

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Michael Lane Morris entitled "Clergy Marital Satisfaction as Predicted by Work/Family Stress." I have examined the final copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Human Ecology.

Priscilla Blanton

Priscilla Blanton, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Connie Steele

Jim E. Allen

William A. Pappen

Accepted for the Council:

Cowminkel

Associate Vice Chancellor
and Dean of The Graduate School

CLERGY MARITAL SATISFACTION AS PREDICTED
BY WORK/FAMILY STRESS

A Dissertation
Presented for the
Doctor of Philosophy
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Michael Lane Morris

August 1992

Copyright 1992 by Michael Lane Morris

All rights reserved

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

During the past three years of my life at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, I have been extremely fortunate to have had academic mentors who have encouraged and shaped the way I view myself and family life. I am very indebted to Priscilla White-Blanton for her guidance, friendship, mentoring, and commitment. I am grateful to my committee members: Connie Steele, Jan Allen, and Bill Poppen who have also shared their time and commitment to this project. Also, I am appreciative of Ann Reed, my computer consultant, who worked many hours with me in preparing and analyzing data for the project. Finally, I want to thank my extended and nuclear family, particularly DeVee and Chad. While they have shared a great deal of patience and love as I took time from them to work on this project, they also have reminded me of the importance of never being too busy for my family.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the predictive power of 5 stressors (i.e., mobility, compensation, family boundaries, expectations, social support) with marital conventionalization on clergy marital satisfaction.

The sample of this study included 86 (n=172) randomly selected clergy couples representing 5 denominations (e.g., Southern Baptist Convention, Lutheran Missouri Synod, Church of God Cleveland, Tennessee, Seventh Day Adventist, and American Baptist Church). Sociodemographic data indicated that the average age of the clergy person was 43, and his spouse was 41, had been married about 19 years, had an average of 2 children, and had been in the ministry as a professional for about 16 years. The criteria for participation in this study were that the clergy person be male, be married to a nonclergy person, be serving as an ordained pastor in a denominationally affiliated parish, and has at least one child under 18 living at home.

In the present study, regression analyses indicated that the model predicting marital satisfaction was significant. In the reduced model marital conventionalization and expectations were the best predictors of marital satisfaction. When a reduced model containing expectations being separated into congregational

and familial expectations was examined, it was found that congregational expectations was a significant predictor of clergy marital satisfaction. Additional regression analyses were also performed using sociodemographic variables as predictors of clergy marital satisfaction. Church size, educational level, length of marriage, and number of moves since entering the ministry were significant predictors in the reduced model of marital satisfaction.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Rationale	2
Statement of the Problem	5
Objectives of the Study	6
Nominal Definitions	7
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	9
Clergy Stress Literature	9
Mobility	13
Financial Compensation	14
Family Boundaries	16
Expectations	18
Social Support	23
Clergy Marital Satisfaction Literature Review	25
Marital Satisfaction of Clergy	26
Stressors Affecting Clergy Marital Satisfaction	26
Summary of Clergy Stress and Marital Satisfaction Literature	30
III. METHODS	31
Selection of the Sample	31
Description of the Sample	32
Instrumentation	37
Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale (KMS)	37
Clergy Family Life Inventory (CFLI)	41
Edmonds's Marital Conventionalization Scale (EMC)	42
Personal History Inventory	44
Procedures	44
Data Collection	44
Data Management	45
Data Analyses	46
Operational Definitions	49
Hypotheses of the Study	51
IV. RESULTS	52
Descriptive Statistics	52
Hypothesis 1	57
Hypothesis 2	63
V. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION	67
Conclusions from the Study	67
Discussion	68
Implications for Research	75
Implications for Practice	77

Limitations of the Study	79
Summary	81
REFERENCES	82
APPENDICES	93
APPENDIX A	94
APPENDIX B	96
VITA	107

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Education Level	34
2. Family and Personal Pre-Tax Income	36
3. Sample Means, Ranges, Standard Deviation, and Chronbach's Alpha on the Study's Variables . .	54
4. Predictors of Clergy Marital Satisfaction: A Summary of Multiple Regressions and Bivariate Correlations With All Predictor Variables in Stepwise Regression Analysis (N= 172: 86 Husbands and 86 Wives)	58
5. Predictors of Clergy Marital Satisfaction: Reduced Model For Forced Entry Regression Analysis (N= 172: 86 Husbands and 86 Wives) . .	60
6. Predictors of Clergy Marital Satisfaction: Expectations of Family and Congregation Independently in Forced Entry Regression Analysis (N= 172: 86 Husbands and 86 Wives) . .	62
7. Predictors of Clergy Marital Satisfaction: Sociodemographic Model in Stepwise Regression Analysis (N= 172: 86 Husbands and 86 Wives) . .	64
8. Predictors of Clergy Marital Satisfaction: Reduced Model of Sociodemographic Variables Using Forced Entry Regression Analysis (N= 172: 86 Husbands and 86 Wives)	65

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

For over 50 years, family science researchers have been interested in studying variables that are hypothesized to influence, interact, and predict marital satisfaction. The list of variables impacting marital satisfaction is lengthy and beyond the scope of this study.

The contribution of this study was to expand our knowledge base concerning a population that has remained relatively obscure and hidden in the family science literature. Specifically, this research examined clergy marriages and the work/family stressors that impact marital satisfaction.

By virtue of their occupation, clergy and their spouses are "expected" to juggle the greedy demands of the ministry, while maintaining a perfect marriage and healthy family functioning. Pauck (1983) observed that clergy marriage and family life, as designed by the 16th century Reformers, is to serve as the "symbolic expression of the communal character of the evangelical faith" (p.146). The communal character implied is one that demonstrates exemplary love, service, obedience, and submission in the human context of life. However, for many clergy and their spouses, this idealistic assignment is difficult and problematic, as it fails to acknowledge the overlapping

work/family context of the clergy. No doubt there are relatively few occupations, as compared with the occupation of clergy, that have the potential of creating external stressors that can impede the overall satisfaction of the marital dyad. Thus, it seems that the Reformers' emancipation privileges enabling and encouraging Protestant clergy to marry are also the same privileges that can potentially make their profession difficult. This is the "double bind" of clergy: keeping the professional marriage and ministry as sacred symbol, while also keeping the personal marriage and ministry separate and satisfied. Lucille Lavender (1983) has wisely commented that "clergy are one of the last remaining minorities to be freed."

Rationale

Research on clergy marital satisfaction, as predicted by external stressors, should be guided by a holistic rationale that gives attention to theoretical, methodological, and practical concerns.

Theoretically, clergy and their families are not different from other family systems with roles, rules, and relationships. They are no better prepared for marriage and family functioning than other family systems (Hiltner, 1958). However, Hulme (1985) and Lee and Balswick (1989) contended that the minister's occupation causes the family to operate in a unique "built-in community" context.

Further, Presnell (1977) believed that in no other profession are the philosophy and performance of vocation so intimately tied to one's private life. Deluca (1980) called the clergy profession a "holy crossfire" as the clergy person and his family attempt to juggle the expectations of self, family, congregation, denomination, and God.

Friedman (1985) and Whybrew (1980), working from a multi-generational family therapy context (Bowen, 1978), suggested that clergy and their families experience stress as a result of triangulation dynamics involving interlocking emotional forces from families within the congregation, the congregation as a family, and the clergy person's own family.

Additional theoretical considerations of the social context of clergy families have been offered by Cameron Lee (1986) who adapted Brofenbrenner's (1977) ecological model. In this model, four settings are included. These settings, as adapted by Lee for clergy families, are as follows:

- (1) the "microsystem," which includes "the interactional patterns of the minister's family independently..."

- (2) the "mesosystem," which "includes the micro-analyses of both his family participation and his work in pastoral ministry, as well as how they affect each other..."

- (3) the "exosystem," which includes the impact

of the minister's work from the viewpoint of his wife and children..."

(4) the "macrosystem," which includes "the denominational polity or doctrine impacting the role of the minister vis-a-vis his congregation" (p.20).

Brofenbrenner (1977) concluded that, based on this model, an ecologically valid experiment "invites consideration of the joint impact of two or more settings or their elements" (p.520). This study adhered to Brofenbrenner's conclusion, as it examined the outcome effects of clergy marital satisfaction (microsystem), as predicted by the perceived external stressors resulting from the interactional patterns of the clergy marital dyad in pastoral ministry with the congregation (meso- and exo- systems) and the denomination (macrosystem).

Methodologically, much of the stress research on clergy and their families has been anecdotal in nature, rather than empirically based research and has, therefore, overlooked the importance of necessary scientific rigor for generalization to broader populations. Examples of clergy family research have centered on the utilization of unidimensional instruments designed by Adams (1984) and Holmes and Rahe (1967); small sample sizes (Hsieh & Rugg, 1983); nonrandom samples (Barber, 1985); convenience samples (Lee, 1986); response bias (Douglas, 1965); single gender studies (Platt & Moss, 1976; Hartley, 1978; Hartley

& Taylor, 1977), one denomination studies (Hutchinson & Hutchinson, 1979; London & Allen, 1986; Nauss, 1974; Reilly, 1975; Fichter, 1984; King, 1988), and the continual usage of descriptive rather than inferential statistics (Crow, 1990; Mills & Koval, 1971).

Speaking practically, the study of religion and family in the social science field is becoming an ever increasing interest. In 1984, the National Council of Family Relations established a section on religion to facilitate dialogue on the research and theoretical implications of religion on the family. As a result, hundreds of articles have addressed the additive and/or interactive effects of religion and family on other variables of importance. Interestingly, however, little research has focused on clergy and their families. Thomas and Cornwall (1990) in an exhaustive review of 427 articles written from 1980-1989 on religion and the family discovered only five articles on missionary and clergy families. This is alarming when one considers that there are approximately 500,000 clergy, many of whom serve as family models and pastoral counselors for 142 million U.S. members (Jacquet, 1990).

Statement of the Problem

Bochini (1991) indicated that research on clergy should identify and discriminate among various forms of stressors and corresponding strain experienced by clergy families. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to

investigate the predictive power of five stressors (i.e., mobility, compensation, family boundaries, expectations, social support) on clergy marital satisfaction. Further, the relative influence of sociodemographic variables on the marital satisfaction of clergy couples also was examined.

Objectives of the Study

The general objective of this study was to determine if the marital satisfaction of clergy and their wives was predicted by five stressors. The primary objectives for the study were to examine:

1. The predictive power of a model consisting of five stressors (i.e., mobility, compensation, family boundaries, expectations, and social support) for the marital satisfaction of clergy couples.
2. The predictive power of other selected demographic variables (i.e., gender, age, race, educational level, denominational affiliation, number of hours worked per week, family income, compensation benefits, employment status, length of marriage, number of children, number of moves made since entering the ministry, housing status, previous marriage, congregational size, number of years in the ministry, and number of years in ministry at this present location) for clergy marital satisfaction.

Nominal Definitions

1. Mobility: the various aspects related to the relocation process, including the physical process of moving, as well as the decision-making process and the emotional and physical adjustments involved in dealing with the changes and losses experienced in moving (Blanton, Morris, Anderson, 1990).

2. Compensation: one's pay package, including monetary salary and other benefits, such as housing, medical insurance, retirement, vacation, and a time off from one's ministerial duties (Blanton et al., 1990).

3. Family boundaries: emotional and physical separations between systems, subsystems, and roles required for adequate functioning. In other words, the ways in which the family is able to mark clearly its emotional and physical time and space (Blanton et al., 1990).

4. Expectations: perceived guidelines for behavior for self and others that emerge from one's understanding of self and of the interaction with family, work, and other facets of the social context. Expectations are multidimensional, consisting of perceived self-expectations, social expectations, and employer expectations (Blanton et al., 1990).

5. Social Support: the availability of friendships, social activities, and attachment relationships in one's social context. This domain includes both the quantity of

available relationships, and the quality of those relationships in regard to the kinds of needs one is able to have met (Blanton et al., 1990).

6. Marital Conventionalization: "the extent to which a person distorts the appraisal of his/her marriage in the direction of social desirability" (Edmonds, 1967).

7. Marital Satisfaction: the global subjective evaluation of one's feelings about his/her marriage (Fincham & Bradbury, 1987; Sabatelli, 1988).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Clergy Stress Literature

Stress research has historically focused on the impact of external events or the effects of persistent stressors that bring long-term demands on the family (Lavee, McCubbin, & Olson, 1987). An area of interest in stress research has been the interaction of work-related stressors on marital satisfaction and family functioning. It has been concluded that work and family stressors impede the satisfying balance of work and family life (Portner, 1983).

Researchers and clinicians have suggested that clergy families, like other family types (e.g., military family, corporate executive family), are subject to stressors that place heavy strains and demands on their resources and perceptions, which inhibit growth of members and satisfaction with intrafamily relationships (McCubbin & Patterson, 1983). Mills and Koval (1971), in a systematic random sample survey of 4,908 clergy representing 21 denominations, found that 75% of clergy experience at least one major stress period in their ministry. King (1988), in a survey of Episcopal clergy and spouses, found that 58% of clergy and 88% of their spouses reported that their

families regularly dealt with stressors unique to the clergy family context.

Several researchers have attempted to identify the external stressors of clergy families. Mills and Koval (1971) discovered clergy family stress can be subclassified under four types, namely "job stress" involving congregation relationships; "family stress" involving marital and parent/child relationships; "career stress" involving uncertainty about occupational choice and mobility; and "personal stress" involving physical health and financial problems. Houts (1977) found in anecdotal reports prepared by Methodist district superintendents that clergy family loneliness and congregational expectations placed on spouses are chronic stressors experienced by the clergy family. Gleason (1977) asked 21 clergy and 11 clergy spouses to rank order 43 stressors and found that proliferation of activities, perfectionism, role conflicts, unwelcome surprises, "goldfish bowl" existence, and no visible or tangible results of work were ranked as some of the most problematic issues. Croskery (1977) asked 200 clergy spouses to rank order stressors and found that congregational expectations, financial security, lack of social life, living in a manse, and life in a goldfish bowl were the most problematic. Also, Lee (1986) asked 300 clergy couples, randomly drawn from a seminary student population, to rank order their most problematic stressors. Lee found that inadequate family time, loneliness,

congregational expectations, and lack of family privacy were major concerns for the clergy couples.

Clinicians also have contributed to our knowledge of stressors facing clergy and their families. Presnell (1977) found in interviews and therapy with 56 clergy and their spouses that issues of financial strain, time, social isolation, communication, and sex were problematic and contributed to much of their perceived stress. Wayne Oates (1986) identified the financial strains, social isolation, and congregational expectations as the "endemic" stressors of clergy and their families.

Denominational leaders are not unfamiliar with the effects of the stressors facing clergy and their families (Morris & Blanton 1992; Slack, 1979). Evidences of the stressors effects are seen in the growing number of clergy marriages ending in divorce, the number of clergy entering mental health centers, and the number of clergy who prematurely terminate their careers due to feelings of burnout. Concerning divorce, Goodling and Smith (1983) suggested that clergy divorce statistics indicate that divorce is becoming the solution to strife in the parsonage. Census data do not provide accurate figures of clergy divorce rates; however, Morgan (1982) estimated the divorce rate of clergy doubled from 1960 to 1970. In 1987, Morgan (1987) projected that 16% of clergy are now divorced or divorcing. Lavender (1983) indicated that clergy rank

third among professional groups in terms of the number of divorces granted annually.

In terms of the number of clergy entering mental health centers, the Religious News Service (1984) reported that in a study of persons admitted to mental health centers, clergy ranked 36th among 130 professions. Finally in terms of burnout, Fichter (1984) studied data on 4,660 clergy and found that over 6% were "candidates" for burnout.

In reviewing the anecdotal and limited number of empirical studies using clergy and their families as the primary population, it seemed apparent that the findings repeatedly pointed to at least five external work and family stressors. These issues center around mobility, financial compensation, boundaries of the family, expectations, and social support. Each of these external stressors impedes the family's sense of trust in relationship to Antovosky's (1979) description of "coherence." Coherence is the family's ability to balance two dimensions relative to its life circumstances: control and trust. Control is the ability to influence and shape internal life events toward a directed goal; whereas, trust refers to the life events that operate and originate outside of the family and are controlled by institutions or a higher power who is acting (trustfully) with their best interest in mind (McCubbin & Patterson, 1983).

Mobility

This source of stress is related to the family's sense of vulnerability in decisions made by church members and superiors (Houts, 1982). In a survey of 3,000 members of the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE) (Crow, 1990), 21% of the clergy spouses reporting (n=538) expressed concerns about moving from one pastorate to another. Lavender (1983) estimated that nearly 200 clergy move every day of every year. These findings are to be expected when observing the statistics that one in five families in the U.S. moves each year (Mace & Mace, 1980).

Studies of people in occupations with high rates of job transfer display symptoms of "mobility syndrome" (Anderson & Stark, 1988). Stressors of the mobility syndrome include loss of support networks, acquisition of greater role burdens, interruption of personal growth and development, and marital and family dysfunction. Anderson and Stark (1988) indicated that the greater the relocation frequency, the greater the conditions for increased family strain.

Among the factors affecting clergy mobility rates are the authority structure of the denomination (Lee & Balswick, 1989; Smith, 1953), size of the congregation (Nelsen & Everett, 1976), effectiveness of the pastor in his role (Nauss, 1974), marital status and stability (Hutchinson & Hutchinson, 1979), and material attractiveness of the particular church (Mitchell, 1965).

Alexander (1980) indicated that the impact of mobility as a stressor was determined by the family's meaning of the stressor. The greatest negative effect occurs when the family perceives their inability to control the decision for moving. Effects of high mobility rates of clergy and their families are evidenced in their lack of ability to form roots (Lee and Balswick, 1989), clergy children's experience of isolation (Stevenson, 1982), and greater load responsibility on the wife and children (Jud, Mills, & Burch, 1970).

Financial Compensation

A second type of work and family stressor is the financial compensation of clergy families. Financial stress is a chronic stressor facing many clergy and their families (Oden, 1977). The number of financial needs encountered by clergy families are not less than those of other families (Scherer, 1965). Crow (1990) found that nearly a third of his NAE respondents (n=516) expressed concern about their finances. Mills and Koval (1971) found that 25% of their respondents (n= 4665) noted major stressors involving financial problems. Douglas (1965) found in his survey of ministers' wives (n=4777), that 69% expressed that the income for family needs was barely sufficient or worse. Lavender (1983) noted that 95% of all clergy are grossly underpaid. According to Lavender, these conditions explain why clergy are five times more likely than the rest of the

labor force to hold two or more jobs. Also, the wife of a clergy person is more likely to work outside the home to supplement spousal income than her cohorts in the general population of married women. London and Allen (1986) found that younger clergy have the greatest problems of income and were the least tolerant of the situation. This may explain the high attrition rate of young clergy.

The Maces (1982) have noted that even though clergy rank in the top 10% of the population in terms of education they rank 325 out of 432 occupations in terms of salary. Of the 107 occupations ranking lower than clergy, most of the occupations listed do not even require an eighth-grade education.

Pastoral compensation decisions often are made on the basis of subtle but powerful pressures to conform to an ascetic ideal (Hiltner, 1965; Presnell, 1977). Many clergy and their families are caught in a "double bind" of attempting to meet their needs while not feeling guilty for pursuing the "filthy lucre" of money (Chikes, 1968). Landis (1965) warned that it is "uneconomical economy" for congregations and denominations to fail to meet the financial needs of the clergy family as they will soon become discouraged and dissatisfied with their "calling" to serve. Compensation is a symbolic representation of meaning and importance for the clergy and his family (Oates, 1965). Clergy and their families, unlike other professional organizations, do not have an organized channel or union

for appealing and/or requesting greater remuneration for their services.

The effects of inadequate financial resources for the clergy family are reflected in their lack of appropriate pension plans, retirement savings and investments (Blackmon, 1984); lack of equity in a home (Herin, 1980); spouses pursuing outside employment (Bohn, 1975); clergy pursuing secular part-time or moonlighting employment (Bonn, 1975); greater pressure on the wife who is responsible for the household finances and making ends meet (Lee and Balswick, 1989); and dissatisfaction with the ministry leading to leaving the ministry altogether (Nelson & Everett, 1976).

Family Boundaries

Family boundary issues also create stressors for clergy families. Boundaries are both the physical and emotional separations among systems, subsystems, and roles that are necessary for adequate functioning (Blanton et al., 1990). Kantor and Lehr (1976) indicated that families need "social intraspace" with the systems in which they interact. Lee (1986) suggested that the minister's family is confronted with a problem of boundaries among the microsystem and the mesosystem, exosystem, and macrosystem. Friedman (1985) pointed out that clergy and their families experience chronic challenges to their boundaries making differentiation of the family and individuation of the

family members extremely difficult. Differentiated boundaries for clergy families would recognize their sense of identity, while also providing them the permeability to adapt and change to the demands of life. When differentiation of boundaries is not maintained by the clergy family system, boundary clarity erodes paving the way for boundary ambiguity and triangulation of the family (Whybrew, 1980). Pauline Boss (1980) noted that boundary ambiguity is "not knowing who is in and who is out of the family" (p. 73). For Boss, boundary ambiguity comes in two forms. The first type is physical presence with psychological absence, and the second is physical absence with psychological presence. The parsonage system of many denominations places clergy families in a situation of high vulnerability to this second type of boundary ambiguity. The physical absence and psychological presence of the congregation's "parsonage ghosts," as well as congregational influence, makes the members of the clergy family feel inhibited in their routine functioning as a family.

Douglas (1965) found in his survey of ministers' wives (n=4,777) that 30% of the wives felt that the lack of privacy or "goldfish" existence was their most problematic issue. Others have also found the intrusion of boundaries to be problematic (Scanzoni, 1965a, Mace and Mace, 1982, Sinclair, 1982, Lee and Balswick, 1989). Lee and Balswick (1989) found that as congregations became more intrusive,

the clergy family becomes more vulnerable to higher levels of stress.

The effects of family boundary problems are evidenced in the open criticisms of church officers and members who believe that the minister's wife is too concerned about the comfortable state of the parsonage (e.g., appliances, size) (Rankin, 1960) and clergy adolescent problems of rebellion as the teenager seeks his/her independence (Stevenson, 1982).

Expectations

Expectations reflect the blue print for "fit" between the family and the community (McCubbin & Patterson, 1983). The Maces (1982) found that expectations were the number one stressor for clergy families. Rayburn (1991) found that expectations from role ambiguity, role insufficiency, and role overload were stressful for clergy marriages. Crow's (1990) NAE sample of clergy wives found that one in five wrestle with expectations caused by "pedestal effects." Portner (1983) offered three types of work and family expectations that can be sources of stress for families: self-expectations, perceived social expectations, and employer expectations. Each of these expectations has been discussed in the clergy literature.

Concerning self-expectations, McGinnis (1969) suggested that many of the self expectation stressors have been "achieved" as a result of the seminary learning

experience. The seminarian has witnessed a wide variety of models and feels that his/her level of performance is measured by an external standard found at the seminary. The Maces (1982) and Oden (1988) indicated that the perceived pressures of clergy families may be mirrored expectations of the congregation and actually originated in the inner self of the clergy family itself. King (1988) found that a majority of clergy do have unrealistic expectations for themselves. The dangers of self imposed expectations are that the clergy take themselves too seriously, become humorless and perfectionistic, and are unable to adapt to the situational and normative stressors of the lifespan (Houts, 1982). Also, they see themselves as exempt from being able to pursue help from qualified colleagues and professionals for fear of being judged "unfit" (Brown, 1982). Richmond (1991) and Gavin (1991) suggested clergy research should focus on the cognitive processes associated with the "calling" of clergy, which is both taxing and sacrificial, thereby preventing one from pursuing psychotherapeutic assistance. As a result, clergy conceal the pain that others are encouraged to share openly and it may fester.

Concerning perceived social expectations, McGinnis (1969) noted that clergy have "ascribed" roles that create conflict. Many clergy and their families complain that their stress comes from roles that are often implied rather than explicitly stated (Klink, 1969). Certainly stress for

many is defined by a state of unpredictability. Other clergy families feel their stress comes from feeling that they are "owned" by the congregation (Seamands & Seamands, 1981). Hiltner (1971) alluded to this sense of ownership in his clergy metaphor of a "minister in the human circus." Clergy find themselves acting like the circus clown who is driven by the expected needs of the audience to laugh and cry. When these audience needs are met, anxiety for the clergy and their family is low; however, when they are unmet, anxiety increases (Campbell, 1987).

DeLuca (1980) noted that the job description of clergy is a "holy crossfire" of expectations. Regardless of the essence of the expectation, congregational expectations for the clergy family are absorptive and greedy, as they wear down and diminish the individual's and family's resources (Kieren & Munro, 1988).

Employer expectations function at two levels for clergy families, the mesosystem (congregational expectations) and the macrosystem (denominational expectations). Lee and Balswick (1989) suggested that congregational expectations flow out of the congregation's personal history. History breeds tradition and tradition presents great opposition to adaptability and change. Many clergy families find themselves caught in the tradition of God first, church second, and nothing else third. As a result they feel extreme stress in trying to achieve balance in their vows to God, church, and family (Hunt,

1978, Lee and Balswick, 1989). Hunt (1978) found in research with 46 Methodist clergy couples that both husbands and wives ranked congregational expectations as their greatest problem. Lee and Balswick (1989) found that clergy families ranked unrealistic congregational expectations as the second greatest stressor impacting on their families.

Denominational expectations also impede the clergy family. McCubbin and Patterson (1983) noted that the "family's ability to manage stress may depend upon the efficacy and/or adequacy of the solutions the culture or community provide" (p. 14). It seems obvious that when offered solutions are limited and expectations are great, then stressors are generated. Houts (1982) found that denominations that ignore the supporting and nurturing needs of clergy families for healthy family functioning communicate a message of unrealistic expectations. King (1988) found that 75% of his clergy couple sample felt that the church hierarchy was responsible to some extent for the wellbeing of clergy families.

Denominational leaders (e.g., clergy administrators) have indicated that they are not unfamiliar with the effects of stressor demands facing clergy families (Slack, 1979). However, Morris and Blanton (1992) found a significant variation in the denominational perceptions of stress and the types of services being offered to clergy families by their denominations. In terms of perceptions of

stress, seven items comprised the 5 most perceived stressors of denominations for their clergy were (1) meeting regular financial obligations, (2) accepting the salary level for their ministerial position, (3a) finding time for their children, (3b) managing criticism from the congregation, (4) saving money for their child(ren)'s education, (5a) finding time for their spouse, (5b) finding time for ministerial preparation. In terms of support services being offered by denominations to their clergy families, it seemed that a majority of denominations were offering only services mandated by the federal government (e.g., pension programs, insurance programs). Deficiencies in programs being offered by many denominations were in areas involving psychological services (e.g., counseling, therapy) and family services (e.g., marital enrichment seminars, retreat/vacation centers, newsletters for clergy families, and relocation services for children and spouses).

The effects of expectations on clergy and their families are evidenced in clergy family needs for perfectionism (Wynn, 1960), spending too much time on clergy roles that are of no interest (Blizzard, 1956), spouses feeling that they are the unpaid and unrecognized assistant pastor (Douglas, 1965), extraordinary time commitments to ministerial duties (Coates & Kistler, 1965), self blame (Mills and Koval, 1971), and feelings of being

"unchurched" as the clergy family seeks to be beneficiaries of the church's ministry (Howe, 1964).

Social Support

Another stressor faced by clergy families is social support. Richmond (1991) found that religious professionals, when compared with the general population, have greater role overload and less feelings of social support. Social networks that are rich, varied, and provide strong social support for families and individuals serve both as a buffer of stress and a coping resource when stressors are experienced (Cobb, 1976). Clergy families find that they have a need to be a part of groups that recognize their identity needs apart from an occupation or vocation (Scheuer, 1981). Blackbird and Wright (1985) examined the relationships of clergy and their congregation (n=12) and found that "antifraternalization norms" do exist among clergy and individuals within the congregation. Individuals in the congregation expressing reservations about forming friendships with the minister were hindered by their own perceptions of a "pedestal effect." Later research, by Wright and Blackbird (1986), pointed to ministers feeling more freedom to pursue stronger relationships with congregational friends when they perceived a balance of expressions that gave approval and those that gave disapproval.

When relationships outside the family system are not available to the clergy family, most research has shown that they place a greater burden upon intrafamily relationships (Mills and Koval, 1971; Kieren and Munro, 1989, Friedman, 1985). Oates (1986) indicated that the clergy family needs "stress sharers" that are within the "taproot" (family and congregation) as well as a "peripheral" root system (community). Without such a system the clergy family is susceptible to stagnation.

Douglas (1965) found that 88% of the 4,777 ministers' wives in his study claimed that they had many acquaintances, but few friends. Houts (1977) found in a 1973 comprehensive report on all United Methodist pastoral care offices that clergy families need a total career support system. Oden (1988) asked 200 clergy spouses to write anonymous letters and describe things they would like to say to their congregations. A major issue raised by the clergy spouses were feelings of loneliness. Lee and Balswick (1989) discussed the importance of integration for clergy families. Higher levels of support and integration, accompanied by lessened feelings of loneliness, means that clergy family members feel a part of the congregation, but that their separateness as a family is recognized and affirmed. Supporting friendships and integration are emotional resources that aid in producing effective coping skills in the family system during times of stress.

The effects of deficient social support as a stressor are evidenced in greater feelings of isolation (Presnell, 1977), greater social class distance (Mitchell, 1965), greater wife loneliness (Niswander, 1982), clergy adolescent adjustment and satisfaction (Stevenson, 1982), and increased self-improvement steps to resolve stress (Mills and Koval, 1971).

Clergy Marital Satisfaction Literature Review

Family science researchers have known for some time that people who are highly involved with religion report higher marital satisfaction (Schuum, Bollman, & Jurich, 1982). The majority of these studies examined the effects of religious beliefs and practices on marital satisfaction. It is striking, however, that those (e.g., clergy and their families) who are most exposed to the stressors of nurturing and representing these beliefs and practices have been relatively overlooked in the marital satisfaction literature. The Maces (1982) noted that despite the amount of research on marital satisfaction over the last four decades, there is very little research on the marital satisfaction of clergy.

Marital Satisfaction of Clergy

The Maces (1982) found in their survey of clergy couples that a primary disadvantage of clergy marriages was the need to maintain a perfect model of marriage. Jud et

al. (1970) noted that nearly one-third of those clergy leaving the ministry expressed some form of family problem. Mills and Koval (1971) found in their study of 4,908 clergy that the most difficult problems for a minister to handle are those involving his own marriage. Hartley (1978) found that the greatest predictor of marital satisfaction of clergy wives was their agreement with the assertion that their "own fulfillment comes through their husband." However, Barber (1985) found no significant differences in the degree of marital satisfaction between 30 clergy and 30 laity couples. Lee and Balswick (1989), based on multid denominational studies, suggested that there was more reason to believe that the majority of clergy couples experience happy marriages. It remains unclear what factors may differently impact on marital satisfaction for clergy couples in contrast to couples in other occupations.

Stressors Affecting Clergy Marital Satisfaction

Families who experience overall life satisfaction are generally not under undue stress (Olson & McCubbin, 1983). According to Lee and Balswick (1989), the experience of stress is a "signpost" pointing toward particular problems like relationship imbalances. To assume that stressors of mobility, compensation, boundaries, expectations, and social support, that are endemic to clergy and their families, have nominal effects on clergy marital satisfaction is to believe in a "mirage of myths" (Rediger,

1971). Many have been guilty of believing that the marriage vows of clergy have been hermetically sealed by the clergy person's vow to the church and God. Such a belief also assumes that the clergy person can freely ignore his responsibilities to wife and children, without anyone knowing the difference (Bomberger, 1974). Others have not been influenced by this mirage of myths and instead have recognized that there is a great tension in the covenants of marriage and ministry (Noyce, 1980). Richmond, Raymond, and Rogers (1985) stated that "being clergy and being married, which most clergy are, is risky business for all spouses..." (p.84).

Concerning the particular stressors of mobility, compensation, boundaries, expectations, and social support as empirical predictors of clergy marital satisfaction, little is known. Marital satisfaction, as predicted by mobility, is closely tied to the social support system of the clergy and their families. Lee and Balswick (1989) noted that as families move more frequently, "rootedness" issues become centrally important. Lack of roots would prevent clergy couples from establishing a network of meaningful relationships with others outside of the family system. Anderson and Stark (1988) indicated that frequent moves place heavy emotional demands on the marital relationship. Such demands are usually counterproductive to personal individuation and dyad satisfaction.

Social support, as a predictor of clergy marital satisfaction, has received some attention in the empirical literature. Warner and Carter (1984) found in their survey comparing clergy couples with nonclergy couples, that clergy and their wives individually experience significantly more loneliness, as measured by the UCLA Loneliness Scale, and diminished marital adjustment, as measured by the Dyadic Adjustment Scale, than their nonclergy counterparts. Baker (1989) examined the pre/post-test effects of a peer social support program on marital satisfaction of clergy wives. Findings pointed to a significant difference between the treatment group's marital satisfaction and the control group's satisfaction, with the treatment group's marital satisfaction being higher.

Clergy compensation as a predictor of clergy marital satisfaction also has received some attention. Hartley (1978) surveyed 448 clergy spouses representing six mainline denominations to determine factors contributing to clergy wives' marital satisfaction. Hartley found, using nonparametric correlations, that husbands' income moderately correlated with marital satisfaction ($r=.099$, $p<.027$).

Concerning family boundaries as a predictor of marital satisfaction, Lee and Balswick (1989) found in their study that various aspects of clergy family life became easier when the clergy family experienced boundaries that made

them feel "integrated" and part of the congregation. Likewise, as the clergy family had boundaries that allowed "intrusion," the clergy family experienced greater family stress and increased dissatisfaction.

Expectations as a predictor of marital satisfaction was alluded to by Scanzoni's (1965b) survey comparing 13 "church" type clergy couples (n=26) with 18 "sect" type couples (n=36). The "church" type group is distinguished from the "sect" type group by their perception of family and church. "Church" type couples consider their families as an ally; whereas, "sect" type couples consider their family as a competitor for their time to be used for ministry. "Church" type couples were significantly different from "sect" type couples on a variety of issues. When asked questions like "Should the minister put his church work ahead of his family?", 88% of the "sect" type clergy agreed with this belief; whereas, 80% of the "church" type clergy disagreed with this belief. Also when asked, "Should the minister postpone a definitely scheduled family time because an important church official phones and requests that the pastor call a board meeting at once due to an urgent matter which he says has 'just' arisen?" Seventy-three percent of the "sect" type clergy reported that they would postpone the scheduled family time; whereas, 80% of the "church" type clergy indicated that they would postpone the church meeting.

Summary of Clergy Stress and Marital Satisfaction Review

It seems apparent from this review of the clergy stress and marital satisfaction literature, that a great deal of work has been accomplished in identifying the stressors endemic to clergy families, while some foundational work has been made in linking the stressors as predictors of marital satisfaction. The intention of this study was to link further these two areas through multivariate analyses.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

Selection of the Sample

Several denominations were invited to form a consortium and participate in a study called The Clergy Family Project. The questionnaire developed for The Clergy Family Project contains instruments that assess issues like family functioning (Bloom, 1985), physiological well-being (Spanier & Thompson, 1984), life satisfaction (Spanier & Thompson, 1984), marital satisfaction (Schuum, 1983b) marital conventionalization (Edmonds, 1967), and denominational support services (Morris & Blanton, 1992), and others. Each denomination was requested to provide a current list of names and addresses of all the ordained clergy in their denomination fulfilling parish ministries. The criteria for eligibility for the study were that the clergy person be male, be married to a nonclergy person, be serving as an ordained pastor in a denominationally affiliated parish, and have at least one child under 18 living at home.

The sample for this study included ordained married clergy randomly selected from five denominations (i.e., Southern Baptist Convention (SBC); Lutheran Missouri Synod (LMS); Church of God Cleveland, Tennessee (COG); Seventh

Day Adventists (SDA); and the American Baptist Church (ABC). These ordained clergy were randomly selected using a random number table. Invited participants were sent an introductory letter explaining the project, a duplicated copy of the letter of consent from the denomination, and a reply card indicating whether or not the couple wished to receive additional information about the project (see Appendix A).

Description of the Sample

Eight-hundred fifteen randomly selected ordained clergy and their spouses ($n=1630$), representing five denominations, were originally invited to participate in this study. After the introductory invitation and one follow-up mailing, 227 ($n=454$) clergy and their spouses returned reply cards indicating their agreement to participate further in the study. Each of the 227 consenting clergy and spouses were mailed informed consent forms and surveys for the clergy person and the spouse to complete. Of these 227, only 73 couples ($n=146$) to date have completed and returned the surveys. Due to the poor response rate of the initial sample, a second random-selection procedure was performed utilizing the same sampling methods. The second sample included an additional 465 ($n=930$) randomly selected ordained married clergy. After follow-up mailings, only 13 ($n=26$) couples to date have completed and returned their surveys.

Aggregate totals of the first and second sampling procedures (i.e., 1280 couples, $n=2560$) produced a sample size of 86 ($n=172$) couples for a response rate of 6.7%. This low response rate might be due to the respondents having concerns about the "guarantee" of confidentiality, not having sufficient time to complete the survey, or believing that some of the instruments were "too sensitive" for them to complete. Denominational representation included 57 (33%) of the couples from the Lutheran Church, 30 (18%) from the Church of God, 37 (22%) from the American Baptist, 34 (19%) were Seventh Day Adventists, and 12 (7%) from the Southern Baptist Church. Due to resource constraints (e.g., time, funding), no additional sampling procedures were made.

Descriptive analyses of the demographic data provided by the clergy and their spouses indicated that 88% were Anglo-American, 9.5% were Afro-American, and 2.5% were of Hispanic descent. The mean age of the sample was 42 years ranging from 28 to 61 years old. The average age of the clergy person was 43, and his spouse was 41. The majority (95%) of the couples were still in their first marriages, which were about 19 years in length. As a group, the clergy families had an average of 2 children whose ages ranged from a few months to age 18.

The education level reported by the group indicated that 86% had pursued educational endeavors beyond a high school diploma (see Table 1). In fact, a total of 47% of

Table 1. Education Level.

Category	Husbands (n=86)		Wives (n=86)		Combined (n=172)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Grades K-5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grades 6-8	1	1.1	0	0	1	.6
Grades 9-12	5	5.7	18	21.4	23	13.4
Bachelor's	13	14.8	31	36.9	44	25.6
Master's	52	59.1	9	10.7	61	35.5
Doctorate	15	17.0	4	4.8	19	11.0
Other	2	2.3	22	26.2	24	14.0

the group have earned graduate degrees at the Masters (36%) or Doctorate (11%) level.

The clergy respondents in the sample indicated that 89% serve as Senior Pastor in their parish working on the average of 55 hours per week in ministerial responsibilities at parishes averaging 200-300 members. The clergy indicated that they had been in the ministry as a professional approximately 16 years, had been 7 years at the current parish, and moved about 3-4 times since entering the ministry. Interestingly, 9% indicated that they needed to work either part or full-time in other areas to assist the family in meeting financial obligations. In terms of clergy spouses, 74% of the spouses were employed outside the home as professional teachers (25%), secretaries (9.5%), nurses and social workers (13.6%), business and sales (12%), and other jobs (12%) working an average of 31 hours per week. The spouses indicated that they had been employed on average for over 21 years.

The salary package of clergy and their spouses were combined into couple income (i.e., pairing actual husbands and wives). The couple income indicated that clergy and their spouses ranged from \$32,500 to \$45,000. Personal income percentages indicated that 75% of the clergy and 36% of the spouses each earn over \$20,000 per year (see Table 2). As couples, the group felt that their financial status was "comparable or better" to those in the same denomination (83%), with the same education (23%), living

Table 2. Family and Personal Pre-Tax Income.

Income	Husbands (n=86)		Wives (n=86)	
	N	%	N	%
\$0-\$4,999	1	1.2	18	26.9
\$5K-\$7,499	0	0	8	11.9
\$7,500-\$9,999	0	0	6	9.0
\$10K-\$14,999	3	3.5	9	13.4
\$15K-\$19,999	6	7.0	2	3.0
\$20K-\$24,999	15	17.4	8	11.9
\$25K-\$34,999	35	40.7	7	10.4
\$35K-\$49,999	24	27.9	5	7.5
OVER \$50,000	2	2.3	4	6.0

in the same community (75%). Personal benefits of clergy point to feelings of adequacy regarding life insurance (74%), health and medical insurance (80%), savings plans (16%), and retirement and pension plans (52%). Data concerning the living arrangements of clergy and their spouses indicated that 45% live in a church-owned home; whereas, 48% own their homes.

Instrumentation

Three instruments were completed by participants in the study. They are as follows: the Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale (KMS), the Clergy Family Life Inventory (CFLI), and the Edmonds Marital Conventionalization Scale (EMC). In addition to these instruments, a Personal History Inventory was used to gather sociodemographic information (see Appendix B).

Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale (KMS)

The KMS, developed by Walter Schuum (Mitchell, Newell, & Schuum, 1983) was used to measure the dependent variable of marital satisfaction. The KMS is a three-item, 7 point Likert-type instrument initially designed to measure satisfaction with marriage: as an institution, as a relationship, and the character of one's spouse. Spanier and Cole (1976) originally constructed the three items in their discussion of marital satisfaction as a component of marital adjustment. However, in practice, the items have

demonstrated remarkable psychometric evidence for the scale's usage. Schuum, Paff-Bergen, Hatch, Obiorah, Copeland, Meens, and Bugaighis (1986) suggested that a benefit for using the scale is its ability to assess one dimension of marital satisfaction with enough items to establish equal and/or better reliability alpha's than longer scales.

In terms of reliability, the KMS as a scale has demonstrated Chronbach's alphas ranging from $r=.84$ to $r=.98$ (Schuum, Hess, Bollman, & Jurich, 1981; Mitchell et al., 1983). Alphas for husbands and wives are relatively different, with husbands being slightly lower (Schuum, Nichols, Schectman, & Grigsby, 1983a; Schuum, Scanlon, Crow, Green, & Buckler, 1983b). Test-retest reliabilities over a ten-week period were $r=.71$ (Mitchell et al., 1983).

Recognizing that this present study contains a different population from those found in previous studies, and that it would be inappropriate methodologically to be psychometrically dependent on previous studies, Chronbach's alpha procedures were performed. For this population, the KMS produced an alpha of .94 (see Table 1), which is within the expected range found in earlier studies.

Determinations for validity for the KMS also have been established. Some arguments for evidence of content validity can be made if one considers that the instrument items were recommended by Spanier and Cole (1976) after a lengthy review of the marital adjustment literature.

Concurrent criterion validity for the KMS was established by Schuum, Anderson, Benigas, McCutchen, Griffen, Morris, and Race (1985) who found significant differences between 212 wives from intact marriages and 8 wives who had recently separated from their spouses.

Construct validity for the KMS also have been confirmed. Convergent construct validity was determined by Grover, Paff-Bergen, Russell, and Schuum (1984) who found significant correlations with six of the seven satisfaction subscale items of Spanier's Dyadic Adjustment Scale. The authors pointed out that this was evidence for concurrent validity. However, there is some question as to whether or not this is really a measure of concurrent or convergent validity. Grotevant and Carlson (1989) noted that convergent construct and discriminant construct validity is "the extent to which the measure, or subscales of the measure, correlate positively with other measures of the same construct (convergent validity) and do not correlate with measures of constructs hypothesized to be distinct (discriminant validity)" (p.62). It appears that construct validity was being measured by Grover et al., (1984) and Schuum et al., (1986) as they were measuring the correlation of the construct "satisfaction" using the KMS and the DAS (1984) and KMS and the DAS and Quality Marital Index (1986) respectively.

Discriminant construct validity was assessed by Schuum et al. (1986) who found that the KMS did not correlate well

with satisfaction items in areas like politics, police, and place. Based on the findings of this study, the authors commented that the "KMS scale demonstrated no worse, if not better, discriminant validity than the other two (DAS and QMI, inferred) more established scales" (p.385).

Methodological concerns about the KMS have been offered by Schuum et al. (1981). The first involves the scale's tendency to produce response distributions that violate the assumption of multivariate normality. Several researchers (Schuum et al., 1983a; Schuum et al., 1983b; Schuum et al., 1986) have reported skewness values ranging from -1.125 to -2.20 and kurtosis values ranging from 1.17 to 6.32. In addressing the etiology of nonnormality, Schuum et al. (1983b, 1985) indicated that nonnormality may reflect the reality of unhappy marriages that end early and thereby create skewed distributions for the researchers who use the remaining intact marriages in the population. Schuum et al. (1986) also suggested that nonnormality problems related to the content of the KMS. An additional methodological concern related to the response distribution issue is volunteer bias (e.g., self-selection) in sampling. It seems logical to assume that when self-selection bias is present in the sample that skewness and kurtosis problems will be magnified. Factors influencing self-selection bias in a sample may be related to participants who are satisfied and proud of their marriage. It seems obvious that such participants may be more willing, possibly even

more exaggerated, than their dissatisfied counterparts in their willingness to participate. As a result, their overt enthusiasm may contaminate further the nonnormality of the sample. Regardless, of the etiology, however, Schuum and colleagues (1983b, 1985) have indicated that nonnormal distributions, when present, are not out of the control of the researcher and should be handled through appropriate data transformation techniques that center the values around zero (e.g., normality). Another factor that may influence nonnormality involves the scale's tendency to produce socially desirable responses. Regarding each of these concerns, Sabatelli (1988) suggested that each of these issues is common to all global measures of marital satisfaction.

Therefore, due to the content, construction, and previously established psychometric strength of the KMS, it was chosen as a global measure of marital satisfaction.

Clergy Family Life Inventory (CFLI)

Based on a lengthy review of the existing literature on stress in clergy families, the CFLI was developed by Blanton et al. (1990) and will be used for measuring the stressors (independent variables) experienced by the clergy and their spouses. The CFLI is a 56-item, 4 point Likert-type questionnaire measuring five domains of external stressors. Those five domains are as follows: mobility (9 items), compensation (11 items), family boundaries (13

items), expectations (14 items), and social support (9 items).

Pilot test results on the CFLI for reliability and validity have been established. Chronbach's alphas from a pilot test of seminary couples ($n=28$) for each of the domains were as follows: mobility $=.81$, compensation $=.89$, family boundaries $=.87$, expectations $=.87$, and social support $=.81$. For this present study, the CFLI as a scale produced an alpha of $.95$ (see Table 1). As individual stressor domains, the mobility scale alpha was $.80$, the compensation scale alpha was $.86$, the family boundary scale alpha was $.85$, the expectation scale alpha was $.83$, and the social support scale was $.84$. Face validity was determined using Q-sort procedures with a panel of experts ($n=20$) in the area of pastoral care.

Edmonds Marital Conventionalization Scale (EMC)

The EMC (1967) measures the respondents' tendencies to distort their appraisals of their marriages in the direction of social desirable responses. The original scale was comprised of fifty true/false items containing 34 conventional statements and 16 distractor statements.

Two shortened versions of the EMC have been recommended for usage with the KMS (Schuum et al., 1983a; 1983b). Both shortened versions contain slightly reworded items and deceptor questions from the original EMC. The first version possesses a Chronbach's alpha of $.67$, and the

second version possesses a Chronbach's alpha of .82 for husbands and .81 for wives. This study combined the first and second version, as they only differ on one item, and produced an alpha of .73 (see Table 1), which is within the normal expected range found in previous studies.

Schuum et al. (1981) has recommended that removing conventionalizing subjects from the analysis appeared to be a better way to assess the impact of social desirability on marital satisfaction rather than partialing out conventionalization or making the scale into an independent variable. Schuum's et al. (1981) main criticism for removing the conventionalizing subjects is the large reduction of the sample size, as it might affect the robustness of the statistical procedures in smaller samples. Additionally, Schuum and colleagues do not clearly delineate the appropriate criterion for removing the conventional subjects (e.g., should every conventional subject be removed from every item, or only those who are conventional on 3 or 4 or 5 items?). Thus it seems that the researcher is left with an arbitrary decision of choosing the best method for dealing methodologically with conventionalizing responses. Further, Schuum and colleagues suggested that the concerns for marital conventionalization may have been overstated in previous research. Regardless of the overstatement of the marital conventionalization argument, the EMC will be important in assessing the sample of the present study, as should be the case with other

samples involving religion as a variable (Thomas & Cornwall, 1990).

Personal History Inventory

An instrument was designed to collect sociodemographic and familial data. Information was requested pertaining to gender, age, race, educational level, denominational affiliation, number of hours worked per week, family income, compensation benefits, employment status, length of marriage, number of children, number of moves made since entering the ministry, housing status, previous marriage, congregational size, number of years in ministry, and number of years in ministry at this present location.

Procedures

Data Collection

Prior to data collection with the actual sample, a pilot study using the CFLI was conducted with a convenience sample of 14 clergy and their spouses from the Church of God and Southern Baptist denominations. As a result of this pilot study, a total of three items were deleted from the CFLI because of their low internal consistency with the rest of the domain items.

Upon completion of this pilot study, identical questionnaires, informed consent forms, letters of endorsement from the denominational sponsor, letters of introduction to the project, and a stamped addressed return

envelope were mailed to the husbands and wives separately at their home. Spouses were requested to complete their work in one sitting, to complete each form independently, to avoid comparing and/or discussing items and responses until completing their work, and not to change any of their responses in the event of such discussions after completing the survey.

Data Management

As the surveys were returned by the participants, the researcher verified that both the clergy person and spouse had completed the informed consent form and the proper survey. Data were entered into the computer based upon a previously constructed codebook by the research team. Data entry was verified by the researcher by double checking surveys randomly selected with at least two other persons.

Upon completion of the data entry process, missing data cases were determined through frequency distribution procedures. Any item containing more than 2% (e.g., 5 or more missing cases per item) of missing data received substituted values equivalent to the item mean (Cohen & Cohen 1983). Any items that needed to be recoded or reversed were transformed. All items were re-run utilizing frequency procedures to verify that they were accurately handled for further data analyses.

Data Analyses

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was the computer program used for all analyses. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to compute, organize, clean, and test hypotheses pertaining to the survey's variables. Descriptive procedures included FREQUENCIES that were used to determine the mean, sum, range, and standard deviations of each of the items and scales, EXAMINE procedures to verify the assumption of normality in the scales. Inferential statistic procedures included ONE WAY analysis of variance procedures to test the null hypothesis of marital satisfaction transdenominationally, CORRELATIONS procedures to test the strength of linear relationships between the criterion variable and the predictor variables, and REGRESSION procedures (e.g., stepwise and forced entry variable selection methods) to test the form of relationship of the criterion variable marital satisfaction as predicted by the predictor variables.

Regarding the variable selection method of stepwise and forced entry, the researcher is aware that some criticisms have been issued against the usage of the stepwise variable selection method in explanatory research. Arguments for not using the stepwise procedure focus on the entering of variables into a regression equation due to the uniqueness of the variable. Thus, the temptation arises in allowing the computer, rather than theory, to control for the selection of variables (Cohen & Cohen, 1983). Forced

entry as a variable selection method enters a variable "one at a time in the order of decreasing tolerance but are treated as a single block for statistics computed for changes in the equation" (SPSS-X User's Guide, p.851). Cohen and Cohen (1983) have asserted their preference for a "forced entry" stepwise regression procedure. Warnings offered in the Cohen's text are well worth heeding if it is the researcher's sole intention of completely depending upon stepwise procedures for all explanatory analyses. It might be counter offered, however, that when a research area is exploratory, rather than explanatory, that a method of utilizing stepwise regression procedures followed by forced entry procedures to confirm the model given in a stepwise regression analysis would guide the researcher both theoretically and empirically in the exploratory research process of building a regression model. Norusis (1990) indicated that different variable selection methods may yield different models, and recommends using a second additional method to reconfirm the first method. Norusis believes that when two or more variable selection methods produce similar findings that researchers can place more confidence in their findings, because two different statistical methods have been found to produce the same results.

Tolerance in the definition of forced entry procedure is a test for multicollinearity. Multicollinearity is defined as "the proportion of variability in an independent

variable not explained by other independent variables" (Norusis, 1990, p. 280). High intercorrelations inflate the variances of the estimates and hinder the individual coefficients from contributing to the fit of the model (Norusis, 1990). Provisions in the SPSS REGRESSION procedures warn the researcher of multicollinearity problems found in variables in the equation or the variable itself through indications that a criterion of less than .0001 has been violated.

The researcher, through the sample selection procedures, controlled for marriage (e.g., only married couples were included), ministerial status (e.g., only male ordained clergy presently serving as a pastor were included), and children (e.g., only married couples with at least one child at home were included).

Primary data analyses for the study included testing two hypotheses. The first tested was that the criterion variable of marital satisfaction could be predicted by clergy work/family stressors of mobility, compensation, family boundaries, expectations, social support, and gender, with marital conventionalization. The second tested was that the criterion variable of marital satisfaction could be predicted by sociodemographic variables.

Ad hoc data analyses for the study included hypotheses testing the criterion variable of marital satisfaction as predicted by separate dimensions of congregational and family expectations with marital conventionalization.

Operational Definitions

The following definitions were used to conceptualize and transform data into scales for data analyses in the study.

Mobility as a stressor was defined as the sum score of the mobility subscale of the CFLI with higher stressor levels reported being concomitant with higher scale scores; whereas, lower reported stressor levels being concomitant with lower scale scores. The mobility subscale contains eight items (e.g., see Appendix B, Section 1, items 1, 29, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 44) with possible scores ranging from 8 to 32.

Compensation as a stressor was defined as the sum score of the compensation subscale of the CFLI with higher stressor levels reported being concomitant with higher scale scores; whereas, lower reported stressor levels being concomitant with lower scale scores. The compensation subscale contains 11 items (e.g., see Appendix B, Section 1, items 2, 9, 13, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, 40, 52, 53) with possible scores ranging from 11 to 44.

Family Boundaries as a stressor was defined as the sum score of the boundary subscale of the CFLI with higher stressor levels reported being concomitant with higher scale scores; whereas, lower reported stressor levels being concomitant with lower scale scores. The boundary subscale contains 12 items (e.g., see Appendix B, Section 1, items

15, 16, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 33, 35, 43, 45, 49) with possible scores ranging from 12 to 48.

Expectations as a stressor was defined as the sum score of the expectations subscale of the CFLI with higher stressor levels reported being concomitant with higher scale scores; whereas, lower reported stressor levels being concomitant with lower scale scores. The expectations subscale contains 12 items (e.g., see Appendix B, Section 1, items 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 21, 22, 31, 32) with possible scores ranging from 12 to 48.

Social Support as a stressor was defined as the sum score of the social support subscale of the CFLI with higher stressor levels reported being concomitant with higher scale scores; whereas, lower reported stressor levels being concomitant with lower scale scores. The social support subscale contains 10 items (e.g., see Appendix B, Section 1, items 5, 14, 17, 34, 37, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51) with possible scores ranging from 10 to 40.

Marital Conventionalization was defined as the sum score of the shortened EMC scale with higher conventionalization levels reported being concomitant with higher scale scores; whereas, non-conventionalization levels being concomitant with lower scale scores. The short form of the EMC contains nine dichotomous items (e.g., see Appendix B, Section 6, items 1 to 9) along with three lie or disguise items (e.g., items 10 to 12). The 12 items comprising this shortened form of the EMC are item numbers

10, 15, 20, 24, 26, 28, 31, 32, 35, 39, 41, and 48 from the original 50 item EMC. Items 3, 7, and 8 were recoded to maintain the scoring system in a single direction. Possible scores for the EMC range from 9 to 18.

Marital Satisfaction was defined as the sum score of the KMS scale with higher satisfaction levels reported being concomitant with higher scale scores; whereas, lower reported satisfaction levels being concomitant with lower scale scores. The KMS contains three items (e.g., see Appendix B, Section 5, items 1 to 3). Possible scores for the KMS range from 3 to 21.

Hypotheses of the Study

The hypotheses for this study were as follows:

1. That subjects' marital satisfaction as measured by the KMS could be predicted by a model that included the five stressor domains of the CFLI, marital conventionalization as measured by the EMC, and gender.
2. That subjects' marital satisfaction as measured by the KMS could be predicted by the demographic variables including age, length of marriage, gender, congregational size, income, educational level, denominational affiliation, and number of children.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Prior to tabulating summary scores for the sample, tests of normality were made regarding the individual scales in the study. Each of the stressor domains of the CFLI and the EMC were sufficient to support the assumption of normality; whereas, the KMS was in violation of the normality assumption. Therefore, data transformation methods were undertaken to normalize this scale.

According to Shectman et al. (1985), Mitchell et al. (1983), and Schuum et al. (1983a, 1983b, 1984, 1985, 1986), the KMS has repeatedly been shown to have problems of negative skewness (e.g., ranging from -1.125 to -2.20) and positive kurtosis (e.g., ranging from 1.17 to 6.32) that require data transformation to normalize (e.g., as close to zero for skewness and kurtosis) before usage in data analyses. Cohen and Cohen (1983) have indicated that "whenever it seems reasonable to suppose that a construct being measured by a variable v is represented with greater fidelity by rescaling it so it yields a frequency distribution of normal form, this transformation may be applied" (p. 270). The Cohens further add that data normalization should be used cautiously, "but whenever an

original scaling yields a wild distribution, particularly where there is some basis for belief that the construct being assessed is usefully conceived as being more or less normally distributed in the population being sampled, it is well worth the effort to normalize" (p. 271). It seems obvious that due to the empirical history of the KMS and the occurrence of nonnormality in the criterion variable in the present study, steps for normalizing the scale should be undertaken.

The Levene's tests for determining the necessary data transformation options for stabilizing variances is offered as a subcommand in the EXAMINE procedures in SPSS. After initially testing the homogeneity of variance in the criterion variable marital satisfaction (e.g., skewness= -2.281 and kurtosis=+7.348), it was determined and reconfirmed through spread-and-level plots that the cubed power transformation provided the best results (e.g., marital satisfaction cubed, skewness= -.4368 and kurtosis= +1.417) for normalizing the frequency distribution.

Scale scores in a sum format (e.g., possible range 3-21) for the sample (see Table 3) were compared with the scale scores recorded by other researchers. A review of the literature indicates that the KMS as a scale score has a mean ranging from 16.4 (Schuum et al., 1983b) to 18.28 (Schuum et al., 1986). The KMS as a scale score for this study indicated that the mean was 17.709. Husband and wife means were found by Schuum et al. (1983b) to be 17.97 and

Table 3. Sample Means, Ranges, Standard Deviation, and Chronbach's Alpha on Study's Variables.

Scale	Husbands (n=86)			Wives (n=86)			Combined (n=172)			Chronbach's alpha
	Range	Mean	SD	Range	Mean	SD	Range	Mean	SD	
KMS										
Marital satisfaction	5-21	17.96	3.02	3-21	17.44	3.25	3-21	17.71	3.14	.94
CFLI										
Mobility	7-28	15.58	4.81	8-28	16.70	5.13	7-28	16.13	4.98	.80
Compensation	11-42	24.28	7.19	11-44	24.98	6.61	11-44	24.62	6.90	.86
Family boundaries	12-39	23.68	6.64	12-39	24.44	6.45	12-39	24.05	6.54	.85
Expectations	9-36	22.00	5.87	12-39	22.38	5.98	9-39	22.18	5.91	.83
Social support	6-34	20.99	6.11	5-35	21.00	6.04	5-35	20.99	6.06	.85
EMC										
Marital conventionalization	9-17	11.21	2.11	8-17	11.27	2.03	8-17	11.24	2.06	.73

17.43 respectively. Mean for husbands in this present study were 17.96 and 17.44 for wives. It seems that the means for this sample are well within the parameters of other research findings for the KMS.

Concerning the CFLI as a scale, only findings in a mean format (e.g., possible range 1-4) from the pilot test performed by Blanton et al. (1990) were available for comparison. The means for the mobility scale were 1.849, the compensation scale was 2.213, the family boundary scale was 2.037, the expectations scale was 2.019, and the social support scale was 1.971. Means in a computed mean format (e.g., possible range 1-4) for the CFLI in this study were also tabulated. The mean of the mobility scale was 2.036, the compensation scale was 2.253, family boundary scale was 2.019, the expectation scale was 1.869, and the support scale was 2.124. Comparison of the results of the pilot study and data from the present study indicated that this group reported slightly more stress only on the boundary and expectation scale. Although this group seems to differ slightly from the pilot test group, it should be noted that the sample for the pilot test included primarily seminary students. There seems to be little question that the stressor demands of young "pre-ministry" seminary students could be different from "in-ministry" veteran pastors. Overall, it does seem that this group is within the parameters of other pilot study data on the CFLI.

Finally, previous researchers using the short form of the EMC have used a variety of different items from the longer version of the EMC and unfortunately have not cited (e.g., to the knowledge of this researcher) their findings for the means of their version. It should be noted, however, that Edmonds (1967) found that the most discriminating item in his research was item 48 in the original 50 item version. This item reads, "There are times when my mate does things that make me unhappy." Edmonds (1967) reported that 42% of his sample reported in a conventional manner on this one item. For this study, only 4.7% of this sample responded in a conventionalizing manner and, consequently, this item was the least discriminating one in this shorter version.

Although denominational affiliation was not used as a predictor variable in the present study, data analysis was performed to substantiate the assumption that denominations did not differ. ONEWAY analysis of variance procedures were performed to test for differences among the denominations all variables. No significant differences were found among the five denominations on any of the predictor variables of the CFLI or EMC, or the criterion variable of the KMS. [Cohen and Cohen (1983) have urged that researchers omit detailed reporting of research endeavors that were attempted and found lacking.]

In summary, the scales for this study seem to be consistent with the empirical history (e.g., comparing

means and states of normality) of past research endeavors. No notable differences are evident.

Hypothesis 1

Stepwise regression analysis were performed to explore the variable predicting marital satisfaction (see Table 4). The model predicting marital satisfaction was significant ($F=30.75$, $p=.0000$), accounting for 27% of the variance. As a result, Hypothesis 1 was accepted.

From the stepwise analysis procedures, marital conventionalization ($B=.43$, $p=.0000$) and expectations ($B=-.21$, $p=.0027$) were the best predictors of marital satisfaction. Pearson's correlation coefficients were also obtained (see Table 4). It should be noted that along with conventionalization ($r=.48$, $p=.001$) and expectations ($r=-.33$, $p=.001$), mobility ($r=-.24$, $p=.01$), family boundary ($r=-.29$, $p=.001$), and social support ($r=-.26$) were significantly correlated with marital satisfaction, but were not explaining enough of the variance to enter the regression equation. Also, gender ($B=-.10$, $p=.1411$) as an independent variable was not sufficient to enter the equation. Tolerance levels for each of the independent variables were well above the .0001 criteria for tolerance level.

A series of forced entry procedures followed the stepwise procedure to verify the findings of the stepwise model. Results of this analysis verified the model attained

Table 4. Predictors of Clergy Marital Satisfaction: A Summary of Multiple Regressions and Bivariate Correlations with All Predictor Variables in Stepwise Regression Analysis (N=172: 86 Husbands and 86 Wives).

Predictor variables	Marital satisfaction			
	r	B	F	Signifi- cance of F
Marital conventionalization	.48***	.42***	37.50	.0000
Expectations	-.33***	-.21***	9.29	.0027
Mobility	-.23**	-.003	.002	.9649
Compensation	-.09	.11	2.25	.1360
Family boundaries	-.28***	-.02	.05	.8240
Social support	-.26***	-.06	.42	.5172
Gender	-.10	-.09	2.18	.1411
Multiple correlation (R)	.52			
Multiple correlation squared (R ²)	.27			
F-value	30.75***			
				Significance of F=.0000

Note: r = Pearson's Correlation Coefficient; B = Standardized Beta.

*p<.05
 **p<.01
 ***p<.001

in the stepwise procedure (see Table 5). The model predicting marital satisfaction was significant ($F= 30.10$, $p=.0000$), accounting for 27% of the variance. Both marital conventionalization ($B=.42$, $p=.0000$) and expectations ($B=-.21$, $p=.0038$) were significant predictors of marital satisfaction. Tolerance levels for the independent variables were well above the criterion of .0001.

Further regression analyses were performed in attempts to control for marital conventionalization. Controlling for marital conventionalization is somewhat arbitrary as discussed earlier. The decision made in the present study for controlling for conventionalization was to select the single most discriminating item in the sample and separate conventional respondents from nonconventional respondents using this criterion. This method was used for two reasons. First, it removes the researcher from selecting some arbitrary and rather artificial number of items for removing respondents. Second, it assumes that the conventionalizing respondents who are marginally conventionalizing on other items will be almost certainly grouped in the conventionalizing category using the most discriminating item as the criterion for grouping subjects. The major threat for this method is that, like the removal of all conventionalizing subjects on all the items, it reduces the size of the sample and might affect the accuracy of the statistical procedures.

Table 5. Predictors of Clergy Marital Satisfaction: Reduced Model for Forced Entry Regression Analysis (N=172: 86 Husbands and 86 Wives).

Predictor variables	Marital satisfaction			
	r	B	F	Signifi- cance of F
Marital conventionalization	.48***	.42***	36.62	.0000
Expectations	-.33***	-.20**	8.64	.0038
Multiple correlation (R)	.52			
Multiple correlation squared (R ²)	.26			
F-value	30.09***			
	Significance of F=.0000			

Note: r = Pearson's Correlation Coefficient; B = Standardized Beta.

**p<.01

***p<.001

The most discriminating item for this sample read as "I have never regretted my marriage, not even for a moment." Ninety-one respondents (53%) responded in a conventionalizing manner to this item. Regression analysis with these respondents removed indicated that expectation stressors ($B = -.373$, $p = .0008$) was the only significant contributor to marital satisfaction explaining 14% of the variance. It seems that even with the conventionalizing subjects removed from the original model, the same results were substantiated.

Ad hoc regression analyses were performed using marital satisfaction as a criterion variable as predicted by expectations being separated into more specific domains of congregational and family expectations with marital conventionalization (see Table 6). The items comprising the congregational expectations domain were items 3, 4, 7, 21, and 22; whereas, items 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, and 31, were identified as family expectations domain items. Chronbach's alpha scores for congregational and family expectations were .81 and .56 respectively showing adequate levels of internal consistency. Stepwise regression analysis followed by forced entry procedures indicated that the model predicting marital satisfaction was significant ($F = 30.12$, $p = .0000$), explaining 26% of the variance. Marital conventionalization ($B = .43$, $p = .0000$) and congregational expectations ($B = -.20$, $p = .0037$) were significant contributors to the model. It should be noted, however,

Table 6. Predictors of Clergy Marital Satisfaction: Expectations of Family and Congregation Independently in Forced Entry Regression Analysis (N=172: 86 Husbands and 86 Wives).

Predictor variables	Marital satisfaction			
	r	B	F	Signifi- cance of F
Marital conventionalization	.48***	.44***	41.26	.0000
Congregational expectations	-.29***	-.20**	8.68	.0037
Family expectations	-.31**	-.05	.32	.58
Multiple correlation (R)	.51			
Multiple correlation squared (R ²)	.26			
F-value	30.12***			Significance of F=.0000

Note: r = Pearson's Correlation Coefficient; B = Standardized Beta.

**p<.01

***p<.001

that family expectations ($r=-.31$, $p=.001$) was significantly correlated, but did not explain enough variance to enter the equation.

Hypothesis 2

Stepwise regression analysis were performed to determine their predictive power of marital satisfaction (see Table 7). The predictor variables selected from the sociodemographic data were size of church membership, educational level, length of marriage, number of moves since entering the ministry, age, income, age of youngest son, age of youngest daughter. The model predicting marital satisfaction was significant ($F=6.36$, $p=.0001$), explaining 15% of the variance. The null hypothesis was not rejected.

Significant contributors to model were size of church membership ($B=.20$, $p=.0110$), educational level ($B=-.20$, $p=.0102$), length of marriage ($B=.22$, $p=.0064$), and number of moves since entering the ministry ($B=-.19$, $p=.0000$). Tolerances for the independent variables were well above the tolerance criterion level of .0001.

Forced entry regression analysis procedures also were performed to substantiate the reduced model (see Table 8). The reduced model predicting marital satisfaction was significant ($F=6.23$, $p=.0001$), explaining .13% of the variance.

Significant contributors to model were size of church membership ($B=.15$, $p=.0347$), educational level ($B=-.17$,

Table 7. Predictors of Clergy Marital Satisfaction: Sociodemographic Model in Stepwise Regression Analysis (N=172: 86 Husbands and 86 Wives).

Predictor variables	Marital satisfaction			
	r	B	F	Signifi- cance of F
Church size	.16*	.20*	6.64	.0110
Education level	-.15*	-.20*	6.78	.0102
Length of marriage	.18*	.22**	7.65	.0062
Number of moves	-.17*	-.19***	5.88	.0000
Age	.02	-.06	.38	.5355
Income	.04	.05	.46	.4981
Age of youngest daughter	.06	.04	.29	.5870
Age of youngest son	.10	.12	2.12	.1474
Multiple correlation (R)	.39			
Multiple correlation squared (R ²)	.15			
F-value	6.36***		Significance of F=.0001	

Note: r = Pearson's Correlation Coefficient; B = Standardized Beta.

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.001

Table 8. Predictors of Clergy Marital Satisfaction: Reduced Model of Sociodemographic Variables Using Forced Entry Regression Analysis (N=172: 86 Husbands and 86 Wives).

Predictor variables	Marital satisfaction				
	r	B	F	Signifi- cance of F	Tolerance
Church size	.16*	.16*	4.532	.0347	.97
Education level	-.15*	-.17*	5.415	.0212	.98
Length of marriage	.18*	.23**	9.917	.0019	.99
Number of moves	-.17*	-.19**	6.774	.0101	.99
Multiple correlation (R)	.36				
Multiple correlation squared (R ²)	.13				
F-value	6.23***			Significance of F=.0001	

Note: r = Pearson's Correlation Coefficient; B = Standardized Beta.

*p<.05
 **p<.01
 ***p<.001

$p=.0212$), length of marriage ($B=.23$, $p=.0019$), and number of moves since entering the ministry ($B= -.19$, $p=.0101$). Tolerances for the independent variables were well above the tolerance criterion level of .0001.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

In conclusion, data analysis procedures in this study indicated that clergy marital satisfaction could be significantly predicted by a reduced model that included marital conventionalization and expectations. With regards to expectations, it seemed that congregational expectations, rather than family expectations, was a significant predictor of marital satisfaction. Further data analysis indicated that socio-demographic variables were also significant predictors of marital satisfaction. Specific conclusions for this study are identified and discussed below.

Conclusions from the Study

1. It was found that the CFLI was a reliable instrument. This was the first field test of the CFLI beyond initial pilot testing and it held together as a reliable instrument in terms of the internal consistency of items in the five domains.

2. Regarding clergy and their spouses, there were no significant gender differences.

3. A model of variables was found to be predictive of the criterion variable of marital satisfaction as reported by husbands and wives. This model included stressor demands

of mobility, compensation, family boundaries, expectations, social support, and marital conventionalization. A reduced model revealed that marital conventionalization and expectation stressor demands were predictor variables. When expectations were examined more closely, it was the congregational expectations, rather than family expectations, that contributed inversely to marital satisfaction. Further it was learned that congregational expectations, when controlling for marital conventionalization, was a significant predictor of marital satisfaction.

4. A model of sociodemographic variables was found to be predictive of the criterion variable of marital satisfaction. This model included church size, education level, length of marriage, number of moves since entering the ministry, age, income, age of youngest daughter, and age of youngest son. A reduced model included church size, education level, length of marriage, and number of moves since entering the ministry.

Discussion

In terms of gender and denominational differences, this study seems to restate the anecdotal notion that the marital satisfaction of clergy couples was similar to marriages of other occupations and across denominational groups. This was evidenced in the striking similarities of

reports offered by the sample in the present study when compared to parameters for other populations.

Members of the sample of the present study were homogeneous in terms of demographic characteristics and were not representative in some respects of the broader population of clergy and their spouses. A brief review of the demographic data reported by the clergy person reveals that most were Senior Pastors, with over a decade of ministerial experience, and had been married for nearly twenty years. This would seem to indicate that the clergy in this sample may represent a later life-span cohort (e.g., "greying of the clergy", refers to the imbalanced ratio of younger "entering the ministry" clergy versus older "retiring from ministry" clergy. Brushaber (1991) indicated that several denominational leaders anticipate that 40% of their active ministers will reach retirement age by the year 2,000.) both occupationally and familially. As a result, they would have perhaps developed a repertoire of effective management skills to handle the stressor demands resulting from work and family. It would also seem to indicate that the clergy, by virtue of their ministerial status as Senior Pastor, would have greater control of the resources (e.g., higher income, higher occupational leverage) that might contribute to their own or spouse's satisfaction. These findings would be consistent with Spanier and Lewis's (1980) assertion of a U-shaped curvilinear relationship for marital satisfaction over the

life span. Unfortunately, due to self selection biases in the sample, generalized conclusions about this group must be tempered with the awareness that the combination of younger clergy and newer marriages might have yielded somewhat different results in reports of marital satisfaction. Such a group was not present in this study, either due to ministerial attrition rates, denominational regulations of ordination (e.g., being a certain age or having years of experience), or divorce (Glenn, 1990).

Regarding spouses, the greatest number were employed outside the home, had better than average education levels, had good incomes, and were living in their own homes, rather than parsonages. These wives were perhaps developing their potentials through careers and education to a greater extent than might be true of the broader population of clergy spouses. Recent research by Baker and Scott (1992) indicated that many of the clergy wives in their sample were employed outside their home in service orientation careers that are similar to the career of their clergy husbands. As employed wives, when compared with unemployed clergy wives, employed wives reported greater global wellbeing, greater positive affect, greater life satisfaction, less loneliness, less depression, and experience less negative impacts from their husband's occupational stressors. Also these findings are consistent with Thompson and Walker's (1989) research on women in general, which indicated that women with higher education,

higher income, and employment outside the home report more positive overall levels of well-being.

Concerning the stressor demands in relationship to the criterion variable marital satisfaction, it was surprising that a relatively modest amount of variance in the criterion variable was explained by the model. For this sample, only marital conventionalization and expectations were significant predictors of marital satisfaction. Closer examination of the expectation variable indicates that family expectations, while significant in a direct linear relationship, does not seem to significantly impact the couples satisfaction when congregational expectations are present. This finding seems to address the triangulation issues faced by clergy and their families in tension with the congregation as a family and families within the congregation (Friedman, 1985; Whybrew 1980). The Maces (1982) indicated that many clergy experience stress that is projected from unresolved congregational issues that are greedy and absorptive of the couple's or family's resources (Kieren and Munro, 1988). When unresolved issues exist in the relationship of the clergy and the congregation, clergy are more prone for burnout and subsequent departure from the ministry (Marsh, 1986). Lee and Balswick (1989) have indicated that many congregational expectations flow out of a church history or tradition of highly valued prescribed roles that are nonnegotiable. Prescribed roles of this nature reflect noninterpersonal demands that are not often

discussed or communicated (Klink, 1969). One priest has pointed out that when every member of the congregation has a small amount of expectations that the aggregation of this amount is overwhelming (Whittemore, 1991). It does seem that clergy and their spouses do indeed deal with a "holy crossfire" of congregational demands (DeLuca, 1980). Thus, clergy and their spouses are affected by work and family stressors that impede the satisfying balance of work and family (Portner, 1983).

Closer review of the items comprising the congregational expectations scale indicates that items that interfere with the marital functioning of couples were most critical. For example, the most discriminating item associated with congregational expectations reads, "My spouse is expected to participate in most every church event, even though other members are not expected to participate." For clergy who have wives involved in their own careers as well as family demands, this might mean that congregational expectations force the clergy person and his spouse to renegotiate continuously resources (e.g., time schedules, role demands).

In terms of conventionalization, marital satisfaction was predicted by the variable. It might be that this occupational population is more susceptible to problems of conventionalization. Clergy have been suspected of overtly positive attitudes and evaluations (Gavin, 1991). The definitive etiology of this mindset is unknown, but may be

reflective of the clergy person's seminary training, personal need to present themselves as a "model," or even the congregation's need to idealize what a "model marriage" should be like. Although conventionalization was a significant predictor of marital satisfaction, when more conventionalizing subjects were removed from the analysis, the predictive model did not change. Thus, it does seem that conventionalization is a characteristic of this sample and should be addressed methodologically in studies of clergy professionals. However, it should not necessarily be assumed as always differentiating clergy.

In terms of the sociodemographic variables and their predictive for marital satisfaction, a number of interpretations can be made. Church size and length of marriage were positively related to marital satisfaction; whereas, educational level and number of moves were inversely related. In terms of the church-size variable, it seems that increases in the size of the church might influence marital satisfaction by providing additional resources like larger administrative staffs and laity for delegating responsibilities, or "psychological ownership" release (e.g., members assume that the pastor is so busy taking care of the larger congregation) from the congregation to allow more effective functioning as a couple. As discussed earlier, these couples had a length of marriage likely to be associated with more economic

resources, children being less dependent, and greater couple companionship (Brubaker, 1990).

In terms of educational level, it seems that decreases in education affect levels of marital satisfaction. Education has been defined by McCubbin and Patterson (1983) as a family adaptive resource at individual level that facilitates one in developing realistic perceptions of stress and contributing to problem-solving skills. In contrast, in the present study educational level was inversely predictive to marital satisfaction. One possible explanation for this atypical finding might be the perceptions of clergy and their spouses as they were asked to compare their financial situation with others similarly educated and qualified professionals in their community. Only one out of five expressed equitable or better comparisons. No doubt clergy as professionals have spent numerous years in Bible college and seminary preparation only to discover that economic resources are limited in the professional work place.

Finally, in terms of number of moves since entering the ministry, it seems that the greater the number of moves the lower the level of marital satisfaction. This finding seems to reinforce the notion that frequent moving does perhaps contribute to the "mobility syndrome" described by Anderson and Stark (1988). Yet, mobility was not a significant predictor in the regression analysis of external stressors as predictors of marital satisfaction.

Although these couples have indicated a history of moving, the greatest percentage of this group reported that they had been where they are currently for longer than four years. It would seem that these couples have been in their current situation long enough to have overcome some of the more immediate stressors associated with mobility. Yet in a broader view of their history of mobility, the cumulative pile-up effects of the disruptions of mobility may adversely affect marital satisfaction.

In brief summary, findings indicated that clergy and their spouses seemed to have negotiated together the arduous task of managing and adapting to work/family stressor demands of the clergy occupation enabling them to enjoy relatively satisfying marriages. However, because of sampling considerations it may be that the picture of clergy marriages portrayed may in some respects be "the best it can be."

Implications for Research

Implications for research can be developed from this study. First is the issue of the nonnormalization problems found with the KMS. The magnitude of this problem with the KMS was notable with this type of population who may be more prone to respond in a socially desirable manner than other populations. While it is understood that instruments assessing global satisfaction inherently possess problems of nonnormality, researchers using such instruments should

be cautious in working with homogeneous samples since this situation compounds further the lack of variation needed to achieve normality of data. It does seem, however, that when researchers have encountered these problems, that data transformations are viable alternatives for normalizing data. However, such transformations artificially spread the data to a normal distribution. The reality may be that homogeneity is hard to avoid because of self-selection bias in studies of marital satisfaction.

Second, the issue of marital conventionalization for this sample deserves discussion. As a group, this sample does seem to differ slightly on marital conventionalization from other groups. As noted earlier, items that were most discriminating in other studies were least discriminating in this study. However, when direct relationships were examined between marital conventionalization and the criterion variable of marital satisfaction, there were indications that this group is within the norms of earlier research by Schuum et al. (1981, 1983b) who found correlations ranging from $r=.41$ ($p< .001$) to $r=.53$ ($p<.001$). Regarding Schuum's et al. (1981) assertion that conventionalization concerns have been overstated, for this group the concerns seem to need reexamination. Questions about clergy as professionals have been raised concerning their "overly rosy" psychological perceptions of the ministry and life in general (Gavin, 1991). Little is known about the nature and etiology (e.g., self or other induced)

of these questions, thereby seeming to raise doubts about the accuracy of clergy respondents. A noteworthy finding in this study was that husbands and wives were similar in terms of their conventionalization. Even though conventionalization was a significant predictor variable, when more conventionalizing subjects were removed, the predictive model did not change. It appears at least for the sample in the present study, that conventionalization was not a differentiating variable in terms of predictors of marital satisfaction.

Third, the CFLI in its first field test has been shown to be reliable as a scale and reliable in assessing stressor domains of clergy and their spouses. Its reliability in this study warrants further usage in clergy research as both a dependent and independent variable. Broader possibilities for the CFLI might include experimentation in counseling and therapy with clergy couples.

Future research endeavors will include instruments found in the broader Clergy Family Project that examine clergy couple's responses to the support services being offered to them by their denomination, family functioning, emotional well-being, among others.

Implications for Practice

This study does lend credibility to the concerns expressed by some for clergy to receive support programs at

the congregational and denominational level (Morris and Blanton, 1992). As stated earlier, congregations and denominations do perceive that clergy and their spouses are struggling with the demands of the professional ministry. Intervention (e.g., enrichment seminars designed to address marital, parental, self-esteem, and life-span issues) and therapeutic (e.g., counseling or therapy) programs that are respected and trusted should be made available to clergy at the congregational and denominational levels. It seems apparent from this study that if we really believe that the marriages of clergy and their spouses are no different from other marriages, then preventing accessibility to services that would facilitate their personal and interpersonal functioning seems unrealistic. Furthermore, it seems unethical, as clergy have indicated that they look to their spouses and to other colleagues for assistance in times of crisis (Mills and Koval, 1971).

Such programs and interventions need to address directly the impact of congregational expectations on clergy marriages. The aggregate impact (e.g., combination of individual members' expectations with expectations of the congregation as a whole) is enormously taxing physically, economically, emotionally, socially, and spiritually for clergy. Few occupations have so many "bosses" overseeing and evaluating performance levels. For example, the toll of stress-related illness is found in the high numbers of medical claims paid by insurance companies

each year (Whittemore, 1991). The educational goal of prevention and intervention programs should facilitate the congregation's awareness and understanding of the importance of specialized care needed by the clergy family as they serve in their professional and familial roles (Morris and Blanton, 1992). Whittemore (1991) has recommended that support programs should include opportunities for clergy to receive "positive" feedback, a group to monitor the quality of life for the pastor's family, encouraging vacations and sabbaticals for continued education, and the "full participation" of all the congregation's members in the ministry of the church and to the clergy family. Morris and Blanton (1992) has suggested that congregational efforts of this nature will be "reciprocally beneficial" to the congregation and the clergy family. The congregation is rewarded through the health and happiness of the minister, while the minister enjoys full freedom to dedicate him/herself to the important ministry of the congregation.

Limitations of the Study

The response rate for the sample in this study seemed unusually low. A review of some of the sociodemographic variables reported by the group indicates that the sample could be characterized as homogeneous in age, marital length, number of children, income, education, ministerial status, and ministerial career length. Self-selection bias

seems to be present in the study. The influence of self-selection bias in this sample, as discussed earlier, may be reflective of couples who are indeed satisfied and proud of their marriages. It may also reflect couples who were experiencing lower stress (e.g., having less time constraints and could complete the survey, or felt confident that their surveys would be kept confidential) and, therefore, agreed to participate. Regardless of the offered reasons, there does seem to be a sampling bias that may have contributed to some of the results in the multiple regression models. As a group, there seem to be slight differences only in a few of the predictor variables when comparing them to previous research results. With regards to these points it seems important to review some of the more important characteristics that have been learned from this sample of clergy and their spouses.

Thus, the sample for this study does create questions about the generalizability of these findings for all clergy marriages. Due to the self-selection process that produced a homogeneous sample, it seems apparent that findings from this study should be restricted to a cohort of ordained clergy who are mid-career, mid-life span, married to their first wife, with at least one child living at home.

Furthermore, this study like those that utilize self-report methodologies, suffers from limitations that might be overcome through methods that employed observation or interviewing formats. Certainly the depth of information

about clergy marriages would be greater if interviews were conducted with clergy and their spouses. Hopefully, more qualitative studies of clergy marriages will occur.

Summary

In summary, this study examined the predictive power of a model containing five stressors (e.g., mobility, compensation, family boundaries, expectations, and social support), marital conventionalization, and gender on clergy marital satisfaction. It was found that the model was significant in predicting marital satisfaction. Both marital conventionalization and congregational expectations, were significant contributors to the model. When conventionalization was controlled for by removing subjects on the most discriminating item, the model remained unchanged. Issues of self-selection bias in the sample affected the study and were addressed methodologically. The first field test of the CFLI indicated that the instrument was reliable as a scale and with reliable stressor domains.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. (1984). Ministry related stress survey. Leadership, 5(1), 95-96.
- Alexander, C. (November, 1980). The interface of marriage and ministry: A survey of conference directors of pastoral care. Paper presented to The Consultation on Clergy Marriage, Lake Junalska, N.C.
- Anderson, C. & Stark, C. (1988). Psychosocial problems of job relocation: Preventive roles in industry. Social Work, 33(1), 38-41.
- Antovosky, A. (1979). Health, stress, and coping. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Baker, D. (1989). Peer support: An intervention program for minister's wives. The Journal of Pastoral Care, 43(1), 16-24.
- Baker, D. & Scott, J. (1992). Predictors of wellbeing among pastor's wives: A comparison with nonclergy wives. The Journal of Pastoral Care, 46(1), 33-43.
- Barber, S. (1985). Comparing the marital satisfaction of clergy and lay couples. The Journal of Pastoral Counseling, 19(Fall/Winter), 77-88.
- Blackbird, T. & Wright, P. (1985). Pastors' friendships, Part 1: Project overview and an exploration of the pedestal effect. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 13(4), 274-283.
- Blackmon, R. (1984). The hazards of the ministry. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Graduate School of Psychology, Fuller Theological Seminary, 1984.
- Blanton, P., Morris, L., & Anderson, D. (1990). The development of a questionnaire to measure stress in clergy families. Paper presented at the 1990 National Council on Family Relations, Seattle, Washington.
- Blizzard, (April 25, 1956). The minister's dilemma. The Christian Century, 508-510.
- Bloom, B. (1985). A factor analysis of self-report measures of family functioning. Family Process, 24, 225-239.

- Bochini, M. (1991). Discussion: Clergywomen and stress. Psychotherapy in Private Practice, 8(4), 147-151.
- Bomberger, H. (1974). The parsonage: A way of christian family living. Lutheran Quarterly, 26, 58-63.
- Bohn, R. (1975a). Does the ministry pay? The Christian Ministry, 6(1), 29-32.
- Bonn, R. (1975b). Moonlighting clergy. The Christian Ministry, 6(5), 4-21.
- Boss, P. (1980). Family stress management. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publication.
- Bowen, M. (1978). Family therapy in clinical practice. New York: Jason Aronson.
- Brofenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. American Psychologist, 32, 513-530.
- Brown, S. (1982). Clergy divorce and remarriage. Pastoral Psychology, 30(3), 187-197.
- Brubaker, T. (1990). Families in later life: A burgeoning research area. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52(4), 959-981.
- Brushaber, G. (February 11, 1991). The coming clergy dearth. Christianity Today, 35, p. 14.
- Campbell, D. (1987). The minister's own family. Austin Seminary Bulletin, 102, 21-38.
- Chikes, T. (1968). Partners in the basic parish. Pastoral Psychology, 19(188), 8-14.
- Coates, C. & Kistler, R. (1965). Role dilemmas of protestant clergymen in a metropolitan community. The Review of Religious Research, 6(3), 147-152.
- Cobb, S. (1976). Social support as a moderator of life stress. Psychosomatic Medicine, 38(5), 300-314.
- Cohen, J. & Cohen, P. (1983). Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.
- Croskery, B. (1977). The wife's view of parish life. The Christian Ministry, 8(1), 10-13.

- Crow, K. (1990). National association of evangelicals task force on the family survey of ministers' wives. Paper presented to the National Association of Evangelicals.
- DeLuca, J. (1980). The holy crossfire: Diagnosis of a pastor's position. Pastoral Psychology, 28(4), 233-242.
- Denton, W. (1961). Role attitudes of the minister's wife. Pastoral Psychology, 12(119), 17-23.
- Douglas, W. (1965). Ministers' wives. New York: Harper and Row.
- Edmonds, V. (1967). Marital conventionalization: Definition and measurement. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 29, 681-688.
- Fichter, J. (1984). The myth of clergy burnout. Sociological Analysis, 45(4), 373-382.
- Fincham, F. & Bradbury, T. (1987). The assessment of marital quality: Toward a methodological and conceptual refinement. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 49, 31-49.
- Friedman, E. (1985). Generation to generation. New York: Guilford Press.
- Gavin, E. (1991). Discussion: Reflections of clergypersons and stress. Psychotherapy in private practice, 8(4), 141-146.
- Gleason, J. (1977). Perception of stress among clergy and their spouses. The Journal of Pastoral Care, 31(4), 248-251.
- Glenn, N. (1990). Quantitative research on marital quality in the 1980's: A critical review. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52(4), 818-831.
- Goodling, R. & Smith, C. (1983). Clergy divorce: A survey of issues and emerging ecclesiastical structures. The Journal of Pastoral Care, 37(4), 277-291.
- Grotevant, H. & Carlson, C. (1989). Family Assessment: A Guide to Methods & Measures. New York: Guilford Press.
- Grover, K., Paff-Bergen, L., Russell, C., & Schuum, W. (1984). The Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale: A further brief report. Psychological Reports, 54, 629-630.

- Hartley, S. & Taylor, M. (1977). Religious beliefs of clergy wives. The Review of Religious Research, 19, 63-73.
- Hartley, S. (1978). Marital satisfaction among clergy wives. The Review of Religious Research, 19, 178-191.
- Herin, M. (Ed.). (1980). The interface of marriage and the ministry: Findings of the consultation on clergy marriages. (Available from the Intentional Growth Center, Lake Junalska, NC).
- Hiltner, S. (1958). Divorced ministers. Pastoral Psychology, 9(87), 18-24.
- Hiltner, S. (1965). The psychology of pastoral economics. Pastoral Psychology, 16(152), 14-22.
- Hiltner, S. (1971). The minister in the human circus. Pastoral Psychology, 22(219), 13-20.
- Holmes, T. & Rahe, R. (1967). The social readjustment rating scale. Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 11, 213-218.
- Houts, D. (1977). Pastoral care for pastors: Toward a church strategy. Pastoral Psychology, 25(3), 186-196.
- Houts, D. (1982). Marriage enrichment for clergy couples. Pastoral Psychology, 30(3), 141-150.
- Howe, R. (1964). Problems of communication between clergy and laity. Pastoral Psychology, 15(149), 21-26.
- Hsieh, T. & Rugg, E. (1983). Coping patterns of ministers' wives. Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 2, 73-82.
- Hulme, W. (1985). Managing stress in ministry. San Francisco: Harper and Row.
- Hunt, R. (1978). Clergy families under stress. Paper presented at the Seminar on Clergy Marriage and Divorce, United Methodist Church, Oklahoma City, OK.
- Hutchinson, I. & Hutchinson, K. (1979). The impact of divorce upon clergy career mobility. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41(4), 847-855.
- Jacquet, C. (1990). Yearbook of American & Canadian churches. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Jud, G., Mills, E., & Burch, G. (1970). Ex-Pastors: Why men leave the parish ministry. Philadelphia: Pilgrim Press.

- Kantor, D. & Lehr, W. (1976). Inside the family. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kieren, D. & Munro, B. (1988). Handling greedy clergy roles: A dual clergy example. Pastoral Psychology, 36(4), 239-248.
- Kieren, D. & Munro, B. (1989). The support gap for dual clergy couples. Pastoral Psychology, 37(3), 165-171.
- King, W. (1988). The clergy family project of the diocese of Alabama. Birmingham, AL: The Episcopal Diocese of Alabama.
- Klink, T. (1969). The ministry as career and crisis. Pastoral Psychology, 20(195), 13-19.
- Landis, B. (1965). Incomes of ministers. Pastoral Psychology, 16(152), 9-13.
- LaVee, Y, McCubbin, H., & Olson, D. (1987). The effect of stressful life events and transitions on family functioning and well-being. The Journal of Marriage and the Family, 49(4), 857-873.
- Lavender, L. (1983). The cry too. New York: Hawthorne Books.
- Lee, C. (1986). The social and psychological dynamics of the minister's family: An ecological model for research. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, School of Theology, Fuller Theological Seminary.
- Lee, C. & Balswick, J. (1989). Life in a Glass House. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- London, H. & Allen, K. (1986). Family versus career responsibilities. Marriage and Family Review, 9(3/4), 199-208.
- Mace, D. & Mace, V. (1980). What's Happening to Clergy Marriages? Nashville: Abingdon.
- Mace, D. & Mace, V. (1982). Marital enrichment for clergy couples. Pastoral Psychology, 30(3), 151-159.
- Marsh, J. (1986). Burnout in the pastoral ministry. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee.
- McCubbin, H. & Patterson, J. (1983). The family stress process: The double ABC-X model of adjustment and adaptation. Marriage and Family Review, 6(1/2), 7-37.

- McGinnis, T. (1969). Clergymen in conflict. Pastoral Psychology, 20(197), 13-20.
- Mills, E. & Koval, J. (1971). Stress in the ministry. Washington, DC: Ministry Studies Board.
- Mitchell, R. (1965). When ministers and their parishioners have different social class positions. The Review of Religious Research, 7(1), 28-41.
- Mitchell, S., Newell, G., & Schuum, W. (1983). Test-retest reliability of the Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale. Psychological Reports, 53, 545-546.
- Morgan, R. (1982). Any balm in Gilead for divorced clergy? The Christian Ministry, 13(3), 24-28.
- Morgan, R. (1987). What's being done for divorced clergy? The Christian Ministry, 18(1), 24-25.
- Morris, L. & Blanton, P. (1992). Denominational perceptions of stress and the provision of support services for clergy families. Unpublished predoctoral research, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn.
- Nauss, A. (1974). The relations of pastoral mobility to effectiveness. The Review of Religious Research, 15 (2), 80-86.
- Nelson, H. & Everett, R. (1976). Impact of church size on clergy role and career. The Review of Religious Research, 18(1), 62-73.
- Niswander, B. (1982). Clergy wives of a new generation. Pastoral Psychology, 30(3), 160-169.
- Norusis, M. (1990). SPSS introductory statistics guide. Chicago: SPSS, Inc.
- Noyce, G. (1980). The tensions of our calling. The Christian Ministry, 11(5), 18-21.
- Oates, W. (1965). The pastor's money: Selfhood and ambiguity. Pastoral Psychology, 16(152), 23-31.
- Oates, W. (1986). Stress perception and management in the pastor's life and work. Review and Expositor, 83(4), 573-585.
- Oden, M. (1977). Updating the minister's wife. The Christian Ministry, 8(1), 1977.

- Oden, M. (April 20, 1988). Stress and purpose: Clergy spouses today. The Christian Century, 402-404.
- Olson, D. & McCubbin, H. (1983). Families what makes them work. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Pauck, W. (1983). The ministry in the time of the continental reformation. In H. Richard Niehbuhr and Daniel D. Williams (Eds.), The Ministry in Historical Perspective. San Francisco: Harper and Row.
- Platt, N. & Moss, D. (1976). Self-perceptive dispositions of episcopal clergy wives. Journal of Religion and Health, 15(3), 191-209.
- Portner, J. (1983). Work and family: Achieving a balance. In H.I. McCubbin & C.R. Figley (Eds.), Stress and the family: Vol. 1. Coping with normative transitions. (p. 163-177). New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Presnell, W. (1977). The minister's own marriage. Pastoral Psychology, 25(4), 272-281.
- Rankin, R. (1960). The ministerial calling and the minister's wife. Pastoral Psychology, 8(1), 16-22.
- Rayburn, C. (1991). Clergy couples and stress: Clergy married to clergy. Psychotherapy in Private Practice, 8(4), 127-130.
- Rediger, L. (1971). Mirages in the pastor's marriage. The Christian Ministry, 2(4), 7-9.
- Reilly, M. (1975). Perceptions of the priest role. Sociological Analysis, 36(4), 347-356.
- Religious News Service. (November 9, 1984). Experts say clergy stress doesn't have to result in burnout. Christianity Today, 71-72.
- Richmond, L. (1991). Stress and single clergy women. Psychotherapy in Private Practice, 8(4), 119-125.
- Richmond, L., Raymond, C., & Rogers, L. (1985). Clergymen, clergywomen, and their spouses: Stress in professional religious families. Journal of Career Development, 12(1), 81-86.
- Sabatelli, R. (1988). Measurement issues in marital research: A review and critique of contemporary survey instruments. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 50(4), 891-915.

- Scanzoni, J. (1965a). A model for the analysis of role conflict within the clergy marriage. The Family Life Coordinator, 14(1), 3-6.
- Scanzoni, J. (1965b). Resolution of occupational-conjugal role conflict in clergy marriages. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 27(3), 396-402.
- Scherer, R. (1965). New light on ministerial compensation. Pastoral Psychology, 16(155), 45-52.
- Scheuer, G. & Scheuer, C. (1981). A "normal" life--The clergy family. The Christian Ministry, 12(3), 5-9.
- Schuum, W., Anderson, S., Benigas, J., McCutchen, M., Griffen, C., Morris, J., & Race, G. (1985). Criterion-related validity of the Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale. Psychological Reports, 55, 719-722.
- Schuum, W., Bollman, S., & Jurich, A. (1982). The "marital conventionalization" argument: Implications for the study of religiosity and marital satisfaction. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 10, 236-241.
- Schuum, W., Hess, J., Bollman, S., & Jurich, A. (1981). Marital conventionalization revisited. Psychological Reports, 49, 607-615.
- Schuum, W., Nichols, C., Schectman, K., & Grigsby, C. (1983a). Characteristics of responses to the marital satisfaction scale by a sample of 84 married mothers. Psychological Reports, 53, 567-572.
- Schuum, W., Paff-Bergen, L., Hatch, R., Obiorah, F., Copeland, J., Meens, L., & Bugaighis, M. (1986). Concurrent and discriminant validity of the Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48, 381-387.
- Schuum, W., Scanlon, E., Crow, C., Green, D., & Buckler, D. (1983b). Characteristics of the Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale in a sample of 79 married couples. Psychological Reports, 53, 583-588.
- Seamands, D. & Seamands, H. (1981). The story of raising a pastoral family. Leadership, 2, Fall, 16-28.
- Schectman, K., Bergen, M., Schuum, W., & Bugaighis, M. (1985). Characteristics of the Kansas marital satisfaction scale among female participants in community childbirth education classes. Psychological Reports, 56, 537-538.

- Scheuer, G. & Scheuer, C. (1981). A "normal" life--The clergy family. The Christian Ministry, 12(2), 5-9.
- Sinclair, D. (1982). Grace, drosophilia, rover, and us. The Christian Ministry, 13(6), 13-15.
- Slack, S. (1979). Clergy divorce. The Christian Ministry, 10(1), 22-26.
- Smith, L. (1953). The clergy: Authority structure, ideology, migration. American Sociological Review, 18(3), 242-247.
- Spanier, G. & Cole, C. (1976). Toward clarification and investigation of marital adjustment. International Journal of Sociology of the Family, 6(Spring), 121-146.
- Spanier, G. & Lewis, R. (1980). Marital quality: A review of the seventies. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42(4), 825-839.
- Spanier, G. & Thompson, L. (1984). Parting: The aftermath of separation and divorce. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- SPSS-X users guide. (1988). 3rd Edition. Chicago: SPSS Inc.
- Stevenson, R. (1982). Children of the parsonage. Pastoral Psychology, 30(3), 179-186.
- Thomas, D. & Cornwall, M. (1990). Religion and family in the 1980s: Discovery and development. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52, 983-992.
- Thompson, L. & Walker, A. (1989). Gender in families: Women and men in marriage, work, and parenthood. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51(4), 845-872.
- Warner, J. & Carter, J. (1984). Loneliness, marital adjustment, and burnout in pastoral and lay persons. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 12(2), 125-131.
- Whittemore, H. (April 14, 1991). Ministers under stress. Parade Magazine, pp.4-6.
- Whybrew, L. (1980). Minister, wife, and church: Unlocking the triangles. Washington, DC: Alban Institute Publication.
- Wright, P. & Blackbird, T. (1986). Pastors' friendships, Part 2: The impact of congregational norms. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 14(1), 29-41.

Wynn, J. (1960). Consider the children. Pastoral Psychology, 11(106), 23-26.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

July 23, 1992

Dear Participant:

The names of you and your spouse were obtained from the national governance structure of your denomination which is assisting us in identifying individuals to participate in a research project we are conducting. All of us working on this project have been a part of clergy families and we are keenly aware of the need for a better understanding of some of the unique aspects of this family situation. We are interested in seeing how clergy and their spouses handle work and family demands. Your participation in this project may help establish a base of information that could be used to address more effectively the needs of clergy families. We will send questionnaires for each of you to complete individually and return to us in postage paid envelopes. Your responses will not be shared with anyone except in group summary data. Filling out the questionnaire will take about an hour of your time. Please return the enclosed postcard indicating whether or not you would like further information about the project if your family meets the requirements for participation.

Requirements for your family's participation are as follows:

- 1) a spouse is full time in a pastorate
- 2) you are currently married
- 3) you have at least one child under age 18 living at home

Sincerely,

Priscilla Blanton, Ed.D.
Professor

Lane Morris, M. Div.
Ph.D Student

Don Anderson, M. Div.
Ph.D Student

The study you have been asked to participate in focuses on how clergy and their spouses deal with a variety of demands from both work and family arenas. Having more information of this nature would help us better address the needs of families such as yours. We are hoping you will agree to participate in this research project.

Anticipated benefits for you may involve a better understanding of yourself and your spouse's perceptions of your work/family situation. We would like for you to understand our commitment to the following safeguards in your interest:

1. The confidentiality of information about you will be maintained by the use of code numbers instead of names on all materials. The data gathered will be reported in summary form with no reference to you personally. Individual data and participant identities will not be shared with anyone.
2. You are free to withdraw your consent and to discontinue participation in this study at any time or to elect not to participate without penalty.
3. Answers to any questions you may have about the procedures of this study are available at any time.
Contact:

Dr. Priscilla White Blanton
Department of Child and Family Studies
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville
115 Jessie Harris Building
Knoxville, TN 37996-1900
Phone: (615) 974-5316

4. We do not anticipate that participation in our project will involve any risks for you, but if responding to the questionnaire creates concern for you and/or your spouse, we will be happy to refer you to a trained professional. In addition to the insight you may gain from reflecting on yourself and your family, the group results from this study may be of interest to you and will be available to you upon your request.
5. It probably will take about one (1) hour of your time to complete the questionnaire.

YOUR SIGNATURE INDICATES THAT YOU HAVE READ THIS FORM AND, ON THE BASIS OF INFORMED CONSENT, AGREE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY.

Signature

Date

APPENDIX B

CLERGY FAMILY LIFE INVENTORY

Section 1

Please write the appropriate response in the blank to the left of the item number.

Instructions:

For each of the following items please indicate the extent of the stress created for your family by the situation described using the following scale:

1	2	3	4
creates no stress	creates mild stress	creates moderate stress	creates severe stress

- 1 - creates no stress for our family
- 2 - creates mild stress for our family
- 3 - creates moderate stress for our family
- 4 - creates severe stress for our family

- _____ 1. Moving makes it very difficult to manage effectively the career involvement of both husband and wife.
- _____ 2. It is difficult to make it through each month without worrying whether or not our financial resources will be adequate for our needs.
- _____ 3. Our family is expected never to need outside professional intervention like therapy or counseling.
- _____ 4. Our congregation's expectations for our children are unrealistically high.
- _____ 5. Most of our social activities are out of a sense of obligation rather than choice.
- _____ 6. Our family has a public lifestyle that is different from our private lifestyle.
- _____ 7. Our congregation expects the needs of our family to be secondary to their needs.
- _____ 8. My spouse's expectations for how our family should function are too high.
- _____ 9. Our family's financial situation requires more than the salary received from the church.
- _____ 10. My spouse is expected to participate in most every church event even though our members are not always expected to participate.

- _____ 11. Our family is expected by our congregation to be a "model family."
- _____ 12. My expectations for how our family functions are too high.
- _____ 13. My compensation package does not provide adequate periods of paid vacation.
- _____ 14. We do not have a network of other clergy families with whom we can really be open.
- _____ 15. I feel we are caught in a tug-of-war between "church" and "family."
- _____ 16. Our family does not have enough privacy.
- _____ 17. It is difficult to maintain friendships that were made in former pastorates.
- _____ 18. I am concerned about the level of retirement benefits we will have in the later years.
- _____ 19. Our family's inability to save money on a regular basis is a worry for me.
- _____ 20. Our family does not have affordable and comprehensive medical coverage.
- _____ 21. Our congregation feels our marriage should be a role model for them to look to in shaping their own marital relationships.
- _____ 22. Our congregation does not accept our family's expressions of frustration and dissatisfaction.
- _____ 23. It is difficult for us to provide the same standard of living for our children as most of their peers have.
- _____ 24. Clergy salaries in our organization simply do not provide a strong enough financial base for our family.
- _____ 25. Our family resents having congregational input on how our house is decorated and/or maintained.
- _____ 26. Congregation members have a right to know what goes on in our family.
- _____ 27. Our family resents congregational influences on our decision-making.
- _____ 28. We find it difficult to establish times for our marital relationship without having interruptions related to the needs of our children.
- _____ 29. It is difficult to balance church and family considerations in making decisions about changing pastorates.
- _____ 30. Our congregation disrupts days off and vacations for reasons other than emergencies.
- _____ 31. Selflessness is an important aspect of ministering effectively to a congregation.
- _____ 32. The leadership of my denomination does not respond in a positive manner to evidence of human failings or family problems in clergy families.
- _____ 33. Planning times away from our congregation for vacations is problematic if congregational needs arise.

- ___ 34. Our family does not feel close to our denomination's leadership.
- ___ 35. There are not enough hours in the week to handle all our responsibilities and still have enough leisure time together as a family.
- ___ 36. Our children have difficulty adjusting to new people and new situations when we move.
- ___ 37. I have very few people I can confide in about the really important matters in my life.
- ___ 38. When our family changes pastorates, we find it difficult to make new friends.
- ___ 39. Our family is upset when faced with the possibility of moving.
- ___ 40. The lack of equity acquired in owning a house is a concern for our family.
- ___ 41. The moves our family has made have created financial concerns for us.
- ___ 42. Moves are difficult to cope with because they are the result of decisions external to our family.
- ___ 43. The free time most families have during the week are times when congregational demands interfere with our family's time together.
- ___ 44. We have moved because at times we did not feel a sense of belonging to the community.
- ___ 45. Our family is living in a "fish bowl."
- ___ 46. Our family does not get to spend enough time with our relatives.
- ___ 47. There are not enough relationships in our lives where we feel we can be ourselves.
- ___ 48. Our family stays so busy that it is hard to find time for friends to visit with us.
- ___ 49. We find it difficult to establish times for our marital relationship without having interruptions related to the needs of our congregation.
- ___ 50. It is difficult to maintain friendships with congregation members because of the complications of being both friend and minister or minister's spouse.
- ___ 51. There are too few relationships in my life that make me feel "emotionally connected" with others.
- ___ 52. Any unexpected financial demand plays havoc with our family's financial situation.
- ___ 53. I am concerned about how well we will manage financially to provide college educations for our children.

KANSAS MARITAL SATISFACTION SCALE

Section 5

1) Instructions:

Please respond to the following items using the following scale:

- 1 - extremely dissatisfied
- 2 - very dissatisfied
- 3 - somewhat dissatisfied
- 4 - mixed
- 5 - somewhat satisfied
- 6 - very satisfied
- 7 - extremely satisfied

Please write the appropriate response in the blank to the left of the item number.

- _____ 1. How satisfied are you with your marriage?
- _____ 2. How satisfied are you with your husband/wife as a spouse?
- _____ 3. How satisfied are you with your relationship with your husband/wife?

EDMOND'S MARITAL CONVENTIONALIZATION SCALE

Section 6

Please respond to the following items in terms of whether they are true or false for you.

If true, place a "T" in the blank to the left of the item.
If false, place an "F" in the blank to the left of the item.

- _____ 1. My marriage could be happier than it is.
- _____ 2. My husband/wife and I get angry with each other.
- _____ 3. I have never regretted my marriage, not even for a moment.
- _____ 4. My husband/wife and I sometimes get on each other's nerves.
- _____ 5. My marriage is not a perfect success.
- _____ 6. There are some things about my husband/wife that I do not like.
- _____ 7. Every new thing I have learned about my husband/wife has pleased me.
- _____ 8. My husband/wife has all of the qualities I've always wanted in a husband/wife.
- _____ 9. There are times when my husband/wife does things that make me unhappy.
- _____ 10. My marriage is a very happy one.
- _____ 11. I have known little happiness in my marriage.
- _____ 12. I believe our marriage is reasonably happy.

Clergy Persons Personal History Inventory

1. Age: _____
2. Gender: _____ Male _____ Female
3. How would you describe your ethnic or racial background? (optional)
 1. _____ White/American, Caucasian
 2. _____ Black American
 3. _____ Native American, Indian
 4. _____ Latin American, Hispanic
 5. _____ Oriental American, Asian Pacific
4. Present Marital Status:

1. _____ Single	5. _____ Married and Separated
2. _____ Married	6. _____ Widowed and Remarried
3. _____ Widowed	7. _____ Divorced and Remarried
4. _____ Divorce	8. Other (specify) _____
5. Length of present marital status: _____
6. Number of children currently living in your household:

1. _____ Daughters	Ages: _____
2. _____ Sons	Ages: _____
7. Highest degree earned:

1. _____ Elementary school	(grades K-5)
2. _____ Junior High	(grades 6-8)
3. _____ High School	(grades 9-12)
4. _____ Bachelors	
5. _____ Masters	
6. _____ Doctorate	
7. _____ Other	_____
8. What is your denominational affiliation? (Please give the full name of your denomination) _____
9. What is your specific position in the church you are now serving?

1. _____ Senior pastor
2. _____ Associate pastor
3. _____ Assistant pastor
4. Other (please specify) _____
10. On the average, how many hours a week do you work on ministerial responsibilities? _____
11. Which of the following best describes your non-ministerial or secular employment status?

1. _____ No secular employment
2. _____ part time
3. _____ full time
4. _____ Other
12. If secularly employed, how many hours do you work per week on this job? _____

13. What is your personal pre-tax income? Please do not count your spouse's income, but do include your other income allowances (i.e., car allowance, house allowance, social security allowance).
1. _____ less than \$5,000
 2. _____ \$5,000 to \$7,499
 3. _____ \$7,500 to \$9,999
 4. _____ \$10,000 to \$14,999
 5. _____ \$15,000 to \$19,999
 6. _____ \$20,000 to \$24,999
 7. _____ \$25,000 to \$34,999
 8. _____ \$35,000 to \$49,999
 9. _____ \$50,000 or more
14. What is the size of your church's active membership?
- | | |
|---------------------|------------------------|
| 1. _____ 1-49 | 11. _____ 1500-2000 |
| 2. _____ 50-99 | 12. _____ 2000-2499 |
| 3. _____ 100-149 | 13. _____ 2500-2999 |
| 4. _____ 150-199 | 14. _____ 3000-3499 |
| 5. _____ 200-249 | 15. _____ 3500-3999 |
| 6. _____ 250-299 | 16. _____ 4000-4999 |
| 7. _____ 300-499 | 17. _____ 5000-5999 |
| 8. _____ 500-749 | 18. _____ 6000-6999 |
| 9. _____ 750-999 | 19. _____ 7000-7999 |
| 10. _____ 1000-1499 | 20. _____ 8000 or more |
15. How many years have you been employed in the ministry?
16. How many years have you been in ministry at this church?
17. How many moves have you made since entering the ministry?
- | | |
|--------------|---------------------|
| 1. _____ 0-2 | 5. _____ 9-10 |
| 2. _____ 3-4 | 6. _____ 11-15 |
| 3. _____ 5-6 | 7. _____ 16-20 |
| 4. _____ 7-8 | 8. _____ 21 or more |

18. Which of the following best describes your living arrangements?

1. _____ Church owned home; one block or less from church
2. _____ Church owned home; more than one block from church
3. _____ Our own apartment; one block or less from church
4. _____ Our own apartment; more than one block from church
5. _____ Our own home; one block or less from church
6. _____ Our own home; more than one block from church
7. _____ Other (please specify) _____

19. Do you feel that you have adequate:

- | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------|----------|
| 1. Life insurance? | _____ Yes | _____ No |
| 2. Health/Medical insurance? | _____ Yes | _____ No |
| 3. Savings? | _____ Yes | _____ No |
| 4. Retirement/Pension plans? | _____ Yes | _____ No |

20. Using the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5
much better	somewhat better	comparable	somewhat worse	much worse

which of the following best describes your overall financial situation in comparison to:

1. _____ The average financial situation of other clergy families in our community (regardless of denominational affiliation)
2. _____ The average financial situation of other clergy families in our denomination
3. _____ The average financial situation of other similarly educated and qualified professionals in your community.

Spouse's Personal History Inventory

1. Age: _____
2. Gender: _____ Male _____ Female
3. How would you describe your ethnic or racial background? (optional)
 1. _____ White/American, Caucasian
 2. _____ Black American
 3. _____ Native American, Indian
 4. _____ Latin American, Hispanic
 5. _____ Oriental American, Asian Pacific
4. Present Marital Status:

1. _____ Single	5. _____ Married and Separated
2. _____ Married	6. _____ Widowed and Remarried
3. _____ Widowed	7. _____ Divorced and Remarried
4. _____ Divorced	8. Other (please specify) _____
5. Length of present marital status: _____
6. Number of children currently living in your household:

1. _____ Daughters	Ages: _____
2. _____ Sons	Ages: _____
7. Highest degree earned:

1. _____ Elementary school	(grades K-5)
2. _____ Junior High	(grades 6-8)
3. _____ High School	(grades 9-12)
4. _____ Bachelors	
5. _____ Masters	
6. _____ Doctorate	
7. _____ Other	
8. What is your denominational affiliation? (Please give the full name of your denomination) _____
9. What is your profession? _____
10. On the average, how many hours a week do you work? _____
11. Which of the following best describes your employment status?
 1. _____ No employment (Please skip to question 16 if not employed.)
 2. _____ part time
 3. _____ full time
 4. _____ Other
12. What is your current employment position or title?

13. In which of the following categories would you say your current job fits? Please choose only one category.
(Circle)

1. Professional, technical, and kindred workers
2. Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm
3. Clerical, sales, and kindred workers
4. Craftspeople, crew managers, and kindred workers
5. Machine operators
6. Service workers, including private household
7. Laborers, except farm and mine
8. Farmers and miners
9. Not applicable

14. If employed, how many hours do you work per week on this job? _____

15. What is your personal pre-tax income? Please do not count your spouse's income, but do include your other income allowances (i.e., car allowance, house allowance, social security allowance).

1. _____ less than \$5,000
2. _____ \$5,000 to \$7,499
3. _____ \$7,500 to \$9,999
4. _____ \$10,000 to \$14,999
5. _____ \$15,000 to \$19,999
6. _____ \$20,000 to \$24,999
7. _____ \$25,000 to \$34,999
8. _____ \$35,000 to \$49,999
9. _____ \$50,000 or more

16. How many years have you been employed? _____

17. What is the size of your church's active membership? _____

- | | |
|---------------------|------------------------|
| 1. _____ 1-49 | 11. _____ 1500-2000 |
| 2. _____ 50-99 | 12. _____ 2000-2499 |
| 3. _____ 100-149 | 13. _____ 2500-2999 |
| 4. _____ 150-199 | 14. _____ 3000-3499 |
| 5. _____ 200-249 | 15. _____ 3500-3999 |
| 6. _____ 250-299 | 16. _____ 4000-4999 |
| 7. _____ 300-499 | 17. _____ 5000-5999 |
| 8. _____ 500-749 | 18. _____ 6000-6999 |
| 9. _____ 750-999 | 19. _____ 7000-7999 |
| 10. _____ 1000-1499 | 20. _____ 8000 or more |

18. How many moves have you made since entering the ministry?

- | | |
|--------------|---------------------|
| 1. _____ 0-2 | 5. _____ 9-10 |
| 2. _____ 3-4 | 6. _____ 11-15 |
| 3. _____ 5-6 | 7. _____ 16-20 |
| 4. _____ 7-8 | 8. _____ 21 or more |

19. Which of the following best describes your living arrangements?

1. _____ Church owned home; one block or less from church
 2. _____ Church owned home; more than one block from church
 3. _____ Our own apartment; one block or less from church
 4. _____ Our own apartment; more than one block from church
 5. _____ Our own home; one block or less from church
 6. _____ Our own home; more than one block from church
 7. _____ Other (please specify) _____
20. Do you feel that you have adequate:
1. Life insurance? _____ Yes _____ No
 2. Health/Medical insurance? _____ Yes _____ No
 3. Savings? _____ Yes _____ No
 4. Retirement/Pension plans? _____ Yes _____ No
21. Using the following scale

1	2	3	4	5
much better	somewhat better	comparable	somewhat worse	much worse

which of the following best describes your overall financial situation in comparison to:

1. _____ The average financial situation of other clergy families in our community (regardless of denominational affiliation)
2. _____ The average financial situation of other clergy families in our denomination
3. _____ The average financial situation of other similarly educated and qualified professionals in your community.

VITA

Michael Lane Morris was born in Anderson, South Carolina, on April 29, 1959. He attended public schools in Cleveland, Tennessee and graduated from Cleveland High School in May 1977. He completed his Bachelor of Science degree in 1981 at Lee College in Cleveland, Tennessee majoring in Biology and Chemistry. Upon graduation he was employed for 3 years by Teledyne Firth Sterling in LaVergne, Tennessee as a project engineer. In 1984, he began Master of Divinity studies at the School of Theology in Cleveland, Tennessee. After graduation in 1987, he married DeVee Harkins and they moved to Fresno, California. During this time, the author served as the Director of Institutional Advancement until 1989. While in California, the couple celebrated the birth of their only child named Michael Chadwick, who was born on October 27, 1988.

In the fall of 1989, the author began Ph.D. studies at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, in the Child and Family Studies Department. During this academic period at the University of Tennessee, the author was awarded the Chancellor's Citation for Academic Achievement and Professional Promise, the Child and Family Studies Departmental Award for Outstanding Teaching as a Graduate Student, was recognized as a College of Human Ecology Dean's Scholar, was inducted as a lifetime member of the

Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society, and was nominated for the National Council on Family Relations Student of the Year Award. The author is a member of the National Council on Family Relations and the American Association of Marriage and Family Therapy.