WOMEN IN THE MINISTRY
PERSONALITY AND BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF A GROUP OF UNITED METHODIST CLERGY AND THEOLOGICAL STUDENTS

By

Martha Orrick

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Psychology

1984

ABSTRACT

WOMEN IN THE MINISTRY

Personality and Background Characteristics of a Group of United Methodist Clergy and Theological Students

By

Martha Orrick

Until recently, professional roles in the Christian church have been heavily sex-typed, with priestly functions reserved for men. Now that the major Protestant denominations have lifted restrictions against their ordination, however, increasing numbers of women are entering the ministry. To find out how these women compare to women in other male-dominated occupations and to findings on male clergy reported in the literature, two groups were administered the Adjective Check List and the Bem Sex-Role Inventory: 114 male and female theological students and 22 professionally employed women ministers. It was predicted that the female subjects would show characteristics traditionally associated with opposing sex roles, such as dominance and nurturance, and that a high proportion of them could be classified as androgynous. These predictions were upheld. Researchers studying male clergy have frequently concluded that they are feminine in orientation. Results for male subjects on the BSRI suggest that they too may be better described as androgynous. Interview data from the clergywomen are presented, reporting their experience as innovators and identifying issues affecting their future. The nature of the ministry is discussed in terms of Bakan's modalities of agency and communion.

For Jim

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Research and writing for this dissertation was done after I left Michigan State and moved to Colorado. Completing a doctoral program under these circumstances, I discovered, requires three things: motivation on the part of the candidate, dependable support back on the campus, and people in the new location who are willing to help when little of their self interest is involved. I had all three.

Initially, my motivation came from my long-standing interest in the topic of ordination for women. It was my fortuitous friendship with the Rev. Lois Strohmeyer which turned my interest into a project. Through her I learned of the numbers--and the calibre--of women entering the United Methodist Ministry, and it was her encouragement and readiness to help with background instruction and introductions which started me off. I soon found out that Lois, for all her hospitality, was not unique. The other clergywomen I met and interviewed were equally helpful. They took time out of busy schedules, welcomed me into their homes, offered me lunch and produce from their gardens, and interviewed me almost as thoroughly as I interviewed them. Relationships are indeed their métier, as I hope I have conveyed in my report. The number of students who were willing to perform a paper-and-pencil task with no reward was also encouraging. Some of them sent notes back with their questionnaires expressing interest in the study and wishing me well. With this kind of response, my energy and motivation grew.

In the course of solving problems away from the resources of MSU I got crucial help from two men whom I came to think of as my shadow committee. Dr. John Spangler, Associate Professor of Pastoral Care and Psychology of Religion at the Iliff School of Theology in Denver, reviewed my proposal and graciously provided a cover letter for the student questionnaires. In addition, he made astute suggestions for improving my approach and gave me access to results from his own surveys of Iliff students over the past decade. Dr. Frederick Keller, Coordinator of Academic Computing at The Colorado College in Colorado Springs, not only made it possible for me to use the college computer for analyzing my data but personally initiated me into the wonders of its use. This represented a considerable contribution of time on his part, for which I am immensely grateful.

At the University, I depended on Suzy Pavick, assistant to the Associate Chairperson, to take care of administrative details which I could not attend to in person. She did this with great good nature and efficiency and thus relieved me of a number of potentially time-consuming tasks.

Then there was my committee. How many candidates for a degree can say of their dissertation defense that they wish it had lasted longer? As a member of both my master's thesis and dissertation committees, Dr. Albert Aniskiewicz has been a steady source of support and quietly incisive questions. Dr. Elaine Donelson was a late addition, and I am only sorry that I didn't get to take greater advantage of her own work on religion and the psychology of women and her ability to challenge my thinking on these subjects. As a student of his, I knew first hand of Dr. Lawrence O'Kelly's wide-ranging knowledge and his undiminished enthusiasm as both teacher and learner. His imminent retirement became one of the spurs for completing this dissertation. I am proud to have had him on my committee and I wish him well in whatever he pursues next.

I am fond of saying that the smartest decision I made in graduate school was to ask Dr. Norman Abeles to be chairman of my master's and doctoral committees. In the course of my training I have worked with him as student, research assistant, supervisee, clinic intern, and degree candidate. He has guided me through the shoals of these endeavors with unfailing acumen, practicality, administrative ability, and good humor, becoming in the process not only my mentor but my professional model. I hope and trust that our association will not end here.

The dedication is to my husband, James Malcolm. Having read by now untold numbers of acknowledgments which close with a tribute to the author's spouse, it gives me great pleasure to write that Jim has not typed manuscripts for me, has never edited my drafts, has offered no critiques of my ideas, and is in no way to be considered a co-author of this work. He has simply stood by during the ten year process of turning myself into a psychologist, accepting my absences, providing encouragement, expressing pride, and offering me the gifts of his affection, his wit, and his talents as a cook. I suppose I could have done it without him, but it wouldn't have been much fun.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

A woman should learn quietly and humbly. Personally, I don't allow women to teach, nor do I ever put them in positions of authority over men--I believe their role is to be receptive.

St. Paul's First Letter
to Timothy, II:11-12
(J.B. Phillips translation)

Sir, a woman's preaching is like a dog's walking on his hinder legs. It is not done well, but you are surprized to find it done at all.

Boswell's Life of Johnson,
1799/1904, p. 309.

An exploration of women's part in the history of religion soon encounters two constants: women usually outnumber men; men exercise the authority. For a long time historians have been preoccupied with the authority, particularly with clerical officialdom: the men who preached and administered the sacraments, expounded theology, and ran the affairs of the larger organized faiths. The preponderance of female communicants has been recognized but seldom discussed, and their subordination has been taken for granted.

James, Women in American
Religion, 1982, p. 1.

CHAPTER I

WOMEN AND THE CHURCH: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

American women have always been active and prominent in Protestant Christianity and have usually made up the bulk of its membership. Their roles, however, have been subordinate. They have been praised for their piety, depended on for the religious education of children, even exalted as the moral ennoblers of men. Authority has been withheld.

Successive feminist movements have attempted to raise women's status in the church and increase their influence. As early as the 1630s, there was a movement of this kind among the Puritans. The spokeswoman was Ann Hutchinson, who taught that individual salvation was not mediated by the minister or demonstrated through works; it came through grace and the Holy Spirit. This doctrine, as Dunn (1980) points out, is fundamental to the status of women: if the individual can be directly inspired then women as well as men can receive the gifts of the spirit. Ann Hutchinson's ministry ended in trial and defeat and the Puritans reverted to traditional separations based on gender. Shortly after this, however, in 1681, the Society of Friends began to hold women's meetings for business affairs along with the men's, and by 1740 it was mandatory for women to be represented among the elders of the Meeting. (Dunn discusses reasons why these two sects, both arising out of the egalitarian reforms of English Protestantism, took such different paths in the New World.)

The inclusion of women within the structure of the church remained unique to the Friends. In other denominations, where clergy held central authority, women tended instead to organize alongside the institution in societies

formed to promote Christian works and values. These expressions of American voluntarism were a feature of 19th Century Protestantism and included the Women's Christian Temperance Union, the Young Women's Christian Association, and the powerful women's missionary societies (see Brereton & Klein, 1980; Ryan, 1980; Welter, 1980).

Another route to influence was through the founding of sects. Mary Baker Eddy and Aimee Semple McPherson are familiar examples of women who drew great numbers of followers through the eloquence of their preaching and the power of their personalities. Women have continued to be most conspicuous in pentecostal and evangelical groups where the charismatic gifts of healing and speaking carry their own validation. James points out, however, that even in the case of the sects, once they become organized denominations, women's leadership tends to diminish (1980, p. 22). The women's missionary societies met a similar fate. The female leadership of these highly successful fund-raising and proselytizing organizations lost both power and influence when they were consolidated with denominational missionary boards in the 1920s.

Women working in lay ministries within the church have generally been less effective than those working outside it. Several of the larger Protestant churches have experimented with lay orders, such as the diaconate for women in the Lutheran, Methodist and Episcopal churches, but these have never attracted women with leadership abilities. Brereton and Klein estimate that there were never more than two thousand deaconesses at any one time among all the denominations combined (1980, p. 179).

Despite a gradual increase in paid roles for women in the church during the years following World War I, the only place where a woman could function as an autonomous professional remained until very recently the mission field. Welter

(1980) traces the process. At the beginning of the movement, women went into the field only in the role of the missionary's wife, who might occasionally teach but whose primary duty was to give her husband support. Single women were first recruited for their access to females, since it became apparent that in other cultures, as in the United States, women were the strongest influence in the religious life of the community. As these women missionaries expanded their activities, the movement began to attract others with professional training.

> (S)ingle women found in the missionary field a rare combination of church- and socially-sanctioned activity and freedom. The woman doctor found a far more interesting practice, an opportunity to perform operations, to study rare diseases, and to escape a professional life as a poorly paid listener to female complaints, her probable lot had she remained at home. (p. 121)

By 1893, the proportion of women among active missionaries was more than 60%, a proportion which was maintained for the next seventy years. In 1962, Drakeford estimated their number at two thirds of those working abroad for the church.

Welter questions whether women's entry into the mission field represented "less a victory than a strategic retreat by the opposition" (p. 111). She names three phenomena associated with the admission of women to an occupation from which they have previously been barred. First, there is a need for personnel in some area closed to men; second, the work itself has become less prestigious or less rewarding for men; third, there is a desire "to maintain the rhetoric of certain institutions without any concomitant wish to bother with the substance" (ibid.). All three of these are well illustrated in the missionary movement of the 19th century.

From this brief history, two things should be evident: attempts to reform women's role in the church are not new, and their outcome has always been the same. The institution may have been altered in the process but the gains for women have been neither substantial nor lasting.

In the current era of feminism and revival in the churches, the symbolic issue and the strategic goal has been ordination. In theory, this has always been open to women in denominations in which the local church is autonomous. In practice, few women have been ordained; fewer still have held the post of pastor, or leader of a congregation. The American Baptist Convention, for example, gave official approval for women's ordination before the turn of the century. According to recent figures, however, of 6,609 ordained ministers in this denomination only 248, less than 4%, were women (Howe, 1982, P. 140). National census figures for 1910 list 685 women clergy, or 0.5% of the total. By 1970, the figure had risen to 6,314, still no more than 2.9%. Four per cent was the overall figure estimated by Jacquet (1977), based on a study for the Yearbook of American and Canadian Churches. The majority of these were from pentecostal groups, or from organizations such as the Salvation Army; only 17.4% belonged to one of the ten major Protestant denominations.[1]

Among the mainline churches, the United Presbyterian church and the Methodist church both gave clergy rights to women in 1956; the Lutheran Church in America authorized ordination in 1970; the Episcopal church gave its approval in 1976. Of these, the United Methodist church (as it is known since merging with the Evangelical United Brethren in 1968) has the greatest number of women clergy; a demographic study published in 1980 (Hale, King & Jones) listed 838 nationwide, of whom 87% were serving in the local church as pastors or associate pastors. Although Jacquet, in his 1977 summary, predicted a slow growth in the employment of women as parish ministers, a recent increase in the numbers of

---

[1]Up to date figures on the number of ordained women in the United States are surprisingly hard to come by. The 1980 census figures had not been released at the time of this study. The most recent totals available through the National Council of Churches were those in the 1977 report by Jacquet.

women entering seminary suggests that pressure for these jobs may soon become acute. At the Iliff School of Theology in Denver, for example, which prepares ministers for the United Methodist church, the enrollment of women in the Master of Divinity program rose from 15% in 1971 to 30% in 1978 and then to 40% in 1981.

In making ordination their goal, the current generation of religious feminists has already set itself apart from earlier movements. The missionaries exercised their freedom at a distance from their society and its norms; the deaconesses deferred to the authority of men; the founders of the 19th century women's organizations worked essentially for the support of institutions which remained governed by men. The women now seeking professional roles in the church, on the other hand, are aiming for its central structures; they include scholars and theologians as well as pastors and administrators. Their quest, as Brereton and Klein point out, goes beyond "women's issues"; it is directed at redefining the exercise of authority in the church in favor of less directive styles (1980, p. 190). In this sense, the theological issues which motivated Ann Hutchinson in 1630 remain at the heart of women's relation to the hierarchy.

In spite of their apparent success in breaking through barriers to their full participation as clergy, the question arises as to whether, as in the case of the missionaries, women are being allowed into the ministry at a time when its prestige as an occupation is declining, its employment opportunities are becoming constricted, and our public debates honor the rhetoric, but ignore the substance, of the teachings of the church. Societal factors bearing on this question are beyond the scope of this review. The focus here is on the women themselves. Few in number, unique among women professionals, they are still an unknown quantity in the equation.

CHAPTER II

MEN IN THE MINISTRY, WOMEN IN A MAN'S FIELD: A LITERATURE REVIEW

Almquist and Angrist (1970) call women in atypical, or stereotypically masculine, occupations "unconventional choosers." For women to seek ordination represents what is perhaps, in a Judaeo-Christian society, the ultimately unconventional choice. What kind of women are they?

In surveying theories which attempt to account for atypical career choice, Almquist and Angrist find two types, which they call "deviance" and "enrichment." According to the deviance hypothesis, if a woman is both invested in her career and drawn to a masculine field, then she herself must be masculinized. Something in her upbringing must have led her to reject the feminine values of home and family. According to the enrichment hypothesis, the unconventional chooser's life experience has not been deviant, in the sense of abnormal; it has simply been more extensive. The range of a woman's choices appears wider to her, either because she has had the example of teachers or family members, or because she herself has had greater opportunities to explore the world of work.

To date, there have been no published psychological studies of women ministers to suggest which type of theory best accounts for their choice. There are two bodies of research, however, which may help to clarify questions for investigation: that on men in the ministry and that on women in male-dominated occupations.

Men in the Ministry

The first thing which strikes one in reviewing the literature on male ministers is that a large proportion of it appears to follow a deviance hypothesis. On the basis of his MMPI studies, Bier referred to clergymen as "the most deviant portion of an already deviant population (college and graduate school men)" (in Bloom, 1971, p. 51). Bowers (1963a) coined the word "set-apartness" to describe their status. Clergy themselves seem painfully aware of being different. Siegelmann and Peck (1960) report that a major dissatisfaction named by the ministers they interviewed had to do with being regarded as only "more or less human", belonging to a "third sex."

In summarizing the research on these men, we find three general features: first, there is at least a rough consensus on certain common personality factors; second, there are apparent inconsistencies, with attempts at reconciling them based largely on theories of neurotic conflict; finally, there is considerable disagreement on the question of clergy mental health.

One of the largest areas of agreement concerns needs in relation to others. Ministers are found to be extroverted (Nauss, 1973), affiliative (Byers, Forrest & Zaccaria, 1968), high on sociability (Cockrum, 1952; Lonsway, 1969). In some reports, this orientation toward others appears as a strong need for approval (Childers & White, 1966). Schroeder (1958) calls his group of theology students conformist. Siegelmann and Peck (1960) describe their ministerial group as exhibiting a strong need for attention, acceptance, and approval. "The minister is person-oriented and he prepares himself intensively for the task of convincing others that his, or the church's, value system is the one in which to believe. When people do not agree with him, his basic ability and self-assurance are threatened. He is dependent on personal acceptance and recognition . . . He thus becomes anxious, when his ideas, with which he identifies, are threatened" (p. 329).

Nurturance, the concern for others, and the desire to help people figure prominently, as might be expected (Siegelmann & Peck, 1960; Byers et. al., 1968; Lonsway, 1969). There are frequent references to dominance in conjunction with affiliation (e.g. Byers et. al.). Siegelmann and Peck observed the desire to dominate others, but described it as taking a subtle form, of which the minister himself might not be aware. Their subjects voiced disapproval of open control of others, yet the interviewers became convinced that the minister "has such a strong desire . . . to influence people to think as he does, to accept his beliefs, to recognize the church as the only truth and the only way of life, that there is an important element of attempted control or domination of people's attitudes. He sincerely desires to help others. He does not seem to be aware that part of his observable motivation is a personal need to impose his own, personal outlook on all about him" (p. 320).

In apparent contradiction to these findings on sociability, affiliation, nurturance, and need for approval, runs a parallel list of findings that clergy also tend to score above average on autonomy and isolation (Byers, et. al., 1968; Schroeder, 1958). Interpreters of these disparities generally ascribe them to unconscious conflicts. Booth (1955) says that the "average" minister reaches for relationships in the attempt to repress tendencies to withdraw. Bowers calls the clergy "lonely, set-apart people. Even the healthy, fulfilled, successful ones remember the loneliness of their childhood. Many of their histories show an early experience of loss or abandonment" (1963a, p. 1). As a clinician treating religious personnel in her practice, she came to believe that many of her patients had gone into the ministry in search for love. "Never having experienced sufficient human love, they hope to find love in God" (1963b, p. 12). Siegelmann and Peck also heard references to an unhappy childhood. They speculate, like Bowers, that early

losses have left these men with feelings of insecurity and needs for succorance and support. Helping and pleasing others is seen as a way to get their needs met.

Bloom, in his review Who become clergymen? (1971), claims that many of them show a tendency to merge, or closely identify, with their congregations. They participate in parishioners' life events in a "parafamilial" role, he says, in hopes of overcoming the separateness of the ministerial role. He cites a particularly provocative study by Schroeder (1958), who found similar motivations between theology students and physical science students: both groups showed signs of discomfort in close personal relations. Bloom's comment: "It may be that the scientists have made the decision not to resolve their problem of set-apartness by merging with others, but by retreat into the world of science, and so remain separate, aloof, and intellectual. The clergyman, on the other hand, tries to resolve the problem by the tendency to merge, to be involved, and, as so many clergy have put it, to help others" (p. 64).

A second area frequently referred to as conflictual is that of impulse expression. Stern (1954) calls difficulty in reconciling impulse expression with conscience "the characteristic disturbance" of the small sample of students he studied in depth. This appears to have been as true of the "ideal" students selected by faculty and peers as it was of the students rated "undesirable." Booth (1955) says that the average minister deals with his aggressive tendencies by subordinating them to conscience, or by expressing them in relation to impersonal causes. Dodson (1955) reports that seminary students handle their hostility in intropunitive ways, and Schroeder (1958), in calling his group of theological students passive and conformist, interpreted this as a reaction formation against hostility and rebelliousness. Bloom observes that this is another case of how the church may provide a setting in which some measure of resolution of internal conflicts can be

achieved. "(A)ggression for the greater glory of God, the church, and its ideals, becomes aggression for which one cannot be blamed or punished. One is doing it because he is an idealist, not because one is self-seeking. The clergyman can be as hostile as he wants to, he can express all of the aggression he wants to, but he avoids any kind of direct, open retribution" (1971, pp. 67-68). In the same vein, Bloom quotes Dittes' observation that "the conflict over dependence versus independence, over authority, over the expression or inhibition of hostility would all seem to find particularly successful compromise solutions in a clergy role where both dependence and independence can be especially well expressed or in which hostility can be condemned and love extolled--in a hostile, prophetic manner" (p. 66).

As with aggression, so with sex. Dodson finds seminarians "uncomfortable" with sexual feelings (1955). Schroeder's findings also suggest this (1958). Bowers refers to problems with exhibitionism and homosexuality which may cause clergy to seek psychiatric help (1963b). Christensen (1963) believes that religion may be used unconsciously as a means of attempting to resolve sexual conflicts, "usually in terms of an inhibitory type of control" (p. 3). Siegelmann and Peck (1960) report that among the three vocational groups they tested, the ministers scored highest on "vicarious sexual interest", but add that this was not out of the average range.

The hallmark of clergy test scores, and one finding on which there is virtually no disagreement in the research, is their peak on the Masculinity-femininity scale of the MMPI. Nauss (1973) lists eleven studies which give MMPI scale scores for a variety of sample groups, both Protestant and Catholic. In all of them, Mf is the peak score. In ten, T scores fall between 60 and 65, in the remaining study between 55 and 60.

Interpretation of clergy Mf scores varies. For some (e.g. Bloom, 1970), they suggest that although a feminine interest pattern cannot be assumed to mean homosexuality, it may point to some conflicts in this area. Cardwell (1967) disputes this. She did an item analysis of the Mf responses of a group of theology students, in order to trace the sources of elevation. She found that items related to sexual identification contributed hardly at all; the final scores reflected high means for item groups related to denial of masculine occupations, to altruism, and to cultural, literary, and artistic interests. Furthermore, she points out that two items on an HSX (homosexuality) subscale were "I pray several times a week" and "I go to church almost every week"--hardly deviant activities for seminarians.

The second distinguishing characteristic of clergy MMPI profiles is a high K score (T=55-60 in the majority of the studies surveyed by Nauss). The K scale is generally assumed to measure the tendency to be defensive and to deny psychological problems. Percentages of K are therefore routinely added to scores on the clinical scales in order to compensate for the inclination to conceal or distort. Elevated K scores are part of the evidence given to demonstrate the pathology of the clergy.

Kania (1967) tested the validity of this assumption in regard to seminary students. He obtained measures of adjustment, dogmatism, self-disclosure, defensiveness, and anxiety, and correlated these with the students' K scores. His conclusion is that theological students display what he calls "healthy defensiveness", in that their K scores were not only positively related to defensiveness but also to lower dogmatism, greater self-acceptance, better adjustment, lower anxiety, less guilt-proneness, and more ego strength. He therefore recommends that K corrections not be added to the clinical scales for this population, since they may distort the profile. He suggests that similar tests

of K need to be made with other groups. "Defensiveness in normal populations," he concludes, "does not appear to be the same as defensiveness in abnormal populations" (p. 19).

Another proposal for modifying the MMPI for use with religious personnel comes from Bier (1971). He addressed himself to the problem of screening out candidates for whom the Catholic priesthood is not an appropriate way of life, citing figures to show that over a 57-year period only 25-35% of those who entered seminary had completed their training and been ordained. Working with a celibate population, he accepts the proposition that mental health is relative. He then sets out to identify those items which discriminate within the seminary group, rather than between the seminary group and others from whom they clearly deviate. His adapted version of the MMPI eliminates items relating to sex and religion, which obviously carry unique meanings for this group. The remaining items do differentiate between well-adjusted and poorly adjusted seminary students. While this may seem to beg the question of the pathology of religious commitments, perhaps Bier's point is well-taken: "If there prove to be areas of adjustment in which the seminary group differs from the general population, it is important that a seminary candidate be judged, in respect to his mental health, by these modified norms, for this is the specialized way of life to which he proposes to apply himself. It can scarcely be doubted that what is unsatisfactory adjustment in one way of life may be very acceptable in another" (p. 587).

Women in Male-dominated Occupations

Personality characteristics: Research, perhaps more than we would like to think, tends to follow--or even to promote--the ideologies of its time. The type of deviance hypothesis evident in many studies of male clergy done in the 50s

and 60s--often traceable to the constructs of psychoanalytic theory--was also to be seen in studies of professional women made during the same period. Looking back on earlier attitudes, Almquist and Angrist (1970) cite an unpublished paper by Rossi in which she reports a negative relation between the salience of career and family: the more "masculine" the field and the higher the woman's aspirations, the less likely she was to place a high value on home and family. Hoyt and Kennedy (1958), comparing homemaking and career-oriented women on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, found the career-oriented women below average on the Heterosexuality scale, which they interpreted as a need to avoid relations with the opposite sex. The homemaking group, for their part, were well above average on succorance, which the authors define as the need for affection and acceptance. Other high scores in the career group were on achievement, endurance, and intraception or the need to understand. It is a mark of change that we view this now with a sense of approval; it is instructive to read the comments following the article, made by a member of the Harvard University Health Services. He saw the intellectual interests of the career women as secondary, a form of defense against the heterosexual conflicts pointed to in the low score on that scale. The succorance need, which was so strong among the homemaking women, he called a "warm reaching for people." Helson (1972), in her discussion of this study, points out that if men were being evaluated by the succorance scale it would have been called "dependence"--and indeed this is exactly the interpretation given of this scale in assessments of male clergy (see, for example, Siegelmann & Peck, 1960).

Helson's overview of the changing image of the career woman points to certain historical necessities behind some of the attitudes of the post-World War II period. Following World War I, she reminds us, the career woman had a certain limited glamour. It is true that in movies of the twenties and thirties she appears as daring, unconventional, sexually liberated. But even where the idea of a

woman working was approved, it was necessary to the image that she be single: unmarried, widowed, or working only until she got married. Helson suggests that in order for our society to become comfortable with the idea that a woman could have both a career and a family, it may have been necessary to go through a period in which this was permissible provided the roles of wife and mother were clearly put first. To illustrate this, she cites Vassar researches which identified two types of college students: the high achievers, and the underachievers with a future family orientation. Although there was some positive acknowledgment of the first group, the highest praise, she says, went to the second group, who were considered to be taking the healthier course, that of integrating their intellectual abilities into their feminine role.

New social pressures, says Helson, stimulate new lines of research, and women psychologists are now "working away like billboard artists" at revising the image of the career woman. Profession by profession, the studies are accumulating: on the woman Ph.D. (Astin, 1969); on women in medicine (Cartwright, 1972; Kutner & Brogan, 1980); on lawyers (Epstein, 1968); on mathematicians (Helson, 1971); on politicians (Constantini & Craik, 1972; Werner & Bachtold, 1974); on psychologists (Bachtold & Werner, 1970, 1971); on business executives (Hennig, 1973; Morrison & Sebald, 1974). In addition, there are studies in which subjects are selected not from a particular occupation but on the basis of atypicality of choice (Almquist & Angrist, 1970; Tangri, 1972; Patrick, 1973; Standley & Soule, 1974; Feulner, 1979). A review of this literature is offered by Lemkau (1979).

Several features of this research stand out. First, the findings do not lend much support to the deviance hypothesis. Second, there is considerable congruence among the findings on personality traits, regardless of the field.

Third, there also seem to be at least a few background characteristics which predispose a woman for a serious commitment to a career.

In regard to the deviance hypothesis, Almquist and Angrist (1970) found no significant differences between career and non-career groups on the frequency of their dating or their involvement in student activities, although the non-career women were more likely to be engaged, married, or going steady by their senior year (embarking on their career, as it were). Tangri (1972) also found no difference in a group of role innovators' romantic and friendship relations with men. Feulner (1979) surveyed 173 women attorneys, university professors, and physicians in the St. Louis area. As a group, she found them to be above the average on scales relating to self-confidence and personal adjustment. Those who were married reported stable marriages, with a high proportion of these being of an "intrinsic" style, one which emphasizes the importance of the relationship between the partners over "utilitarian" concerns. Hennig (1973) found that her group of successful women executives showed high self-esteem, derived, she concluded, from warm, supportive childhood relations with their parents. Bachtold and Werner (1974) found that their group of women legislators resembled the norms for women in general on sociability, ego strength, sensitivity, and trust. Profiles of women psychologists, on the other hand, studied by the same authors, did tend to diverge from that of the average woman (Bachtold & Werner, 1970). Although there were no significant differences from the norms on ego strength and self-control, as evidence on the 16PF, the psychologist sample did differ significantly on the other 14 variables, with many of these differences being in the direction of superior functioning, such as higher self-confidence and lower anxiety.

The only contradictory findings, suggesting poorer adjustment, come from Helson's study of highly creative women mathematicians (1971), who

appeared to be more depressed and socially withdrawn than a comparison group. Constantini and Craik's sample of women politicians (1972) also tended to score considerably higher than male politicians on a "counseling readiness" scale, which suggests some anxieties about themselves on their status. Apart from this scale score, however, these women did not differ from female norms on heterosexuality, nurturance, or affiliation, and did show somewhat higher mean scores on self-confidence and personal adjustment. Helson points out that the mathematicians, although high on some indicators of disturbance, did not show correspondingly low scores on ego strength. In fact, she sees this combination--psychological difficulties accompanied by superior resources--as a hallmark of the creative person.

In brief, it appears that women committed to male-dominated careers do not differ from other women in their overall adjustment, although in some instances they may actually be better-adjusted and in others there are some indications of role strain. Where they do differ, rather consistently, is in what has been added to the profile of a normal woman rather than in what is deficient--as the enrichment hypothesis would predict.

There is a considerable degree of consistency among assessments of professional women when it comes to personality characteristics related to competence. As might be expected, they score high on achievement and independence (Helson, 1971; Cartwright, 1972; Tangri, 1972; Feulner, 1979). In some cases, the independence may include a certain aloofness, as was found in both the mathematicians (Helson, 1971) and psychologists (Bachtold & Werner, 1970). Compared to other women, role innovators see themselves as more dominant, more assertive, even more aggressive (Bachtold & Werner, 1970; Constantini & Craik, 1972; Morrison & Sebald, 1974; Feulner, 1979). They score correspondingly lower on variables related to submissiveness, such as deference,

abasement, or succorance (Cartwright, 1972; Constantini & Craik, 1972; Feulner, 1979). These women appear to achieve their goals by direct means.

Several cautions need to be kept in mind in accepting these findings. Virtually all of these studies rely to a large extent on self-descriptions, usually by way of checklists. Only in one of the studies listed above (Helson, 1971) are the ratings made by observers rather than by the subjects, and then it is by an intuitive, not criterion-based, standard. There is an inevitable tendency in referring to results of this kind to take the label for the fact, and to assume that a subject who describes herself as dominant would also display dominance by behavioral measures. A second assumption too readily made is that categories on different scales which have the same or similar titles--such as the dominance scales on the Adjective Check List and Edwards' Personal Preference Scale--are interchangeable and can be interpreted as such, whereas there is evidence that when the scales are used together the correlations may not be high (see Megargee & Parker, 1968). Nevertheless, in spite of these important qualifying factors, the evidence is that various groups of professional women do describe themselves in ways that differ consistently from the self-descriptions of women who have made more traditional choices, that these descriptions tend to confirm one another across studies, and that there are no important contradictory findings.

Background: There are certain common features in the backgrounds of women in male-dominated professions. Many of them are firstborns, for example. Astin (1969) found that 47% of the Ph.D.s she surveyed were the oldest children in their families. Helson (1971) found that very few of her creative mathematicians had a brother. Hennig (1973) interviewed 25 out of 100 women presidents and vice-presidents of major business firms and found that all of them were firstborn and that none had a brother. In the one study available on the background

characteristics of female clergy, it was found that 24% were only children and 29% were the oldest children in their families (Hale, King & Jones, 1980).

Women in the professions are generally believed to come from families which are at least comfortably off and to have parents who attained a higher than average level of education. This is borne out by most of the studies under consideration. Cartwright (1972) reports that over two thirds of the fathers in her sample of women in medicine had a college education and 40% of them had followed it with some graduate work or professional training. Of the mothers, 43% had completed college, 17% had some kind of postgraduate education. In her study of women in graduate schools of law, medicine, architecture, and the sciences, Patrick (1973) found that 59% of their fathers had graduate or professional degrees, in addition to 14% with undergraduate degrees. Fully one half of their mothers had a college degree or above. Similar trends are reported by Astin (1969), Epstein (1968), and Hennig (1974).

Professional women also tend to have professional parents. Fathers with professional status were reported for their samples by Epstein (19%), Patrick (28%), Helson (76%). Fathers in business at the managerial level were also reported by Patrick (40%) and Epstein (50%). All of Hennig's successful women executives had fathers who were also in business. Among the more academically oriented professions, there is a high proportion of women who were either born abroad or have parents who were born abroad. Of the lawyers interviewed by Epstein, for example, 46% had foreign-born fathers, 43% had foreign-born mothers. A similar background is reported by Ph.D.s by Astin (1969) and for mathematicians by Helson (1971). In non-academic professions, the trend is reversed. Half of the women politicians studied by Constantini and Craik (1972) were at least third generation American. All of Hennig's executive sample were American born (1974).

A variable of particular interest to researchers involves the employment history of the professional woman's mother. Tangri (1972) found a strong relation between the mother's current employment and the choice of an innovative career by the daughter ($p<.001$). There was also a significant relationship between the daughter's choice and whether the mother had also chosen a field in which women were in a minority ($p<.025$). Among Epstein's lawyers, 67% had mothers who were employed, 20% of them as professionals (1968). Patrick (1973) also found a significant difference on this variable between her professional and homemaking groups: 47% of the professionals had working mothers, with 21% in professional occupations as against 10% of the homemaker mothers. Almquist and Angrist (1970) found that 66% of their career salient group had mothers who were employed. The exception to these findings is Hennig's. She states that only one of the mothers of her successful executives had pursued a career (1974).

In a related study, Hansson, Chernovetz and Jones (1977) found a relation between sex role and whether or not the subject's mother worked outside the home. A significantly higher percentage of female subjects classified as either masculine or androgynous in their sex role orientation had working mothers, as compared to those classified as feminine.

Finally, there is the question of relations with parents and parental identifications. Here the findings are not uniform. Hennig (1974) believes that family dynamics constituted the major difference between a group of top women executives and a group who did not rise beyond middle management. She summarizes the family constellation as one which provided the young daughter with positive support for autonomy and exploration, without devaluing her femaleness. The women who later became presidents or vice-presidents remembered their childhood relations with both their parents as warm and close;

they particularly regarded their fathers' readiness to share interests with them as an important influence. Helson (1971) also finds differences between more and less creative mathematicians, but in this case it was the comparison group, the less creative, who described their homes as secure and warm. The more creative women were more alienated; they tended to identify with their fathers, but received little affection from them. More of Epstein's (1968) lawyers felt closer to their mothers than their fathers and also tended to identify with their mothers. Tangri's role innovators among college students showed no clear identification with either parent. She describes them as having "substantial cognitive distance from both parents, warm feelings toward mother, but some perceived similarity to father" (1972, p. 185).

Clergywomen: A New Group of Women Professionals

Based on the studies described above, what characteristics might we expect to find in women entering the male-dominated profession of the ministry? Since a theological education requires that they meet high academic standards, we might expect them to score high on measures related to achievement and endurance. In addition, they must be prepared to surmount opposition to their choice of career, whether from friends, family, or those within the church who do not accept the validity of ordination for women. It seems likely therefore that they will share with other professional women a higher than average degree of dominance and perhaps also of aggression. Given the pastoral nature of their chosen work, it is not likely that they will score below the norms on affiliation and nurturance. Indeed, the women ministers surveyed by Hale, King and Jones (1980) gave the pastoral functions of counseling the sick or bereaved as one of their major motivations for entering the ministry, second only to preaching the gospel. Hale et. al. do not inquire into relations with parents. They do find, as

mentioned above, that 53% of the women were either only children or firstborns. They also report that almost half have family members in the ministry; 28% of them are married to ministers.

Since there are remarkably few signs of maladjustment among the other groups of role-innovative women studied to date, we may assume that clergywomen will also tend to be self-confident, with good ego strength. It would not be surprising, however, to find them showing some signs of role strain. Hale et. al. note the "superwoman complex" referred to by several of their respondents. In addition to combining, in many cases, the roles of wife, mother, and professional, they are under pressure from the expectations of their congregations--the proclivity for "setting apart" the clergy, which clergymen have so often complained about.

Studies of men in the ministry call attention to the "feminine" pattern of their interests. This is particularly evident in their MMPI profiles. Among the studies of women which have been cited above, only one gives MMPI scores: Helson's investigation of women mathematicians (1971). If it is true, as is sometimes claimed, that women in male-dominated professions tend to be somewhat masculine in their interests, then we might expect to find a corresponding elevation on the Mf scale. In fact, both of Helson's mathematician groups, the creative and the less creative, show mean scores a few points <u>below</u> average--that is to say, if there is a tendency, it is toward a more rather than less feminine orientation.

These mild indications to the contrary notwithstanding, there is some evidence for the presence of masculine characteristics among women in occupations considered masculine. In the traditional view, descriptors such as "aggressive", "assertive", "clear-thinking", "confident" apply to men rather than to women. Indeed, they are all adjectives on the masculinity scale of the Adjective

Check List. They are also words which are repeatedly used in describing women who have been successful in the world of work.

In attempting to predict the sex role orientation of women ministers, therefore, we have several alternatives: (1) they will be predominantly feminine, following the pattern of the mathematicians; (2) they will appear comparatively masculine, on account of high scores on competency variables; (3) they will show features of both. The third alternative is the one this study will explore: that a vocation in the church permits the expression of both masculine and feminine qualities and will therefore attract individuals who display some of the characteristics associated with the opposite sex as well as their own.

The Idea of Androgyny

Conceptualizations of sex role are the social reflection of profound dichotomizations of experience. There have been numberless attempts to name these divisions of task and spirit. Parsons and Bales (1955), in one of the more enduring sociological formulations, called the two aspects instrumental and expressive. Instrumental, or prototypically masculine activities, are those related to the achievement of a goal; expressive, or feminine, activities focus on emotions and relations. Gutmann (1965) contends that the customary situations, the milieux, of men and women are fundamentally different and therefore require different standards of ego development and ego strength. The masculine world is allocentric--other-centered--which means that it is impersonal, unpredictable, inconstant, open. Effective action in this world requires objectivity, the ability to delay, to plan, to shape one's own order in the context of the uncontrollable order of what is other. The feminine world is autocentric, ordered around the self. It is familiar, personal, constant, enclosed. Meaningful interactions in this world have to do with cyclical rhythms, reciprocality, shared emotions. Order is intrinsic.

Still another way of framing the same dichotomy is Bakan's concept of agency and communion. Agency refers to existence as an individual, communion to the participation of the individual in some larger organism.

> Agency manifests itself in self-protection, self-assertion and self-expansion; communion manifests itself in the sense of being at one with other organisms ... Agency manifests itself in isolation, alienation, and aloneness; communion in contact, openness, and union. Agency manifests itself in the urge to master, communion in noncontractual cooperation. (1966, p. 14).

It is Bakan's thesis that "unmitigated agency", which expresses itself in exploitation and untrammeled instrumentality, is what is meant by the term "evil," and that the human task is "to try to mitigate agency with communion." Block (1973) describes what this means for individual men and women: for men "that self-assertion, self-interest, and self-extension are tempered by considerations of mutuality, interdependence, and joint welfare"; for women, "that the concern for harmonious functioning of the group, the submersion of self, and the importance of consensus be amended to include aspects of agentic self-assertion and self-expression" (p. 515). This, in essence, is the androgynous ideal: that members of each sex should temper their role performance with some of the virtues belonging to the other.

The assumption that home and career are antithetical arises from the belief that society needs the instrumental and expressive functions to be divided, and that women, by reason of the child-bearing function, carry the natural responsibility for the expressive. For a woman to exercise an instrumental role is therefore, by this line of reasoning, to behave in a way which is unnatural or abnormal. Nowhere has this been more succinctly expressed than by an anonymous chief engineer quoted in the Harvard Business Review (Bowman, Worthy & Greyser, 1965, p. 172):

> The requirements for a manager--toughness and concern only for the dollar--do not and will not ever mix with the cultural idea ascribed to (but not necessarily found in) females. Someone has to stand for the things spiritual, i.e. kindness and tolerance. So, as a culture, all of us look to women to personify this.

Rating scales for assessing masculinity and femininity have generally followed the same assumption: that these are mutually exclusive qualities, at opposite poles of a single continuum. Inevitably, the more one has of one, the less one has of the other. Items on these scales have therefore been selected according to their frequency of endorsement by either men or women. In recent years, however, the idea that certain personality traits properly belong to one sex or the other has been challenged, notably by Constantinople (1973) and by Bem (1974), who is responsible for popularizing the term "androgyny." According to this increasingly accepted view, masculinity and femininity are not polarities. To be clear-thinking need not rule out being sympathetic; to be actively engaged in seeking a goal need not preclude the ability to be emotionally expressive. There is therefore, under this formulation, the possibility of a third type, the "androgynous" person, who ascribes to socially desirable qualities which may have been sex-typed for either men or women. The items on Bem's Sex-Role Inventory were selected not by frequency of endorsement but by the extent to which they matched the cultural stereotypes of sex roles. As scales of masculinity and femininity, they are free to vary independently, so that each subject can be given ratings on <u>both</u> masculine and feminine dimensions. It is the way in which these two scores are related to one another which determines the subject's classification.

Androgyny and the Christian Church

A case can be made that the church, by its very nature, exemplifies the dialectic between agency and communion. To the extent that it is

institutionalized, hierarchical, prophetic, and power-seeking it is agentic. Yet its scriptures exalt the values of communion, of interdependence, of the sacrifice of self-interest. Historically, these polarities have been in contradiction more often than they have been integrated, and it is this split which has been reflected in the subordination of women within the church. Bakan says, "One of the fundamental points which I attempt to make is that the very split of agency from communion, which is a separation, arises from the agency feature itself, and that it represses the communion from which it has separated itself" (1965, pp. 14-15). To the extent that women represent what is affective, noncompetitive, intimate as opposed to public, they have been relegated to secondary positions. One of the crucial questions for the future of the church, as many thoughtful people see it, is whether the entrance of women into more influential roles foreshadows the lifting of this repression, the potential integration of communion with agency. Failing this, clergywomen must either adopt or continue to be devalued by the dominance of agentic structures. An allied fear, for some, is that if the larger society retains an imbalance in favor of agency, then a church which restores communion to a more visible status will simply become less influential or less prestigious.

When one looks at the personality profiles of male ministers, one wonders whether they have not been victims as much as women. Is it possible that what has been called a feminine interest pattern in these men is, by another view, androgynousness? The current resurgence of feminism has given women an ideology by which to understand and defend their aspirations; men have lacked a comparable source of support. Without encouragement to see their feminine aspect as a positive, even a necessary, value, perhaps they have experienced it instead as a conflict. This is one alternative explanation for the signs of stress conspicuous in so many of the reports.

A single study will rarely answer such broadly speculative questions. The thesis to be examined here is nonetheless that the role of minister requires what is in many ways a unique combination of feminine and masculine qualities, which can be related to ideas of agency and communion. It is likely that it appeals to androgynous persons of both sexes, and that this is one source of the feminine interest patterns commonly seen in test profiles of male clergy. We may expect that women who seek this role will also tend toward an androgynous personality style, in that they will show socially desirable characteristics commonly sex-typed as masculine, without any loss of desirable characteristics sex-typed as feminine.

CHAPTER III

HYPOTHESES AND PREDICTIONS

Hypothesis One: A career in the ministry offers scope for the expression of both agentic and communal values. It is therefore likely to attract men and women whose personalities combine masculine and feminine qualities.

Prediction 1: *A significantly high proportion of a group of women ministers will be classified as androgynous on the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. The same will be true of seminary students preparing for the ministry, whether male or female.*

Hypothesis Two: Women who seek roles in the church formerly reserved for men will show agentic, or masculine, qualities of the type found in women in other male-dominated occupations.

Prediction 2: *On the Adjective Check List, female ministers and female seminary students will score significantly above the norms for women on scales measuring achievement, dominance, and endurance.*

Prediction 3: *On the Adjective Check List, female ministers and female seminary students will score significantly below the norms for women on scales measuring deference and abasement.*

Hypothesis Three: Women choosing the pastoral role of minister will retain qualities associated with the modality of communion and the traditional idea of femininity.

Prediction 4: *On the Adjective Check List, female ministers and female seminary students will not score significantly below the norms for women on scales measuring nurturance and affiliation.*

Hypothesis Four: Men choosing the pastoral role of minister will also display qualities related to the modality of communion.

Prediction 5: *On the Adjective Check List, male seminary students will score significantly above the norms for men on scales measuring nurturance and affiliation.*

Hypothesis Five: At the present time, the awareness of cross-sex identifications are likely to create greater intrapersonal conflicts for men than for women.

Prediction 6: *On the Adjective Check List, female ministers and female seminary students will score significantly higher than male students on the scale measuring personal adjustment, relative to the norms for their sex.*

CHAPTER IV

METHODS

Subjects

Subjects for this study were drawn from two populations: students at the Iliff School of Theology in Denver and women serving appointments in the Rocky Mountain Conference of the United Methodist Church.

Students: Names and addresses were obtained from the 1981-82 Iliff student directory. A mailing was sent to all students, male and female, listed as being in either the Master of Divinity or Master of Arts in Religion programs. This excluded non-degree students, candidates for doctoral or other academic degrees, and students listed but on leave of absence. The total mailing went to 195 students. Ten packets were returned for various reasons, such as the student having withdrawn since publication of the directory. Response to the first mailing was 114 (61.62%). A follow-up letter to those who had not responded gained another 17 replies, for a total response of 131 out of 185, or 70.81% of those surveyed.

Fifteen of the student responses were from students working toward the degree of Master of Arts in Religion. This degree is for those who are seeking a theological education without intending to be ordained. It was originally thought that this group might serve as a comparison to ministers in training (the M.Div. program) but the number responding was too small for meaningful analysis. These questionnaires were therefore removed from the sample. Two incomplete or inaccurately completed questionnaires were also dropped, leaving a final sample of 114 students (65 males and 49 females), all working toward the Master of Divinity degree.

Clergywomen: The list of ordained women in the Rocky Mountain Conference published in June, 1982, includes 28 women appointed to serve as ministers in a local parish (out of approximately 268 positions). Three of these women had just graduated from Iliff and had been contacted earlier as part of the student sample. Two were lay pastors, one was a student associate, and one was a minister of another denomination. The remaining 21 women were contacted by letter requesting an interview. One of the District Superintendents in the Conference is a woman. She and a woman currently awaiting appointment were also contacted, for a total of twenty-three. The letters were followed by a personal phone call. Twenty-two women were reached in this way and all agreed to the interview. The twenty-third was not available, due to an extended illness. The final sample therefore includes all but one of the women active as ministers in the Rocky Mountain Conference at the time of the study.

Procedures

The mailing to the students included (1) a letter introducing the study and asking for their participation, (2) a background questionnaire inquiring into such variables as marital status, previous occupations, professional goals, and role models, (3) the Gough-Heilbrun Adjective Check List, (4) the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, and (5) the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. These were to be filled out anonymously and returned to the author. Copies of this material are included in the Appendix.

Each of the clergywomen was interviewed personally by the author. These interviews were semi-structured, following an outline which included all of the variables on the student questionnaire, plus additional topics relevant to the ordained ministry. Subjects were also invited to introduce topics of their own. (See the Appendix for a copy of the interview outline.)

Interviews were conducted at a time and place convenient to the subject, generally at their church office or in the home provided for them as part of their appointment. Interviews lasted anywhere from one to two hours, depending on the time available and the talkativeness of the subject. All interviews were tape recorded, with the subject's permission. At the conclusion of the interview, each of the women was given a set of the three personality inventories, to be returned by mail to a third party. Responses on these were kept anonymous; no attempt was made to draw connections between the views expressed by individual women and their responses on the personality scales.

Instruments

Adjective Check List (ACL): The Adjective Check List was developed at the Institute for Personality Assessment and Research at the University of California at Berkeley and published in 1949. It has since been used, according to the latest edition of the manual (Gough & Heilbrun, 1980), in nearly 700 studies.

The ACL consists of 300 adjectives, common in everyday language, which can be checked or left blank. The subject uses these for self-description. There are no upper or lower limits as to the number which may or must be checked, and there are no restrictions against checking adjectives which may seem to conflict with one another. The manual provides for 37 scales which can be abstracted from the list. Twenty-eight were scored for this study. These include four scales assessing the subject's modus operandi in responding to the task, fifteen scales drawn from Murray's need-press theory of personality, and nine so-called topical scales, derived from no single theory, reflecting additional characteristics such as personal adjustment and masculine and feminine attributes.

Scores on the ACL are adjusted according to the sex of the respondent and the total number of adjectives checked. Raw scores are converted to standard scores, with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. Standard scores for males are based on the scores of seven subsamples tested in a variety of studies, including high school, college, graduate, and medical students, smaller groups of delinquents and psychiatric patients, and a mixed group of 1,986 adults, drawn from surveys and studies of specific professions. The total normative sample for males equals 5,238. The normative sample for females is drawn from similar studies and totals 4,144.

As might be expected, the internal consistency of the ACL varies according to the scale. The manual cites alpha coefficients ranging from .53 (for female subjects on the Counseling Readiness scale) to .95 (for males on Favorable Adjectives Checked). The median alpha for females is given as .75, for males as .76. Test-retest coefficients also vary widely. On the scales used in this study, they range for males from .41, on Feminine Attributes, to .77 on Aggression, with a median of .65. For females, test-retest data yield a low of .45 on three of the scales, including Feminine Attributes, and a high of .86 on Exhibition. The median for females is given as .71. These figures are not high, but are acceptable. The authors of the check list point out that variability over time may reflect changes in the subject as well as errors in the instrument and as such are a meaningful variable (Gough & Heilbrun, 1980, p. 30).

The advantages of the ACL for this study are several. It is the instrument used in the number of studies relevant to the hypotheses. These include Helson (1971), Cartwright (1972), Constantini and Craik (1972), and Feulner (1979). Especially where mean scores are reported, this makes it possible to compare the sample groups in this study with samples of women in other

professions as well as with norm groups. In addition, the ACL is readily acceptable to subjects, being non-intrusive and easily filled out.

The disadvantages of the ACL are inherent in the check list method itself. It is a self-description measure, which means that assumptions regarding the congruence of the subject's presented self-image with actual behavior are risky. This needs to be kept in mind while interpreting scores. Nevertheless, the checking of the adjectives is itself a form of behavior which varies meaningfully across groups, and self-image and self-identified perceptions of sex role are of interest to this study.

The interpretation of scores follows the descriptions provided in the manual for high and low scorers on the various scales. These descriptions, according to the authors, have been derived from a combination of sources: (1) correlations with Q-sorts made by observers of subjects under study at the Institute for Personality Assessment and Research; (2) correlations with other items on the check list; (3) consideration of the items contained in the scales themselves; (4) the personal experience of the authors with the instrument, in both clinical and research settings.

The Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI): The Bem Sex-Role Inventory was developed by Sandra Bem at Stanford and published in 1974. Its purpose was to present scales in which masculinity and femininity could be treated as independent rather than bipolar dimensions of personality. It consists of 60 adjectives or short phrases. Twenty of these refer to qualities traditionally typed as feminine, twenty to qualities typed as masculine, and twenty considered neutral as to sex role. The subject is asked to rate the extent to which these descriptions apply to himself or herself on a seven-point scale, from "never or almost never true" to "always or almost always true." Separate scores are calculated for each subject on masculinity and femininity. The neutral items are not scored.

Analysis shows the BSRI to be internally consistent, with coefficient alpha no lower than .75 (for one of the female samples tested) and as high as .90 (for a male sample). Test-retest data over a period of four weeks range from .76 to .94 for various groups.

Mean raw scores on the BSRI can be used to classify subjects into four types of sex role identification: masculine, feminine, androgynous, and undifferentiated. Methods for doing this have been controversial. Bem's original method called for computing a t ratio as the index of androgyny, based on the difference between masculinity and femininity subscores. This method, however, did not disciminate between subjects who scored high on both scales or low on both. Agreeing with Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp (1975) that only those persons should be called androgynous who show high levels of both masculinity and femininity, Bem now recommends that subjects be classified on the basis of a median split. Those who score above the median on masculinity and below it on femininity can be considered to have a masculine sex role identification; those who score above on femininity and below on masculinity can be considered feminine. Subjects scoring above the medians on both subscales are designated androgynous, while those with both scores below the medians are called "undifferentiated." Median figures for performing this classification can be derived from the sample under investigation or from the normative sample. Bem's original sample consisted of 340 female and 476 male members of an introductory psychology class at Stanford, 1978. Median scores for this sample are reported in the manual and were used for classifying subjects in the present study. Bem also reports mean scores from other representative groups, including a sample of "adults" aged 31-65. Unfortunately, medians are not given for this group. Abrahams, Feldman, and Nash (1978), in their study of adults before and after marriage and children, have demonstrated that sex role identifications may shift over time and ought not

be treated as stable traits. In their samples, the change was in the direction of more traditional attitudes, as subjects grew older and took on the roles of parents. A similar pattern is suggested in the mean scores reported by Bem (1981, p. 8): femininity scores for the women tend to increase with age, with only minimum changes in masculinity subscores. The scores of the male samples fluctuate less over time. Neugarten (1964) did find an increased tolerance for dominance in women and for nurturance and affiliation in men as a function of aging, but this only began to be apparent in a 55-70 year old age group: subjects between the ages of 40 and 54 maintained traditional attitudes. As Motowidlo (1981) has pointed out, what is needed for the Bem inventory are standard cutting scores, so that changes of this kind can be measured against an empirical norm. Until this is accomplished the medians from Bem's samples can only be considered provisional norms. The available evidence suggests, however, that younger men and women are less rather than more sex-typed in their self-assessments (Abrahams, et. al., 1978).

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (SDS): As a check on the test behavior of the subjects, they were also asked to complete the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). This scale consists of 33 statements, 18 of which are keyed "true" and 15 of which are keyed "false". To be qualified for inclusion in the scale, according to the authors, an item should refer to a behavior which is "culturally sanctioned and approved but . . . improbable of occurrence" (ibid., p. 350). For example, the first item reads "Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates." A "true" response is considered to be governed by its social desirability rather than by the subject's actual behavior. An attempt was made, in constructing the scale, to avoid items with pathological implications, since, as the authors maintain, it may be difficult to tell in such a case whether subjects' replies are attributable to social desirability effects or to a genuine absence of symptoms.

The internal consistency coefficient of the SDS is reported as .88, with a test-retest correlation of .89, indicating a stable measure.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Tests of the Hypotheses

Hypothesis One: The first hypothesis maintains that the professional ministry calls on a combination of attributes belonging to both masculine and feminine sex roles, as these are conventionally defined. It therefore predicts that all three groups will contain a significantly high proportion of individuals whose self-descriptions classify them as androgynous on the Bem Sex-Role Inventory.

Classifications were obtained through a median split. The manual for the BSRI provides medians from the 1978 Stanford normative sample, based on the combined raw scores of both male and female subjects. The median raw score on femininity is 4.90; the median raw score on masculinity is 4.95. Subjects whose mean raw scores fell above the median on femininity but at or below it on masculinity were classified as feminine. Those with mean scores above the median on masculinity but at or below it on femininity were classified as masculine. Those with both scores above the medians were classified as androgynous; those with both scores below it were classified as undifferentiated.

Tables 1, 2 and 3 present the results, compared with the results for the normative samples.

If the medians of the original sample are used as criteria, fully a third more of both groups of theological students can be classified as androgynous. Among the clergywomen, almost twice as many qualify as androgynous on the basis of a median split. Hypothesis One is therefore supported.

Table 1. Comparison of Percentages of Subjects Classified as Feminine, Masculine, Androgynous, or Undifferentiated on the Bem Sex-Role Inventory; Stanford Normative Sample vs. Female Theological Students.

Sample	Classification			
	Fem.	Masc.	Andr.	Undiff.
Stanford normative sample, females (N=340)	39.4%	12.4%	30.3%	17.9%
Female theological students (n=49)	26.5%	14.3%	40.8%	18.4%

$X^2 = 8.16$, with 3 df, $p < .05$

Table 2. Comparison of Percentages of Subjects Classified as Feminine, Masculine, Androgynous, or Undifferentiated on the Bem Sex-Role Inventory: Stanford Normative Sample vs. Male Theological Students.

Sample	Classification			
	Fem.	Masc.	Andr.	Undiff.
Stanford normative sample, males (N=476)	11.6%	42.0%	19.5%	26.9%
Male theological students (n=65)	13.8%	35.0%	30.8%	20.0%

$X^2 = 10.58$, with 3 df, $p < .025$

Table 3. Comparison of Percentages of Subjects Classified as Feminine, Masculine, Androgynous, or Undifferentiated on the Bem Sex-Role Inventory: Stanford Normative Sample vs. Female Ministers.

Sample	Classification			
	Fem.	Masc.	Andr.	Undiff.
Stanford normative sample, females (N=340)	39.4%	12.4%	30.3%	17.9%
Female ministers (n=22)	27.3%	13.6%	59.1%	0.0%

$X^2 = 49.11$, with 3 df, $p < .001$

It will be evident from examining the frequencies that there is very little difference between the norm groups and the groups tested for this study in the proportion of subjects with cross-sex identifications; there is no more than a few percentage points difference between the samples in the numbers of males classified as feminine and the number of females classified as masculine. The increase in the proportion of subjects classified as androgynous reflects a decrease in the women classified as feminine and the men classified as masculine. There is also, in the case of the male seminarians and the female ministers, a drop in the percentages of subjects in the undifferentiated category. These shifts will be discussed in the following section.

Hypothesis Two: This hypothesis asserts that women in the professional ministry will be likely to show the agentic, or masculine, qualities identified in previous studies of women in male-dominated occupations. The first prediction following from this hypothesis expects that the female students and the female ministers will both score significantly above the norms for women on the Adjective Check List scales for Achievement, Dominance, and Endurance.

The mean score for the female students on the Achievement scale is 56.31 (s.d.=6.94). On a standard scale with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10, this score corresponds to a percentile rank of 74. The student sample is skewed, with 77.6% of the scores higher than the mean of 50. The difference between their mean score and the population mean of 50 is significant ($t=6.36$, $p<.001$).

The mean score on the Achievement scale is even higher for the professional clergywomen: $\overline{x} = 57.32$ (s.d=5.78). This is at the 77th percentile. Only two of the women in this group have scores lower than 50. The difference between the mean of this group and the population mean is significant ($t=5.93$, $p<.001$).

The mean score of the female students on the Dominance scale of the ACL is 55.02 (s.d=8.80). This corresponds to the 69th percentile. Almost three fourths of the female students' scores fall above the mean of 50 (73.5%). The difference between their mean score and the population mean is significant ($t=3.99$, $p<.001$).

The results for the clergywomen are equally strong. Their mean score on Dominance is 56.68 (s.d=7.62). This falls at the 75th percentile. The difference between this mean and the population mean is significant ($t=4.11$, $p<.001$).

The mean score for the female students on the Endurance scale of the ACL is 54.86 (s.d.=6.68). This places them at the 69th percentile. Three quarters of them (75.5%) score above the mean of 50 and the difference between this mean and their mean score is statistically significant ($t=5.09$, $p<.001$).

The mean Endurance score for the clergywomen is 53.82, which places them at the 65th percentile on this scale. Two thirds of them (68.2%) score higher than 50. The difference between their mean score and the population mean is also significant ($t=3.12$, $p<.01$).

The first prediction under Hypothesis Two is fulfilled. Women seeking or performing professional roles in the ministry do show significantly high levels of motivation for Achievement, Dominance, and Endurance, as these are measured by self-descriptions on the Adjective Check List.

A second prediction under Hypothesis Two sets forth the expectation that women in ministry who are high on dominant, agentic characteristics will show correspondingly low needs for Deference and Abasement.

The female students score below the population mean for Abasement: $\overline{x} = 46.65$ (s.d.=9.16). Two thirds of the students score below the standard mean of 50 and their mean score puts them at the 37th percentile on this scale. The

difference between their score and the population mean is significant ($t=-2.56$, $p<.05$).

The clergywomen's mean on the Abasement scale is lower still: $\overline{x} = 45.14$, s.d.=9.00. No less than 77.3% of this sample have a score below 50. The percentile rank for the group's mean score is 31. The difference between the population and sample means is significant ($t=2.54$, $p<.05$).

Results on the Deference scale are less unequivocal. Once again both female groups score below the standard mean, with mean scores that are almost identical: $\overline{x} = 47.33$ for the students (s.d.=9.24) and $\overline{x} = 47.23$ for the clergywomen (s.d.=8.62). These scores fall at the 39th percentile of a normal distribution. Sixty-eight percent of the clergywomen's scores and sixty-one per cent of the students' scores are less than 50. The difference between the mean score for the students and the population mean is significant ($t=-2.03$, $p<.05$) but this significance does not hold for the smaller group of clergywomen.

This prediction is therefore only partially supported. Both the women seminarians and the working clergywomen score significantly lower than women in general on the Abasement scale of the ACL. However, on the Deference scale, only the students' mean score differs significantly from the norm.

Hypothesis Three proposes that in spite of the high degree of agentic qualities, such as Dominance, shown by women in the ministry, they will also retain some of the traditionally feminine qualities associated with the modality of communion. Specifically, it is predicted that they will not score below the norms for women on the ACL scales for Affiliation and Nurturance.

As the results show, these two groups of ministerial women score significantly higher than women in general on these dimensions. The mean score for the female students on the Nurturance scale is 54.35 (s.d.=6.69). This is at the 67th percentile. Some 73.5% of this group have scores higher than 50. The

difference between their mean and the population mean is significant (t=4.55, $p<.001$). The score for the women ministers is similar: $\overline{x} = 54.91$ (s.d=5.69). The mean score is at the 69th percentile and 68.2% of the scores are higher than 50. This too is statistically significant (t=4.05, $p<.001$).

The same holds true for Affiliation. The female students, with a mean of 52.57 at the 60th percentile (s.d.=8.53), show a significant deviation from the norm (t=2.11, $p<.05$). The mean score of the clergywomen is even higher: $\overline{x} = 54.73$, s.d.=6.96. This corresponds to a percentile rank of 68. A full 81.8% of the clergywomen's scores are higher than 50. The difference between the means is significant (t=3.18, $p<.01$).

The third hypothesis is therefore supported.

Hypothesis Four concerns the males in the sample. Since it is believed that the ministry represents an androgynous profession, it is proposed that male as well as female clergy will display some of the qualities of the opposite sex, as these have been traditionally understood. Prediction five states that the male students will score significantly above the norms for men on the scales for Affiliation and Nurturance. This prediction is upheld.

The male theological students show a mean of 54.89 on the Nurturance scale of the ACL (s.d=7.98). The percentile rank for this score is 69; 74.3% of the men score higher than the norm. This is significantly higher than the population mean of 50 (t=5.15, $p<.001$).

The results are similar for their Affiliation scores. The mean score is the same, 54.89, but variability among the male students is slightly less (s.d.=7.65). Again, over 70% of the group score above the average on this scale. The difference between their mean and the standard mean is significant (t=4.95, $p<.001$).

The final hypothesis, **Hypothesis Five**, is speculative. Suspecting that cross-sex identifications are likely to be more acceptable to women than to men at the present time, given the prevailing values of feminism, this hypothesis suggests that the men may show signs of greater intrapersonal conflict. In the prediction, this is tied to the ACL scale for Personal Adjustment. This prediction is not supported by the data.

All three groups in this study score well above the norms for the Personal Adjustment scale. In the case of the male students, the mean score of 54.59 falls at the 69th percentile. There is a significant difference between this score and the standard mean ($t=6.19$, $p<.001$). Other ACL scales concerned with self-acceptance yield similar scores; on the scales for Self-Confidence and Ideal Self, the scores for all three groups are once again well above average.

Contrary to expectations, therefore, the men in this seminary group present themselves as better adjusted than the male population at large and no less well adjusted than women entering or engaged in the same profession.

Additional Data Supporting the Hypotheses

In addition to comparing percentages of subjects classified according to sex role, it is also instructive to examine the mean raw scores on the BSRI. These are compared in Table 4 with normative samples from the Bem manual.

First of all, it is apparent that all three groups--male and female seminary students and female ministers--could be classified as "androgynous," in that their mean scores fall above the medians given by Bem for Masculinity and Femininity raw scores: 4.95 and 4.90 respectively. However, although the raw score means lie above the medians, they do not differ significantly from the norms for the sex role which matches their biological sex. That is to say, the men do not differ from other men in their masculine identification; the women do not

Table 4. Comparison of Mean Raw Scores on the Bem Sex-Role Inventory: Normative Samples vs. Female Ministers and Male and Female Theological Students.

Sample	Femininity Raw Scores: Mean Score	Standard Deviation		
Stanford normative sample, females* (N=340)	5.05	0.53	t=0.65	n.s.
Female theological students (n=49)	5.01	0.47		
Stanford normative sample, males (N=476)	4.59	0.55	t=7.09	p<.001
Male theological students (n=65)	5.02	0.49		
Stanford adult females (n=59)	5.11	0.46	t=-1.54	n.s.
Female ministers (n=22)	5.00	0.32		

Sample	Masculinity Raw Scores: Mean Score	Standard Deviation		
Stanford normative sample, females (N=340)	4.79	0.66	t=4.30	p<.001
Female theological students (n=49)	5.15	0.59		
Stanford normative sample, males (N=476)	5.12	0.65	t=0.20	n.s.
Male theological students (n=65)	5.14	0.65		
Stanford adult females (n=59)	4.57	0.77	t=7.18	p<.001
Female ministers (n=22)	5.18	0.66		

*Comparison groups are taken from the manual for the BSRI (Bem, 1981, p. 8)

differ from other women in their feminine identification. It is the cross-sex scores which distinguish these groups. The male theological students, without appearing to think of themselves as less masculine, do not hesitate to describe themselves in ways which are typically considered feminine as well. The same is true for the women students and for the working clergywomen. They do not rate themselves as less feminine, but their masculinity mean scores are significantly higher than the masculinity mean scores reported by Bem. In all three cases, the level of significance is high ($p < .001$).

A similar conjunction of scores can be seen on the Adjective Check List. The clergywomen's score on the Feminine Attributes scale, 51.59, does not differ significantly from the population mean of 50, but their score on the Masculine Attributes scale, 53.68, is significantly higher ($p < .05$). The same pattern holds for the male students: their score on the Masculine Attributes scale is exactly at the standard mean, 50.00, but their mean score on Feminine Attributes is higher ($p < .01$). In this case, however, the female students' scores do not differ from those of other females on either scale.

The findings that ministers differ from others not in their identification with their own sex but in their added identification with the opposite sex supports the belief that the ministry calls on both masculine and feminine qualities and is likely to appeal to men and women with an androgynous personality style. This is seen clearly in the scores of working clergywomen and male ministers-in-training on the Bem Sex-Role Inventory and relevant scales of the Adjective Check List. To a lesser extent, it is also seen in the scores of women in training for the ministry. These patterns lend support to the enrichment hypothesis of innovative career choice. According to this view, women making unconventional career decisions are not deviant, in the sense of being less feminine than the average

woman; their experience has been enriched, so that they possess interests or capabilities over and above the norm (Almquist & Angrist, 1970).

Additional support for this interpretation comes from a comparison of the frequencies in each of the four sex role categories. As noted in the previous section, the predicted increase in the numbers of subjects in the androgynous category, when compared with the Stanford norm groups, is largely due to a decrease in the percentage of men in the masculine category and women in the feminine category, that is to say, in the categories representing the conventional stereotypes. This does not mean that there is less masculinity among the men or less femininity among the women, measured overall. Since the androgynous classification requires mean raw scores above the median on both dimensions, this means that there are more subjects with high cross-sex scores in addition to high scores on the qualities associated with their own sex.

This can be illustrated by comparing sums of the two frequencies. In the normative sample of females, 39.4% were classed as feminine and 30.3% as androgynous, for a total of 69.7% with femininity mean scores above the median. Among the student women in this sample, the total is comparable: 67.3%, but the proportion of these classed as androgynous is significantly higher, 40.8%. Among the male students, there are 35.0% classified masculine and 30.8% classified androgynous, for a total of 65.8%, as compared to total of 61.5% in the normative sample of males. In the case of the clergywomen, the total percentage with scores above the median on femininity is very high: 86.4%.

It is once again abundantly clear that the deviance hypothesis regarding women in male-dominated occupations does not hold for these subjects. These women are not less feminine in their identifications; they are more androgynous. The corresponding statement can be made regarding the men: as hypothesized, they are not less masculine than other men; they too are more androgynous in their self-perceived sex role identifications.

An additional finding of interest is the fact that none of the clergywomen were classified as undifferentiated. That is, none of their mean raw scores fell below the median on both masculine and feminine dimensions (17.9% of the norm group were in this category). Without other comparisons, it is not possible to say whether this is due to the effects of maturing, of professional experience, or of the continuing process of selectivity which will undoubtedly reduce the numbers of women graduating from seminary who actually become pastors. It does underscore, however, the impression gained from the interviews that this is a highly individuated group of women, who present themselves in strongly defined terms.

One final comment in this context. In discussing the scores on the Bem inventory, there has been an implicit assumption that the subjects' self-ratings have some correspondence to their personalities or their behavior. It is also possible, of course, that it is the professional ideal rather than the individual which is androgynous, that subjects think of themselves in these terms because the idealized portrait of a minister combines qualities, such as strength and compassion, which in the ordinary view have been apportioned to different sex roles. Women might be particularly apt to ascribe to such an ideal since it is consciously articulated in feminist discussions. What is interesting in the results reported here is that it is not the women still in seminary, were feminism is very much a topic of concern, who describe themselves in the most androgynous terms, but the more experienced women, who belong to a different cohort. Again, one can only speculate on reasons for this rather pronounced difference between the professional clergywomen and both student groups. A relevant study here would be one which administers the BSRI to a comparable group of professional clergymen.

Background Characteristics[1]

1. The Students

Age: The mean age of the male students is 31.03, of the female students, 35.67. The difference is statistically significant ($t=2.89$; $p<.01$). The women are clearly entering training later than the men. Well over half of the male students are still in their twenties as compared with hardly more than a fourth of the females (58.46% vs. 26.53%).

Marital status: Forty-four of the 65 male students are married (67.69%). Twenty-four of these have at least one child, with eight of them having a child younger than six. All but two of the unmarried men are still in their twenties. Two of the men are divorced, no more than 3% of the sample.

The picture is very different among the women. No less than 10 of the 49 are divorced (20.41%). In addition, one woman lists herself as separated. Thirteen of the women students are single (never married). Only half of the women students (51.02%) are presently married, as compared to two thirds of the men (67.69%). The differences among these frequencies are statistically significant ($X^2=9.02$, with 2 df; $p<.025$).

Seventeen of the married women and seven of the divorced women have children at home. For the majority of these, the youngest child has reached school age, but four of the women students have at least one child under six. Five of the older women have children who are grown (19 or older).

Education: An undergraduate degree is a prerequisite for graduate training in theology. For 51 of the male students this is their highest level of non-seminary education. Six list some graduate study without a degree; eight have an

---

[1]For more detailed data, see tables in the Appendix.

M.A. (several have more than one); there is one Ph.D. A higher proportion of the female students have some education past the undergraduate level, but the difference is not significant. Ten have master's level degrees, while nine more have some graduate education without the degree. This amounts to 38.78% of the women as opposed to 21.54% of the men.

Previous occupations: Eleven of the younger men list no previous occupations. Another 22 of those under 30 list a variety of jobs of a type which suggests a way of making a living more than a career--marking time, perhaps, until the decision, or the opportunity to enter seminary (clerical or construction jobs, for example, or youth work for the church). No more than seven of the 38 men under thirty list a career which requires training (among these are a social worker, a teacher, and a diesel mechanic).

Among the 27 men who are 30 or older, the ministry is more clearly a career change. Five have had previous careers in a profession or at top levels of business management. Five others have held lesser management positions, five have been teachers, four come from the corrections field.

Previous occupations listed by the women students cover most of the fields in which women have traditionally been employed. Twenty-one of the 49 have been teachers, for example, four have been librarians, two have been nurses. Sixteen have been in clerical or sales positions. Only one of the questionnaires listed an executive career. Only one suggested a previous choice of the kind typed as innovative or non-traditional: one young woman had worked as a sheriff's deputy. Seven of the women students have worked in counseling, social service, or other helping roles, and six of them have been employed by the church at one time or another.

Role models: Douvan (1976) has commented on the effect of the lack of role models for women in male-dominated fields. All subjects were therefore asked to identify persons who had significantly influenced their choice of

vocation. Thirty-nine per cent of the women said they had had no role models (as compared to 28% of the men). The percentages of those who named professional role models were similar: 57% of the men and 54% of the women. In the case of the men these were all clergymen. In the case of the women, only 16% had a woman minister as a model. Thirty-one per cent of the women named a male minister; six per cent named a woman in another profession.

Clergy relations: For men, the church has been one of the professions in which family traditions run strong. Hale, King and Jones (1980) report in their national survey of United Methodist clergywomen that 50% of them had relatives who were ordained and 34% of them were married to ministers. The percentages for this group of women are lower than the national figures. Twenty-eight percent of the women students have clergy relatives, as compared to 47% of the men. One of the men and two of the women are married to ministers. Two thirds of both groups have no ordained persons in their families.

Parents' education: Any number of studies of the background of professional women find that they are apt to have educated parents. Patrick (1973), for example, in her study of women pursuing graduate degrees found that 59% of their fathers had graduate or professional degrees, another 14% had undergraduate degrees, and 50% of their mothers also had a B.A. degree or higher. This trend does not hold true for this sample of ministerial students. Only 29% of the women's fathers and 22% of their mothers have a college degree or better. Among the men, the figures are 40% for the fathers and 29% for the mothers. Nine per cent of the men's fathers and ten per cent of the women's fathers have no more than a grade school education.

For this group the ministry clearly represents upward mobility. Once they complete the M. Div. degree, 72% of these men will be exceeding the educational level achieved by their fathers. No less than 84% of the women will

have surpassed their father's educational level and 92% of them will be better educated than their mothers.

Parents' occupations: Ten of the 65 men have fathers who are major professionals or executives in large businesses. Nine of them are the sons of ministers. Nine of their fathers are, or were, in lesser business positions. Six are ranchers or farmers. The rest are clerks, salesmen, technicians, or workers.

Distributions among the women are similar. Eight have fathers who are professionals or executives. Only two are the daughters of ministers (and one of these is part-time, without seminary training). Eight of their fathers are farmers. Six have small businesses of their own or are in middle management. The rest are clerks, technicians and workers.

Twenty-eight of the men (43%) and 11 of the women (22%) call their mothers homemakers. Of the 37 men who list an occupation for their mothers, the majority name jobs with minor skill requirements, such as clerk or waitress. Ten of the mothers were teachers, three were administrators of some kind, four were nurses.

More than three fourths of the women have mothers who have worked at some time. The largest number of these (12) were teachers. Five were nurses. Two are designated ministers, but only one of these is a professional. Eight are semi-professionals in lower level administration. The rest are clerical, sales, or factory workers. Fifty-one per cent of the women say that their mothers were employed all through their childhood; another 18% of the mothers worked for a shorter period of time.

These figures make these women comparable to other professional groups reported in the literature. Epstein (1968) and Almquist and Angrist (1970) both report that two thirds of their career-oriented women had working mothers.

Birth order: Professional women tend to be firstborns. Hale, King and Jones (1980) report 53% eldest or only children among the clergywomen they surveyed. Standley and Soule (1974) report 57% among a mixed group of women professionals. The percentages among this group of women in training are the highest of all: six of them are only children and 28 are eldest children, for a combined total of 69%. Only 38% of the male students are firstborns. This difference is significant: $X^2=10.70$, with 1 df; $p<.005$.

Relations with parents: Subjects in this study were asked to estimate which of their parents they felt closer to while growing up and which they believed they resembled most. Both sexes felt closer to their mothers and both felt they were more like their fathers. Perhaps what is noteworthy in their responses is that almost three fourths of the women felt some identification with their fathers, either predominantly (35%) or in addition to their mothers (37%). About half of the men acknowledged some cross-sex identification.

Bowers (1963) and Siegelmann and Peck (1960) refer to the unhappy childhoods of many ministers and believe that the loss of a parent in childhood is common. This is not borne out by the information given by these subjects. No specific questions were asked concerning memories of childhood, but only four of the women and four of the men had lost a parent at an early age.

Sources of difficulty and support: Subjects were asked to identify major sources of difficulty and support during the period of their choosing and then being trained for the ministry. The major source of support for the men is their wives--but for every three women who call their husband a source of support, there is one who names him as a source of difficulty. Both sexes have found support from family members, but the women have depended more on friends to help them through. Interestingly, more of the women mentioned the support of their home church or pastor: 35% of the women as compared to 11% of the men

called this a major source of support--leading one to conclude that while some women meet opposition to their ordination because of their sex, in other cases the novelty of their choice may gain them extra attention or support. Although "attitudes toward women in ministry" was the third most frequently cited obstacle, the actual percentage of women who mentioned this was 14%. Apparently, in 1982, this was no longer a major deterrent to entering seminary.

The highest place on both lists goes to the struggle with "self"--but considerably more men than women put this down (28% vs. 17%). Money is a greater problem to the men; time is a greater problem to the women. Perhaps this reflects the stresses attendant on family roles: for men trying to support families while they complete their training and for women continuing to manage a home. If women find children a source of role strain, they also find them a source of support. Eighteen per cent of the women called them this; none of the men brought them up.

Vocational choice and career plans: Seventy-one per cent of the male students say that they were in their teens or twenties when they felt called to the ministry, and that they took active steps toward this career within three years after that. For the women, there are two distinct patterns. Fifty-three per cent of the sample began to prepare themselves for their career within three years, but 22 of the 49 women (45%) had waited ten years or longer.

Asked about their immediate career plans, a substantial proportion of both groups expect to be employed in the parish ministry following graduation. The women are less certain than the men, however, that this is the direction in which they will go, 45% vs. 69%. This difference is significant ($X^2=6.83$, with 1 df; $p<.001$).

Asked to describe their ideal job within the church, the percentage of both groups naming the parish ministry drops considerably. It appears that many

of them expect that their first job will be in the local church but hope eventually to exercise a more individual or innovative form of service, such as a chaplaincy, a special ministry (to the arts, or the handicapped, for example), or as pastoral counselors.

Finally, the students were asked what they thought they would be doing if the ministry had been closed to them for any reason. Two thirds of the women and one half of the men named another helping profession. Five of the women who named another profession said they thought they would continue to work for the church in a volunteer capacity. None of the men named this option.

Summary: To summarize briefly, the women in this sample of students preparing for the ministry compare to men in the same school as follows:

They are likely to be older than the men, and to have taken up preparation for the ministry after a longer delay. They are much more likely to be divorced. Like the men, two thirds of them can point to professionals who influenced their choice of vocation, but only 16% of them had a woman minister as a model. Thirty-nine percent of them had no model at all. Fewer of them have had relatives who were ordained. In their families, they are much more likely to have been eldest or only children; sixty-nine per cent of them had this status. Like the men, they felt closer to their mothers as they were growing up, but believe they resemble their fathers more. Like the men, they can point to support from their spouses, but they seem to get more opposition from that source as well. They feel more supported by their friends, their ministers, their home church, and their children. Significantly fewer of them are planning to work in the local church; many would prefer a chaplaincy or a teaching or counseling role. If the ministry had been closed to them, the largest proportion of both men and women would probably be teachers, or, especially in the case of the women, go into another of the helping professions.

These women resemble women in other male-dominated fields in that they are likely to have had mothers who worked. They differ from them in that they are much less likely to have had parents who were educated beyond high school or who had professional careers. Of the mothers who worked, virtually all of them were employed in jobs in which, traditionally, women predominate: they were teachers, nurses, secretaries, and the like. None of them were themselves in male-dominated occupations, and while their daughters may have made an innovative choice in applying to be ministers, if this field had been closed to them they, too, would return to more traditional careers.

2. The Clergywomen[2]

Background characteristics of the clergywomen will be summarized here. A fuller discussion of these and other variables can be found in the following chapter.

Age: The mean age for the clergywomen is 41.33 (s.d.=8.73). The range is from 28 to 57, with the median at 40. Two of the women are still in their twenties, seven are in their thirties, seven in their forties, and five are over fifty. (One woman's age was not given.)

Marital status: Ten are married, three are single (never married), two are widows, and seven (32%) are divorced. In addition, one of the women has remarried following a divorce, and one of the others is presently separated from her husband. Thirteen of the 22 (59%) have children at home. For the majority, the youngest child is now in high school, but four of them have children of grade school age, and for two of them the youngest child is still preschool. Four of the older women no longer have a child living at home.

---

[2]For more detailed data, see tables in the Appendix.

Education: Fifteen of the twenty-two graduated from Iliff, seven from other schools of theology. As undergraduates only one majored in religion. Eight were education majors, two have science degrees, the rest majored in psychology or one of the humanities. Four have master's degrees in addition to the Master of Divinity Degree, and one has gone on to obtain a Ph.D. in theology.

Previous occupations: Their work backgrounds are dominated by teaching and related fields. Nine of them have taught school--up to 17 years before entering seminary--and one of them has been a school administrator at the state level. In addition, three of them have held church staff positions in religious education. One was a counselor, two were in business (one at the managerial level), three were employed as technicians in scientific fields. The remaining two women said that they had been self-employed, or had worked at "odd jobs", but had no prior career as such.

Role models: Virtually all of the women first responded to this question by saying that, at the beginning at least, they had no role models. The people some of them went on to name were those who had helped or influenced them, but who were not necessarily primary inspirations. Only four named clergywomen. Three named clergymen (one said she gained a new image for the ministry by knowing "some nurturing men"). The rest named family members, teachers, or the like.

Clergy relations: Like the students, two-thirds of the clergywomen have had no ordained persons in their families. Of those with clergy relations, the largest number named husbands: three of the women are presently married to ministers, two are divorced from ministers, and one is the widow of a minister. Of the fifteen who said that none of their relatives had been ordained, seven volunteered the information that they came from what they called "a strong

church family," in which lay participation in the work of the church was an important value. Two of these have brothers who are also ministers.

Parents' education: The figures on parents' education are similar to those for the seminary women: 27% of the clergywomen have fathers with a college degree or better, as compared to 29% of the students' fathers. More of the ministers' mothers have a B.A. or some education past the B.A. (27% vs. 22%), but there are no graduate degrees among the ministers' mothers. All of the clergywomen, in other words, are better educated than their mothers were.

Parents' occupations: Two of these women's fathers were professionals (a dentist and a college chancellor). Another two, as noted above, were ministers. Two can be classified as lesser professionals, one was in middle management. Four were farmers, four were in sales and clerical occupations, two were skilled workers, and five were semi-skilled.

Contrary to findings in the literature on professional women--and to those on the female ministerial students in this study--by far the majority of these women grew up with mothers who did not work outside the home (15 of the 22, or 68%). Of the seven who did work, two were teachers, two were nurses, and three did moderately skilled work such as hairdressing. Three of the women, in answering this question, said that although their mothers were not employed, they remember them as very active and influential volunteers.

Birth order: Two of the clergywomen are only children; nine are the oldest in their families. This gives a combined total of eleven firstborns, or 50% of the sample. This is considerably lower than the 68% figure for the women students, but comparable to the national figure given by Hale, King and Jones (1980) for UMC clergywomen (53%).

Relations with parents: Like the students, more of the clergywomen felt closer to their mothers than their fathers while growing up, but the percentage is

notably lower (36% vs. 57%). A higher proportion said they felt close to neither parent, and described independent, if not unhappy, childhoods. Again like the female students, more of the women consider themselves like their fathers. Ten of the 22 (45%) said they were more like their fathers than their mothers; another two thought they resembled both parents.

Sources of support and difficulty: These questions referred to the path to ordination; later questions inquired into their working relationships and relations with their present congregation.

Friends have been by far the greatest source of support for these women, although a couple of them also said that they had lost friends who disapproved of their decision to enter the ministry. As with the students, husbands have been both a source of support and a source of opposition. The greatest source of difficulty, however, has been money, time, or fatigue, the sheer effort required to combine homemaking with professional training. "The male hierarchy" figures in seven of the responses regarding difficulty, but home church or pastor account for eleven of the responses concerning support.

Vocational choice and career plans: Four of the women say that they felt a call to some kind of ministry while still in childhood, but did not "name" it until later in life. Nine of them made the choice in high school or college; nine of them came to the decision as mature women. Eight of the women stated that they began to make plans as soon as the decision was clear and applied to seminary on this basis. But a larger number, eleven, did not actually decide to seek ordination until after entering seminary. This pattern will be explored in the chapter on the interviews.

All but two of the women are presently serving in the local church. Asked what their ideal job would be, seven of them replied, "I have it." Four of

those giving this response were pastors of their own church; three were associates in a larger church with several clergy on the staff. Eight women said they would like to be the senior pastor, with responsibility for their own congregation. One would prefer a chaplaincy. The remaining six described qualities of work or work situations which were important to them--such as "some place with a more open social climate"--but did not specify a role.

Asked what they thought they would be doing if ordination had been closed to them, the largest number, eight (36%), said they thought they would probably be in counseling. Another seven (32%) gave teaching as their probable career. One chose medicine (the career she rejected to enter the ministry), another would have remained in social work. The rest guessed that they would probably be working for the church in some non-ordained capacity.

Other Findings

1. Social desirability

The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale was included as a measure of test-taking attitude. No predictions were made concerning the results.

The mean score for the female students in this study was 14.8 (s.d = 6.08). On the scale provided by Crowne and Marlowe a raw score of 14 is equivalent to a standard score of 48 (1964, p. 210). The male students' mean score is 15.45 (s.d = 5.77), for a standard score of 50. The mean score for the clergywomen is 14.70 (s.d = 5.08), which also gains them a standard score of 50.

Based on these scores, we can say that these subjects did not make any greater attempt to give socially approved answers than the average respondent. The assumption is therefore made that their scores can be evaluated on the same basis as other groups reported in the literature.

2. Personality characteristics of women ministers, with comparisons to women in other male-dominated occupations.

Table 5 provides the mean scores and standard deviations for both groups of female subjects on twenty-eight scales of the Adjective Check List. These are compared for significance against the standard mean of 50. A similar table is provided (Table 6) which compares selected scale scores for the working clergywomen with scores reported in two other studies of professional women: Feulner, 1979, and Constantini and Craik, 1972.

For the purposes of this discussion, findings are grouped under three variables commonly found in studies of professional women: those having to do with achievement motives and competency; those concerned with their femininity; and those related to their personal adjustment. In interpreting the scores, it should be borne in mind that the average scores of the subjects in this study fall within one standard deviation of the mean. That is, they are no more than moderately high. The modal portraits offered by the authors should therefore be tempered accordingly.

Achievement and competence: Gough and Heilbrun define the need for achievement as "to strive to be outstanding in pursuits of socially recognized significance" (1980, p. 8). They described the high-scorer on their Ach scale as

> . . . a hard-working, goal-oriented individual, who is determined to do well and usually does. The motive to succeed seems to lie less in competitive drives than in an insistent need to live up to high and socially commendable criteria of performance. (ibid.)

Both the clergywomen and the women students are, as predicted under the hypotheses, high-scorers on the Achievement scale--well above the norms for their sex ($p < .001$) and well into the company of high-achievers described in the literature on professional women. The mean score of the clergywomen is not significantly different from the mean score reported by Feulner for a mixed group

Table 5. Mean Standard Scores on the Adjective Check List for Female Ministers and Theological Students, Tested for Significance Against the Standard Mean ($\overline{X}$ =50).

ACL Scale	Ministers $\bar{x}$	Ministers s.d.	Students $\bar{x}$	Students s.d.
Total no. of adjectives checked	53.18***	6.66	53.20***	10.34
No. of favorable adjectives checked	56.66*	6.78	55.59*	7.67
No. of unfavorable adjectives checked	41.86*	3.24	44.61*	6.19
Communality	48.73	7.13	51.00	7.20
Achievement	57.32*	5.78	56.31*	6.94
Dominance	56.68*	7.62	55.02*	8.80
Endurance	53.82**	5.75	54.86*	6.68
Order	51.73	5.82	52.52**	6.53
Intraception	56.41*	6.70	56.67*	6.88
Nurturance	54.91*	5.69	54.35*	6.69
Affiliation	54.74**	6.96	52.57***	6.96
Heterosexuality	54.46**	6.43	53.49**	8.97
Exhibition	50.86	8.82	51.85	8.64
Autonomy	50.91	7.62	51.00	8.93
Aggression	52.55	10.40	52.78	9.89
Change	52.32	7.30	53.10**	7.61
Succorance	41.50*	6.10	46.63**	8.20
Abasement	45.14***	9.00	46.65***	9.16
Deference	47.23	8.62	47.33***	9.24
Counseling Readiness	49.14	7.76	48.67	9.03
Self-Control	48.46	7.96	48.49	9.54
Self-Confidence	57.77*	6.29	54.98*	8.34
Personal Adjustment	53.77**	4.87	53.80*	7.51
Ideal Self	59.50*	7.70	56.92*	6.76
Creative Personality	60.68*	7.02	57.49*	8.97
Military Leadership	52.32	6.21	53.86*	6.72
Masculine Attributes	53.68***	8.07	50.80	9.19
Feminine Attributes	51.59	7.85	51.12	10.31

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

Table 6. Mean Standard Scores of Professional Clergywomen on Selected Scales of the Adjective Check List Compared with Mean Scores of Female Political Leaders and a Mixed Group of Female Physicians, Lawyers, and University Professors.

	$\bar{x}$		$\bar{x}$	t	p
Scale 5: Achievement					
Orrick, 1983 Clergywomen (n=22)	57.32	Feulner, 1979 Mixed professionals (n=173)	59.08		n.s.
		Constantini and Craik, 1972 Political leaders (n=93)	60.70	-2.74	.025
Scale 6: Dominance					
Orrick, 1983 Clergywomen (n=22)	56.68	Feulner, 1979 Mixed professionals (n=173)	57.94		n.s.
		Constantini and Craik, 1972 Political leaders (n=93)	61.23	-2.80	.025
Scale 10: Nurturance					
Orrick, 1983 Clergywomen (n=22)	54.91	Feulner, 1979 Mixed professionals (n=173)	50.27	3.82	.01
		Constantini and Craik, 1972 Political leaders (n=93)	51.53	3.03	.025
Scale 11: Affiliation					
Orrick, 1983 Clergywomen (n=22)	54.73	Constantini and Craik, 1972 Political leaders (n=93)	50.30	2.98	.025
Scale 12: Heterosexuality					
Orrick, 1983 Clergywomen (n=22)	54.46	Feulner, 1979 Mixed professionals (n=173)	50.17	3.12	.025
		Constantini and Craik, 1972 Political leaders (n=93)	49.41	3.68	.01

Table 6: (Continued)

	$\bar{x}$		$\bar{x}$	t	p
Scale 17: Succorance					
Orrick, 1983 Clergywomen (n=22)	41.50	Feulner, 1979 Mixed professionals (n=173)	46.31	-3.97	.025
		Constantini and Craik, 1972 Political leaders (n=93)	42.30		n.s.
Scale 18: Abasement					
Orrick, 1983 Clergywomen (n=22)	45.14	Constantini and Craik, 1972 Political leaders (n=93)	41.39		n.s.
Scale 23: Personal Adjustment					
Orrick, 1983 Clergywomen (n=22)	53.77	Feulner, 1979 Mixed professionals (n=173)	51.32	2.36	.01
		Constantini and Craik, 1972 Political leaders (n=93)	55.58		n.s.

of women physicians, lawyers, and university professors (1979). The clergywomen are somewhat less achievement-oriented, however, than the women political leaders studied by Constantini and Craik (1972).

Dominance is a quality associated with achievement and leadership. Gough and Heilbrun define it as the need "to seek and maintain a role as leader in groups or to be influential and controlling in individual relationships" (1980, p. 8).

> The high-scorer on Dominance is a strong-willed, ambitious, determined, and forceful individual, free of self-doubt in the pursuit of goals, and little if at all inhibited by the disapproval or opposition of others. The high-scorer is affiliative and adroit in directing the group's activities toward the attainment of socially worthy objectives. (ibid., p. 9)

Again as predicted under the hypotheses, the scores of both groups of women on Dominance are higher than those of women in the general population ($p < .001$). The clergywomen do not differ from Feulner's women professionals in this respect, although again they are less dominant than the politicians.

Predictions were also made concerning the women's scores on the ACL scales for Deference and Abasement, predictions which were for the most part supported. Gough and Heilbrun call Abasement the need "to express feelings of inferiority through self-criticism, guilt, or social impotence." They call Deference the need "to seek and maintain subordinate roles in relationships with others" (p. 14). Women pursuing careers in the ministry are actively seeking leadership roles and score, as expected, significantly below other women on these scales. In this, the clergywomen especially resemble the political leaders, whose scores on the Abasement scale are also considerably below the norm. They neither feel nor act inferior, nor do they readily accept subordinate positions.

The clergywomen resemble the politicians as well in their scores on the Succorance scale, which rank among their lowest. Succorance is defined as the need "to solicit sympathy, affection, or emotional support from others" and the

low-scorer is described as "independent, relatively unbothered by self-doubt and equivocation, and effective in setting and attaining goals" (p. 14).

Interestingly enough, in spite of their willingness to set themselves apart in assuming a leadership role and their reluctance to show dependency on others, the clergywomen and the women students do not score significantly above average on scales for Autonomy and Aggression. Presumably, their high levels of nuturance and affiliation work against their withdrawing from others and treating them as rivals. (It should be noted, however, that Aggression scores show greater variability among the clergywomen than any other scale.) It does not appear, either, that the opportunity to perform or gain the attention of others is a significant motivator for these two groups of women in ministry. Their scores on Exhibition are at the mean for women in general.

Another scale which can be related to competence is the one known as Creative Personality. This scale includes such adjectives as "clever," "interests wide," "original," "resourceful," and "inventive." Gough and Heilbrun call the high-scorer "venturesome, aesthetically reactive, clever, and quick to respond. Intellectual characteristics such as breadth of interests, cognitive ability, and ideational fluency are also apparent" (p. 18).

> High-scorers will be seen as ambitious and assertive, impatient when blocked or frustrated, quick to take the initiative and get things moving, and stubbornly insistent on attaining their goals. (p. 19).

For both groups of women in this study, Creative Personaltiy is their highest score, suggesting that their predominant qualities, as they describe themselves, have to do with their intellectual capacities and the value they place on ideas and the ability to express them. This seems congruent with the role of minister, involving as it does the public explication of theological ideas. Support for this can also be found in their high scores on Intraception, or the attempt "to understand one's own behavior or the behavior of others" (p. 10). Intraception is

the third highest score for the women still in seminary and the seventh highest for the clergywomen, differing from the population mean at $p < .001$.

Personal Adjustment: The emotional adjustment of career-oriented women has received a good deal of attention, as exemplified in the argument over deviance and enrichment theories of career choice. The Adjective Check List provides several scales which are intended as indices of emotional health. The Personal Adjustment scale, for one, is said to reflect adaptation and self-esteem. The high-scorer on this scale

> . . . has a positive attitude toward life, enjoys the company of others, and feels capable of initiating activities and carrying them through to conclusion. High-scorers do not possess psychodynamic self-understanding, but they do appear to possess the ability to 'love and work', proposed by Freud as the critical criteria of personal adjustment. (p. 17)

Both the clergywomen and the student women score significantly above the standard mean on this scale. Their scores are also significantly higher than those of Feulner's mixed group of professional women. The mean score reported by Constantini and Craik for their group of women political leaders is higher than those for the women in this study, but the differences are not significant.

Confidence is a necessity for professional women and appears in virtually all summaries of their distinguishing characteristics. As measured by the Self-Confidence scale of the ACL, these ministers and ministers-in-training have it to a much higher degree than the average woman ($p < .001$) and in a measure comparable to that of the other professional women whose ACL scores are reported for this scale.

> The high-scorers on S-Cfd are initiators, confident of their ability to achieve goals. They are not above cutting a few corners to create a good impression, and observers do see them as assertive, enterprising and self-confident. (p. 17).

The Counseling Readiness scale is intended to tap the kind of insecurities and dissatisfactions which commonly lead an individual to seek counseling.

Positive correlations on the Q-sort are with items describing anxiety, anomie, gloominess, and a tendency to ruminate. The women politicians score high on this scale--higher than a group of male politicians--suggesting that their position places them under strain. The two groups of women in ministry, however, score slightly below the mean, suggesting that they are generally at ease with themselves. Support for this interpretation is also seen in their scores on the Ideal Self scale, which measures congruence between image of the self and image of the ideal. Their scores on this scale rank second highest of the 28 scales scored for the study. Gough and Heilbrun compare high-scorers on this scale with high-scorers on Personal Adjustment:

> High-scorers appear to be characterized by interpersonal effectiveness and goal-attaining abilities, as were high-scorers on P-Adj. In addition, there seem to be elements of narcissistic ego-inflation. High-scorers on Iss should tend to be rated as well-adjusted by observers, on a par with high-scorers on P-Adj, but as less likeable. (p. 18).

Related to their presentation of self as close to their ideal is the fact that both groups of women checked substantially more favorable adjectives to describe themselves (and correspondingly fewer unfavorable adjectives). Compared to the average score on these two scales, the difference is significant at $p < .001$. The authors of the ACL do not accept the proposition that this kind of responding can be attributed simply to the desire to appear in a favorable light to the examiner. They believe that favorability is itself a personality factor which correlates with other attributes.

> The method used to develop the scale (selection of the 75 most favorable items on the list) suggested at least the possibility that high-scorers would be egotistical, self-centered persons, indifferent to their own imperfections. The description and other correlates of the scale, however, indicate that these inferences are incorrect. High-scorers are seen as adaptable, outgoing individuals, protective of those close to them, cheerful in the face of adversity, and productive as workers. The desirability of their self-descriptions, in other words, is not a fraud or self-deception; on the contrary, high-scorers on Fav appear to be quite justified in ascribing these favorable items to themselves. (p. 6).

Another dimension frequently used as an index of adjustment is heterosexual relations. Both groups of women in this study score significantly higher than the average on the Heterosexuality scale of the ACL. The mean scores are 53.49 for the students and 54.46 for the working clergywomen ($p < .01$). Constantini and Craik report a mean of 49.41 for their sample of politicians; Feulner reports a mean of 50.41 for her group. Neither of these stores is deviant, but the difference between them and the two minister groups' scores is significant at $p < .01$, suggesting that these churchwomen are, if anything, more apt to be oriented toward the opposite sex than other women professionals.

On all these counts, therefore, it seems that women pursuing professional careers in the ministry not only match but exceed the levels of adjustment shown by certain other groups of professional women as well as those shown by women in the general population. These women see themselves as self-confident, sociable, active, successful people, generally untroubled by introspective self-doubt.

Femininity: A prime concern of investigators of career-oriented women has been their femininity. Are they "normal" women? or are they imitators and enviers of men?

The high score on Heterosexuality reported above is one indication that these women are no less feminine than other women. Other indications are their mean scores on the Feminine Attributes scale. Neither these means nor their mean Femininity scores on the BSRI diverge from those of other women. They tend to be slightly, though not significantly, higher.

Nurturance and affiliation--the desires to be with others and to care for them--are associated with the idea of communion and qualities of traditional femininity. Gough and Heilbrun define Nurturance as "to engage in behaviors that provide material or emotional benefits to others." The high-scorer on Nurturance

"appears to like people; to have a cooperative, unaffected, and tactful social manner; and to be sympathetic and supportive in temperament" (p. 10). They call Affiliation the need "to seek and maintain numerous personal friendships" (p. 10).

> The high-scorer on Affiliation is comfortable in social situations, likes to be with people, and adapts easily to the changing demands of group process. Little if at all given to soul-searching, the high-scorer glosses over inner complexities and prefers to take people and events at face value. (p. 11).

It is in their high scores on these two scales that the women in ministry differ from the other professional samples for which ACL scores are available. According to their self-ratings, they are more nurturant and more affiliative than the political leaders and more nurturant than the lawyers, physicians, and professors. (Affiliation scores are not given for Feulner's group.) They are even, as reported above, more highly nurturant and affiliative than the average--and presumably more traditional--woman, lending support to the thesis that the ministry will attract women with special combinations of masculine and feminine attributes.

Summary: To summarize briefly, studies of women in male-dominated professions such as medicine, law, and politics find them to be above average in their self-confidence, self-esteem, and personal adjustment. They are achievement oriented and independent, often dominant, sometimes aggressive, and persistent in reaching their goals. They dislike subordinate roles and seldom appeal to others for reassurance and emotional support. Apart from these qualities—which have traditionally been called masculine—they do not differ from other women in their interest in the opposite sex, their sociability, or their ability to care for others.

Women pursuing career goals in the ministry, as represented by the seminary students and clergywomen surveyed for this study, resemble other career women in many respects. They too present themselves as confident and well-adjusted, with high aspirations, the ability to persist, and a liking for

leadership roles. They are dominant rather than submissive, self-sufficient rather than dependent. Where they diverge from the consensus on career women is in their highly nurturant approach to others and in their high need for affiliation. They have both these qualities to a greater degree than either the average woman or the typical career woman. Besides their general tendency to involve themselves in numerous relationships, the clergywomen may also tend to seek the company of men more than other women. As a group, they also appear to be less aggressive than other career-oriented women--although certain individuals among them may be high on this quality.

3. Personality characteristics of male theological students

Findings on men in the ministry do not converge quite so consistently as those on career women. Some outlines do emerge from the research, however, sufficient for a rough comparison with the subjects in this study. Table 7 gives mean scores on the ACL for the male subjects in this study, tested for significance against the population mean.

There is general agreement that ministers are highly affiliative. This is true of the men in this sample, who score significantly higher than average on the ACL Affiliation scale. There is also agreement on the finding that clergymen are nurturant. This group's mean score on this variable bears this out; they differ from the average man on this dimension at the level of $p < .001$. Another common finding is that ministers are dominant and this, too, is seen in the significantly high scores of these men on the ACL scales for Dominance and their significantly low scores on Abasement.

Some authors believe that a distinguishing characteristic of ministers is their need for attention and approval. Siegelmann and Peck, for example, call them insecure men, "dependent on personal acceptance and recognition" (1960, p.

Table 7. Mean Standard Scores on the Adjective Check List for Male Theological Students, Tested for Significance Against the Standard Mean ($\overline{X}$ =50).

ACL Scale	$\overline{x}$	s.d.
Total no. of adjectives checked	52.86**	7.71
No. of favorable adjectives checked	55.11*	7.19
No. of unfavorable adjectives checked	44.77*	5.33
Communality	50.88	6.84
Achievement	52.28	9.35
Dominance	52.92**	8.24
Endurance	52.06	9.07
Order	51.52	8.59
Intraception	55.17*	6.77
Nurturance	54.89*	7.98
Affiliation	54.89*	7.65
Heterosexuality	56.65*	9.62
Exhibition	51.52	8.87
Autonomy	49.22	7.96
Aggression	51.43	9.30
Change	50.92	8.27
Succorance	46.80*	6.92
Abasement	47.26***	8.33
Deference	50.43	8.90
Counseling Readiness	46.62**	7.97
Self-Control	49.06	8.39
Self-Confidence	54.99*	8.20
Personal Adjustment	54.59*	6.54
Ideal Self	56.15*	8.01
Creative Personality	54.03*	7.78
Military Leadership	51.79	7.56
Masculine Attributes	50.00	9.64
Feminine Attributes	53.68*	9.60

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

329). At least in their self-descriptions, these men do not fit that pattern. Their mean scores on Exhibition are no more than average and they score well below the norm on Succorance, or emotional dependency and need for reassurance.

Some authors emphasize the "set-apartness" of the clergy and point to above average scores on measures of autonomy and isolation (e.g. Byers, 1968, and Schroeder, 1958). Autonomy scores are not elevated for this group on the ACL, however. Others, in speaking of difficulties with impulse expression, talk of repressed or displaced aggressiveness as an area of conflict (see Bloom, 1971). On the ACL scale for Aggression, the mean score for this group is very close to the mean for the general population, suggesting that they neither express nor deny aggression to an unusual degree.

Much has been made of the elevation on the Mf scale of the MMPI which is typical of clergy profiles. Many have interpreted this as a sign of homosexual conflicts. The men in this sample have no hesitation in expressing either their femininity or their interest in the opposite sex. Their Feminine Attributes score is higher than the mean for men in general; their Masculine Attributes score is exactly at the mean for other men; and their highest scale score is that on Heterosexuality ($\overline{x}$ = 56.65, $p < .001$). While one interpretation might be that the high Heterosexuality score represents a defense against feminine interests, the general pattern also seems consistent with the hypothesis that male clergy may be better termed androgynous than effeminate. Correlational studies by Volentine (1981) found that individuals classified as androgynous on the BSRI tended to be typed as feminine on the basis of their scores on the Mf scale of the MMPI. This led her to conclude that this scale might better be considered a measure of F rather than M/F.

Finally, there is the question of the adjustment--or maladjustment--of the clergy. On all the relevant scales of the ACL this group of men presents as

better adjusted than average. These scales include Self-Confidence, Personal Adjustment, Ideal Self, Favorable Adjectives Checked, and Counseling Readiness.

4. A modal portrait of the clergy

Since standard scores on the ACL are computed from different tables for men and women, direct statistical comparisons of scores are not appropriate. It can be seen, however, that the significantly high scores in both groups tend to be on the same scales. There are no high scale scores for the men which are not also high scale scores for the women. Nevertheless, there are two scales on which the women score significantly above the norms for their sex but the men do not: the scales for Achievement and Endurance. These are qualities which do not figure in research on men in the ministry. Compared to other options open to men, the ministry does not demand unusual levels of aspiration or persistence. For women, it is another story. At the present time, it seems likely that only a high-achieving woman will present herself for such a career.

Bachtold (1976) believes that characteristics which define a vocation may be specific to the vocation rather than to the sex of the person seeking it. She proposes, in other words, that men and women in a given field may differ less from each other than from members of their own sex in another field. Constantini and Craik provide an illustration of this in their study of political leaders (1972). Men and women in this field obtain their highest mean scores on the same three scales, with a rank correlation among all scales of .88.

Mean scores for the three groups in this study are ranked in the Appendix. Calculation of Spearman's rank correlation coefficient between the scale scores of male and female students gives a rho of .83. Between the clergywomen and the female students the correlation is .93. The difference between these two correlations is not significant.

Drawing on the self-descriptions of these three groups of clergy and clergy-in-training, we can construct a modal portrait of a minister. She--or he --is a highly self-confident, sociable individual who enjoys taking an ascendant role in relation to others. This may be either as a leader or as a helper; both roles can satisfy needs to dominate. Ministers prefer to present themselves to others as socially at ease and successful. They avoid unproductive ruminations over their own shortcomings and they seldom seek others out to ask for their reassurance. A minister, whether male or female, values ideas and has the ability to express them fluently. Without deviating greatly from the accepted values of the community, a minister may be unconventional in one respect: in the possession and expression of qualities traditionally assigned to the opposite sex. She may be dominant as well as nurturing; he can be pastoral as well as prophetic. Whether it is the clergy who have shifted, or merely the prevailing modes of description, the results of this study suggest that an enrichment, rather than a deviance, hypothesis may best explain the choice of a career in the ministry, by men as well as by women.

CHAPTER VI

INTERVIEWS WITH THE CLERGYWOMEN

Material from the interviews which can be quantified and compared with the results of previous studies has been presented above. In the course of the conversations, however, much emerged which was not anticipated and cannot be counted. It was in the expectation of this that the clergywomen were interviewed in person, rather than surveyed by mail, and that both subject and interviewer were left free to depart from the outline. Since little formal research has been published to date on women entering the ministry, it was hoped that an open approach would help to clarify issues and identify areas for future investigation.

The setting

The Rocky Mountain Conference of the United Methodist Church covers the states of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming. The jurisdiction to which it belongs has one of the highest percentages in the UMC of women among clergy under pastoral appointment. This conference also includes one of the three UMC clergywomen in the nation serving as a District Superintendent. Like Iliff, the theological school from which many of its clergy have graduated, the conference has recently taken a liberal and supportive stance toward the ordination of women. Their experience in this region cannot therefore be assumed to comparable to the experience of women in other denominations, or even typical of United Methodist clergywomen in other parts of the country.

Pastoral appointments in the UMC are made by the bishop, in contrast to other denominations in which the local congregation "calls" its minister. This is a

primary factor in the careers of women. Provided that the bishop is sympathetic, it means that the introduction of women into pastoral roles does not wait on a change of attitude in the local church. It has been said that within the next five years, given the numbers of women entering training, a majority of the churches in the Rocky Mountain Conference will have the experience of having a woman on their ministerial staff--whether they want to or not. This has already produced a situation which may be close to unique: one in which women are beginning to constitute a significant portion of the working clergy in a mainline denomination (approximately 10% at the time of the survey). These women and their experience reflect, in other words, not so much things as they are but the shape of things to come.

Present appointments

At the time of the interviews, thirteen of the twenty women working in the local church were still in their first appointment since being ordained. Traditionally, first appointments are of two types: either as an associate pastor in a large urban or suburban congregation or as pastor (and sole minister) in a small rural congregation.

Especially in the case of the rural churches, the guaranteed appointment system is a mixed blessing--for both the women and their congregations. Many of these churches are in communities of a few hundred people on the high plains of eastern Colorado, where it may be 40 miles to the next town, and as much as 200 miles to Denver or Colorado Springs. Their populations tend to be both church-centered and conservative, and not necessarily hospitable to innovation. From the point of view of the women, in order to begin their career, the appointment system may require them to move away from friends, home, and resources, perhaps to move family with them, into some very small towns indeed. From the

point of view of the rural churches, the appointment system guarantees them a pastor, without their having to compete with affluent urban congregations, but they may be forced to accept one whom they consider uncongenial. The anomaly arising from this practice lies in the fact that the quality and level of experience of the women currently being ordained is high--with the result that some of these isolated parishes are presently better served than they have been in years. Noting the situation, a wry saying has sprung up among the women in which they refer to themselves as "a string of pearls across the plains."

Pastors: Of the eight women with current appointments as pastors, five have rural congregations of this type. Three of these are "two-point charges," in which the minister is responsible for churches in more than one town (anywhere from ten to thirty miles apart). Two other women with appointments as pastor--and longer tenure in the conference--now have congregations within commuting distance of Denver. One woman, ordained some fifteen years ago, has become the first to be named pastor of a church in Denver itself.

Pastors of a small congregation are responsible for all the functions of a minister, including conducting services, teaching, counseling, pastoral care, and the details of church leadership and administration. If there are other paid staff, which is not necessarily the case, they are part-time secretarial or janitorial help only. The minister must depend for other assistance on the willingness of church members to volunteer their time. Only one of the women is in a position to have clergy working under her: as pastor of a Denver congregation with 400 members, she has two part-time student associates.

Associates: Twelve of the women have appointments as associates. Two of these are serving with their husbands, one in a co-pastorate, one sharing a one-and-a-half time position. The rest function as assistants to a (male) senior pastor, and may be one of the several clergy on his staff.

Associates tend to be filling well-defined slots, with primary responsibilities limited to specific parts of the church's program. One is designated a Youth Minister, for example; others may be titled Minister of Education. Education, in any case, seems to be the province of most of the women with associate status, whether or not it is their preferred specialty. Nine of the twelve women with staff positions give this as their main responsibility. Feelings about this are mixed. Seven of the women taught before entering the ministry, either in school systems or in the church, and their interests continue to lie in this area. A couple of them, however, chafe under the knowledge the teaching remains within the traditional boundaries of "women's work" in the church, and are hoping to be able to move out of these roles. "It's no longer my main interest," one of them remarked, "but it was the job I could get."

Most of the associates also share other duties with the senior pastor, such as counseling, hospital visiting, and preaching. Five of the twelve associates are on a regular rotation for preaching, typically once a month. Only two, however, play any significant role in the financial decisions of their congregation. This remains, on the whole, a male prerogative. One woman--who in her secular job managed a budget far larger than that of her present congregation--finds her exclusion from this area particularly ironic. Another index of the status and acceptance of women is the number of liturgical functions they are invited to perform. Several of them are sensitive to the fact, for instance, that local funeral directors will not accept them to officiate at services and may seek out the minister of a more distant church instead. They acknowledge, however, that in this, as in other matters, it is often hard to tease apart the effects of being female and the effects of having junior status as an associate.

District Superintendent: In the United Methodist Church, the district superintendent is a minister appointed by the bishop and serving directly under

him with administrative responsibility for the work of the church in a given district. For the woman presently in this post in the Rocky Mountain Conference, this means overseeing some 47 churches in an area 600 miles across, visiting them on a regular basis, providing pastoral support for their clergy, and raising funds for the general work of the church through local pledges to the budget of the conference. As she describes it, "I'm the cheerleader and the tax collector." As a member of the bishop's cabinet, she also takes part in decisions governing clergy appointments and church policy. The appointment is limited to six years, of which she is currently in her fourth.

While the post of district superintendent is a significant one, in many ways it is not in the direct line of competition where the hierarchy of clergy appointments is concerned. Status in the Protestant ministry is more apt to be tied to the size, wealth, and social status of one's congregation and the perceived influence of its pulpit. Tradition in the UMC dictates that when a D.S. steps down from this post he is awarded a major appointment of this type, as senior pastor of one of the more conspicuous congregations in the conference. Many of the women interviewed, in reflecting on the achievements--and limits to achievement--of the women in their area, said they were waiting to see what kind of appointment this woman would be given at the end of her tenure. They viewed this as a potential benchmark of progress.

The road to ordination

Although the Methodist Church formally approved the ordination of women in 1956, it was not until 1968, when the church joined with the Evangelical United Brethren to become the United Methodist Church, that women were brought under the guaranteed appointment system. Only two of the women interviewed were ordained before that date. The majority of them (thirteen of

the twenty-two) were ordained no earlier than 1979. The contrasts in the experience of those ordained earlier and more recent graduates tells how rapidly the situation is changing.

Early aspirants to the ministry found substantial obstacles in their path. One was sent a form, along with her application to seminary, in which she was asked to promise never to marry if ordained. One was offered ordination only on condition that she not ask for an appointment. One waited five years after ordination for her first job as a minister. None of these women had role models. Indeed, one of them makes the remarkable statement that she had never even heard of a woman minister when it came to her that this was what she should be. One says she had no opposition at all; even at her ordination, no one took her seriously enough to imagine that she would ask for a job.

The women ordained from 1976 to 1978 also say they had no role models, although they came to look to the few women ahead of them in seminary as mentors. There were still stumbling blocks. Boards of Ministry, charged with the responsibility of passing on the fitness of candidates for ordination, were still uneasy about interviewing women. There are reports of offensive questions concerning dating, plans for children, marriage relations. In some cases, there was thinly veiled hostility. To one woman it was insinuated that if her husband was willing to follow her to an appointment, he must be homosexual.

At the annual ordination ceremony in 1979, women were actually in the majority. A few of those ordained at that time still refer to minor obstacles which delayed, but did not prevent, their progress, but from this point on they are much more apt to say that they had no major discouragements from sources within the church. They are more likely to name difficulties in their personal lives as impediments than institutional opposition.

Considering that most of the women say that initially they had no role models, what led them to consider the ministry? Two of them suspect that some of their motivation came from the experience of having favored brothers, making them intent on proving their own worth. One says she was inspired by hearing a bad sermon and thinking, "I can do better than that." Many of them can point to family traditions. One comes from "a long line of ministers" and married a minister herself. Another says that as a child she was told stories about her great aunts who were missionaries. A couple of women from clergy families call them a negative influence, an image of what they wished not to be. Nine of the clergywomen said that their families were not church-goers at all and have been somewhat confused by their choice of career. But five of them describe a family atmosphere imbued with church commitment. "My father has taught Sunday school for 55 years," said one with pride. The father of another had himself entered seminary, but financial hardships forced him to leave. One has a mother who has become a lay minister since her daughter's ordination.

For thirteen of the twenty-two women, going to seminary was part of a clear career decision. Several of these speak of the ministry as one option among several, a choice they came to after rejecting other careers. For others among this group it was a natural outgrowth of an ongoing involvement in the work of the church. Three had planned since high school to continue on to seminary after college. The rest of the women tell a different story. I entered seminary, they will say, "to learn more about my faith," "to improve my teaching," "to upgrade my credentials." Once there, the encouragement of faculty, or the sheer presence of other women, had an impact on them, and it was at that point that they decided to seek ordination.

In other words, there seem to be three types of vocational choice among them: there are those for whom the ministry is a first career, a course decided upon early and pursued in a straight line; there are those for whom entering seminary represented a step in a planned change of course; and then there are those, generally in their late thirties or early forties, for whom seeking a theological education was itself part of a process of life change, which later led to the decision to be ordained. For these last, especially, the history of their vocational choice is closely intertwined with the history of their marriages.

Marriage and family

Marriage is a complex subject for these women. They spoke of their own, or one another's, marriages tactfully but with a sad sense that this is an area in which their experiences divide them.

Seven of the clergywomen have been married for ten years or more. In their case, becoming a minister occurred in the context of a marriage which began on a very different premise, and they are well aware of the adjustments this has required their husbands to make. "He couldn't make a sandwich when we got married," said one of them, "so you can see what that poor man has been through." Four of these women say that their husbands have remained supportive throughout the process. The other three say that their husbands encouraged their getting an education, but were initially dubious about ordination. In some cases the wife's decision has meant that the husband himself had to deal with opposition from family or friends. One woman said that friends of her husband's began to avoid him at work. Asked why, she thought for a moment and said, "I guess they thought I would contaminate their women." Husbands who help with laundry or children have become objects of curiosity, or have lost status in the eyes of other men.

For at least six of the women, entering seminary coincided with marital conflicts, ending, in some cases, in divorce. None of these women believes that her decision, in and of itself, caused the breakup of her marriage, although they are all well aware that the sequence of the events is open to that interpretation. "Any change in me would have threatened him," said one. "It was the last straw in a crumbling relationship," said another. Some of these women describe comfortable, conventional lifestyles which they found increasingly unrewarding but which their husbands counted on them to maintain.

For women without husbands, the ministry is problematic. Finding acceptance as a divorced minister compounds the problems of being female. Single women may find that for many men the idea of dating a minister is somewhat daunting. Especially in small, isolated communities, they simply have to do without male companionship. "Close relationships go on hold." A divorced woman may express gratitude for her children--and wonder what her life will be like when they leave home. Another woman says poignantly, "I never thought I'd have to do without so many things to be a minister."

At the time of the interviews, only ten of the twenty-two clergywomen were married and living with their husbands. Many of the women, married or not, worried about the implications of this, about the pressures of a job in which one serves others and whether it is possible to continue to do it without support--or impossible to sustain a marriage under such conditions. Some were acutely aware that ministry has sometimes been feasible for men only because a wife functioned as an unpaid co-worker. "I'm up against it all the time," commented one of these single women. "I preach, I teach, and I'm also expected to make the crabapple jelly and give the teas. Clergymen in the district who are married listen--but they haven't had the experience of being alone, of not having support." "I believe

mutuality can work," she continued, "but finding someone who can fit into all this is difficult."

For some the solution lies in a clergy marriage. Both women sharing posts with their husbands expressed satisfaction, particularly concerning the ability the arrangement gave them to divide tasks--at church and at home--according to preference rather than sex role.

In any case, an itinerant system, in which clergy change appointments with some regularity, has the potential for considerable stress on family life. Where women are concerned, it may mean the choice between asking their husband and children to move with them or turning down an appointment, with no guarantee they will be offered another. Of the married women with rural appointments, one is in the area where her husband has already worked for years, one has a husband who is self-employed, one's husband is retired and therefore able--as well as willing--to accompany her to her job. Children may be forced to make a dual adjustment: first to the unfamiliar status of "clergy kid" and then a rural school. In some cases, in order to avoid making this demand, the entry of a woman minister into her profession may be long drawn out indeed. One 1981 graduate says she began her training in 1967.

Working relationships

Some of the questions asked in the interview had to do with the difference being a woman made in their relations with their congregations, their fellow ministers, or others in their community. In their responses, most of the women named the positive aspects first. Ten of them said they thought they were perceived as more empathic and more accessible than men on the staff, or than a previous pastor. Their counseling loads reflected this response. Some said they thought preaching was "heard" differently from a woman. A couple of them said

there were people in their congregations who valued the opportunity for contact with a woman professional of any kind. In this respect, they believed they were providing role models. Several mentioned personal benefits, such as the freedom they experience in a role for which there are as yet no stereotypes. An example given was that they had the impression a woman's emotionality was more acceptable, so that they did not feel constrained from expressing personal feelings. Some named advantages in relation to other women. "I've been in the delivery room at the birth of a child." "Women can talk to me about sexuality, something they have a hard time talking to a male minister about." They can be acutely aware of the powerless position women have had in their congregations and take it as one of their tasks to encourage them to take their own influence seriously.

Many of the women remarked that although there may have been an initial period of curiosity and awkwardness in relations with their congregation, once they had settled into their jobs they felt their sex made relatively little difference--much less than they had expected.

As to negative effects, the largest number of responses had to do with the problems some parishioners had in adjusting to an unfamiliar situation: meeting opposition to the idea of a woman minister, for example; being rejected for weddings and funerals; having difficulty in getting sufficient authority in the governance of the church. Several of them referred to special problems in relations with unpaid--or underpaid--women working for the church. Having given their time for years, as helpmeet to a male, some of these women have a hard time accepting a female in a leadership role. Three of the women found drawbacks in the very supportiveness of their congregations; they appreciated the affection, but recognized a patronizing, paternalistic element in it.

Some felt that they were apt to receive less in the way of resources or staff support. As an illustration of this, one of them described an incident from her internship, in which she and a fellow intern (male) both had lengthy seminary papers due at the same time. It was his paper which the church secretary was assigned to type, in spite of the fact that he was single and she was struggling to maintain a home for her family while holding a job and completing her studies at the same time. A single clergywoman may also receive fewer considerations in the matter of housing, although the women themselves said that the security and aesthetics of a home were a major psychological support.

Nine of the women working in multistaff situations said that they had experienced no significant problems with their pastors or fellow associates. They felt they had good support and cooperative working relations, and expressed good-natured amusement at any lingering chauvinist attitudes. Those who had experienced problems generally placed them in the past and attributed them to feelings of threat. One clergywoman spoke of a previous pastor, for example, who in their two years of working together never spoke to her in his office without his secretary or some other third party present.

Relations with the community vary. Some of the women are actively involved with local agencies and other clergy. They serve on boards or as hospital chaplains, they organize assistance programs, they provide counseling services. Others find themselves excluded from the fraternity of local clergy--not informed about meetings, for example. One woman had the experience of becoming the target of an organized campaign mounted by a group in her town who believed that the ordination of women was against scripture. Members of her own congregation were pressured to oppose her. The situation was never resolved and she was forced to withdraw.

Relations with other clergywomen

Apart from personal relationships, contacts with other clergywomen represent an area of uncertainty. Although a formally organized support group exists, not all of the women are active in it--or even see it as desirable. In responding to the questions, "Are you involved with other clergywomen in working for change?" most of them gave variants of the same answer: "We've tried, but we haven't succeeded very well."

A number of explanations were offered for their failure to maintain contact as a group. Many of them cited factors of time and distance. They are widely dispersed and on overloaded work schedules, making it difficult to congregate. Most of them depend on personal networks of friendship, frequently with women of their own seminary cohort. Some were dubious about the value of a women's special interest group, saying that they thought it was more effective to work within established church structures, alongside men. Several said they made a special effort to serve on church commissions or to meet with other clergy locally. One woman didn't see the lack of attendance at clergywomen's retreats as a particularly bad sign. "We can pull it together if we need to--if someone's in trouble."

Others reflected on more subtle reasons for their lack of cohesion. There are complex personal histories among them, producing awkwardness or tension. There is diversity among them in age, interests, marital status. Some feel under criticism for career paths they have chosen, which may not "further the cause." Some speculate on the extent to which the system itself, insofar as it is competitive and hierarchical, breeds rivalry.

Strategies for change and models for ministry

Asked if they thought of themselves consciously as innovators, all but one of the women unhesitatingly said yes. "Well, I think I must be," one of the

older ministers said, "when I think of all the things I've done that people said I couldn't." They were then asked to describe the approach they used in working for change. The answers to this question show a remarkable consistency. All of the women can conceptualize and articulate their strategies clearly, and all of them follow what is basically the same model.

They speak of the necessity of first accepting and understanding their parishioners and their attitudes as they are, and of winning acceptance for themselves before initiating changes. "I build relationships and trust first, one on one, and then I use those people as change agents to influence others." They see the process as a gradual one and avoid exhortations. "I confront, but selectively, and only when the groundwork has been laid." In a particularly expressive image, one compared herself to a sculptor. "I chip away. Whenever I see an opportunity to remove another little piece of marble that's in the way, I do it. And although I see the form in the marble, I don't think it's always necessary to let them know there's a statue in there. Until eventually they say, 'Hey, that looks like a . . . whatever.' And then they think it's their idea. And that's fine." "There's a lot you can accomplish," she concluded, "if you don't care who gets the credit."

This approach is consistent with their models for ministry. Asked how they conceptualized the role for themselves, by far the majority picked some version of an "enabler" or "facilitator" model. This model portrays the church as a community within which individuals grow toward some potential with the assistance of a guide--or gardener--or coach (the metaphors vary). Some explicitly rejected popular older models, such as the shepherd (taking too much responsibility for others) or the suffering servant (too much self-abnegation). Although several made it clear that they believe there are times when an authoritative stance is called for, and others balanced the modesty of the enabler with a more confrontative or prophetic pole, their goals for their congregations

fit the enabler pattern. They want to see them share leadership, in what is known in the church as "the priesthood of all believers." Even the women who brought world issues into the conversation, such as hunger or disarmament, still proposed to raise consciousness of these imperatives through personal approaches.

The issues

Looking to the future, these women have a great many questions about their presence in the church. They feel, for example, that the major confrontation with the hierarchy is still to come. They accept the secondary positions which they presently fill as appropriate levels of entry into a new profession. They are performing these jobs well, in some cases with distinction, and they expect this to be recognized and rewarded. As their seniority increases they expect to become eligible for more challenging, more conspicuous, more central, or otherwise more desirable posts. They recognize that appointment decisions are not made in a vacuum. There are a limited number of pastorates in the front range cities where most of them would prefer to live. For every woman who moves into one of these jobs, a man will be displaced.

There are profound dilemmas underlying these questions, which can be expressed also as tensions between agency and communion. Some of the women find that their values are well satisfied by the jobs they now hold. Those in charge of small congregations were especially apt to say that their ideal job is "the one I have." They welcome the variety, the autonomy, and the authority. They value the intimate knowledge they have of their people and the close relations their people can have with one another. They believe that a Christian community is meant to be modest, non-competitive, mutually accepting, mutually responsible. Many of them would wish to see these values more honored in the connectional church, the church at large. They would like to see it become less

absorbed with status, more appreciative of cooperation. In a recurring image, they would like to see it "more like a circle and less like a ladder." For them, the entrance of women into priestly roles represents more than an expansion of career options; they see it as an opportunity to modify masculine, agentic ideals.

For some of the women, however, the values of agency remain salient. They see power as a significant variable and consider it the responsibility of women to gain it and learn to use it. If the ladder is there, then women ought not to be perceived as relegated to the bottom rung. If communion values are upheld only at the lower levels of the system, they will continue to be deprecated, and women along with them. One of them characterized the ideological splits among them as "the radical feminists vs. the women who just want to do their ministry vs. those who seem to be following male models." On this personal level, the tension between agency and communion persists.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study started from the premise that the church is an androgynous profession and that this will be reflected in the characteristics of men and women who take up roles as clergy. A survey of the literature on men in the ministry yielded a variety of findings with disparate conclusions but a general consensus that clergymen show stereotypically feminine qualities such as needs for nurturance and affiliation, along with the masculine desire to dominate. The finding of significant intrapersonal conflicts among the clergy is also common, although some dispute this. In the absence of personality studies of women ministers, the literature on women in male-dominated occupations was surveyed. Findings on their characteristics were generally consistent: they tend to be high on such traditionally masculine qualities as achievement, dominance, and endurance, without being notably either high or low on feminine qualities of nurturance and affiliation. Contrary to deviance hypotheses of innovative career choice, professional women have also been found to be generally self-confident and well-adjusted. Background characteristics predisposing women to innovative career choices were also identified. These include family status as firstborns, parents with high levels of education and professional achievement, and some tendency (not universally found) toward identification with the father. A particularly strong influence on women's commitment to careers has been found to be the mother's employment outside the home.

Three types of predictions were made: (1) that both men and women seeking or performing professional roles in the ministry would qualify as

androgynous, as measured by the Bem Sex-Role Inventory; (2) that clergywomen would be distinguished by their having combined nurturant qualities with the achievement orientation of other professional women; and (3) that men in training for the ministry would tend to show more signs of conflict than women. These propositions were tested on two samples: a group of 65 male and 49 female theological students, and a group of 22 clergywomen, 20 of whom are currently employed as ministers in the local church.

The first two predictions were strongly confirmed by the data. All three groups of men and women in ministry showed significant proportions of persons classified as androgynous. In the case of the clergywomen, the percentage was more than twice that of the norm group, amounting to nearly two-thirds of the sample. Androgynousness was also implied in other findings. The male group, while showing significantly high scores on a feminine attributes scale, did not score below male norms on the corresponding scale for masculine attributes. The clergywomen's scores showed a complementary pattern: higher than average scores on masculine attributes, coupled with scores on feminine attributes comparable to those of other women. These findings lend support to the hypothesis that innovative career choices by women are the outcome of enriched experience and a more diversified personality, rather than the expression of deficiencies or deviant adjustments. They also suggest that the choice of the ministry may reflect a similar disposition in men: the addition of feminine interests to a masculine personality.

Both sexes' scores on the personality scales of the Adjective Check List are consistent with a portrayal of the clergy as dominant, nurturant, affiliative, and intraceptive. There are correspondingly low scores on needs for abasement and succorance. These clergy dislike subordinate roles and seldom appeal to others for emotional support. Compared to the norms for their sex, the women

are more achievement-oriented than the men, but both men and women are highly self-confident and present themselves as well-adjusted and generally untroubled by self-doubts.

The final prediction was therefore not confirmed. On all the relevant scales of the ACL, the men as well as the women scored significantly above the average on personal adjustment. It can be argued that this may reflect a desire to present oneself in a good light. Their mean scores on the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale contradict this interpretation; these subjects gave no greater number of socially approved answers than the average respondent.

The background characteristics of the two groups of women match the findings in the literature on only a few counts. A high proportion of them are firstborns: half of the clergywomen and two thirds of the students. Both groups of women show a tendency toward identification with their fathers. The student women report the expected high number of working mothers. But by far the majority of the clergywomen had mothers who were never employed outside the home. For both samples, the ministry appears to represent upward mobility. In contrast to studies showing that professional women tend to have highly educated parents, the Master of Divinity degree makes 92% of the student women and 100% of the clergywomen better educated than their mothers.

Additional findings from the background questionnaires and from personal interviews with the clergywomen reveal characteristics which may distinguish them as a professional group. First of all, in spite of their high motivation for achievement and their choice of a career in a field historically dominated by men, their biographies suggest that they belong in other ways to the categories of "traditionals" rather than "pioneers" as these are defined by Rossi (1965). The occupations in which they were engaged before entering training for the ministry are those in which women traditionally predominate: elementary and

secondary school teaching, religious education, social work, library science, nursing, secretarial work. If the ministry had been closed to them, most of them would choose teaching or counseling as an alternative career. A second striking feature of their histories is the number of them who are divorced (20% of the students and 32% of the clergywomen). Less than half of the ministers are currently married and living with their husbands. This raises questions concerning the pressures of the ministry, which has been among the "two-person single careers" in which the wife serves as an unpaid adjunct to her husband's professional role. What readjustments are required if the same role is performed by a single woman?

At the present time, in this sector of the church, the ministry holds a strong attraction for women embarking on a second or late career. A substantial part of both female groups turns out to be composed of women who are moving into the ministry out of careers in teaching, or after a period spent as full-time mothers, or following a divorce. Acceptance into the ministry is still a recent phenomenon. As time goes on and it becomes a more familiar option, it may become easier to describe the nature of its selection by younger women. One of the strongest impressions left by this survey is that a career in the ministry is filling a distinct need for mature women and that it offers a satisfying solution to some of the problems generated by role discontinuity.

A distinctive feature of women's lives over time is the regular requirement placed on them to shift roles: from daughter to wife to mother, for example. A working woman adds roles to the repertoire; a divorced or aging woman loses roles which may have formerly provided her with status or feelings of success, or which may have helped her meet the expectations of others. For some of the women interviewed, the decision for ordination was not made until after they were in seminary. Applying for a theological education may have

functioned as a means of easing a role transition. Seminary was an extension of a familiar environment, the church; it anticipated entrance into a new role, through preparation for ordination; and it provided a vocational opportunity for linking achievement with skills and experience already possessed, involving caring relationships with others.

The discovery that women making what has heretofore been a highly unorthodox choice are, in fact, more like traditionals than pioneers leads to the conclusion that one source of the appeal of the ministry for women may lie in its gender-appropriateness. A congregation is one milieu in which successful leadership can be exercised through the modality of communion. It exemplifies the notion of the individual as a participant in a larger organism; it exists, by definition, to heal separations. If this is the case, then the paradox lies not in women preaching, as Dr. Johnson believed, but in the long held belief that this is the divinely decreed province of men.

CHAPTER VIII

ANDROGYNY AND THE CHURCH RECONSIDERED: A DISCUSSION

At the beginning of this dissertation, it was proposed that the church itself can be described as androgynous in that it contains in its structures and its scriptures a continuing dialectic between the values of agency and communion. It was proposed that at the level of its individual members, this dialectic would be expressed in the personalities and self-descriptions of men and women choosing the vocation of minister. This expectation has been fulfilled through the findings reported above. What also emerged from the conversations with the clergywomen who served as research subjects is a clearer view of how this dialectic interacts with the issues surrounding women's participation in leadership roles in the church and with the personal dilemmas of the women now taking up these roles in increasing numbers.

It is Bakan's thesis that the Protestant ethic is agentic in spirit. The Calvinist preoccupation with personal success as the mark of salvation makes virtues of high initiative, control over others, and distrust of emotion and interpersonal relations, of, as Bakan synthesizes it, "self-assertion, self-expression, self-expansion" (1966, p. 16). This contrasts with scriptural teachings which emphasize the communal ideal of sacrifice for the good of others. It is in the nature of agency to split off and then expel, rather than integrate, the values of communion. Insofar as women may symbolize or defend these values, then agency demands that they be subordinated, trivialized, or excluded. One way to understand the potential impact of women ministers on the church is to describe their integration into its leadership structures as related to

the necessity of mitigating agency with communion, which Bakan calls the human task.

The tension between the two modalities can be seen in the ongoing dialogue among the clergywomen regarding the politics of advancement, which frequently seems to pit the communal virtues of the local church against the agentic preoccupations of the administrative hierarchies. This polarity recalls Gutmann's ideas on the differences in the milieux of men and women (1965). Man's world is allocentric. It is an impersonal world of open space which "can only be articulated to the self through purposeful movement" (p. 234). Identity in this world is achieved through instrumental acts. One has impact by imposing some form of control through structures, schedules, artifacts. Woman's world is autocentric, personal, intimate, affectional. Structure is intrinsic, revealed, and need not be imposed. It arises out of seasons, rituals, domestic routines.

The local church exemplifies the autocentric milieu. It exists in personal, contained space, with its own network of familiar relationships and its own recurring rhythms of liturgies and life passages. This can be a deeply congenial work setting for a woman. It is one reason a highly educated woman can honestly say of her post in an unsophisticated rural community "my ideal job is the one I have." No wonder women have made an evident success of some notoriously difficult pastoral appointments. The nuances of this world are familiar.

Away from this secure base, women may be aliens in the allocentric world (so are men, but they accept alienation as a feature of its reality). Women may distrust its values and question the requirement to learn its skills. They would prefer to see it transformed. Otherwise, they fear a divided system in which the women tend the "families" of their congregations, with little influence

and low remuneration, while the men continue to do the public business of the connectional church.

Elizabeth Douvan compares the problem for a woman entering a male-dominated field to the mobility problem faced by an immigrant. According to her analysis, there are three routes open:

> The first is to become just like the dominant group and abandon one's past. A form of overlearning, we identify this solution clinically as identification with the aggressor; in the particular case at issue here, it signifies a defeminization or abandonment of feminine goals. The second adaptation is deprofessionalization, the abandonment or de-emphasis of competence, and the third is a trenchant, continuing effort to integrate professionalism and feminine goals. (1976, p. 13).

For women entering the ministry, these routes may be represented by the following choices: they can devote themselves to learning the existing means for advancement within a competitive system, so that women will receive higher status appointments (this may mean rejecting roles in Christian education, for example, which are not on the advancement track); they can allow themselves to become the "mascots" of their congregations, devaluing their professionalism and reducing their threat (this is a particularly ready solution for younger women); or they can persist in the never-wholly-successful attempt neither to withdraw from the arena nor be dictated to by its values. Douvan calls this "integrating identifications" and she acknowledges that it is not easy. "Such integration is difficult, for it requires a willingness to remain forever marginal, to live between and partake in two realities without negating or invalidating either one of them" (p. 14).

The two realities for these women, it appears, are those of the autocentric congregation and the allocentric institution. As clergy, they speak clearly of the need for the institution to learn to mitigate agency with communion. As women, their task has been the reverse, to learn to mitigate communion with agency. The evidence of this study is that they have succeeded

to a considerable extent with the latter. Their profiles indicate that they have integrated masculine and feminine qualities in their ideals and their perceptions of themselves; their histories demonstrate that they have persisted in the agentic self-assertion required to reach professional goals. The task before them is to extend this understanding into their interpretation and enactment of their positions within the church. The issues which trouble them, in which the two milieux are often characterized as opposed rather than complementary, suggest that this integration has not yet taken place. There is a sense, of course, in which resolution of this dilemma can never be fully achieved (it is agency which seeks to erase discrepancies and remove paradoxes), but the presence of women in priestly roles in the church sharpens the engagement with these complex questions and renews the potential for a higher, if not final, synthesis.

REFERENCES

Abrahams, B., Feldman, S.S., and Nash, S.C. Sex role, self concept and sex role attitudes: Enduring personality characteristics or adaptations to changing life situations? Developmental Psychology, 1978, 14, 393-400.

Almquist, E.M. and Angrist, S.S. Career salience and atypicality of occupational choice among college women. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1970, 32, 242-249.

Astin, H. The woman doctorate in America. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969.

Bachtold, L.M. Personality characteristics of women of distinction. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1976, 1, 70-78.

Bachtold, L.M. and Werner, E.E. Personality profiles of gifted women: Psychologists. American Psychologist, 1970, 25, 234-243.

Bachtold, L.M. and Werner, E.E. Personality profiles of women psychologists: Three generations. Developmental Psychology, 1971, 5, 273-278.

Bakan, D. The duality of human existence. An essay on psychology and religion. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

Bem, S.L. Bem sex-role inventory. Professional manual. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists press, 1981.

Bem, S.L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-62.

Bem, S.L. Sex role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 634-643.

Bem, S.L., Martyrna, W., and Watson, C. Sex typing and androgyny: Further explorations of the expressive domain. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 1016-1023.

Bier, W.C. A comparative study of five Catholic college groups on the MMPI. In G.S. Welsh and W.G. Dahlstrom (Eds.) Basic readings on the MMPI in psychology and medicine. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1956.

Block, J.H. Conceptions of sex role: Some cross-cultural and longitudinal perspectives. American Psychologist, 1973, 28, 512-526.

Bloom, J.H. Who become clergymen? Journal of Religion and Health, 1971, 10, 50-76.

Booth, G. Unconscious motivation in the choice of the ministry as a vocation. In W.E. Oates (Ed.) The minister's own mental health. Great Neck, NY: Channel Press, 1955.

Boswell, J. Boswell's life of Johnson. Vol. I. London: H. Frowde, 1904.

Bowers, M.K. Conflicts of the clergy. New York: Thomas Nelson, 1963a.

Bowers, M.K. Psychotherapy of religious personnel. Some observations and recommendations. Journal of Pastoral Care, 1963b, 17, 11-16.

Bowman, G.W., Worthy, N.B. and Greyser, S.A. Are women executives people? Harvard Business Review, 1965, 43, 14-28, 164-178.

Brereton, V.L. and Klein, C.R. American women in ministry. In J.W. James (Ed.) Women in American religion. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980, pp. 171-190.

Byers, A.P., Forrest, G.G., and Zaccaria, J.S. Recalled early parent-child relations, adult needs, and occupational choice: A test of Roe's theory. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 324-328.

Cardwell, S.W. The MMPI as a predictor of success among seminary students. Ministry Studies, 1967, 1, 3-20.

Cartwright, L.K. Decisions of women to study medicine. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 201-215.

Childers, R.D. and White, W.F. The personality of select theological students. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1966, 44, 507-510.

Christensen, C.W. The occurrence of mental illness in the ministry: Psychoneurotic disorders. Journal of Pastoral Care, 1963, 17, 1-10.

Cockrum, L.K. Personality traits and interests of theological students. Religious Education, 1952, 47, 28-32.

Constantini, E. and Craik, K.H. Women as politicians: The social background, personality, and political careers of female party leaders. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 217-236.

Constantinople, A. Masculinity-femininity: An exception to a famous dictum? Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 5, 389-407.

Crowne, D.P. and Marlowe, D. The approval motive: Studies in evaluative independence. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Dodson, F.J. Personality factors in the choice of the Protestant ministry as a vocation. Ph.D. dissertation, Univ. of Southern California, 1955. (Unpublished)

Douglas, W. Women in the church: Historical perspectives and contemporary dilemmas. Pastoral psychology, 1961, 12, 13-20.

Douvan, E. The role of models in women's professional development. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1976, 1, 5-20.

Drakeford, J.W. The dilemma of a woman counselor in a church situation. Journal of Pastoral Care, 1962, 13, 37-42.

Dunn, M.M. Saints and sisters. Congregational and Quaker women in the early Colonial period. In J.W. James (Ed.) Women in American religion. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980, pp. 27-46.

Epstein, C.F. Women and professional careers: The case of the woman lawyer. Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia Univ., 1968. (Unpublished)

Feulner, P.N. Women in the professions: A social-psychological study. Palo Alto, CA: R. & E. Research Assoc., 1979.

Gough, H.G. and Heilbrun, A.B. Jr. The Adjective Check List manual. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists press, 1980.

Gutmann, D.L. Women and the conception of ego strength. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1965, 11, 229-240.

Hale, H., King, M. and Jones, D.M. New witnesses. United Methodist clergywomen. Nashville, TN: Board of Higher Education and Ministry, United Methodist Church, 1980.

Hansson, R.E., Chernovetz, M.E. and Jones, W.H. Maternal employment and androgyny. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1977, 2, 76-78.

Helson, R. Women mathematicians and the creative personality. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1971, 36, 210-220.

Helson, R. The changing image of the career woman. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 33-46.

Hennig, M.M. Family dynamics and the successful woman executive. In R. Kundsin (Ed.) Women and success. New York: William Morrow, 1973.

Hoyt, D.P. and Kennedy, C.E. Interest and personality correlates of career-motivated and homemaking-motivated college women. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1958, 5, 44-48.

Jacquet, C.H. Jr. Women ministers in 1977. New York: Office of Research, Evaluation, and Planning, National Council of Churches, 1977.

James, J.W. Women in American religious history. In J.W. James (Ed.) Women in American religion. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980, pp. 1-25.

Kania, W. Healthy defensiveness in theological students. Ministry Studies, 1967, 1, 3-20.

Kutner, N.G. and Brogan, D.R. The decision to enter medicine: Motivations, social support, and discouragements for women. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1980, 5, 341-356.

Lemkau, J.P. Personality and background characteristics of women in male-dominated occupations: A review. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1979, 4, 221-240.

Lonsway, F.A. Personality characteristics of seminarians. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 1969, 18, 133-136.

Marlowe, D. and Crowne, D.P. A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1960, 24, 349-354.

Megaree, E.I. and Parker, G.V.C. An exploration of the equivalence of Murrayan needs as assessed by the Adjective Check List, the TAT and Edwards' Personal Preference Schedule. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1968, 24, 47-51.

Morrison, R.F. and Sebald, M.L. Personal characteristics differentiating female executive from female nonexecutive personnel. Journal of Applied psychology, 1974, 59, 656-659.

Motowidlo, S.J. A scoring procedure for sex-role orientation based on profile similarity indices. Educational and psychological Measurement, 1981, 41, 735-745.

Nauss, A.H. The ministerial personality: Myth or reality? Journal of Religion and Health, 1973, 12, 77-96.

Neugarten, B.L. and Gutmann, D.L. Age, sex roles and personality in middle age: A Thematic Apperception study. In Neugarten, B.L. (Ed.) Personality in middle and late life. New York: Atherton, 1964.

Parsons, T. and Bales, R.F. Family socialization and interaction process. Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1955.

Patrick, T.A. Personality and family background characteristics of women who enter male-dominated professions. Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia Univ., 1973. (Unpublished)

Rossi, A. Barriers to the career choice of engineering, medicine, or science among American women. In J.A. Mattfield and C.G. Van Aken (Eds.) Women and the scientific professions. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1965.

Ryan, M.P. A women's awakening. Evangelical religion and the families of Utica, 1800-1840. In J.W. James (Ed.) Women in American religion. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980, pp. 89-110.

Schroeder, C.E. Personality patterns of advanced Protestant theology students and physical science students. Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State Univ., 1956. (Unpublished)

Siegelmann, M. and Peck, R.F. Personality patterns related to occupational roles. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1960, 61, 291-349.

Spence, J.T., Helmreich, R. and Stapp, J. Ratings of self and peers on sex-role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 32, 29-39.

Standley, K. and Soule, B. Women in male-dominated professions: Contrasts in their personal and vocational histories. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1974, 4, 245-258.

Stern, G.G. Assessing theological student personality structure. Journal of Pastoral Care, 1954, 8, 76-83.

Tangri, S.S. Determinants of occupational role innovation among college women. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 177-199.

Welter, B. She hath done what she could. Protestant women's missionary careers in nineteenth century America. In J.W. James (Ed.) Women in American religion. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980, pp. 111-124.

Werner, E.E. and Bachtold, L.M. Personality characteristics of women in American politics. In J.S. Jaquette (Ed.) Women in American politics. New York: Wiley, 1974.

APPENDIX A: LETTERS TO SUBJECTS

March, 1983

Dear Iliff Student:

I am conducting a study of men and women who are taking up a vocation in the Christian church of the 80 s. This is part of the research I am doing for my doctorate in psychology at Michigan State University.

My interest in this topic grows out of my own experience of having worked in a church in New York City during the decade of the 60s. It is my belief that, as a result of changes which began then, many of the conclusions drawn from earlier research with theological students may no longer hold true. Professional roles in the church are not what they were, and I am interested in the perceptions of those who are shaping the new roles--where you come from and how you see yourselves.

The material enclosed includes a background questionnaire and three brief inventories. None of them is difficult to answer and they should take you less than forty-five minutes to fill out.

All the information which you give me is anonymous and confidential. You are not asked to sign your name to any of the forms. I hope this will encourage you to be frank in your responses. You may notice a number on the return envelope. This is to assist me in identifying which of you have returned the questionnaires, in case a reminder mailing is necessary to those who have not. The envelope will be discarded before the answers are read.

The results of the study will be made available to those of you who contribute to it, in the form of a separate report.

I hope that you will be willing to participate in this. I believe that the outcome will have some value, and the successful completion of my doctorate depends on your help.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Martha Orrick

April 1982

Dear Iliff Student:

About a month ago, I sent you a letter describing a study I am doing of men and women entering careers in the Christian church. This is for my doctoral dissertation at Michigan State University. I also enclosed three inventories and a background questionnaire which I asked you to complete and return to me.

The response from the Iliff student body to date has been excellent. According to my records, however, you are among those who have not yet replied to my request. If you have been putting it off (as I sometimes do with questionnaires), I ask you to fill out the forms now. It should take you less than forty-five minutes to do so. A duplicate set is enclosed.

If you have some personal objection to taking part in such a study, I would appreciate it if you would make a note of your reasons in the space provided for comments at the end of the third inventory, and then return the packet to me. This, too, is useful information.

Remember that all replies are confidential and anonymous. The number on the return envelope is so that I will have a list of participants to whom I can send a report of results. These envelopes are discarded before the questionnaires are read.

I hope that you will be willing to participate. The more responses I have, the more trustworthy the findings will be.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Martha Orrick

July, 1982

Dear Rev. :

I am writing to you concerning a study I am engaged in, a major focus of which has to do with women in the ministry. This is part of the research I am doing for my doctorate in psychology at Michigan State University.

My choice of this topic grows in large part out of my own experience. I spent seven years as a church worker in New York City during the 60s. I am also interested generally in women who undertake innovative or creative careers.

There are two parts to my study which would involve you: an interview and the completion of three short checklists. The checklists can be filled out in 30-40 minutes; the interview takes roughly an hour and a half.

All personal information given to me will be kept anonymous and confidential. For analysis, your responses would be pooled with those of other women, rather than individually reported. At the completion of the study, I will send a summary of results to those who have participated in it.

I hope that you will be willing to take part in this with me. I believe that the results will have some value, and the successful completion of my doctorate depends on your help.

I will be contacting you within the next week or so to see if we can set up a time to meet.

Sincerely,

Martha Orrick

APPENDIX B: INSTRUMENTS

Directions: A list of 300 adjectives follows. Please read them quickly and put an X beside each one you would consider to be self-descriptive. Do not worry about duplications, contradictions, and so forth. Work quickly and do not spend too much time on any one adjective. Try to be frank, and check those adjectives which describe you as you really are, not as you would like to be.

1____absent-minded
2____active
3____adaptable
4____adventurous
5____affected
6____affectionate
7____aggressive
8____alert
9____aloof
10____ambitious
11____anxious
12____apathetic
13____appreciative
14____argumentative
15____arrogant
16____artistic
17____assertive
18____attractive
19____autocratic
20____awkward
21____bitter
22____blustery
23____boastful
24____bossy
25____calm
26____capable
27____careless
28____cautious
29____changeable
30____charming
31____cheerful
32____civilized
33____clear-thinking
34____clever
35____coarse
36____cold
37____commonplace
38____complaining
39____complicated
40____conceited
41____confident
42____confused
43____conscientious
44____conservative
45____considerate
46____contented
47____conventional
48____cool
49____cooperative
50____courageous
51____cowardly
52____cruel
53____curious
54____cynical
55____daring
56____deceitful
57____defensive
58____deliberate
59____demanding
60____dependable
61____dependent
62____despondent
63____determined
64____dignified
65____discreet
66____disorderly
67____dissatisfied
68____distractible
69____distrustful
70____dominant
71____dreamy
72____dull
73____easy-going
74____effeminate
75____efficient
76____egotistical
77____emotional
78____energetic
79____enterprising
80____enthusiastic
81____evasive
82____excitable
83____fair-minded
84____fault-finding
85____fearful
86____feminine
87____fickle
88____flirtatious
89____foolish
90____forceful
91____foresighted
92____forgetful
93____forgiving
94____formal
95____frank
96____friendly
97____frivolous
98____fussy
99____generous
100____gentle
101____gloomy
102____good-looking
103____good-natured
104____greedy
105____handsome
106____hard-headed
107____hard-hearted
108____hasty
109____headstrong
110____healthy
111____helpful
112____high-strung
113____honest
114____hostile
115____humorous
116____hurried
117____idealistic
118____imaginative
119____immature
120____impatient
121____impulsive
122____independent
123____indifferent
124____individualistic
125____industrious
126____infantile
127____informal
128____ingenious
129____inhibited
130____initiative
131____insightful
132____intelligent
133____interests narrow
134____interests wide
135____intolerant
136____inventive
137____irresponsible
138____irritable
139____jolly

Continued on the back of the page

140____kind
141____lazy
142____leisurely
143____logical
144____loud
145____loyal
146____mannerly
147____masculine
148____mature
149____meek
150____methodical
151____mild
152____mischievous
153____moderate
154____modest
155____moody
156____nagging
157____natural
158____nervous
159____noisy
160____obliging
161____obnoxious
162____opinionated
163____opportunistic
164____optimistic
165____organized
166____original
167____outgoing
168____outspoken
169____painstaking
170____patient
171____peaceable
172____peculiar
173____perservering
174____persistent
175____pessimistic
176____planful
177____pleasant
178____pleasure-seeking
179____poised
180____polished
181____practical
182____praising
183____precise
184____prejudiced
185____preoccupied
186____progressive
187____prudish
188____quarrelsome
189____queer
190____quick
191____quiet
192____quitting
193____rational
194____rattlebrained
195____realistic
196____reasonable
197____rebellious
198____reckless
199____reflective
200____relaxed
201____reliable
202____resentful
203____reserved
204____resourceful
205____responsible
206____restless
207____retiring
208____rigid
209____robust
210____rude
211____sarcastic
212____self-centered
213____self-confident
214____self-controlled
215____self-denying
216____self-pitying
217____self-punishing
218____self-seeking
219____selfish
220____sensitive
221____sentimental
222____serious
223____severe
224____sexy
225____shallow
226____sharp-witted
227____shiftless
228____show-off
229____shrewd
230____shy
231____silent
232____simple
233____sincere
234____slipshod
235____slow
236____sly
237____smug
238____snobbish
239____sociable
240____soft-hearted
241____sophisticated
242____spendthrift
243____spineless
244____spontaneous
245____spunky
246____stable
247____steady
248____stern
249____stingy
250____stolid
251____strong
252____stubborn
253____submissive
254____suggestible
255____sulky
256____superstitious
257____suspicious
258____sympathetic
259____tactful
260____tactless
261____talkative
262____temperamental
263____tense
264____thankless
265____thorough
266____thoughtful
267____thrifty
268____timid
269____tolerant
270____touchy
271____tough
272____trusting
273____unaffected
274____unambitious
275____unassuming
276____unconventional
277____undependable
278____understanding
279____unemotional
280____unexcitable
281____unfriendly
282____uninhibited
283____unintelligent
284____unkind
285____unrealistic
286____unscrupulous
287____unselfish
288____unstable
289____vindictive
290____versatile
291____warm
292____wary
293____weak
294____whiny
295____wholesome
296____wise
297____withdrawn
298____witty
299____worrying
300____zany

BEM SEX-ROLE INVENTORY

Directions: Another list of characteristics follows. Whether or not you checked any of these words on the previous list, I would like you to use them now to describe yourself, that is, I would like you to indicate, on a scale from 1 to 7, how true of you each of these characteristics is. Please do not leave any of them unmarked.

1 = Never or almost never true; 2 = Usually not true; 3 = Sometimes but infrequently true; 4 = Occasionally true; 5 = Often true; 6 = Usually true; and 7 = Always or almost always true.

Defend my own beliefs	____	Adaptable	____	Flatterable	____
Affectionate	____	Dominant	____	Theatrical	____
Conscientious	____	Tender	____	Self-sufficient	____
Independent	____	Conceited	____	Loyal	____
Sympathetic	____	Willing to take a stand	____	Happy	____
Moody	____	Love children	____	Individualistic	____
Assertive	____	Tactful	____	Soft-spoken	____
Sensitive to needs of others	____	Aggressive	____	Unpredictable	____
Reliable	____	Gentle	____	Masculine	____
Strong personality	____	Conventional	____	Gullible	____
Understanding	____	Self-reliant	____	Solemn	____
Jealous	____	Yielding	____	Competitive	____
Forceful	____	Helpful	____	Childlike	____
Compassionate	____	Athletic	____	Likable	____
Truthful	____	Cheerful	____	Ambitious	____
Have leadership abilities	____	Unsystematic	____	Do not use harsh language	____
Eager to soothe hurt feelings	____	Analytical	____	Sincere	____
Secretive	____	Shy	____	Act as a leader	____
Willing to take risks	____	Inefficient	____	Feminine	____
Warm	____	Make decisions easily	____	Friendly	____

MARLOWE-CROWNE SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE

Directions: Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true (T) or false (F) as it pertains to you personally.

1. Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates. ____
2. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble ____
3. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged. ____
4. I have never intensely disliked anyone. ____
5. On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life. ____
6. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way. ____
7. I am always careful about my manner of dress. ____
8. My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant. ____
9. If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen I would probably do it. ____
10. On a few occasions I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability. ____
11. I like to gossip at times. ____
12. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right. ____
13. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener. ____
14. I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something. ____
15. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone. ____
16. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake. ____
17. I always try to practice what I preach. ____
18. I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud mouthed, obnoxious people. ____
19. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget. ____
20. When I don't know something I don't at all mind admitting it. ____
21. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable. ____

Continued on the back of the page

22. At times I have really insisted on having things my own way. ____

23. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things. ____

24. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrongdoings. ____

25. I never resent being asked to return a favor. ____

26. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own. ____

27. I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car. ____

28. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others. ____

29. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off. ____

30. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me. ____

31. I have never felt that I was punished without cause. ____

32. I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved. ____

33. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings. ____

* * *

This is the last questionnaire. If you have any comments on this study, or any guesses as to what specific questions it may have been designed to answer, please write them here. Thank you again.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

I would appreciate your giving me the following information about your personal and professional history. Remember, all information is anonymous. Please do not include your name. Thank you.

1. Degree program you are enrolled in at Iliff: _____

   Current year in this program: _____

   Career toward which you are aiming: _____

2. Your denominational affiliation: _____

3. Your sex: ____ male ____ female

4. Your birth date (month/day/year): _____/_____/ _____

5. Your marital status:

   ____ single (never married)
   ____ married (living with spouse)
   ____ separated
   ____ divorced
   ____ widowed

6. Number of children: _____ Their ages: _____

7. Your highest level of non-seminary education:

   ____ college degree
   ____ graduate study (no degree)
   ____ master's degree
   major field: _____
   ____ doctor's degree
   major field: _____

   other training: _____

8. Please list any previous occupations (including homemaking):

   _____

9. Can you identify any important role models who influenced your choice of vocation?

   _____

10. Please list, by relationship, any relatives of yours who are, or were, ordained clergy (father, husband, uncle, sister, etc.):

    _____

11. What was your father's highest level of education?

    ____ grade school
    ____ some high school
    ____ completed high school
    ____ some college
    ____ college degree
    ____ some graduate study
    ____ master's degree
    ____ doctor's degree

    other training: _____

Over

12. What is, or was, your father's occupation?

_____

13. Is your father still living? _____

If not, in what year did he die? _____

14. What was your mother's highest level of education?

____ grade school
____ some high school
____ completed high school
____ some college
____ college degree
____ some graduate study
____ master's degree
____ doctor's degree

other training: _____

15. Is your mother still living? _____

If not, in what year did she die? _____

16. What is, or was, your mother's occupation (including homemaking)?

_____

Was your mother employed outside the home at any time during your childhood? _____. If so, for how long? _____

17. How many children were there in your childhood family? _____

What was your place (first or oldest, second, etc.)? _____

18. When you look back now, which parent would you say you were closest to as a child (father, mother, both, neither)?

Which parent would you say you "took after"?

19. At what age did you first experience a call to your vocation?

At what age did you take the first direct steps toward taking up your vocation?

20. Who has been the greatest source of support to you?

Who, or what, has been the greatest source of difficulty?

21. If you could choose the ideal form of ministry for yourself, what would that be?

22. If the work role for which you are now preparing had been closed toyou, what would you have done instead?

APPENDIX C: OUTLINE FOR INTERVIEWS

Date:

I. Where did you receive your theological education?

When were you ordained? (age and year)

Deacon Elder

What is your present relation to your annual conference?

full member
associate member
probationary member
seminary student pastor
local pastor

What is your present appointment? Your title?

What are your responsibilities in this job?

How long have you held this appointment?

What is the size of your congregation?

How would you describe your congregation?

What previous appointments have you had?

II. Are you married? What is your spouse's occupation?

Do you have any children?

What is your highest level of non-seminary education?

Have you followed any other occupations, before entering the ministry?

Can you identify anyone who served as a role model, or was an important influence on the choice of your work?

Have any of your relatives been ordained clergy?

What was your father's highest level of education?

His occupation?

Is he living? (How long ago did he die?)

What was your mother's highest level of education?

Did she work while you were growing up?

Is she living? (How long ago did she die?)

How many children were there in your family? What was your place?

When you look back now, which parent would you say you "took after"?

Which one were you closer to?

At what age did you first experience a call to the ministry?

When did you take the first steps toward taking it up?

What, or who, has been the greatest source of support to you?

The greatest source of difficulty?

III. If you could design the ideal job or role for yourself in the church, what would it be?

If the ministry had been closed to you, what do you think you might have done instead?

Do you consider yourself an innovator?

What kind of changes would you like to see introduced into the life of your congregation?

What changes would you like to see in the church at large?

How are you working toward these changes? What approach would you say you use?

Are you involved with other clergywomen in doing this?

How does your sex influence your relations with your congregation?

Your co-workers? (Your community?)

How could your congregation be of more help to you?

What is your model of the ministry?

APPENDIX D: ADDITIONAL DATA ON BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF THEOLOGICAL STUDENTS

Table 8. Persons Named as Role Models or Influences on Choice of Vocation by Male and Female Theological Students.

Named by male students (n=65)	%	Named by female students (n=49)	%
Minister	56.9	No one	38.8
No one	27.7	Minister (male)	30.6
Family member	23.1	Family member	20.4
Teacher	15.4	Minister (female)	16.3
Hero	9.2	Teacher, counselor	16.3
Friend	4.6	Woman professional	6.1
Employer	3.1	Heroine	4.1

Table 9. Relatives of Male and Female Theological Students Who Were Ordained Clergy.

Relatives of male students (n=65)	%	Relatives of female students (n=49)	%
None	67.7	None	67.4
Father	13.9	Grandfather	10.2
Grandfather	12.3	In-laws	8.2
Uncle	12.3	Father	4.1
In-laws	6.2	Mother	4.1
Brother	3.1	Cousin (male)	4.1
Sister	1.5	Spouse	4.1
Spouse	1.5	Uncle	2.0
More than one	9.2	Brother	2.0
		Cousin (female)	2.0
		More than one	6.1

Table 10. Highest Level of Education Attained by Fathers of Male and Female Theological Students.

Level of education	Fathers of male students (n=65) %	Fathers of female students (n=49) %
Grade school only	9.2	10.2
Some high school	7.7	10.2
High school graduate	27.7	30.6
Some college	15.4	20.4
College graduate	7.7	8.1
Some grade study	4.6	4.1
Master's level degree	24.6	14.3
Doctoral level degree	3.1	2.0

Table 11. Highest Level of Education Attained by Mothers of Male and Female Theological Students.

Level of education	Mothers of male students (n=65) %	Mothers of female students (n=49) %
Grade school only	1.5	2.0
Some high school	10.8	6.1
High school graduate	38.7	44.9
Some college	20.0	24.5
College graduate	13.9	10.2
Some graduate study	7.7	4.0
Master's level degree	6.1	8.2
Doctoral level degree	1.5	0.0

Table 12. Period of Employment of Mothers of Male and Female Theological Students.

Period employed	Mothers of male students (n=65) %	Mothers of female students (n=49) %
Never	60.0	57.1
Less than 5 years	10.7	18.4
More than 5 years	43.1	5.10

Table 13. Closeness to Parents as Perceived by Male and Female Theological Students.

Parent closest to	Male students (n=65) %	Female students (n=49) %
Mother	60.0	57.1
Father	10.8	18.4
Both	23.1	16.3
Neither	6.2	8.2

Table 14. Resemblance to Parents as Perceived by Male and Female Theological Students.

Parent most like	Male students (n=65) %	Female students (n=49) %
Mother	25.2	22.5
Father	41.5	34.7
Both	21.5	36.7
Neither	10.8	6.1

Table 15. Sources of Support Named by Male and Female Theological Students.

Named by male students (n=65)	%	Named by female students (n=49)	%
Spouse	47.7	Spouse	34.7
Other family members	29.2	Friends	34.7
Friends	16.9	Other family members	26.5
Clergy	7.7	Clergy	22.5
God/faith	6.2	Children	18.4
Home church	3.1	Home church	12.2
Teachers, counselors	3.1	Teachers, counselors	6.1
Seminary community	1.5	God/faith	6.1
Self	1.5	Seminary community	2.0
None	1.5	None	2.0

Table 16. Sources of Difficulty Named by Male and Female Theological Students.

Named by male students (n=65)	%	Named by female students (n=49)	%
Self	27.7	Self	16.3
Money	16.9	Family	16.3
Family	15.4	Attitudes toward ordination for women	14.3
Institutional church	10.8	Spouse	12.2
None	7.7	Institutional church	12.2
Seminary requirements	6.2	Time/priorities	12.2
Peers	4.6	Money	8.2
Church members	4.6	Seminary requirements	4.1
Spouse	3.1	Home church or pastor	4.1
Home church or pastor	3.1	Health	2.0
Time/priorities	3.1		

Table 17. Age at First Call to the Ministry for Male and Female Theological Students.

Age at call	Male students (n=65) %	Female students (n=49) %
Childhood	6.2	12.2
13-19	47.7	46.9
20-29	26.2	18.4
30-39	9.2	10.2
40-49	3.1	10.2
No answer	7.7	2.0

Table 18. Period of Delay Between Vocational Choice and Implementation for Male and Female Theological Students.

Period of delay	Male students (n=65) %	Female students (n=49) %
Less than three years	70.8	53.1
Four to ten years	15.4	2.0
More than ten years	13.9	44.9

Table 19. Current Career Plans of Male and Female Theological Students.

Plans of male students (n=65)	%	Plans of female students (n=49)	%
Parish ministry	69.2	Parish ministry	44.9
Undecided/unspecific	20.0	Undecided/unspecific	24.5
Campus ministry	3.1	Teaching ministry	10.2
Missionary	3.1	Special ministry (e.g. (arts, handicapped)	8.2
Military chaplaincy	1.5	Hospital chaplaincy	6.1
Youth ministry	1.5	Pastoral counseling	6.1
Pastoral counseling	1.5		

Table 20. Ideal Career Selected by Male and Female Theological Students.

Selected by male students (n=65)	%	Selected by female students (n=49)	%
Local church	46.2	Local church	32.7
Special ministry	15.4	Chaplaincy	18.4
Youth ministry	15.4	Combine w/teaching	14.3
Combine w/teaching	9.2	Special ministry	12.2
Counseling	7.7	Counseling	12.2
Uncertain	4.6	Administration	4.1
		Uncertain	2.0

Table 21. Alternative Careers to Ministry Selected by Male and Female Theological Students.

Selected by male students (n=65)	%	Selected by female students (n=49)	%
Teaching	27.7	Teaching	26.5
Business, management	12.3	Counseling	22.5
Law	9.2	Arts	16.3
Counseling	9.2	Social work	10.2
Skilled labor, craft	9.2	Librarian	6.1
Other church work	7.7	Nursing	4.1
Arts	7.7	Business	4.1
Geology	4.6	Speech/occupational therapy	4.1
Engineering	3.1	Computers	2.0
Medicine	3.1	Energy resources	2.0
Sociology	1.5	Public relations	2.0
Politics	1.5	Other church work	2.0
Corrections	1.5	Don't know	8.2
Farming	1.5		
Librarian	1.5		
Extension agent	1.5		

APPENDIX E: ADDITIONAL DATA ON BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF FEMALE MINISTERS.

Table 22. Persons Named as Role Models or Influences on Choice of Vocation by Female Ministers (n=22).

Persons named	%
None	36.7
Minister (female)	18.2
Minister (male)	13.6
Family member	13.6
Teacher	9.1
Clergy couple	4.6

Table 23. Relatives of Female Ministers who Were Ordained Clergy (n=22).

Relative named	%
None	68.2
Husband	27.3
Father	9.1
Brother	9.1
Other	9.1

Table 24. Highest Level of Education Attained by Parents of Female Ministers (n=22).

Level of education	Father %	Mother %
Grade school only	27.3	9.1
Some high school	0.0	4.6
High school graduate	22.7	31.8
Some college	22.7	22.7
College degree	4.6	18.2
Some graduate study	0.0	9.1
Graduate degree	22.7	0.0

Table 25. Closeness and Resemblance to Parents as Perceived by Female Ministers (n=22).

Persons named	Closest to %	More like %
Father	18.2	45.5
Mother	36.4	27.3
Both	22.7	9.1
Neither	22.7	18.2

Table 26. Sources of Support and Difficulty Named by Female Ministers (n=22).

Source of support	%	Source of difficulty	%
Friends	72.7	Money/time/fatigue	36.4
Husband	36.4	Male hierarchy	31.8
Pastor	31.8	Self	22.7
Family	22.7	Husband	18.2
Children	22.7	Parents	13.6
Teachers	22.7	Hostile congregation	13.6
Home church	18.2	Friends	9.1
God/faith	13.6	Divorce	9.1
		In-laws	4.6

APPENDIX F: ADDITIONAL DATA ON ADJECTIVE CHECK LIST SCORES

Table 27. Rank Order of Mean Standard Scores on the Adjective Check List for Female Ministers and Male and Female Theological Students.

Rank	Female ministers (n=22)		Female students (n=49)		Male students (n=65)	
1.	Cps	60.68	Cps	57.49	Het	56.65
2.	Iss	59.50	Iss	56.92	Iss	56.15
3.	S-Cfd	57.77	Int	56.67	Int	55.17
4.	Ach	57.32	Ach	56.31	Fav	55.11
5.	Dom	56.68	Fav	55.59	S-Cfd	54.99
6.	Fav	56.55	Dom	55.02	Nur	54.89
7.	Int	56.41	S-Cfd	54.98	Aff	54.89
8.	Nur	54.91	End	54.86	P-Adj	54.59
9.	Aff	54.73	Nur	54.35	Cps	54.03
10.	Het	54.46	Mls	53.86	Fem	53.69
11.	End	53.82	P-Adj	53.80	Dom	52.92
12.	P-Adj	53.77	Het	53.49	No.Ckd	52.86
13.	Mas	53.68	No.Ckd	53.20	Ach	52.28
14.	No.Ckd	53.18	Cha	53.10	End	52.06
15.	Agg	52.55	Agg	52.57	Mls	51.79
16.	Cha	52.32	Aff	52.57	Ord	51.52
17.	Mls	52.32	Ord	52.51	Exh	51.52
18.	Fem	51.91	Exh	51.85	Agg	51.43
19.	Ord	51.73	Fem	51.12	Cha	50.92
20.	Aut	50.91	Aut	51.00	Com	50.88
21.	Exh	50.86	Com	51.00	Def	50.43
22.	Crs	49.14	Mas	50.80	Mas	50.00
23.	Com	48.73	Crs	48.67	Aut	49.22
24.	S-Cn	48.46	S-Cn	48.49	S-Cn	49.02
25.	Def	47.23	Def	47.33	Aba	47.26
26.	Aba	45.14	Aba	46.65	Suc	46.80
27.	Unfav	41.86	Suc	46.63	Crs	46.62
28.	Suc	41.50	Unfav	44.61	Unfav	44.77