



12-1-1982

The Pedestal Effect and Pastors' Friendships

Tegan Blackbird

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/theses>

Recommended Citation

Blackbird, Tegan, "The Pedestal Effect and Pastors' Friendships" (1982). *Theses and Dissertations*. 2889.
<https://commons.und.edu/theses/2889>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Senior Projects at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.common@library.und.edu.

THE PEDESTAL EFFECT
AND PASTORS' FRIENDSHIPS

by
TEGAN BLACKBIRD

B.A. PSYCHOLOGY
B.A. SOCIOLOGY

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty

of the

University of North Dakota

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Grand Forks, North Dakota

December
1982

This thesis submitted by TEGAN BLACKBIRD in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of MASTER OF ARTS from the University of North Dakota is hereby approved by the Faculty Advisory Committee under whom the work has been done.

Paul H. Wright
(Chairman)

Thomas V. Petros

Mark Deak

This thesis meets the standards for appearance and conforms to the style and format requirements of the Graduate School of the University of North Dakota, and is hereby approved.

A. William Johnson

Title THE PEDESTAL EFFECT AND PASTORS' FRIENDSHIPS

Department DEPT. OF PSYCHOLOGY

Degree MASTER OF ARTS

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a graduate degree from the University of North Dakota, I agree that the Library of this University shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor who supervised my thesis work or, in his absence, by the Chairman of the Department or the Dean of the Graduate School. It is understood that any copying or publication or other use of this thesis or part thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of North Dakota in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis.

Signature _____

Date _____

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES v

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS vi

ABSTRACT vii

Chapter

 I. INTRODUCTION 1

 II. STUDYING FRIENDSHIP 23

 III. METHODOLOGY 44

 IV. RESULTS 51

 V. DISCUSSION 57

APPENDIX A 63

APPENDIX B 70

REFERENCES 80

LIST OF TABLES

Table	page
1. Rank Order of Importance of Ministers' Sources of Reward	5
2. Means, Standard Deviations and t-values of the ADF Scores of the Pastors and Controls Describing their Closest Friends	52
3. Mean Total Friendship and Pedestal Effect Scores of Congregation Members Describing Pastors and Controls	52
4. Correlations Between Pedestal Effect and Total Friendship Scores of Pastors and Controls	54
5. Correlations Between Pedestal Effect Scores and Criteria of Friendship Strength for Subjects Describing Pastor and Control Target Persons	55

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to extend my thanks to Dr. Paul Wright, chairman of my committee, for his benevolent support and guidance and enthusiasm which was such an asset for me throughout the course of this project. His attitude helped in making this study not only an academically rewarding experience, but one that was personally rewarding as well.

Thanks also to Dr. Thomas Petros and Dr. Mark Grabe, whose input, criticism, feedback and time extended on my behalf were well appreciated.

A special word of thanks must also go to the participating pastors. Such an attitude of interest and cooperativeness was greatly appreciated. Their insights were invaluable and my interactions with them were most enjoyable. I am looking forward to our continued interaction in future stages of this study area.

I especially must acknowledge my parents at this time also. You've been encouraging me from day one and your confidence in me has always made me feel both very fortunate and very special. Surprise and Merry Christmas!

Finally, and most importantly, my deepest thanks to the Lord who has been my unceasing strength (Isa 40:30-31).

ABSTRACT

Traditionally, the ministry has had a reputation for being a very lonely profession. Although widely acknowledged in the literature, no empirical research seems to be available investigating the nature of this alleged problem. On the basis of information gathered from the literature and from a number of interviews with several pastors in the Grand Forks area, the present study set out to investigate ministerial loneliness by qualitatively assessing and comparing a) the nature of the friendships of a population of pastors with those of matched control laymen, and b) the amount of discomfort aroused by the presence of those pastors vs. of the controls. Such discomfort is discussed as significant, for the implications it has for the pastor's ability to form friendships with men in his congregation.

The questionnaire format of data gathering was used. Pastors and controls from 12 congregations responded to a questionnaire to provide a qualitative description of their closest friendship. A second questionnaire was given to a larger group of respondents from each congregation, half responding with the pastor and half with the control person (Mr. X) as their focus. This questionnaire provided a description of some normative restrictions which the respondent imposes on the focus person (to be analyzed at a later stage), the strength of the friendship he has with the focus

person, and the amount of discomfort he experiences in the focus person's presence. The pastors were also asked to respond to this questionnaire as they would expect these men to respond.

Correlational analyses, multiple regression and matched t-tests were conducted on the data. The results showed that there was no difference between the closest friendships of the pastors vs. those of the controls. There was a significant difference between pastors and controls in terms of the pedestal effect: respondents reported significantly greater discomfort aroused by the pastors' presence than by the controls'. However, neither this pedestal effect on the average, nor the pastors' perception of the pedestal effect were able to account for any significance in the variability of the pastors' closest friendships or of their average friendships in the congregation. Further, averaging across congregations yielded no significance in the correlation between the pedestal effect and friendship strength of respondents toward the focus person. However, when looking at these same correlations for each individual respondent, the relationship was significantly negatively correlated for those men responding to the pastor. This was not true for controls.

The findings were interpreted and discussed in terms of their implications for understanding the problem of minis-

terial loneliness. Recommendations for future research were suggested. It was concluded that while the pedestal effect does not make a difference with pastors' friendships overall, it does have implications for his ability to establish such relationships with certain individuals. Also significant is the finding that this is a problem with which the layman does not have to contend.

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

"We are deeply lonely people", said a small town pastor. "Particularly my wife is extremely lonesome, and I can see why. We live in an emotional and intellectual vacuum. I thought if I ministered to the needs of the congregation they would in turn minister to the needs of my family. This has proved to be unrealistic (Hulme, 1966, p. 111)."

"...The minister may be even more conscious of his isolation because his leadership centers in the inner life. As he attempts to penetrate the loneliness of others, he may actually increase his own sense of loneliness. The ministry is a lonely vocation (ibid., pp.105-106)."

"Most clergy, and this was certainly true of me, want to work with people, want people to like them, and have a lot of needs for affiliation and companionship--and yet the role fundamentally is a very lonely one (Hahn,1979)."

"It is inconceivable to the clergy that the congregation or individual church members should know, accept and care for them as persons...it would be unprofessional for them to expect, much less receive, care from the people in their congregations (Howe, 1964)."

The Prestige of the Ministry

The role of the minister has enjoyed a tradition of veneration and presumably high status. It has come to be regarded as somewhat of a prototype of exemplary character in the Christian community. Christianity Today (see Raymond, 1968) had this to say of the pastoral vocation: "The demands on today's minister are great, the frustrations and perplexities considerable. But it is an exciting field. Pastors are in a better position to serve mankind than ever. There is hardly a profession that offers more favorable circumstances for helping others." Bedsole (1958) commented similarly: "Preachers as a group are the greatest souls on God's earth. Personally and individually, they are the choice spirits of all the ages...even with all their mistakes and blunders. God's ministers remain the most noble group of men in human society today."

Problems of the Profession: Characteristic Research

True, the pastoral vocation is a reputable one. But, as one of the above quotes suggests, it is not without its codicil problems. What exactly are these so-called "frustrations and perplexities"?

A perusal of the literature identified several general problem areas inherent in the pastoral ministry. Typical areas of research to date have investigated difficulties such as the following, as they are relevant to the pastoral ministry.

The traditional authority of the church, in the light of modern science and technology has eroded and its institutional authority is weak. Therefore, the pastor must depend on other devices (e.g. interpersonal skills) to maintain the "necessary political support for his ministry (Lynn, 1965)." Lynn also reports that the ministry unrealistically demands a simultaneous coordination of multiple roles: "It is a striking anomaly in an age of specialization that the parish priest is forced to maintain an adaptive readiness to 'be all things to all men' (p.72)." The voluntary character of religion in the U.S., Lynn writes, makes the clergy unusually responsive to the needs and desires of the laity and to cultural changes.

Another area of research has investigated the laity's pressure upon the pastor to make him behave in traditional ways (Glock & Stark, 1965; Blizzard, 1958; Lauer, 1973). Hulme (1966) and Glock & Stark (1965) have also suggested a double standard of morality implicitly imposed upon the pastor by the laymen.

Gustafson (1965) and Stromm (1973) have attacked pastoral training, which in several ways is unrealistic or inefficient in light of the demands placed upon pastors in the 'real world'. Unexpressed hostility, feelings of failure and inadequacy, job insecurity and role confusion are among the problems of the pastor touched upon by McBurney (1977).

The minister's self-concept and personality problems have also been discussed in considerable detail (Lauer, 1973; Hulme, 1966).

Finally, voluminous research has been done in the areas of family neglect, social pressures and expectations on manse children and wives, and loneliness of the minister's wife (Hulme, 1966; Lynn, 1965; Douglas, 1965; Spann, 1949; Banton, 1965; Blizzard, 1958; Bowers, 1963; and McBurney, 1975).

Ministerial Loneliness: Significance
of the Problem and the Dearth of Research

It is consistently reported in the literature that loneliness is a problem of greater generality and severity for the pastor's wife than it is for the pastor himself, mainly because, unlike her husband, the wife lacks the opportunities for social contact and exposure. Accordingly, much more has been written concerning ministerial loneliness as it pertains to the pastor's wife. While whole books have been dedicated to the former, it was not typical in any of the literature to find more than a few pages discussing loneliness as it relates to the pastor. Moreover, what little that has been written in this area has been restricted to subjective accounts, observations, or simple acknowledgements of the problem. Empirically-based research here is conspicuously lacking and is seemingly non-existent.

Nonetheless, loneliness is a problem with ministers, who as Howe (1964) writes, "have little companionship or relationship with the laity, except for that which is related to their functions as ministers. And much of this relationship is strained and stilted (p. 21)."

Even if the congregation at large is unaware of the minister's need for gratifying social relationships, the pastor himself is not. Table 1 is reproduced from Lauer (1973) and is based on questionnaire data received from the pastors of 25 randomly chosen churches. The table shows the rank ordering the pastors gave to 5 different sources of reward. Noteworthy is the finding that 'relationships with people' took even a slight precedence over 'clear conscience before God'.

Table 1

Rank Order of Importance of Ministers' Sources of Reward

A sense of having done the will of God	1.5
Relationships with people	2.3
Having a clear conscience before God	2.4
Personal growth	3.0
Approval of denominational superiors	4.7

It seems that the problem of loneliness in the ministry is widespread and is something which warrants further attention. This stands out particularly in light of the available research, and such quotes as are found in the opening of this chapter, and especially the personal interviews (at the

end of this chapter) undertaken specifically for this research project.

Contributing Factors

The literature cites several factors which purportedly contribute to ministerial loneliness. According to Howe (1964), the problem resides, in part, in the pastor's training, which has psychologically prepared him to believe that true friendships with members of their congregations are both unrealistic and impractical, and a threat to the effectiveness of their ministry. Moreover, the layman is pre-occupied with his own life and is largely unaware that the minister and his family are lonely in the midst of the community. Mainly, Howe believes, due to diversities in their personal backgrounds and educational histories, the pastor and his congregation each hold unique "Weltanschauungs", or world views; that is, the ways in which they interpret, understand, or order their worlds are both different and incompatible and result ultimately in a breakdown of necessary communication between them.

Oswald (1979) identifies geographical mobility characteristic of the ministry as being uncondusive to the formation of long-term friendships. In an effort to overcome this 'time factor', observes Hulme (1966), a new pastor often has a tendency to try to develop friendships too quickly: "when ties are developed so quickly, they may soon reach a stage

of over-familiarity. The intimacy is more that the relationship can endure because of insufficient time to develop its roots (p. 65)." Lauer (1973) considers the time factor from another perspective, and observes that even on a daily basis the minister's busy schedule does not allow time for many non-church-related activities which are necessary in any friendship relation.

Bedsole (1958) entertains the possibility that the ministry attracts people who were lacking in interpersonal skills to begin with. In this sense, loneliness may be described as a predisposition, characteristic of certain people who are drawn to the ministry.

The pastor's position as a leader has been seen as having an inhibitory effect on his social relationships (Griffin, 1980; Hulme, 1966). Regarding self-disclosure, a prelude to friendship (Walker & Wright, 1976), Griffin writes (p. 26): "The pastor or Christian leader has an additional worry. He lives in a 'fishbowl'. Won't it invalidate his ministry if his followers know what he's really like? It seems safest to merely pray and keep one's own counsel."

Also, since the ministry centers in personal relationships, the minister who has 'perfectionist' tendencies may be unrealistic in the demands he places on himself and on his congregation. Hulme (1966, p. 69) writes: "The same difficulty of the pastor to accept himself apart from his

accomplishments causes him problems also in relating to his people. They too, fall below his expectations and he may show them the same impatience that he shows himself."

Most assuredly, each of these observations contribute to the problem of pastoral loneliness. There is, however, another aspect of the problem which has not yet been discussed, and this concerns the 'role' of the pastor, per se:

"With whom shall the minister and his wife be friends? Naturally, they are friends with the members of the congregation. By this we mean that they are friendly with them and may even know some of them intimately. Yet, this is not friendship in the sense of mutuality and preferential companionship. The very nature of the role of the pastor...to the members of the congregation limits the extent to which they can be friends. Whether he wants to be, or even whether he should be, in this unique position in the congregation, the fact remains that he is. He is the leader, the authority figure, the VIP of the parish...There are those who are attracted to him on this basis. They want to be in on the 'inner circle'...Others feel just the opposite. They are repelled by this 'sucking' of authority and fight the practice by fighting the pastor. Perhaps they simply feel unable to compete and so they attack. Apparently they find it emotionally intolerable to lower their guard for fear of being 'taken in'. Or perhaps they view the pastor as a rival to their own aspirations for authority. If the pastor and his wife form intimate friendships within the congregation, they are jeopardizing his pastoral role with these people (Hulme, 1966, pp.106-7)."

Along similar lines, Glock and Stark (1965) recognize that the pastor stands as a symbol of the divine, and his very presence can make people feel guilty (Hulme, 1966, p. 15), and avoid him.

Summary of Pastoral Interviews

Preliminary interviews of an exploratory nature were undertaken with several pastors in the local Grand Forks area. The purpose of these interviews was to elicit feedback from ministers of various Protestant denominations concerning ways in which the ministerial role interacts with the minister's ability to initiate and maintain friendships. The interviews proved fruitful in that they shed light on several variables which must be dealt with and taken into account in any efforts to further understand (qualitatively and quantitatively) the nature of pastors' friendships.

Several of the pastors interviewed commented on the intrinsic "relational nature" of the pastor's job. The very task of being an effective minister depends on one's ability to interact with people. Whereas most other professions depend on learned skills, it came out in the interviews that the pastors saw themselves as effective only to the degree that they have good relations with people: they must be well-liked, active in social organizations, clubs, functions, etc. They must be able to be trusted (so they may be confided in). Many saw this inherent "relational nature" as advantageous in the sense that there are many opportunities available for the establishment of friendships (e.g. there are many social contacts). However, some at the same time pinpointed a tendency to let this very aspect of their role interfere with the formation of friendships. The pastor is

a friend to all. Yet many described their relationships qualitatively as being "short-term, shallow and professional" in nature. Thus, the "superficiality" of these friendships was alluded to with such descriptions as: "I have many friends, but I don't have many friends," or "I'm always lonely, though I'm never alone."

Most pastors reported that they found it very difficult to initiate friendships, due to what may be referred to as the "box on a pedestal" phenomenon. First of all, pastors described the feeling that they were being "boxed in" by the expectations of the congregation and laity in general. They unanimously reported the strong feeling of social restraints, e.g. you should not ride a motorcycle or wear blue jeans, can't swear or get depressed, cannot raise your voice in anger, etc. They saw these as playing a central role in inhibiting their ability to form friendships, by forcing them to behave in a stereotyped or "artificial" manner. "Once they've got you in the box, you can't be yourself. When you can't be yourself you can't form real friendships." In other words, artificiality interferes with the genuineness of interaction which is seen as essential in the formation of meaningful friendships.

The second part of the "box on the pedestal" phenomenon deals with the layman's propensity to elevate the pastor to

the level of a "superhuman," or "super-Christian." One pastor referred to this as "God Transference." The laymen (either consciously or unconsciously) forget the fact that the pastor is human. There are advantages and disadvantages to this. On the one hand, the pastor can carry this authority to help them. Thus, the pastor's forgiveness, for example, can truly have a cathartic effect. On the other hand, this leads people to treat the pastor in an artificial manner. One pastor, for example, stated: "Everyone is friendly and gregarious, but at the same time they keep a distance...they avoid 'getting too close'. And in addition, I must keep up my guard: I'm on a pedestal--or in a fishbowl, as it were--and if I discredit their image of me, my ministry is ruined. When they see you as human, 'the tin god is no longer a god...the king-makers can also unmake the king'."

The awareness of the "distance" maintained by the laymen was widespread among the pastors. Some actually described the laymen as being "afraid" of the pastor. From the pastors' vantage point, respect for the office of "Minister of God's Word" was both welcome and necessary. However, the problem arises when the congregation is unable to see past the ministerial role and relate to the pastor as a person also. "They tend to always see you as a minister rather than as a friend." Another aspect of the minister being identified as a "God Image" is that, on the other side of the coin, the minister's office also then serves as a re-

minder to the laymen that he is a "sinner". This serves to make the layman uncomfortable, and again, he withdraws. Thus, many commented that when they meet a stranger in a neutral setting (e.g. a bus depot, on a plane, etc.) they find it easy to interact until the conversation drifts around to "What do you do for a living?" "When the other person finds out that you're a pastor, well it's all over. They immediately begin to withdraw from you." One pastor cited two reasons why he believes that people often do not invite him to social gatherings: "a) they don't think I would want to go, or b) they're afraid that I would 'cramp their style'."

All of the pastors interviewed experienced this aspect of the pastoral role--that is, the loneliness and shallowness of relationships that follows from being placed on a pedestal. However, each had something different to say about it. Some saw it as an inevitable burden that comes with the job, and were able to justify their loneliness: "In giving we receive." In the words of one pastor, "It seems you walk alone a lot, but you make up for it in other ways: you minister to them and you get the reward of having helped them. That's more important than having established deep friendships."

Some saw the problem as depending on the "personality" of the congregation. In some parishes they have the problem,

in others they do not. Some were able to see themselves as being "functionally set apart" and on a pedestal, yet still able to move with freedom in their interpersonal relationships.

Others saw the problem as existing only in the area of initiating friendships. If the problem persists it is probably the pastor's own fault in that he is somehow reinforcing it. "It's hard to establish relationships where they see me as a person--after all, I am their pastor!" This was especially true in the instance of the older parishioners. However, this barrier was usually overcome via the ministerial functions of the pastor's life. Friendships are initiated between pastors and clergy through crises and tragedies befalling the laymen. They look for guidance and spiritual strength, and this can be the beginning of a friendship: they feel closer to the pastor when he's shown them he genuinely cares for them as individuals. Yet this only provides the opportunity for the **beginning** of friendships. A large barrier at this point has been overcome, yet since the giving at this stage has been rather one-sided there is still a bit of a gap to be joined. The pastors saw time as the crucial element here. When the biggest obstacle, initiation of friendship, is overcome, it remains only for time to establish the mutuality of the commitment. Time fosters and strengthens the relationship. But then, even here, another element comes into play. Typically, the pastor does not

have the time to foster the relationship. Some claimed that "busyness" prevented the time commitment. However, most pastors acknowledged that if this is the case, then it is the pastor's fault. It is self inflicted. Some also suggested that it is possible to use "busyness" as a convenient excuse to avoid facing the problem of not having any friends. Time may influence pastors' friendships in another sense, in that pastors are transferred too frequently: they do not remain in one area long enough to develop these friendships which they have already initiated. Many saw this as a serious problem.

Finally, most pastors felt that although the potential for loneliness is there, if it remains to be a problem for the pastor then it is of his own devise: it is self-imposed. "Demands aren't a problem unless you let them be...you won't have problems with roles unless you try to live up to them." When asked how he dealt with the pressures, one pastor said, "People are lonely because they let it happen. I won't let them box me in. You'll never please everybody." The general consensus seemed to be that loneliness is often a problem for pastors, but when it is it's the pastor's fault: "If I have to choose between keeping everybody happy and being friendless vs. having friends, being happy and having an effective ministry I'd choose the latter. The pastor has to have friends. He must establish and develop friendships and then deal with any problems as they arise...I have many friends in my my congregation."

Several pastors expressed their resolution of the problem in finally being able to see it not as their problem, but as the congregation's problem. Plainly put, they all acknowledge that "the pastor is only human, he needs friends."

There are other ways in which the pastor's role inhibits his formation of friendships. Sometimes parishioners are rather opportunistic in their preferences for whom they choose to affiliate with. Consequently, it was reported that some will associate with the pastor in an effort to "cash in" on his status. The minister's role is very prestigious in the eyes of the community, and it can prove advantageous to be his friend. Such ulterior motives in friendships reportedly detract significantly from the quality of those friendships. However, consensus seemed to indicate that such instances were not particularly rampant. Though inevitably present, they are usually easily identifiable and thus do not pose much of a problem.

The final way in which the pastor's role was seen as inhibiting the friendships they were able to form was in terms of norms imposed by the congregation regarding what are permissible modes of interaction between clergy and layman. Some reported a certain "possessiveness" on behalf of the laity. This was especially true in more rural areas, where the pastor's role was seen to inhibit the formation of personal friendships (in an urban scene, there is less monitor-

ing of the pastor's time). One pastor expressed that some people have wanted to establish a friendship with the pastor, but were disappointed because they did not know how to do it. As a result they displayed a possessiveness or jealousy when the pastor spent much time with other individuals. Some indicated that physical displays of affection (e.g. a hug rather than a handshake at the "Sign of Peace" in a service) would be frowned upon by some, as would inordinate amounts of time spent in leisure activities. Some pastors said they would feel comfortable fishing or going on an outing with a group of men, but if it involved an "overnight" it would cause a disturbance. Intimate self-disclosure really bothers some in the congregation; "information is power", and they do not want others to have any advantages over the pastor that they do not have themselves. The pastor must be careful who he associates with, since a friend with a bad reputation could damage his ministry. At social functions, the pastor must avoid cliques at all costs. He must maintain a distance and mingle equally with all. In the words of one pastor: "You may show no favoritism...you belong to the public."

Such restraints however, appeared to be very much the exception rather than the rule. Mostly, such restraints were seen, again, as being self-imposed, and not necessarily existing in the minds of the clergy. Some believed that they were "self-imposed through tradition": through training,

etc., they somewhere "pick up" the notion that "pastors cannot have any friends", in very much the same way as others have picked up, directly or indirectly, that "men cannot do dishes". It was expressed that people would react negatively if the pastor spent too much time with a select few individuals to the exclusion of others--but this wasn't seen necessarily as bad! A good balance must be maintained, or the pastor won't know the needs of the congregation. Such selectivity can interfere with the pastor's duties and office, and then people will react, and then it is also good that they do so. Many commented that although there is a certain element of possessiveness ("the congregation wants your time, they want your attention"), it is still only a matter of how you deal with it. The key is that the pastor must distribute his time, and meet his commitments. In the words of one pastor: "The pastor must establish relationships of caring with all before he moves into deep level friendships with a few...he must nurture several friendships first (by caring, giving individual attention and showing concern). After he's done this--his "pastoral homework"--there will be an increasing degree of freedom. It will enhance your freedom to build deeper friendships. If you don't do your "pastoral homework" you leave yourself wide open. If they feel that basic love and caring, it frees the pastor." In other words, if the pastor's relationships are demonstrably preferential and exclusive in na-

ture, problems may be anticipated. Another pastor commented similarly: "So long as I'm sensitive to the congregation, I feel no inhibitions here". Thus, the majority did not see the problem of imposed norms as being a very serious one. It "was there", but could be dealt with easily.

Interestingly, most of the pastors interviewed claimed to have very close friendships in their congregation and indicated that they didn't see any real problem with "pastors' friendships" per se. However, all indicated that they saw it as a problem for other pastors and cited themselves as an apparent exception (suggesting the possibility of the operation of the process of a denial mechanism). Moreover, all also indicated that they saw the pastor's role as a naturally lonely one, which doesn't seem to follow from their description of how easily these problems are dealt with.

Where does the pastor find his closest friends? Most indicated that they felt very comfortable with their congregation and had several close friends there. Others were unable to interact intimately with their own congregation and sought friendships in other congregations. Some found it easiest to relate to other ministers, due to their commonality of experiences in dealing with the pastor's problems, while others felt uncomfortable affiliating with other ministers, especially when crossing denominational barriers. Of the 7 pastors interviewed, 5 indicated that they had

formed significant relationships in their own congregation and that they felt no problem in dealing with constraints from the laity, or in having friends in their congregation.

All the pastors saw loneliness as being a greater problem for the minister's wife than for the minister himself, in that the wife doesn't have the opportunity for social interactions that the pastor has, not the contacts necessary to establish friendships. She is more in the background than is the pastor. Also there are more restraints imposed on the wife than on the pastor and often they are of a more severe nature. The "busyness" of the husband's vocation also results in family neglect quite easily and must be closely monitored by the pastor.

When asked to compare their friendships qualitatively and quantitatively to the friendships of a "non-pastor" or to those of their "pre-pastoral days" some saw the pastor's friendships as drastically fewer and qualitatively poorer, because "the people withdraw, and I'm too busy". However, most saw either no differences or actually perceived advantages in being a pastor. As a pastor they have more encounters with people on an intimate basis, due to the very "relational nature" of their job. Providing they know how to deal with the problems discussed above, and are able to separate the professional from the relational elements of their position and interact genuinely with their congregation, the

pastor's role may actually facilitate the formation and development of close and lasting friendships. Where problems do exist regarding pastor's friendships, consensus seemed to indicate that training was necessary in the pastor's schooling which would prepare the minister to deal with the situation effectively. Also there is a definite need to get together with other ministers: there is no reason why the pastor should try to "go it alone". They should go ahead and develop friendships and deal with problems when they surface. Finally, the congregation must come to see the pastor as human. They must be made aware of the problems involved in pastoral ministry, and come to see the role of the pastor in a different light. Thus, the pastors must learn to minister to each other and the congregation must be taught how to minister to the pastor.

Summary

As was reviewed above, certain attributes of the ministerial position have been identified in the literature and in the interviews which may indirectly interfere with the pastor's ability to build intimate friendships. Even these discussions have been overly concise and speculative. While reasonable they generally lack empirical support. Yet aside from these indirect factors, there is reason to believe that the role of the pastor, per se (that is, the perception of the pastor's role by both the pastor and his congregation) has a direct inhibitory effect on his ability to form and

maintain friendships. It is suggested that this effect may be seen in the form of behavioral norms, surrounding the ministerial role, which govern the pastor's friendships. There is an incredible dearth of literature dealing with ministerial loneliness in general. Research investigating the "role-bound" nature of pastoral friendships is even more difficult to come by. However, from a social-psychological point of view, the question of normative restrictions on friendship formation is most interesting, because, as Wright (1978, p. 199) observes:

"Friendship is a relationship with extremely broad and ambiguous boundaries. One reason for this is that friendship lacks normative definitions or social trappings that are external to the relationship itself. Suttles (1970) notes that friendship is the least role-bound, legalistic, or 'programmed' of any important personal relationship."

Thus, regarding how it is conducted, certainly friendship is a "norm free" relationship. However, there may exist certain norms, mores, or expectations which could potentially restrain and/or inhibit the initiation of friendships. Adequate formation and development of a true friendship may depend on the appropriateness of the broader social climate.

Does the ministerial position, as a profession, create for itself a social climate or setting which is--by its very nature--simply ill-suited for the formation of friendships? To what extent are the minister's friendships inhibited by his role? Does his very presence cause some sort of discom-

fort in people which causes them to withdraw or maintain their distance, or which makes it difficult to pursue a serious friendship relationship with him? Are there norms which govern or impede the formation of his friendships? If so, what is the nature of these norms?

These are a few of the questions which this study of pastors' friendships, as a piece of applied research, sets out to investigate.

Chapter II

STUDYING FRIENDSHIP

Introduction

This chapter begins with a review of the relevant literature on the nature of friendships and several theories regarding various factors which are important to the formation of friendships. Next, a more comprehensive model is presented and discussed in a bit more detail. Finally, an analysis of friendship as a social institution is presented, along with a few more variables which may be said to characterize the friendship relationship.

Friendship: a Review of the Literature

Attraction and friendship as a topic of social-psychological research has demonstrated itself as being an interesting and complicated area of study, involving a long history of speculation and observation.

Consider the following observation of Aristotle (Rhetoric, 1932), almost 2400 years ago:

"And they are friends who have come to regard the same things as good, and the same things as evil, they who are friends of the same people...We like those who resemble us, and are engaged in the same pursuits...We like those who desire the same things as we, if the case is such that we and they can share the things together."

It seems incredible that these "ancient" observations are today still withstanding objective verification. However, contemporary theories of friendship have investigated a considerably greater number of variables.

Among the most simplistic contemporary theories of friendship is that of propinquity theory. Propinquity theory attributes attraction between strangers simply to what Zajonc (1968) calls "mere exposure". Zajonc found that subjects engaged in a pseudo-experimental task, when exposed unwittingly to other subjects (no communication between subjects was allowed) rated those "others" as more or less likeable depending only on how many times they had been exposed: those with a greater number of exposures were perceived as more likeable. In a controlled study focusing on student apartment complexes, Festinger, Schachter and Back (1950) found similar results. Their data also suggests that friendship choices were dependent on both "functional" and spatial distance: residents showed a significant tendency to choose their friends in nearby apartments. Homans (1950) expresses the position as follows, "If the frequency of interaction between two or more people increases, their degree of liking for one another will increase". Homans sees the attraction/interaction relationship as only 'probable', however, and not inevitable. Homans is a proponent of "Exchange Theory", which, in brief, sees man as basically a "profit-seeking" creature, which tries to procure the great-

est possible reward at the lowest possible cost. As applied to interpersonal relationships, one will affiliate most comfortably with those who provide the greatest rewards. According to Homans, we may generally obtain these rewards most "cheaply" from those with whom we are in frequent contact. However, if our initial contact is initially not rewarding, frequent and unavoidable interaction may promote dislike, and even hostility. Rubin (1973) states that the accumulated evidence, however, suggests that mere exposure or proximity to another person is usually not enough to establish what Heider calls a "unit relationship".

Going beyond propinquity theory, Heider (1958) proposes a "balance theory" of friendship. Heider suggests 2 kinds of relationships: a) a unit relationship, where similarity with another and/or perceived similar destinies lead both individuals to see themselves as belonging to a larger "unit", and b) a sentiment relationship, or "liking". A central proposition of balance theory is that the two types of relationships tend toward consistency with one another (Rubin, 1973, p.130), that is, we tend to like those whom we perceive as being similar to us or sharing a similar fate. Heider's theory also asserts that balance must be maintained within a triadic system composed of 2 people and an object of communication (X). A state of imbalance results when a well-liked "other" (O) disagrees with one's own opinion regarding X. To restore balance, either P (one's self) or O

must change regarding their attitude toward X, or they must develop negative attitudes toward each other. This is the cognitive balance theory's basis for regarding similarity as a key determinant in attraction.

Similarity is among the most studied of the "friendship variables". Several investigators (Spuhler, 1962; Kirkpatrick & Stone, 1935; Schiller, 1932; Hunt, 1935) have studied similarities in spouses, uncovering significant relationships between husband and wife in terms of age, race, creed, education, social status, intelligence and even height and hair color. Similarly, Richardson (1940) found correlations between the attitudes of friends to be significantly higher than those reported for randomly assigned subject pairs.

One problem in researching similarity as a friendship determinant lies in deciding what variables to look at. Similarities in socio-economic status, religion, age, education level, political allegiances, and occupational status have all been among the variables which are reportedly able to discriminate between friends and random pairs (Laumann, 1969).

Regarding the effects of personality similarity on attraction and friendship, the results are ambiguous. Izard (1960) reported that compared to randomly paired subjects, friendship pairs have significantly more similar personality

profiles as judged by the Edward Personal Preference Schedule (the EPPS). However, in a later replication of this study, Izard (1963) failed to uphold the similarity-attraction hypothesis regarding personality profiles when using older subjects. In a similar study, Curry and Emerson (1970) asked students to provide measures of their own values, personality (using the EPPS), their liking for their dorm suite mates, and how they perceived their suite mates' values and EPPS profiles, at 5 different times during the semester. While actual and perceived value similarity predicted attraction, personality similarity, neither perceived nor actual, held no significant predictive merit concerning attraction. Byrne (1961), using the "phantom other" technique devised by Smith (1957), also studied the effects of attitude similarity on attraction. Students were asked to fill out an attitude questionnaire. Two weeks later they were asked to rate a "phantom other", who had supposedly filled out the same questionnaire, on a range of social characteristics. Students reacted significantly more favorably to those "others" who had reported similar attitudes than to those with dissimilar attitudes to their own. Byrne (1961a, 1961b) accounts for the attitude-similarity phenomenon in terms of reinforcement theory. When another shares one's attitudes, this is consensually validating and serves as a positive reinforcer. "When one receives positive reinforcement from another, positive affect is elicited and,

through simple conditioning, becomes associated with the other individual. Subsequent evaluative responses directed toward that other individual will be positive (Byrne, 1969)". Several studies have supported the alleged attitude similarity/attraction phenomenon (Byrne & Clore, 1966; Byrne & Griffitt, 1966; Jones & Daugherty, 1959; Smith, 1957; Newcomb, 1961) and several have suggested that such an account is overly simplistic and insufficient (Aronson & Worchel, 1966; Izard, 1963; Kerckhoff & Davis, 1962). Newcomb (1956) suggested that perhaps the predictability of attitude similarity would depend on the importance of the topic, but several other studies (see Byrne and Nelson, 1965) found no support for this contention. Rubin (1973), on the other hand, provides evidence which disagrees with Byrne on this point (p.141).

Heider's and Byrne's views differ in what they see as the underlying motivation beneath the similarity/attraction hypothesis, yet their outcomes and predictions coincide. Though it has many proponents (Schachter, 1951; Izard, 1960, 1963; Berkowitz & Howard, 1959; Worchel & McCormick, 1963), the similarity/attraction hypothesis is not without its problems. Goldstein and Rosenfeld (1969), for example, found it to be confounded with emotional security: only in insecure subjects was similarity found to be an accurate predictor of friendship. Rychlak (1965) found that "need compatibility" was more reliable a predictor than was need similarity.

Several researchers (Rosenfeld & Jackson, 1965; Kerckhoff & Davis, 1962; Duck & Craig, 1978; Newcomb, 1963) have attempted to reconcile various ambiguities by positing the existence of a "time course". These longitudinal studies have attempted to demonstrate that different variables are operative at various times in the sequence of an ongoing relationship. Nevertheless, some have been critical of, or abandoned similarity hypothesis in favor of the equally contestable complementarity hypothesis (Reilly, et al., 1961; Winch, 1955; Morton, 1960).

Novak and Lerner (1968) demonstrated that perceived attitude similarity may actually be threatening and lead to avoidance behavior, when an attitudinally similar "phantom other" is presented as being mentally disturbed.

Walster and Walster (1963) present evidence to suggest that when subjects are assured of being liked by a new acquaintance, they actually prefer to be introduced to someone very dissimilar to themselves. Berkowitz and Goranson (1964) report parallel results. Aronson and Worchel (1966) similarly propose that people implicitly assumed that an attitudinally dissimilar other will be less prone to like them than would one who holds similar views, thus they choose to affiliate with 'similar others', not because it is preferable, but because it's safer.

In conclusion, both variants (cognitive balance and reinforcement models) of the similarity hypothesis of attraction involve several inconsistencies and ambiguities. These theories are overly simplistic in that they fail to take into account many other variables (e.g. security, fear of not being liked, etc.). While the insights provided by these data should neither be disregarded nor considered irrelevant, they do appear to lack the depth and scope which this author considers requisite for a theory which opts to be able to explain a phenomenon so complex as that of friendship.

We turn now to consider Wright's (1978) model of friendship based on a conception of the self.

Wright's Friendship Model

Wright (1978) offers a friendship model which is based on a conception of the self. Wright distinguishes between the behaving person and the entity called self:

"The active, dynamic agent in individual behavior is the person as a whole, not the self. The self, being a conception held by the behaving person has no impetus or energy of its own. However, the person is responsive to his/her conception of self, and having such a conception has important motivational consequences (p. 197)."

The individual has a natural propensity to evaluate the self's worth and to assess its well-being; this concern serves as the "motivational bridge" leading to the involvement of the self in, among other things, social relation-

ships, in that it is manifested in a number of self-referent behavioral tendencies.

An individual has a tendency to behave in ways which, first of all, maintain and/or reaffirm "those self attributes that are important in terms of their evaluative implications for the self as an entity." Third, the individual has a tendency to evaluate the self in a "positive or self-enhancing manner." Finally, the individual is oriented toward changes in self-attitudes "in the direction of positive elaboration and growth (p.198)."

In analyzing the motivational dynamics of interpersonal relationships, Wright departs from the "Exchange Theory" interpretation discussed earlier (Homans, 1950), in favor of the more suitable "investment" interpretation of friendship. Far from seeing the other person as a "merchant" with whom commodities are exchanged or from whom they are purchased, the relationship is seen as a mutual "enterprize" in which a part of the self is invested:

"As compared to a purchase, an investment of self entails greater personal involvement and greater continuity of relatedness, the other becomes an entity in whose well-being and worth the subject has a vested interest...When an investment of self has been made in a relationship, that relationship becomes, in a sense, one of the subject's self-attributes. If the other person benefits, the subject benefits, even in the absence of tangible or immediate personal gain (p. 198-199)."

Thus, friendship is seen as an investment relationship between 2 parties which is specially suited to help the individuals "live out" their self-referent behavioral tendencies (Wright, 1982).

Wright defines friendship as "a relationship characterized by voluntary interdependence in which the individuals respond to each other personalistically, or as person qua persons (Wright, 1974, 1978, 1982)."

This definition includes both a behavioral component (voluntary interdependence, or VID) and an experiential component (person qua person, or PQP). VID refers to the extent to which the individuals purposely spend time together, aside from obligations, constraints, and external pressures; even if this involves inconvenience. The PQP factor acknowledges how the partners positively recognize the other's individuality, genuineness, and irreplaceability in the relationship.

The maintenance and development of a friendship are explained in terms of "four basic assumptions (Wright, 1978)."

First, in order to respond to each other genuinely (i.e. as person qua person), the interaction must be uninhibited by what Suttles (1970) refers to as "norms of propriety". The individuals must feel free to behave in a genuine, spontaneous, and non-stereotyped manner, i.e. to "be them-

Wright's model also includes a friendship variable accounting for another potential (though not inevitable) by-product of friendship; the degree to which the relationship is "difficult to maintain" (DTM). Maintenance difficulty refers to "the degree to which the friendship is characterized by tension or strain reflected in the time and effort spent in clarifying actions or comments, soothing ruffled feelings, and in general, exercising patience and restraint to keep the relationship intact (p. 202)." Wright (1974) also offers a technique in the form of a questionnaire (the "Acquaintance Description Form", or ADF: see Appendix A) specially designed to operationally measure these key variables.

The possible growth of an acquaintanceship into a friendship is conceptualized in terms of a developmental sequence originating in interpersonal contact and proceeding through a period of "friendly relations" (Kurth, 1970) into varying levels of VID (see Wright, 1978).

Initially, investments of self are minimal and involve low risk. However such investments are crucial, in that they allow each partner the opportunity: a) to evaluate whether their investments were "worthwhile", and b) for greater role-free interaction (which permits more accurate assessment of each other's individuality), and c) to decide whether they want to increase their investments or to back

out. Thus, these initial, low-risk investments pave the way for a potential friendship:

"Beginning early in the relationship, actual or anticipated rewards lead to increasing investments of self, which in turn often lead to increasing rewards, etc. (p. 201)."

The development, then, of a friendship from a mere acquaintanceship, according to Wright's model, need not depend on any of the assumptions of either the complementarity- or similarity-attraction hypotheses. Rather, such development is contingent upon the potential rewardingness of VID, and this will depend on "the subject's degree of involvement in the situation and his/her partner's inclination and ability to provide whatever self-referent rewards the situation makes relevant (p. 204)." In other words, attraction depends, in a sense, on the compatibility of the personalities--compatibility, that is, in terms of the extent to which each partner is equipped to provide those self-referent rewards which the other seeks or desires.

Friendship as a Social Institution

In his discussion of friendship as a social institution, Suttles (1970) suggests various ways in which friendship fulfills certain social functions. His discussion also sheds light on several defining variables pertinent to the topic of friendship formation.

Among the most important functions of friendship is its ability to permit individuals to go beyond the basic framework of strictly institutionally required affiliations. Especially valuable in societies in which people are "unrelated by primordial ties or a division of labor" and where social contacts go beyond the family, neighborhood, ethnic groups and social classes, friendship may serve as "a flexible covenant that joins people to one another and regulates their interpersonal relations (p. 96)." Suttles offers 3 defining elements of friendship:

a) It can occur within or between various groups, organizations, social groupings, etc. It has a leveling influence, in that friends (and friend's friends) are all required to see each other as equals.

b) It is an intensely personal relationship that is entered into voluntarily.

c) It is self-governing, to a greater extent than most other social relations.

Friendship, though in many ways similar to other institutions, is much broader in its scope through its capacity as an "interstitial institution".

Suttles also suggests several considerations entailing what it means to consider another individual as a "friend".

In summary form, the bottom line seems to come down to the necessity, in a friendship, of valuing one's partner as a "person qua person", i.e. to appreciate and value him/her as a special person and as a unique individual and self. To the degree that one's interests in a relationship are characterized by utilitarian motives, or to the degree that the Other has exposed not his real self but only a superficial front or facade, to such an extent may that relationship be said to depart from the virtues characteristic of a true friendship relationship.

Given this starting point as a basis for friendship, Suttles further contends, naturally, that before engaging in a true friendship, both partners must:

"...have grounds for believing that each is presenting a 'real self'...This means that there must be some test or demonstration of individuality or sincerity. On the one hand, this test must single out the individual as someone distinct from other people who occupy the same role or social status. On the other hand, such tests must contrast the person's behavior against what seems expedient, conventional, or merely routine (pp. 100-101)."

Thus, Suttles identifies "rules of public propriety", or better, violations of those rules, as a means through which an individual may expose his/her real self. By "rules of propriety" is meant "safe patterns of behavior that can be enacted before the widest possible audience, without exciting justifiable ridicule of criticism...conformity with accepted standards of manners or behavior (p. 101)." When

these rules are observed, they function to make life safe by subduing controversy, dissension or conflict. However, since these rules by their very nature are so structured and impersonal they may also serve as a touchstone against which one's individuality may be determined. Ergo, any derivations from such rules serve as an indication that someone has behaved out of choice:

"Such actions are almost invariably attributed to something basic and essential to the individual; a sort of unalterable and irrepressible force (p. 102)."

These violations "betray individuality" in that they indicate an aspect of one's self that is not amenable to social control. Such violations involve a risk, in that they entail departure from rules of safety, and as such are generally offensive. However, in keeping with the contention that in order to see each other as "persons qua persons" it is necessary to behave in a non-stereotyped manner, violations of public propriety are an essential step toward friendship formation. They do not ensure friendship, but they do provide the requisite unblemished exposure of one's real self which is needed before a true friendship may emerge. Friendship, then, is seen as a self-governing social institution, free from social prescriptions, yet still internally patterned and organized.

Suttles cites structural barriers to friendship formation specifically and foremost is the barrier of status differ-

ences. Crossing status barriers in friendship rouses suspicion in that the participants' motivational processes are in question: it is usually suspected that their interests have a utilitarian bent and it is hard to see them as really being interested in each other as persons qua persons. Therefore, status differences often preclude friendship by dissuading the participants from making the necessary violations of propriety. However, many status relations (interestingly, Suttles cites the minister in particular as an example, along with doctors, lawyers and psychologists) by their very nature demand such violations, in that the "lower" member is subject to very personal exposure of his/her private character. Thus, such instances usually also contain another barrier to friendship formation: an "asymmetry in the amounts of personal information each party to the relationship makes available to the other (p. 121)". Such asymmetry ordinarily forecloses the possibility of friendship between, say a doctor and patient, or (more relevant to our topic) between minister and layman (examples of such asymmetry between minister and layman might be found in such instances wherein the layman comes to the pastor for spiritual guidance, marital counselling, etc. While it would certainly be considered appropriate for the layman to do so--in fact, that is part of the pastor's job--for the pastor to be going to the laymen with such problems would generally be considered much less acceptable: this might (unfortunately perhaps) be

frowned upon, and in some instances might conceivably cause problems for the minister's role as "pastor"). Suttles then goes on to discuss various social arrangements which protect the 'lower status' members of these relations from "self-mortification" (see Suttles, pp. 122-126).

Also relevant is Suttles' suggestion that portions of one's real self are found beyond, or "outside of one's skin" (pp.129-132). These "portions of self" are found in a series of concentric circles reaching out beyond one's body. The most distal circle, perhaps, might include one's possessions, hobbies, interests, etc. The next closest might be the rooms of one's home, followed by one's clothing, one's physical body, and finally the inner self. As these "circles" reach outward, they contain progressively lesser "concentrations of self". Inasmuch as each of these circles contains an element of self, they naturally include violations of propriety. Thus, the outermost circles, containing the least concentration of self, likewise, would involve "a rather low risk investment in the potentials of friendship". As long as the acquaintanceship has not progressed beyond these faint outer circles, or manifestations of self, invitations to friendship may be easily refused (or accepted) as no obligation has been made. These outermost circles then, are crucial in the initiation of friendship, in that they represent the first step in the exposure of one's real self to another person.

Implications for Pastor's Friendships

As discussed in Chapter 1, the purpose of this research is to investigate the ways in which the pastor's role, per se, may be said to have an inhibitory effect on his ability to form and maintain friendships.

Data gathered from the pastoral interviews, as well as the theoretical considerations provided by Wright's model and Suttles' analysis of friendship as a social institution, suggest that behavioral norms characteristic of the ministerial role may hinder the pastor's ability to effectively develop meaningful friendships. Suttles (1970, p. 129) states that places where norms are very strongly sanctioned are very poor places for friendships to develop. With regard to the ministerial position, two general types of behavioral norms appear relevant:

a) Norms of propriety, defined as those expectations which dictate the behaviors which are generally considered appropriate, decent or socially acceptable. In the pastoral interviews, this was seen by the pastors as being the most severe obstacle to their friendships (e.g. one of the pastors interviewed confided in having been 'reprimanded' for such things as offering beer to guests at his house, or for having driven to his Sunday services on his motorcycle). They described such rules as "boxing them in", so that they couldn't be themselves. Suttles similarly reasoned that

such mores may cause individuals to behave in a stereotyped manner, which may prevent others from seeing the individual as he really is, or as a "person qua person". Thus, Suttles' theory sees friendship as necessitating the violation of such social restraints (hence his label of friendship as a "deviant relationship"). With respect to the pastor's social behavior, the questions, then, remain: What types of norms exist? How strongly are they sanctioned? Are they positively or negatively sanctioned?

b) Anti-fraternization norms, defined as social expectations which dictate what modes of interaction between individuals are permissible. Although most pastors generally didn't perceive this as a very severe problem most acknowledged its existence; they observed a sort of "possessiveness" or jealousy which constrained them to monitor closely the extent and nature of their social interactions. Some (see the pastoral interviews) saw such restraints as self-imposed, self-maintained, or learned through tradition or training, or as existing only in the minds of the clergy. Do such restrictions exist? To what extent? Do the pastors perceive them accurately? Or are they only imagined?

Secondly, if it is true that the pastor's presence has a tendency or potential to make individuals in the congregation feel uncomfortable or to "maintain their distance", then this certainly would interfere with their potentials in

friendship formation and maintenance. In the interviews this variable came out in the form of "cramping their style". Do individuals in the congregation feel free to 'act natural' around the pastor? Do they feel compelled to 'watch what they say', or to 'monitor their behavior'? If so, this would certainly make it difficult, perhaps impossible, to relate to the pastor as a "person qua person", and establishing a friendship with him might be a cumbersome task.

In summary then, on the basis of the interviews and review of the literature, a very broad research project is being prepared which is strictly exploratory in nature. Its purpose is to investigate these 3 variables (the 2 types of norms and the "pedestal effect") and their implications for the pastor's ability to initiate and maintain long-term intimate relationships with men in his congregation.

Purpose of this Research

Within the context of the broader research project, the focus at this stage will be on only one of the 3 variables suggested above: the "pedestal effect". The emphasis will be on arriving at an empirically based understanding of the ways in which the discomfort aroused by the pastor's presence is able to influence the friendships he is able to form.

Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

Instruments

Acquaintance Description Form

As an objective description/indicator of the qualitative aspects of the participating pastors' actual friendships, the Acquaintance Description Form (ADF) was used, which has been presented by Wright (1974, 1982) as both a valid and reliable instrument for this purpose (see Appendix A). The ADF is an 80-item questionnaire composed of eight 10-item scales. Seven of these scales correspond to the seven key variables outlined in his model (UV, SAV, ESV, SV, DTM, PQP, pp.26-28) and one scale (GF) is designed to measure tendencies for responding in a generally favorable manner toward the specified acquaintance, or "target person".

The subject indicates on a seven-point scale ranging from 0-6, the degree to which each of the 80 statements applies to his target person or to his relationship with him. This allows for a maximum total of 60 points on each of the eight scales. Finally, the scores from the PQP and VID scales, each of which measure one aspect of friendship strength, are

totalled to yield a variable called "Total Friendship" (TF). The scores obtained for each of these variables provides an objective description of the nature of the friendship between the respondent and the specified acquaintance.

Survey of Personal Reactions

Corresponding with the three postulated modes in which the pastor's role may impede his capacity for friendship formation (anti-fraternization norms, norms of propriety, and the "pedestal effect"), three questionnaires were constructed, one tapping each of these variables. Further, as an indicator of the strength of friendship between the respondent and his pastor, a shortened version of the ADF was constructed. These four were then condensed into a longer 15-page questionnaire, the Survey of Personal Reactions (SPR). The Survey of Personal Reactions, then, consists of three sections (see Appendix B): section one describes 10 behavioral dimensions (one per page), five of which are sensitive to anti-fraternization norms, and five or which are sensitive to proprietarial norms. Each of these dimensions is varied over seven degrees of intensity, in a manner amenable to analysis with Jackson's (1966) Return Potential Model. The normative data will be analyzed at a later stage in the study.

Section two consists of a 12-item shortened version of the PQP and VID scales of Wright's ADF. With the exception

of only minor wording changes (e.g. "your pastor" or "Mr. X" rather than "the target person"), the instructions and wording are identical to those in the ADF. In creating the shortened PQP and VID scales, an item analysis was conducted using a sample of 236 undergraduates. For each of these scales, the six-item combination which produced the strongest average inter-item correlation was used (the alpha coefficients for the two scales were .84 and .88 respectively).

In section three, a simple 10-item set was used which was designed to be sensitive to potential sources of discomfort specific to casual interaction with a clergyman. These items were created on the basis of data obtained from the preliminary pastoral interviews.

Subjects and Procedure

Participating Pastors, Controls and Congregation Members

The selection of subjects to be used in this study entailed a four step process. First of all, based on random selection, a list was comprised of 20 local Protestant churches in the Grand Forks area. Secondly, the senior pastors of these churches were contacted consecutively, until the total number of churches agreeing to participate reached a minimum of 12. During this initial contact, which was made by phone, the pastors were given only a very brief explanation regarding the nature and purpose of the study. After giving them an idea of how much time and effort their

participation would entail, the pastors were then invited to partake in the project. Pending on their interest and/or willingness to participate, a meeting was organized with the pastors, wherein a) they would be asked to provide their responses to two questionnaires (as described in the format below), and b) they would be given a more detailed explanation of the study. It was also promised to the pastors at this time that they would be given both written and verbal feedback concerning the findings of the study upon its completion.

Third, the pastor was asked to select and arrange a meeting with one particular individual ("Mr. X") in his congregation whose social standing in the congregation, visibility, and level of education is similar to his own, who could serve as his control by providing his responses to one of the same questionnaires to which the pastor would be responding (note: in that a great deal was already being asked of the pastors, much flexibility was exercised here. Some pastors chose to contact "Mr. X" and administer the questionnaire to him themselves. Some preferred to provide the investigator with his name and allow them to make arrangements on their own. The majority, however, elected to have the man designated as Mr. X meet along with the pastor at the initial session. The goal here was simply to be as accommodating as possible to the needs or preferences of each pastor).

Finally, the pastors were asked to give some thought as to how a meeting might be organized with a minimum of 10 male respondents within their congregation, for the purpose of getting their responses to one of the questionnaires (the SPR) to which the pastors would also be responding. Arrangements for this meeting could also be discussed in greater depth at the initial session with the pastors.

Initial Session with the Pastors

The initial meeting began with a simple review of the purpose of the study and a brief overview of how the data was going to be gathered. The pastor was then asked to complete two questionnaires: the ADF (with his closest non-clerical friend as the target person) and the SPR' (i.e. he was asked to complete the Survey of Personal Reactions--the same questionnaire which would be given to his congregation--answering the way he would predict his congregation to respond). In the majority of cases (7 of 12) Mr. X was also present at this meeting. In these instances, he was also given the ADF, with the same instructions as the pastor, and was exposed to the SPR. It was explained to him that half of the respondents from the congregation would be responding to this questionnaire with him as its focus.

Before they were given the questionnaire it was explained to each of the pastors (and to the controls, when present) that nothing more could be revealed to them until after they

had completed their responding, so as to prevent possible confounding, distortion, or biasing of their answers. Furthermore, upon their completion they would be debriefed and the study would be explained to them in full, and any questions at that time would be answered in full. Then, at that time they would be given an opportunity to withdraw from the study if, for whatever reason, they might find it objectionable or not wish to participate.

After completing the ADF and SPR', the pastor was asked to provide a list of names from which the 20 men from each congregation would be selected, and to make arrangements for the investigator to meet with them for the administration of the SPR (again, a great deal of flexibility was exercised here. Some of the pastors preferred to contact the chosen men themselves, whereas others preferred to have the investigator contact them. Still others found it much easier to simply have the questionnaires administered to consenting groups of men who met on a regular basis for various church activities: prayer meetings, church council, etc.). In those instances where Mr. X was not present at the initial session, arrangements were also made for a meeting with him, wherein he would be administered the ADF and exposed to the SPR in the same manner as just described above.

At this point, the pastors were given a more complete explanation of the nature of the study, and any questions which they had were answered.

Session with the Congregation Members

Finally, a meeting was organized with the men chosen by the pastor for inclusion in the study. At this meeting the men were given similar instructions: a brief description of the study and a promise of debriefing upon completion. The men were randomly assigned to two groups, A and B. They were then asked to complete the SPR using either the pastor (for group A) or the man identified as Mr. X (for group B) as the focus person.

Chapter IV

RESULTS

Comparing Closest Friendships: Pastors vs. Controls

The ADF data allows a comparison between the most intimate friendships of each of the pastors with those of their respective controls. For each of the nine variables in Wright's (1978) model, the means, standard deviations, t-values, and significance levels for this comparison are depicted in Table 2. Analysis of this data shows that, in terms of the various aspects of friendship described in Wright's model, there are no discernable differences between the closest friendships of the pastors and of the controls who participated in this study. The only aspect of friendship which approached significance was that of Ego Support Value, and this was in the direction of the pastors perceiving their closest friends as being more ego-supportive than do the controls ($p < .069$, $t = 2.01$, $df = 11$).

Reactions of the Congregation Members to the Pastors and Controls: Average Friendship Strength and the Pedestal Effect

There were no significant differences between the strengths of the average friendships which each respondent felt toward the pastors or toward the controls (see Table 3).

TABLE 2

Means, Standard Deviations and t-values of the ADF Scores of the Pastors and Controls Describing their Closest Friends.

Scale	Pastors		Controls		comparison	
	mean	SD	mean	SD	t	p
SV	41.67	6.29	41.17	7.04	0.0	ns
UV	46.83	8.32	45.08	6.42	0.62	ns
DTM	8.67	3.89	11.50	4.71	-1.61	ns
ESV	50.75	3.77	47.08	6.23	2.01	ns
GF	52.08	4.12	51.42	4.08	0.38	ns
SAV	49.08	4.94	45.75	7.20	1.26	ns
VID	41.08	6.21	36.83	10.54	1.08	ns
PQP	48.00	5.95	46.08	6.72	0.80	ns
TF	89.08	11.33	82.92	16.71	1.02	ns

TABLE 3

Mean Total friendship and Pedestal Effect Scores of Congregation Members Describing Pastors and Controls.

Scale	Pastors		Controls		Comparison	
	mean	SD	mean	SD	t	p
TF	39.98	6.40	35.76	8.48	1.29	ns
PE	6.18	1.98	4.81	2.72	2.40	.035

The only statistically significant difference between the pastors and controls was the pedestal effect, averaged for each congregation. The respondents reported feeling more uncomfortable, uneasy, or inhibited in the presence of the pastor than in the presence of his control target person.

The Mean Pedestal Effect, Pastors' Predictions of the Pedestal Effect, and Pastors' Friendships

Two stepwise multiple regression analyses were conducted, using the mean pedestal effect for each congregation, and each pastor's expectation of that mean pedestal effect as predictor variables.

The first regression analysis tested the null hypothesis that these two predictor variables would not account for a significant proportion of the variability in the intensity of the closest friendships of each pastor, as indicated by Total Friendship scores of their ADF profiles on their closest friend. The resulting analysis of variance was not statistically significant ($R\text{-square}=.054$; $p>.78$).

The second analysis used the same two predictors, using as the criterion variable the average Total Friendship which the men in each congregation had toward their pastor, as measured by their responses to the abbreviated ADF. This analysis also failed to reach significance ($R\text{-square}=.152$; $p>.48$).

Further tests of significance revealed no appreciable relationship, for either pastors or controls, between a) mean pedestal effect and closest friendships, and b) mean pedestal effect and average Total Friendship scores provided by congregation members.

The results of these analyses indicate that the two independent variables, individually or in combination, cannot be

said to contribute significantly to the variability of either the Total Friendship of the pastors' or controls' closest friendships, or of their average friendship strength with respondents in the congregation.

The Pedestal Effect and the Friendship Strengths
Toward Pastors and Controls by Individuals
Across Congregations

Comparing scores averaged for each congregation yields no significant correlations between the pedestal effect and the Total Friendship scores of the closest friendships or of the average friendships of pastors or controls within the congregation (see Table 4). Additional information is gained, however, from looking at the correlations between each individual's reported pedestal effect and the friendship strength he has with the focal person. A study of Table 5 indicates that, when scores are considered across rather than within congregations, there is a significant negative correlation between the pedestal effect and the VID, PQP,

TABLE 4

Correlations Between Pedestal Effect and Total Friendship Scores of Pastors and Controls.

=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Scales	Pastors	p	Controls	p
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
PE and TF	.0326	.92	.2062	.52
PE and TFA	-.3803	.22	.0927	.77
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

TABLE 5

Correlations Between Pedestal Effect Scores and Criteria of Friendship Strength for Subjects Describing Pastor and Control Target Persons.

Variables	Pastors (n=82)	Controls (n=77)	z	p
PE-VID	-.31*	.065	-2.39	.01
PE-PQP	-.23*	.01	-1.41	ns
PE-TF	-.30*	.04	-2.15	.02

*p < .05

and TF scales among those subjects responding to their pastors. These correlations are not significant for subjects responding to controls. Furthermore (see Table 5), t-tests for the significance of the difference of these correlations indicate that the magnitude of the correlations involving the VID and TF scales is significantly greater for the pastors than for the controls.

Summary of Results

1. There were no significant differences between the closest friendships of the pastors vs. those of the controls in terms of any of the friendship variables investigated.

2. Averaging over congregations, the reported pedestal effect was significantly greater concerning the pastors vs. the controls.

3. Neither the pedestal effect nor the pastors' predictions of the pedestal effect accounted for a significant proportion of the variability in the overall intensity of the pastors' closest friendships, or the average friendship strength he had with the men in his congregation.

4. There were no significant correlations, for pastors or controls, between their mean friendship strength within the congregation and the average pedestal effect.

5. There were no significant correlations, for pastors or controls, between the intensity of their closest friendships and the average pedestal effect.

6. Looking at individual responses, there was a significant **negative** correlation between the amount of discomfort aroused by the pastor's presence and the total friendship strength which each respondent had toward the pastor. This was not true for non-clerical controls.

7. The correlations between each respondent's pedestal effect and his VID and TF scales were significantly greater for those responding to the pastor than to Mr. X.

Chapter V

DISCUSSION

There were several findings of practical significance which seem to paint a clear picture of the nature of pastors' friendships as well as of the nature of the relationship between the pedestal effect and those friendships.

First of all, differences were found in the amount of discomfort experienced in the presence of the pastors vs. controls. On the average, and to a significant degree, the respondents felt more discomfort in the pastors presence. However, although the reality of this pedestal effect was born out, it was also interesting to find that its existence does not contribute to significant overall variability in the pastors' friendships.

In fact, there were absolutely no differences qualitatively between the friendships of the pastors vs. those of the controls. In sharp contrast to the plethora of reports cited in the literature, the quality of friendships is not "poorer" or less gratifying for those in the ministerial position. Whether looking at his strongest and most intimate friendships, or simply at the casual or average relationships he has with men in his congregation, there were abso-

lutely no discernable differences between the pastors' friendships and the laymen's.

It is very tempting to conclude at this point that the alleged inhibitory influence the pedestal effect has on the pastor's ability to initiate and maintain friendships is a fallacy, a myth...that although there is a pedestal effect, it does not have any effect of friendship formation.

Such an interpretation wouldn't be accurate. The data show that there is a relationship between the pedestal effect and pastors' friendships which may be described as follows. Looking beyond the scores averaged for each congregation and looking at each individual's pedestal effect and Total Friendship scores with his pastor, those individuals who feel more uncomfortable around the pastor also have weaker friendships with him. This relationship is masked by looking at averages. That is, it isn't strong enough to affect the pastors' friendships overall, but it does make a difference when looking at individuals. Discomfort is most intense among those persons who do not have established friendships with their pastors.

As is true of correlational research, it is not possible at this point to prove the direction of causality: a) does the pedestal effect inhibit friendship formation, or b) does discomfort arise from not knowing the pastor.

In either case, the relationship is apparently intense enough that it is evident to the pastor. Also, while it doesn't impede his friendships overall, it does impair some. The importance of this factor may be better understood by taking into consideration the fact that these respondents were not simply ordinary laymen, but moreover were those belonging to his "inner circle". These are the ones the pastor spends most of his time with, and the ones (and this was the very reason they were thus selected) whose behavior and opinions might be expected to have the greatest impact on the pastor and his activities.

It should also be borne in mind that, inasmuch as they are members of the "inner circle" and thus spend more time with him, they likely also know him much better than do those on the "periphery". In other words, the respondents on the periphery likely feel more inhibited around the pastor, since the effect of the negative correlation would be more pronounced among those who are less well-acquainted with the pastor.

Another finding is crucial to understanding the pedestal effect. The negative correlation between the pedestal effect and Total Friendship does not exist at all for Mr. X. The layman typically does not have to contend with this problem of arousing discomfort when interacting with people with whom he is less well acquainted. This situation is

very unique to the pastor. Whether they know him or not, the pedestal effect is not a factor for Mr. X.

This information should be useful and hence would be appropriate within a pastoral training setting. It would be helpful for the pastors to understand the nature of the pedestal effect, as elucidated in this study, and to appreciate that, as described in the pastoral interviews, although the pedestal effect is there for some individuals, it need not--and moreover, should not--interfere with his friendships overall. Moreover, it is informative to know that the myth concerning the inferior quality of the pastor's intimate friendships is not withstanding. Quite the opposite, the pastors' friendships were not found to be any different, and there were even some very slight trends in the opposite direction.

Future research might look at differences in the intensity of the pedestal effect and its effects across different congregations (i.e. liberal vs. conservative, evangelical vs. non-evangelical, etc.) or denominations. A similar analysis of data obtained from more "peripheral" respondents (as opposed to the "inner circle"), though likely difficult to obtain, would be useful in answering some of the questions raised above.

Due to practical considerations and to the very exploratory nature of this study, data was gathered only from male

respondents in the congregation. It should be emphasized that this was not to minimize the importance of the pedestal effect on women in the congregation, nor of the pastors' relationships with those women. Quite the contrary, such information might be invaluable to our understanding of the pedestal effect and the normative restraints surrounding the profession, and is hence something which might be interesting to explore at a later date.

Findings of this study also open doors to a whole new area which has not yet been dealt with. A statement should also be made concerning the whole issue of ministerial loneliness. The finding that pastors' friendships do not differ from those of matched controls does not necessarily invalidate or discredit the widespread claim that "ministers are deeply lonely people." That finding illustrates, quite simply, that pastors' friendships do not differ from those of controls, and nothing more. There is another question, another variable, which must be dealt with, and this is the pastor's subjective/emotional need for friendship and emotional intimacy. It is possible that, for whatever reason (a "predisposition" or personality type characteristic of persons who are drawn to a ministerial vocation? The nature of the job may be such that the pastor's needs are intensified and/or more difficult to satisfy: i.e. the "constant draining" that comes with the position, around-the-clock availability, constantly being called upon to intervene in

"crises-type" situations, lack of reciprocity, no one to lean on, etc.?) the pastor's needs are greater than those of the layman, and that this is the source of his distress. This also is a question for later research.

Finally, an understanding of the nature of the alleged normative restrictions surrounding the pastor's role is a crucial one. Analysis of this data is planned for the near future, and is expected also to be fruitful in the endeavor to understand the nature of the problems with which the minister must contend in his efforts to establish and maintain his interpersonal friendships.

Summary

The study conclusively demonstrated that the pedestal effect does not make a difference overall with the pastor's ability in the long run to initiate and maintain his friendships. However, it is an inhibitory factor, in that it does have implications for his ability to establish such relationships with certain individuals. People who do not know the pastor tend to feel very uncomfortable in his presence. Moreover, this is a problem with which the layman does not have to contend.

APPENDIX A

ACQUAINTANCE DESCRIPTION FORM

Statements

This form lists some statements about your reactions to an acquaintance called the Target Person (TP). Please indicate your reaction to each statement on the special answer sheet you have been given. Perhaps some of the situations described have never come up in your relationship with TP. If this happens, try your best to imagine what things would be like if the situation did come up.

1. TP can come up with thoughts and ideas that give me new and different things to think about.
2. If I were short of cash and needed money in a hurry, I could count on TP to be willing to loan it to me.
3. TP's ways of dealing with people make him/her rather difficult to get along with.
4. TP is the kind of person who likes to "put me down" or embarrass me with seemingly harmless little jokes or comments.
5. TP is a genuinely likeable person.
6. TP is the kind of person who makes it easy for me to behave according to my most important beliefs and values.
7. If I hadn't heard from TP for several days without knowing why, I would make it a point to contact her/him just for the sake of keeping in touch.
8. TP keeps me pretty well informed about his/her true feelings and attitudes about different things that come up.
9. When we get together to work on a task or project, TP can stimulate me to think of new ways to approach jobs and solve problems.
10. If I were looking for a job, I could count on TP to try her/his best to help me find one.
11. I can count on TP's being very easy to get along with, even when we disagree about something.
12. If I have an argument or disagreement with someone, I can count on TP to stand behind me and give me support when (s)he thinks I am in the right.
13. If I were asked to list a few people that I thought represented the very best in "human nature," TP is one of the persons I would name.
14. TP makes it easy for me to express my most important personal qualities in my everyday life.
15. If I had a choice of two good part-time jobs, I would seriously consider taking the somewhat less attractive job if it meant that TP and I could work at the same place.
16. If TP were to move away or "disappear" for some reason, I would really miss the special kind of companionship (s)he provides.

17. TP is the kind of conversationalist who can make me clarify and expand my own ideas and beliefs.
18. TP is willing to use his/her skills and abilities to help me reach my own personal goals.
19. I can count on having to be extra patient with TP to keep from giving up on her/him as a friend.
20. I can converse freely and comfortably with TP without worrying too much about being teased or criticized if I unthinkingly say something pointless, inappropriate, or just plain silly.
21. Although I do not always know exactly why, TP has a way of getting on my nerves.
22. TP really understands the kind of person I want to be and behaves toward me in ways that help me to be that kind of person.
23. If TP and I could arrange our weekly schedules so we each had a free day, I would try to arrange my schedule so that I had the same free day as TP.
24. TP expresses so many personal qualities I like that I think of him/her as being "one of a kind," a truly unique person.
25. TP can get me involved in interesting new activities that I probably wouldn't consider if it weren't for her/him.
26. TP is the kind of person who seems to really enjoy doing favors for me.
27. I can count on having to go out of my way to do things that will keep my relationship with TP from "falling apart."
28. If I accomplish something that makes me look especially competent or skillful, I can count on TP to notice it and appreciate my ability.
29. It would be hard to think of anything bad to say about TP, even if I were trying to describe him/her in a way that gave a true and well-rounded impression of what (s)he is like.
30. TP is the kind of person who makes it easy for me to express my true thoughts and feelings.
31. If I had decided to leave town on a certain day for a leisurely trip or vacation and discovered that TP was leaving for the same place a day later, I would seriously consider waiting a day in order to travel with her/him.
32. "False sincerity" and "phoniness" are the kinds of terms that occur to me when I am trying to think honestly about my impressions of TP.
33. When we discuss beliefs, attitudes and opinions, TP introduces viewpoints that help me see things in a new light.
34. I can count on TP to be a good contact person in helping me to meet worthwhile people and make social connections.
35. I have to be very careful about what I say if I try to talk to TP about topics (s)he considers controversial or touchy.

36. TP has confidence in my advice and opinions about practical matters and personal problems.
37. TP has the kind of personal qualities that would make almost anyone respect and admire him/her if they got to know him/her well.
38. I can tell from the way TP reacts to me that I really am the kind of person I most often think I am.
39. When I plan for leisure time activities, I make it a point to get in touch with TP to see if we can arrange to do things together.
40. TP is the kind of person who likes for me to know where (s)he stands, so I can count on him/her to level with me and really "tell it like it is."
41. I can count on TP to be ready with really good suggestions when we are looking for some activity or project to engage in.
42. If I have some more or less serious difference with a friend or acquaintance, TP is a good person for acting as a go-between in helping me to smooth out the difficulty.
43. I have a hard time really understanding some of TP's actions and comments.
44. If I am in an embarrassing situation, I can count on TP to do things that will make me feel as much at ease as possible.
45. TP is the kind of person for whom the expression "a real loser" is both meaningful and accurate.
46. TP knows the kinds of activities that are most important to me personally and encourages me to get involved in them.
47. If I had no plans for a free evening and TP contacted me suggesting some activity that I am not particularly interested in, I would seriously consider doing it with him/her.
48. Some of the most rewarding ideas, interests and activities I share with TP are the kinds of things I find it difficult, if not impossible, to share with any of my other acquaintances.
49. TP has a way of making ideas and topics that I usually consider useless and boring seem worthwhile and interesting.
50. If I were short of time or faced with an emergency, I could count on TP to help with errands or chores to make things as convenient for me as possible.
51. I can count on TP's acting tense or upset with me without my knowing what I've done to bother her/him.
52. If I have some success or good fortune, I can count on TP to be happy and congratulatory about it.
53. TP is a pleasant person to be around.
54. When it comes to my interests and abilities, TP understands me so well that (s)he knows what to expect from me, and expects neither too much nor too little.
55. TP is one of the persons I would go out of my way to help if (s)he were in some sort of difficulty.

56. When I am with TP, (s)he seems to relax and be him/herself and not think about the kind of impression (s)he is creating.
57. TP can come up with good, challenging questions and ideas.
58. TP is willing to spend time and energy to help me succeed at my own personal tasks and projects, even if (s)he is not directly involved.
59. I can count on TP's being willing to listen to my explanations in a patient and understanding way when I've done something to rub her/him the wrong way.
60. If I have to defend any of my beliefs or convictions, TP is the kind of person who supports me, even if (s)he does not share those beliefs or convictions with me.
61. It is easy to think of favorable things to say about TP.
62. TP treats me in ways that encourage me to be my "true self."
63. If I had just gotten off work or out of class and had some free time, I would wait around and leave with TP if (s)he were leaving the same place an hour or so later.
64. If I were trying to describe TP to someone who didn't know him/her, I would start by saying that (s)he was pretty ordinary with nothing especially unique about him/her.
65. TP is the kind of person from whom I can learn a lot just by listening to her/him talk or watching her/him work on problems.
66. I can count on TP to be willing to loan me personal belongings (for example, his/her books, car, typewriter, tennis racket) if I need them to go somewhere or get something done.
67. I can count on communication with TP to break down when we try to discuss things that are touchy or controversial.
68. TP has a way of making me feel like a really worthwhile person, even when I do not seem to very competent or successful at my more important activities.
69. TP seems to have a knack for annoying me or "turning me off."
70. TP is the kind of person who makes it easy for me to do the kinds of things I really want to do.
71. I try to get interested in activities that TP enjoys, even if they do not seem especially appealing to me at first.
72. When TP and I get together, I enjoy a special kind of companionship I don't get from any of my other acquaintances.
73. TP is the kind of person who is on the lookout for new, interesting and challenging things to do.
74. If I were sick or hurt, I could count on TP to do things that would make it easier to take.
75. I can count on TP to misunderstand me and take my actions and comments the wrong way.

76. TP is a good, sympathetic listener when I have some personal problem I want to talk over with someone.
77. TP is one of those individuals for whom the expression "a really nice person" is both meaningful and accurate.
78. Doing things with TP seems to bring out my most important personal traits and characteristics.
79. If TP and I were planning vacations to the same place and at about the same time and (s)he had to postpone her/his trip for a month, I would seriously consider postponing my own trip for a month also.
80. TP is the kind of person I would miss very much if something happened to interfere with our acquaintanceship.

ACQUAINTANCE DESCRIPTION FORM

Answer Sheet

Your Name _____

Name of Target Person _____

Please record below your response to each of the statements about your Target Person (TP). Decide which of the scale numbers or letters best describes your reaction and record your choice by circling that number or letter. Please read the following codes carefully and use them as guides in circling your choices:

6= Always. Invariably; without exception.
 5= Almost always.
 4= Usually.
 3= About half the time.
 2= Seldom.
 1= Almost never.
 0= Never.

g= Definitely. Absolutely no doubt about it.
 f= Extremely likely. Almost no doubt about it.
 e= Probably.
 d= Perhaps.
 c= Probably not.
 b= Extremely unlikely.
 a= Definitely not.

Statement #1.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	#31.	g f e d c b a	#61.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0
2.	g f e d c b a	32.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	62.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0
3.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	33.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	63.	g f e d c b a
4.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	34.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	64.	g f e d c b a
5.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	35.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	65.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0
6.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	36.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	66.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0
7.	g f e d c b a	37.	g f e d c b a	67.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0
8.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	38.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	68.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0
9.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	39.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	69.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0
10.	g f e d c b a	40.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	70.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0
11.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	41.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	71.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0
12.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	42.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	72.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0
13.	g f e d c b a	43.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	73.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0
14.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	44.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	74.	g f e d c b a
15.	g f e d c b a	45.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	75.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0
16.	g f e d c b a	46.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	76.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0
17.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	47.	g f e d c b a	77.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0
18.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	48.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	78.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0
19.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	49.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	79.	g f e d c b a
20.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	50.	g f e d c b a	80.	g f e d c b a
21.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	51.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0		
22.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	52.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0		
23.	g f e d c b a	53.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0		
24.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	54.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0		
25.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	55.	g f e d c b a		
26.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	56.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0		
27.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	57.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0		
28.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	58.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0		
29.	g f e d c b a	59.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0		
30.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0	60.	6 5 4 3 2 1 0		

A SURVEY OF PERSONAL REACTIONS

Section 1.

This survey describes several sets of situations that might come up in our everyday lives. We would like to have you read each statement carefully and decide how much you approve or disapprove of the situation it presents.

You will notice that each statement is followed by a set of numbers from 6 down to 0. These numbers refer to the statements on the following scale of approval and disapproval.

Approval-Disapproval Scale

6. I would approve very strongly
5. I would approve quite a bit
4. I would approve slightly
3. Neutral; I would neither approve nor disapprove
2. I would disapprove slightly
1. I would disapprove quite a bit
0. I would disapprove very strongly

After you have decided how much you approve or disapprove of the situation described, simply circle the number that comes closest to matching how you feel according to the Approval-Disapproval Scale.

Here is a sample set of situations.

SAMPLE SET

Some people like to keep their lawns neatly mowed all summer long. Other people do not seem to care much how long their grass gets.

Suppose your next door neighbor mowed his lawn three times a week. How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose your next door neighbor mowed his lawn once a week. How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose your next door neighbor mowed his lawn only once a month. How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

If you are the kind of person who really enjoys having the lawns in your neighborhood look nice, you would probably circle a 5 or 6 for the first two situations, and a 1 or 0 for the third situation. If you really do not care much how the lawns look, you would probably circle a 3 for each situation.

SET #1

Some people enjoy participating in clubs or special interest groups like the Fellowship of Christian Athletes, "booster" clubs, the Barbershop Quartet organization, etc.

Suppose your pastor were to participate in such activities several times each week (almost every day). How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose your pastor were to participate in such activities once each week. How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose your pastor were to participate in such activities about twice a month (once every other week). How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose your pastor were to participate in such activities once a month. How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose your pastor were to participate in such activities only 5 or 6 times a year (about every 2 or 3 months). How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose your pastor were to participate in such activities only occasionally (once a year or less). How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose your pastor never participated in such activities, because of his concern that this might interfere with his effectiveness in church work. How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

SET #2

Part of being a friend of another person is sometimes making special arrangements to spend time with that person. The more we make such arrangements to get together, the more special the friendship.

Suppose there was no particular person that your pastor made arrangements to get together with because of his concern that such special friendships might interfere with his effectiveness in church work. How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose there was one particular person that your pastor made special arrangements to get together with only occasionally (about once a year). How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose there was one particular person that your pastor made special arrangements to get together with several times a year (every 2 or 3 months). How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose there was one particular person your pastor made special arrangements to get together with about once each month. How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose there was one particular person that your pastor made special arrangements to get together with about twice a month. How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose there was one particular person your pastor made special arrangements to get together with about once each week. How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose there was one particular person that your pastor made special arrangements to get together with several times a week (almost every day). How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

SET #3

Some people contribute time and effort to service projects and volunteer groups that do worthwhile work in the community.

Suppose your pastor were to participate in such activities several times each week (almost every day). How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose your pastor were to participate in such activities once each week. How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose your pastor were to participate in such activities about twice a month (once every other week). How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose your pastor were to participate in such activities once each month. How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose your pastor were to participate in such activities only 5 or 6 times a year (about every 2 or 3 months). How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose your pastor were to participate in such activities only occasionally (once a year or less). How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose your pastor never participated in such activities, because of his concern that this might interfere with his effectiveness in church work. How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

SET #4

Part of being a friend of another person is letting that person know something about the more "private" side of our lives such as our deep-down likes and dislikes, our true attitudes and opinions, our dreams and secret ambitions, and our hidden faults and shortcomings. The more we feel free to share such personal information, the more special the friendship.

Suppose your pastor had one particular friend with whom he felt free to share everything about his personal life, even the most private and intimate details. How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose your pastor had one particular friend with whom he felt free to share much about his personal life, including some (but not all) of the more private and intimate details. How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose your pastor had one particular friend with whom he felt free to share quite a bit about his personal life, including a few (but not many) of the more private and intimate details. How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose your pastor had one particular friend with whom he felt free to share quite a bit about his personal life, but none of the more private or intimate details. How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose your pastor had one particular friend with whom he felt free to share many of his everyday likes and dislikes, or everyday attitudes and opinions, but nothing really personal. How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose your pastor had one particular friend with whom he felt free to share just a few of his everyday likes and dislikes, or everyday attitudes and opinions, but nothing really personal. How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose your pastor did not have any particular friends with whom he felt free to express himself personally because of his concern that this might interfere with his effectiveness in church work. How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

SET #5

Some people enjoy putting time in hobbies or pastimes, such as photography, woodworking, model building, sports activities (e.g. golf, tennis), reading modern literature, going to plays, etc.

Suppose your pastor spent a couple of hours engaged in such activities several times a week (almost every day). How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose that your pastor set aside a couple hours for such activities about once each week. How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose that your pastor set aside about 2 days out of each month to spend a couple of hours on such activities. How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose that your pastor set aside one day of each month to spend a couple hours on such activities. How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose that your pastor set aside about 5 or 6 days out of the year (about one day every 2 or 3 months) to spend a couple of hours engaged in such activities. How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose your pastor engaged in such activities only occasionally (once a year or less, for just a couple of hours). How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Suppose that your pastor never engaged in such activities, because he felt that it might interfere with his church work. How much would you approve or disapprove of this?

6 5 4 3 2 1 0

Section 2.

Please read carefully the following statements and/or questions about your pastor. Then, decide which of the scale numbers or letters best describes your reaction and record your choice by circling that number or letter which appears directly beneath each item.

Please read the following codes carefully and use them as guides in circling your choices:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 6= Always; invariably, without exception. | g= Definitely; no doubt about it. |
| 5= Almost always. | f= Very Likely; almost no doubt about it. |
| 4= Usually. | e= Probably; better than a 50/50 chance. |
| 3= About half the time. | d= Perhaps. |
| 2= Seldom. | c= Probably not; less than 50/50 chance. |
| 1= Almost never. | b= Very Unlikely. |
| 0= Never. | a= Definitely not. |

1. Suppose you hadn't seen or heard from your pastor for several days without knowing why. Would you make it a point to contact him, just for the sake of keeping in touch?
g f e d c b a
2. Does your pastor keep you rather well informed about his true feelings and attitudes about different things that come up?
6 5 4 3 3 1 0
3. Suppose you'd decided to leave town on a certain day for a lieisurely trip or vacation, and discovered that your pastor was leaving for the same place a day later. Would you seriously consider waiting a day in order to travel together?
g f e d c b a
4. Suppose your pastor were to move away or "disappear" for some reason. Would you really miss the special kind of companionship he provides?
g f e d c b a
5. Suppose you were thinking ahead about the kinds of things you would like to do with your free-time for the coming week. Would you make it a point to get in touch with your pastor to see if you can arrange to do things together?
g f e d c b a

6. Do you feel as though your pastor thinks and acts in ways that "set him apart" and make him distinct from other people you know?
6 5 4 3 2 1 0
7. Suppose you and your pastor were planning vacations to the same place and about the same time, and he had to postpone his trip for a month. Would you seriously consider postponing your own trip for a month also?
6 5 4 3 2 1 0
8. Do you feel as though you can count on your pastor to say the things that express how he truly feels and believes, even if they are not the things he thinks are expected of him?
6 5 4 3 2 1 0
9. Suppose that both you and your pastor could arrange your weekly schedules so you each had a free day. Would you try to arrange your schedule so that you had the same day free as your pastor?
g f e d c b a
10. When you are alone with your pastor, would you say that he seems to be able to relax and be himself and not think about the kind of impression he is creating?
6 5 4 3 2 1 0
11. Suppose that you had no plans for a free evening and your pastor contacted you, suggesting some activity that you aren't particularly interested in. Would you seriously consider doing it with him anyway?
g f e d c b a
12. When you and your pastor get together, would you say that he provides you with a very special kind of companionship that you don't get from any of your other acquaintances?
g f e d c b a

Section 3.

Please read each of the following statements carefully. Decide whether the statement is true or false, or if it is only true part of the time. If it is true, check the space marked "Yes." If it is false, check the space marked "No." If it is true part of the time, check the space marked "Sometimes." Please be frank when you answer these questions. Remember, we have asked you not to put your name on these forms, so your answers will be completely confidential.

1. When I am with the pastor, I am more careful than usual about the kinds of language I use.

Yes ___ Sometimes ___ No ___

2. When I think honestly about the kinds of books, TV shows and movies I enjoy, I have the feeling that the pastor would not approve of some of them.

Yes ___ Sometimes ___ No ___

3. The pastor is such a fine Christian that it is difficult for me to relax and really "be myself" when he is around.

Yes ___ Sometimes ___ No ___

4. When I am with the pastor, I am more careful than usual about the kinds of jokes and stories I tell.

Yes ___ Sometimes ___ No ___

5. When I am with the pastor, I talk a lot more than usual about spiritual or church matters.

Yes ___ Sometimes ___ No ___

6. When I am with the pastor, I am more careful than usual about criticizing or expressing bad feelings toward other people.

Yes ___ Sometimes ___ No ___

7. When the pastor is around, I do and say things that make me appear to be more "religious" than I really think I am.

Yes ___ Sometimes ___ No ___

8. When I think about the kind of example the pastor sets, it reminds me that I am not as good a Christian as I should be.

Yes ___ Sometimes ___ No ___

9. When I am with the pastor, I talk alot less than usual about my everyday activities.

Yes ___ Sometimes ___ No ___

10. When I think honestly about my personal habits and mannerisms, I have the feeling that the pastor would not approve of some of them.

Yes ___ Sometimes ___ No ___

REFERENCES

- Aristotle. The rhetoric. New York: Appleton-Century, 1932.
- Aronson, E. & Worchel, P. Similarity versus liking as determinants of interpersonal attractiveness. Psychonomic Science, 1966, 5, 157-158.
- Banton, M. P. Roles: an introduction to the study of social relations. New York: Basic Books, 1965.
- Bedsole, A. The pastor in profile. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1958.
- Berkowitz, L. & Goranson, R. E. Motivational and judgemental determinants of social perception. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 62, 713-715.
- Berkowitz, L. & Howard, R. Reactions to opinion deviates as affected by affiliation need and group member interdependence. Sociometry, 1959, 22, 81-91.
- Blizzard, S. W. Parish minister's self-image of his master role. Pastoral Psychology, 1958, 9, 25-32.
- Bowers, M. K. Conflicts of the clergy. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1963.
- Byrne, D. Interpersonal attraction and attitude similarity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961a, 62, 713-715.
- Byrne, D. Interpersonal attraction as a function of affiliation need and attitude similarity. Human Relations, 1961b, 14, 283-289.
- Byrne, D. Attitudes and attraction. New York: Academic Press, 1969.
- Byrne, D. & Clore, G. L. Predicting interpersonal attraction toward strangers presented in three stimulus modes. Psychonomic Science, 1966, 4, 239-240.
- Byrne, D. & Griffitt, W. Similarity versus liking: a clarification. Human Relations, 1966, 6, 295-296.

- Byrne, D. & Nelson, D. Attraction as a linear function of positive and negative reinforcement. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 659-663.
- Curry, T. & Emerson, R. M. Balance theory: a theory of interpersonal attraction? Sociometry, 1970, 33, 216-238.
- Douglas, W. Ministers' wives. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.
- Duck, S. W. & Craig, G. Personality similarity and the development of friendship: a longitudinal study. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 17, 237-242.
- Festinger, L., Schachter, S. & Back, K. Social pressures in informal groups: a study of human factors in housing. New York: Harper, 1950.
- Glock, C. & Stark, R. Religion and society in tension. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1965.
- Goldstein, J. & Rosenfeld, H. Insecurity and preference for persons similar to oneself. Journal of Personality, 1969, 37, 253-268.
- Griffin, E. A. Self-disclosure: how far should a leader go? Leadership, 1980, 1, 125-132.
- Gustafson, J. M. The clergy in the U. S. In K. S. Lynn (Ed.), The professions in America. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965.
- Hahn, C. A. Is clergy evaluation possible? Alban Institute Action Information, Alban Institute, Washington D. C., Nov., 1979.
- Heider, F. The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: Wiley, 1958.
- Homans, G. C. The human group. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1950, p. 112.
- Howe, R. C. Problems of communication between clergy and laity. Journal of Pastoral Psychology, 1964, 12, 13-23.
- Hulme, W. E. Your pastor's problems. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1966.
- Hunt, A. A study of the relative values of certain ideals. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1935, 30, 222-228.

- Izard, C. Personality similarity and friendship. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 47-51.
- Izard, C. Personality similarity and friendship: a follow-up study. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 598-600.
- Jackson, J. A conceptual and measurement model for norms and roles. In E. F. Borgatta (Ed.), Social psychology: readings and perspectives, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.
- Jones, E. & Daugherty, B. N. Political orientation and the perceptual effects of an anticipated interaction. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 59, 340:349.
- Kerckhoff, A. & Davis, K. A. Value consensus and need complementarity in mate selection. American Sociological Review, 1962, 27, 295-303.
- Kirkpatrick, C. & Stone, S. Attitude measurement and the comparison of generations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1935, 12, 564-582.
- Kurth, S. Friendship and friendly relations. In G. McCall, et al. (Eds.), Social Relationships, Chicago: Aldine, 1970.
- Lauer, R. H. Organizational punishment: punitive relations in a voluntary association. Human Relations, 1973, 26, 189-202.
- Laumann, E. O. Friends of urban men: an assessment of accuracy in reporting their socioeconomic attributes, mutual choice, and attitude agreement. Sociometry, 1969, 32, 54-69.
- Lynn, K. S. The professions in America. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965.
- Morton, A. S. Similarity as a determinant of friendship: a multidimensional study. Dissertation Abstracts, 1960, 20, 3857-3858.
- Mc Burney, L. Every pastor needs a pastor. Grand Rapids: Word Books, 1975.
- Newcomb, T. M. The prediction of interpersonal attraction. The American Psychologist, 1956, 11, 575-586.
- Newcomb, T. M. The acquaintance process. New York: Holt, 1961.

- Newcomb, T. M. Stabilities underlying changes in interpersonal attraction. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 376-386.
- Novak, D. & Lerner, M. Rejection as a consequence of perceived similarity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 9, 147-152.
- Oswald, M. Your next job may kill you. Alban Institute Action Information, Alban Institute, Washington D. C., Nov., 1979.
- Raymond, L. W. For an effective ministry. Christianity Today, 1968, 12, 8-10.
- Reilly, M. Commins, W. & Stefic, E. The complementarity of personality needs in friendship choice. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 49, 341-350.
- Richardson, H. M. Community values as a factor of friendships of college and adult women. Journal of Social Psychology, 1940, 11, 303-312.
- Rosenfeld, H. M. & Jackson, J. Temporal mediation of the similarity-attraction hypothesis. Journal of Personality, 1965, 33, 649-656.
- Rubin, Z. Liking and Loving. New York: Holt, 1973.
- Rychlak, J. The similarity, compatibility or incompatibility of needs in interpersonal selection. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 2, 334-340.
- Schachter, S. Deviation, rejection, and communication. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1951, 46, 190-207.
- Schiller, B. A quantitative analysis of marriage selection in a small group. Journal of Social Psychology, 1932, 297-319.
- Smith, A. J. Similarity of values and its relation to acceptance and the projection of similarity. Journal of Psychology, 1957, 43, 251-260.
- Spann, J. R. The ministry. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949.
- Spuhler, J. N. Empirical Studies in quantitative human genetics. The use of vital and health statistics for genetics and radiation studies, U. N. and W.H.O., 1962, 241,252.

- Stromm, K. R. New thrusts in clinical education and training for clergymen. International Journal of Social Psychology, 1973, 19, 207-213.
- Suttles, G. Friendship as a social institution. In G. McCall, et al. (Eds.), Social Relationships, Chicago: Aldine, 1970.
- Walker, L. S. & Wright, P. H. Self disclosure in friendship. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1976, 42, 735-742.
- Walster, E. & Walster, B. Effects of expecting to be liked on choice of associates. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67, 402-404.
- Winch, R. Complimentary needs in mate selection. American Sociological Review, 1955, 20, 52-56.
- Worchel, P. & McCormick, B. Self-concept and dissonance reduction. Journal of Personality, 1963, 31, 588-599.
- Wright, P. H. The delineation and measurement of some key variables in the study of friendship. Representative Research in Social Psychology, 1974, 5, 93-96.
- Wright, P. H. Toward a theory of friendship based on a conception of self. Human Communication Research, 1978, 4, 196-207.
- Wright, P. H. Men's friendships, women's friendships, and the alleged inferiority of the latter. Sex Roles, 1982, 8, 1-20.
- Zajonc, R. B. Attitudinal effects of mere exposure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 1968, 9, Monograph Supplement.