of the
specific hypothesis predicting adjustment (U), it nevertheless is consistent with the rationale employed in testing paired variable relationships to the effect that social cost which can be sublimated or kept within the limits of toleration is unlikely to produce adjustment (L). Evidence that this intermediate range of social cost creates greater ambivalence than the low range is seen in the shifting proportions of the responses which fall in adjustment (U). Table 7 summarizes the distribution of these data according to their frequency and percentages. Whereas low social cost has only 8.3 per cent of its responses in this category, the middle range proportion increases nearly four-fold to 32.3 per cent and the proportion of high responses in this adjustment category is exceeded only by the number indicating a desire to leave.

In brief, it is apparent that as social cost increases the distribution of negative or indecisive responses shifts from slightly over ten per cent for low social cost to in excess of eighty per cent for high social cost. Unquestionably then, as negative assessments mount up on the intervening variables a corresponding weakening of career commitment is seen in the growing proportion of clergymen who desire a change in pastorates or who are undecided about
Table 7. Relationship between causal and response variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social cost range</th>
<th>Stay</th>
<th>Adjustment</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (5 - 6)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate (7 - 8)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (9 - 10)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
continuing their tenure at the present locus of their professional careers. Putting this another way, nine out of ten professionals registering low social cost are desirous of continuing their career at its present location. If the intensity of social cost is doubled, only six out of ten careerists wish to stay; if the intensity of social cost is trebled by compounding the negative assessments given on four or more of the intervening variables, less than two out of ten careerists desire to stay.
Recapitulation of the Social Cost Career Model

As initially presented in the section dealing with the derivation of the theory, the Social Cost Career Model is an attempt to express symbolically the relationships among five select intervening variables which are thought to have a causal effect upon the outcome of a professional career. Having submitted the model to an empirical test, it is evident that general conformity to the expectations of the model has been achieved through the acceptance of approximately eight-five per cent of the hypothesized relationships. Where the data fail to produce the expected results explanations can be found which do not detract from the validity of the model, but rather serve to refine the theory by suggesting modifications of the model. These modifications were presented earlier in Figure 3 and are repeated now in the revision of the Social Cost Career Model appearing on the following page.

It can be noted that the principal change is in the nature of the relationships between Vocational Commitment, Aspirations and the two aspects of Career Commitment. Social Satisfaction continues to relate to both aspects of Career
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Figure 5. Revised social cost career model
Commitment, but the personal dimension of the latter now exhibits a feedback effect upon Aspirations which in turn has an effect upon professional career commitment. It also can be noted that an interaction between Vocational Commitment and Professional Career Commitment has replaced the original assumption of Vocational Commitment being a determinant of both aspects of career commitment. Aside from these changes, the basic structure of the model is retained and its causal variable confirmed, i.e., adjustment may be predicted from the intensity of social cost produced by the positive, negative or neutral assessment of the intervening variable relationships.

Recommendations for Future Research

One particular drawback was found in the methodology employed at two stages of data analysis which tended to reduce the power of the data. The decision to utilize means for dichotomizing the data on the intervening and causal variables produced a limitation in their ability to predict the outcome of the response variable. While this had only negligible effect upon the paired intervening variable relationships, it proved wholly untenable as a methodology for
analysis of the summation of these relationships under the causal variable, social cost.

Inasmuch as the use of multiple operators and scaled responses served to overcome the inadequacies of single operators and forced choice responses associated with previous research employing the social cost concept, further improvement might be found in the utilization of more sophisticated statistical procedures applicable to the continuous or additive form of the intervening variable data. In view of the observed variations in causal effect produced by different combinations of intervening variables, it is conceivable that coefficients of correlation might be computed whereby the responses on these data could more accurately contribute to the derivation of social cost. That is to say, responses of the same intensity are not indicative of the same degree of social cost for given pairs of intervening variables, hence, a statistical method which controls for this factor might resolve the problems encountered when some of the distributions are skewed.

Where circumstances would permit it, the development of case studies pertinent to the social, psychological and theological characteristics of respondents in given categories
of social cost might disclose a relationship between specific personality types and the capacity to sublimate social cost or reduce it to a tolerable level through adjustments other than leaving a high social cost career. Since recruitment into many of the trained professions cannot keep pace with the demand, such an extension of the study of social cost as a career determinant might well contribute to the conservation of presently active careerists who are potential dropouts or are highly transient in their career commitments.

Implications for the Ministerial Profession

John B. Coburn, Episcopal clergyman and Dean of the Episcopal Theological Seminary at Cambridge, Massachusetts, concludes that there are four major problem areas which constitute integral parts in the structure of the contemporary role of the minister (9, pp. 181-194):

1. The tension between the minister's image of his work and that held by the laity.
2. The tension between a minister's responsibility to his work and to his family.
3. The conflict between a minister's saying what his people want to hear and what he believes God wants
them to hear.

4. The problem of oneself—the nature of the person which determines how he responds to the demands of life.

Of this last conclusion little or no empirical evidence was sought or supplied by the research herein reported. However, several implications for Coburn's first three conclusions were brought to light by the data.

As pointed out by Samuel W. Blizzard (4, 5), the professional training of the contemporary minister accentuates specialization into several practitioner and integrative roles. From his theological education the clergyman derives a role definition of the ministry which so broadens the identity he has chosen that it renders the pastoral ministry, i.e., serving as the pastor of a local church, relatively confining and inconsistent with the wider view of the work of the ministry imparted by his formal training. Recent reports on the post-graduation plans of present-day theological students indicate that as many as two out of three do not plan to enter the pastoral ministry upon completion of their professional training. It would appear, then, that today's ministerial aspirant both sees and has access to vocational
opportunities far more diverse than his predecessors, yet still within contemporary criteria for a ministerial identity.

In contrast to earlier periods in our national history when rural living and agrarian values predominated the American scene, modern mass communications and population mobility have brought urban-industrial values into prominence. As a result, more Americans look, act and perhaps think more alike than ever before. However, to assume that similarities in extrinsic patterns of consumption (standard of living, fashions in clothing, etc.) can be equated with an absence of intrinsic differences of values among people from divergent community backgrounds is erroneous. This is especially true when comparing persons from less heavily populated communities with those from more densely settled ones.

As noted in the general characteristics of the sample, the majority of the clergymen included in the study came from rural backgrounds. However, the proportion of rural-reared ministers is less than the proportion of rural pastoral charges with the result that many ministers are of necessity serving churches in communities atypical of the ones in which
they were born and reared. When the discrepancy is in the direction of the national trend, i.e., rural to urban, the transition from the value orientation of rural society to that of urban society is more readily accomplished. Mobility in the reverse direction, i.e., urban to rural, is less common and hence is relatively lacking in established patterns for assimilating a person of urban origin or orientation into the highly salient, informal, primary group social system of rural life.

Due to the greater heterogeneity and cosmopolitanism of urban life in contrast to the homogeneity and provincialism more typical of rural life, it is conceivable that if each social system were able to recruit and train its own corps of clergymen greater agreement could be achieved between the ministerial role concepts of the clergy and the laity within a given system. However, since the vast majority of ministerial training institutions are located in urban places and receive students from both backgrounds, the resulting professional training tends to depreciate the rural orientation and appreciate the urban. Consequently, regardless of their community of origin, seminary graduates possess comparable professional training which is weighted in favor
of urban-relevant values and methods.

By virtue of such institutionalized training for the ministry, Protestant denominations comprised of relatively small or modest sized congregations located in population centers of under 10,000 persons frequently find that the majority of their pastors must be placed in careers for which they lack both motivation and training. Whereas the formally trained clergyman's aspirations tend toward a pastoral charge comprised of a single church with a constituency of over 400 persons, the very denomination from which these data were taken is made up of churches having an average membership of 252 persons, with 87 per cent of its congregations consisting of less than 500 members. It would appear, then, that opportunity for the attainment of these professional reference group instilled and reinforced aspirations is critically limited, and ministers must be called upon to serve pastoral charges situated in community settings intrinsically different from their own value system; the result is that discrepancies between their definition of the minister's role and that held by the laity are intensified.

In short, the ministerial profession appears to involve a number of built-in factors conducive to the creation of
discrepancies between expectations and fulfillment. Nevertheless, withdrawals from the ranks of the Christian ministry are said to be fewer than for any other profession, and nearly one-fifth of the high social cost respondents in the present study indicated a desire to continue in the career upon which their negative assessment was made. At least two implications may be drawn from these phenomena: one, ministers are extraordinarily capable of sublimating social cost and reducing it to a tolerable level, or two, those ministers who experience high social cost without making career or vocational adjustments assess their available alternatives as involving greater social cost than is found in the maintenance of the status quo. In the case of the first implication, it would appear that the clergymen included in this research have an available scapegoat in the "system" or Annual Conference which can be both blamed when things go wrong and relied upon to "bail a man out" of an intolerable situation. "Sticking with the system" affords a man reasonable assurance that he can ascend in the professional status hierarchy for "good behavior" if for no other reason. Under this system, relatively high career mobility is both expected and accepted in terms of limited career
tenure and an annual review of career performance and prospects. Tenure is seen to lengthen with age and experience, and changes in career are associated with increments in both personal and professional status and remuneration, hence career adjustments may be welcomed whether solicited or not and regardless of the degree of social cost.

Whereas the inferences of the first implication seem to be on the positive side, such is not the case for the second implication. In recent years the professional religious journals have devoted considerable space to reports and commentary upon the state of mental health enjoyed by the clergy. Some of the literature has been alarmist in nature, has challenged and sought to discredit any allegation of mental illness among the clergy, and the balance has attempted to shed light upon the vulnerability of the ministry to exceptional mental and emotional stresses, both intra- and inter-personally induced. Out of recognition for this latter assessment, various denominational bodies have instituted programs designed to alleviate some of these strains and to provide their member clergymen with available counseling, diagnostic and treatment services. Notable among these are the employment of a full-time counselor for pastors
by The Methodist Church in Indiana, and the provision of the Iowa Synod of the United Presbyterian Church for its pastors and their wives to be admitted to the Menninger Clinic at synod expense for short-term psychiatric evaluation and treatment. However, helpful though these programs may be, the pastor must be willing to avail himself of them before they can do him any good. Experience has shown that he is prone to be extremely reticent in acknowledging his fallibility on the basis of either his shattered self-image, the real or assumed censure of his reference groups, or both. Therefore, if the willingness of a man to stay in a high social cost career is associated with unresolved social-psychological problems of guilt, fear of social disapproval, frustration, alienation, etc., the assumed virtue of ministerial devotion to duty can be a contributing factor to a reduction in his morale, to the prospect of mental illness, and to a general reduction in professional efficiency and competence.

In conclusion, the social cost concept affords the student of human behavior an analytical tool of considerable utility in seeking explanation for various forms of social adjustment based upon an evaluation of actual vs. anticipated outcomes of career decisions.
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December 24, 1963

Dear Colleague:

May I enlist your interest and participation in a research project of vital interest to our Methodist Church and the future of its clergy. As the recent Bishops' Convocation on the ministry pointed out the recruitment of men for the pastoral ministry is of urgent importance. To this end a number of scientific studies have been undertaken in an effort to develop both descriptive and predictive data useful in awakening interest in the pastoral ministry and increasing the satisfaction of those already engaged in this vocation.

The questionnaire which follows asks for selected information about your attitudes and values as a minister and about certain features of your personal and professional background. Most of the questions require only a check mark or a number to answer and the entire schedule can be completed in as little as 20 minutes. A postage paid envelope is enclosed for your convenience in returning your completed questionnaire by January 2, 1964.

It is important that you answer each question candidly and sincerely in order that the most accurate measure of attitudes be secured. Note that there are two columns of questions on both sides of the pages. Your statements will be held in strict confidence and your identity will not be revealed. When published the results of this study will be grouped and all individual respondents will be anonymous.

Respectfully yours,

Everett L. Laning
Study Director*

* A member of the South Iowa Annual Conference of The Methodist Church presently left without appointment to complete a graduate degree in Sociology at Iowa State University.
Please answer the following questions by placing a check mark before the appropriate response. Where additional information is requested please enter it in the blank space provided.
All statements will be held in strict confidence and the identity of individual respondents will not be revealed under any circumstances.
The findings of this study will be incorporated into a thesis submitted to Iowa State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Doctor of Philosophy degree in Sociology.

## I. Biographical Data

1. Age: 18-21 22-25 26-29 30-33 34-37 38-41 42-45 46-49 50-53 54 and over
2. Marital status: Single Married Widowed
3. Size of your present household: (give number)
   - Self
   - Spouse
   - Son(s) age
   - Daughter(s) age
   - Others
   - Total
4. Education: (check the highest attainment)
   - Self
   - Spouse
     - 1-8 grades
     - 9-12 grades
     - Some college
     - College graduate Field
     - Graduate study
     - Graduate degree
     - Other training
5. Number of children in your parental home:
   - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 or more
   (draw a circle around your position in the family)
6. During your childhood were your parents:
   - Living together
   - Separated
   - Divorced (remarried: Father Mother)
   - Widowed (remarried: Father Mother)
7. During childhood were your spouse's parents:
   - Living together
   - Separated
   - Divorced (remarried: Father Mother)
   - Widowed (remarried: Father Mother)
8. In what type of community did you live as a child?
   - Rural-farm
   - Rural non-farm
   - Urban under 10,000 population
   - Urban over 10,000 population
   - Metropolitan
   - Suburban
9. In what type of community did your spouse live as a child?
   - Rural-farm
   - Rural non-farm
   - Urban under 10,000 population
   - Urban over 10,000 population
   - Metropolitan
   - Suburban
10. Appraise the happiness of the homes in which you and your spouse were reared:
    - Self
    - Spouse
      - Very happy
      - Happy
      - Average
      - Unhappy
      - Very unhappy
11. What was your father's occupation?__________________________
12. What was your spouse's father's occupation?:__________________________
13. What was your occupation prior to entering the ministry?:__________________________
14. What was your spouse's occupation prior to marriage or your entering the ministry?:__________________________
15. What are your formal club and organization affiliations at your present place of residence?:______________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>No. of years a member</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>Pres.</td>
<td>Service clubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ministerial group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Study group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hobby or interest group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lodge or fraternity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. How does this level of organization affiliation compare with participation at your last place of residence?:
   - More active in more groups
   - More active in fewer groups
   - About the same
   - Less active in more groups
   - Less active in fewer groups
17. How many years did you reside at your last place of residence?:
   - less than 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 or more
II. Professional Background

18. At what age did you first consider entering a church-related vocation?:

- 13 or less
- 14-17
- 18-21
- 22-25
- 26-29
- 30-33
- 34-37
- 38-41
- 42-45
- 46 and over

19. At what age did you actually enter the ministry by virtue of accepting a pastoral charge or beginning formal training for this vocation?:

- 17 or less
- 18-21
- 22-25
- 26-29
- 30-33
- 34-37
- 38-41
- 42-45
- 46 and over

20. Of what size local church were you a member when you actually entered the ministry?:

- 50 or less
- 51-100
- 101-200
- 201-400
- 401-800
- 801-1,200
- 1,201-1,600
- 1,601-2,000
- 2,001-2,400
- 2,401 and over

21. What formal training for the ministry have you completed?:

- Course of study for Local Preacher’s Licence
- Course of study for ordination
- Supply Pastor’s School
- Some seminary
- Seminary degree

22. What is your Conference Relationship?:

- Approved Supply
- Local Orders
- Probationer
- Full Conference Member
- Retired Supply Pastor
- Retired Conference Member

23. At what age did you become a full member of The Methodist Church?:

- 10 or less
- 11-13
- 14-16
- 17-19
- 20-22
- 23-25
- 26-28
- 29-31
- 32-34
- 35 or over

24. Have you ever been a member of another denomination?:

- Yes
- No

25. Were your parents Methodists?:

- Yes (Father Mother)
- No

26. Were your spouse’s parents Methodists?:

- Yes (Father Mother)
- No

27. How many years have you served your present charge?:

- 0-1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9 or more

28. In what type of community are you now living?:

- Rural-farm
- Rural non-farm
- Urban under 10,000 population
- Urban over 10,000 population
- Metropolitan
- Suburban

29. How many pastoral charges (stations or circuits) have you served in the last ten years?:

- Part-time or student
- Full-time

30. How many years have you served your present charge?:

- 0-1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9 or more

31. What is the longest period of years you have ever served a pastoral charge?:

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10 or more

32. How many churches are on your present charge?:

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10 or more

33. How many churches were on your last charge?:

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10 or more

34. What is the location of churches on your charge?:

- Open country
- Village (under 500)
- Small town (500-1,999)
- Large town (2,000-9,999)
- Small city (10,000-29,999)
- Large city (100,000 and over)
- Suburb (adjacent to a large city)

35. What is the membership of each local church on your charge?:

- 50 or less
- 51-100
- 101-200
- 201-400
- 401-800
- 801-1,200
- 1,201-1,600
- 1,601-2,000
- 2,001-2,400
- 2,401 and over

36. Under what type of appointment are you serving?:

- College student supply
- Seminary student supply
- Part-time supply (reg. job)
- Full-time supply
- Episcopal appointment

37. What is your pastoral responsibility?:

- Pastor in charge (or senior staff pastor)
- Associate pastor

38. The table below lists six major roles which define the types of things a minister is called upon to do. Please rate them 1, 2, 3, etc. from greatest to least in terms of: (1) What you consider to be their importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator (overseeing church work)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizer (involving persons in ch. wlc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastor (calling, counseling, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preacher (public &amp; personal evangelism)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest (officiant at weddings, baptism, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher (S.S., study or other classes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. Which one of these six ministerial roles do you enjoy the most?:

40. In which one of these six ministerial roles would you like to have additional training?:

41. The table below lists a variety of ministerial duties and activities. Please do the following:

- Rank 1, 2, 3, etc. the six activities which require the greatest amount of your time
- Indicate by (+) more, (0) same, (-) less, the amount of time you would prefer to spend in these six activities / (See next page)
etc.) to what extent do you feel adequately supported by your pastoral charge?: (0=0%, 10=100%)

40. To what extent do you feel that the standard of living desired by you and your family can be attained on your pastoral salary alone?:

41. What additional income have you received during the past year?: (estimate $ amounts)

42. Should it be necessary, how would you expect to reconcile the difference between your needs and resources?:

43. All things considered (size of staff, available facilities, your interests, etc.) to what extent do you feel satisfied with the way you must divide your professional time?: (Check your position on the scale below using 0 = no satisfaction, 10 = full satisfaction)

44. What is your present annual salary (including travel)?

45. All things considered (community standard of living, resources of the congregation(s), economic conditions, etc.) to what extent do you feel adequately supported by your pastoral charge?: (0=0%, 10=100%)

46. To what extent do you feel that the standard of living desired by you and your family can be attained on your pastoral salary alone?:

47. To what extent are you and your family satisfied with the adequacy and condition of your housing?:

48. To what extent would you prefer to live in your own (purchased or rented) housing rather than in church property?:

49. To what extent do you feel that ordination is the source of a man's authority as a minister?:

50. To what extent do you feel that ordination is important to the work of the ministry?:

III. Attitudes and Values

51. Rank 1, 2, 3, etc. the order in which you feel you receive the greatest to the least non-material rewards from the following experiences:

52. To what extent do you feel the non-material rewards of the ministry can take the place of financial rewards in excess of your basic needs for food, shelter, etc.?:

53. To what extent are you and your family satisfied with the adequacy and condition of your housing?:

54. To what extent would you prefer to live in your own (purchased or rented) housing rather than in church property?:

55. To what extent do you feel that housing considerations affect your family's willingness for you to serve a given pastoral charge?:

56. The table below lists a variety of community services. Please check:

57. To what extent does your present community offer enough cultural, social, shopping and other advantages to meet the expectations of your family?:

58. To what extent do you feel that ordination is the source of a man's authority as a minister?:

59. To what extent do you feel that ordination is important to the work of the ministry?:
60. Under what circumstances do you feel lay clergy should officiate at the administration of the Sacraments?:
   0 No circumstances
   1 Only when assisting an ordained minister
   2 Only when under appointment, and then only to his own charge
   3 Whenever or wherever called upon to do so
   4 Other

61. Rank 1, 2, 3, etc., the order in which the following persons were active in influencing your decision to enter the ministry: (rank relevant persons only)
   Your parents
   Your spouse
   Local church members
   Sunday School teachers
   Your pastor
   Other

62. How many persons have you guided into church-related vocations in the last ten years?:
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 or more

63. Of this number how many have entered the pastoral ministry?:
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 or more

64. Which of the following forms of clerical garb do you use?:
   Robe or pulpit gown
   Cassock & surplice
   Pendant cross
   Lapel cross

65. Which of the following do you feel is (or would be) your chief reason for using clerical garb at times other than when conducting worship?:
   Identification as a minister
   Convention (everybody's doing it)
   Symbol of ordination
   Tradition
   Other
   Would never use it

66. Rank 1, 2, 3, etc., the order in which you feel the following situations do (or would) pose a difficulty in serving multiple-church charges:
   Multiplication of board and committee meetings
   Multiple worship services
   Separateness & Independence of churches involved
   Poor roads
   Multiple telephone & postal services
   Adaptation of denominational program and goals to local church needs and resources

67. How strongly do you feel that these and other problems can and should be solved in order to keep open local churches too small by themselves to support and employ full-time a trained, conference-member pastor?:
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

68. Rank 1, 2, 3, etc., the order in which you enjoy working with or being a part of the following size groups:
   Individuals
   2-5 persons
   6-19 persons
   20-49 persons
   50 or more persons

69. Rank 1, 2, 3, etc., the order in which you enjoy working with the following type groups:
   Local church
   Local community
   Sub-District or District
   Conference (Annual or larger)
   Secular (social, cultural, civic, etc.)
   Other

70. Rank 1, 2, 3, etc., the order in which you most frequently exchange social visits with the following persons:
   Members of your congregation
   Other laymen
   Fellow Methodist ministers
   Other local ministers
   Laymen living elsewhere
   Relatives

71. Rank 1, 2, 3, etc., the order in which you most frequently turn to the following persons for help with a personal problem:
   Spouse
   Other relative
   Friend (layman)
   Bishop
   Work it out for myself

72. Rank 1, 2, 3, etc., the order in which you most frequently turn to the following persons for help with a professional problem:
   Spouse
   Other relative
   Friend (layman)
   District Superintendent
   Bishop
   Work it out for myself

73. Would you accept an opportunity to move from your present charge to another having greater professional advantages (no., & location of members, facilities, status, etc.) but fewer personal advantages (social, cultural, economic, housing, etc.)?:
   Yes
   No

74. Would you accept an opportunity to move from your present charge to another having fewer professional advantages (no., & location of members, facilities, status, etc.) but greater personal advantages (social, cultural, economic, housing, etc.)?:
   Yes
   No

75. What do you consider to be the strength of your loyalty to The Methodist Church as compared to any other Protestant church?:
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

76. How strong are your professional reasons (projected plans, concept of the ministry, adequacy of facilities, etc.) for wanting to stay on your present pastoral charge?:
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

77. How strong are your personal reasons (family wishes, community ties, friends, etc.) for wanting to stay on your present pastoral charge?:
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

78. When serving a circuit, to what extent do you feel greater loyalty toward the congregation at your place of residence?:
   (never served a circuit)
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

79. To what extent do you feel the office of District Superintendent has a positive and direct contribution to make to your effectiveness as a local church pastor?:
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

80. To what extent do you feel the office of Bishop has a positive and direct contribution to make to your effectiveness as a local church pastor?:
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

81. To what extent do you feel that the appointive power of a Bishop should be accepted without question (either expressed or felt)?:
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

82. What is the strength of your loyalty to The Methodist Church as compared to any other Protestant church?:
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
83. To what extent do you feel that people on your charge accept you as a person?:

     0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

84. How well do you feel your people can see the point of what you are trying to do as a minister of Christ?:

     0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

85. To what extent do you feel your people agree with what you are trying to do as their pastor?:

     0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

86. How strong are your professional reasons (projected plans, concept of the ministry, inadequacy of facilities, etc.) for wanting to leave your present charge?:

     0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

87. How strong are your personal reasons (family wishes, weak community ties, few friends, etc.) for wanting to leave your present charge?:

     0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

88. How well would (or do) you enjoy working as a member of a staff of ministers on a pastoral charge?:

     0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

89. To what extent do you feel you and your family would find your personal values and goals (social, economic, cultural, educational, etc.) satisfied if you were to remain on your present pastoral charge until retirement from the active ministry?:

     0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

90. To what extent do you feel you would find your professional values and goals (level of attainment, challenge, opportunity for service, sense of accomplishment, etc.) satisfied if you were to remain on your present pastoral charge until retirement from the active ministry?:

     0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

91. Do you wish to stay on your present pastoral charge in the coming Conference Year?:

   Yes   No   Undecided

92. Which relationship do you feel has been most important to your personal success as a minister?:

   _ with parishioners
   _ with other laymen in the community
   _ with fellow ministers
   _ with District Superintendents
   _ with Bishops
   _ with others

93. Which relationship do you feel has been most important to your professional success as a minister?:

   _ with parishioners
   _ with other laymen in the community
   _ with fellow ministers
   _ with District Superintendents
   _ with Bishops
   _ with others

94. To what extent do you feel a congregation's indifference toward Conference or other Methodist initiated programs affects your willingness to continue serving as pastor of that congregation?:

     0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

95. To what extent are you willing to stay and solve problems you have encountered on your present pastoral charge?:

     0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

96. To what extent do you feel a congregation's reluctance to change (at least under your ministry) affects your willingness to continue serving as pastor of that congregation?:

     0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

97. How many times in the last ten years would you have requested (or did you request) a change in pastoral appointment if you knew consideration would be given to your wishes?:

     _ 0 _ 1 _ 2 _ 3 _ 4 _ 5 _ 6 _ 7

98. How strongly were you motivated to accept your present appointment for personal reasons (social, cultural, educational, etc.)?:

     0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

99. How strongly were you motivated to accept your present appointment for professional reasons (level of attainment, challenge, opportunity for service, sense of accomplishment, etc.)?:

     0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

100. How often do you attend Methodist meetings outside the local church?:

   _ Seldom
   _ 1-2 per week
   _ 1-2 per month
   _ 1-2 per year
   _ Other: _ per __________

101. How often do you feel laymen should lead or assist in worship?:

   _ Never
   _ Weekly
   _ 1-2 per month
   _ Only on Layman's Sunday
   _ 2-3 per year
   _ Other: _ per __________

102. Aside from vacation periods, how often do you feel outside speakers should be in the pulpit(s) of your charge during the course of a year?:

   _ 0 _ 1 _ 2 _ 3 _ 4 _ 5 _ 6 _ 7 _ 8 _ 9 or more times

103. Rank 1, 2, 3, etc. the order in which you feel a pastor should involve laymen in the following areas:

   _ Local service projects
   _ Larger community or world service projects
   _ Chairing board and committee meetings
   _ Making decisions at the local church level
   _ Church repairs, redecorating, etc.
   _ Leadership training
   _ Beyond-the-local church planning
   _ Other: __________

104. How much time should a pastor devote to Methodist Church work beyond-the-local church?:

   _ None
   _ 1-2 hours per week
   _ 1-2 days per month
   _ 1-2 weeks per year
   _ Other: _ per __________

105. In what order should a minister call on the following persons?:

   _ Active church members
   _ Inactive church members
   _ Unchurched people

106. Which method of sermon delivery do you use most consistently?:

   _ No notes, but prepared in advance
   _ Extemporaneous (no advance preparation)
   _ Notes
   _ Outline
   _ Manuscript
107. Rank 1, 2, 3, etc., the order in which you find the following forms of worship satisfying:

- Creeds or Affirmations of Faith
- Printed unison prayers
- Responsive Readings or litanies
- "Gospel Songs"
- Traditional hymns
- Announced sermon topics
- Prepared prayers read by the pastor
- Extemporaneous pastoral prayer

108. To what extent do you feel that the witness of laymen is important to the vitality of the local church?:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

109. To what extent do you feel that the minister as the paid employee of the local church should assume the major responsibility for carrying out the ongoing programs of the church?:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

110. To what extent do you feel you encourage laymen to be effective witnesses in the work of the local church?:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

111. Do you consider the role of the layman as "second class" to that of the minister?:

Yes No Undecided

112. Do you feel that laymen can reach some persons who have been unresponsive to the outreach of a minister?:

Yes No Undecided

113. If you were to leave the pastoral ministry what kind of work would you consider entering?:

114. To what extent do you feel your commitment to the pastoral ministry overrides any and all considerations (personal or professional) as to where your pastoral service is performed?:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

115. If you were to select your own next appointment, which of the following conditions would you choose?:

Type of community:
- Rural-farm
- Rural non-farm
- Urban under 10,000 population
- Urban over 10,000 population
- Metropolitan
- Suburban

Number of churches:
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Number of ministers:
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Total membership:
- Under 199
- 200-399
- 400-799
- 800-1,599
- 1,600 or more

116. To what extent does your present charge correspond with your ideal charge?:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

117. Please state in a paragraph what you are really trying to do in your job as a Christian minister:

118. To what extent do you feel you are succeeding in achieving these goals in your present pastoral charge?:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Let me express my sincere appreciation for your cooperation in providing the data for this research. The information you have given will be of great value in helping to identify the adequacy with which the contemporary minister feels he is capable of fulfilling the roles assigned to him by experience, training, and the expectations of the laity.

Everett L. Laning, Study Director