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The results of a factor analysis of the responses by a sample of Protestant clergymen (serving churches located in five major U. S. cities) to twenty-three items on clergy role are reported. The community problem solving role is shown to include an orientation toward social action. Of the five roles present, two—traditional and community problem solving—are especially related to protest orientation. Clergy roles, theological and political viewpoints, education, and age are used as predictors of protest in Multiple Classification Analysis. From most to least important as predictors were: political viewpoint, community problem solving role, theological position, age, and education. The role of clergymen as community problem solver is briefly discussed.

A DECADE and a half have passed since seminal work was done on ministers' roles and involvement in civil rights activities (see Blizzard, 1958a; Campbell and Pettigrew, 1959). Yet, those somewhat parallel studies have not been directly linked through the collection and analysis of hard data on roles and stance toward social action. In this article we report the findings of an analysis of data collected by mailed questionnaire from a random sample of Protestant clergymen serving churches located in Boston, Pittsburgh, Minneapolis, Atlanta, and Los Angeles. The data included ministers' behaviors and attitudes of a protest nature (generally involving civil rights).

The Blizzard and Campbell-Pettigrew Clergy Studies

Blizzard developed a theoretical framework for viewing the work and stance of the Protestant clergyman. A brief review of his work is necessary in order to understand a parenthetical critique of his work made by Campbell and Pettigrew (1959b:515).

Blizzard conceived of Protestant clergy roles as involving at least three levels for analysis: means (or practitioner roles), goals (or integrative roles), and conception of the ministry as distinctive from other occupations in the eyes of the individual clergyman (or master roles). Six practitioner roles were described by Blizzard (1956a)—administrator, organizer, pastor, preacher, priest, and teacher. Of interest to us is his description (p. 508) of the organizer role which "involves leadership, participation, and planning in local church associations and community organizations."1 Blizzard (1958a) observed that the "practitioner role" is "performed . . . as a means to an end (or goal)"); and he gave (p. 375) as an example:

Ministers may preach for different purposes. The intent of one minister in preaching (a means oriented practitioner role) may be to be persuasive to the non-believer, or to evangelize (a goal oriented integrative role). Another may preach to instruct the believer, or to edify or to educate; another may preach to bring judgment to the community, or to be prophetic.

The fourteen integrative roles concerned "the end toward which he [the minister] is working in his professional relationship with parishioners, church associations, community

* This study was completed under the support of a grant from NIMH of the National Institute of Health (No. 1 RO1 MH 16573). The authors also thank Samuel Blizzard and Ernest Q. Campbell who served as consultants at critical points in the larger study.

1 Blizzard (1956a:509) reported how his respondents ranked the six roles in terms of importance, effectiveness, and enjoyment. He concluded that the "minister's dilemma" lies in the fact that he is urged to allocate more of his energies in administering programs than would be seemingly demanded in terms of training and his own and his parishioners' feelings (which place more stress on the traditional duties of preacher and pastor).
groups, and the general public" (Blizzard, 1958a:374). Of special interest is his "community problem solver" integrative role in which "the minister conceives his interest and skill as an organizer extending out to community, national, and international issues" (p. 378, italics added). The clergyman with this role will liken himself to an Old Testament prophet or will be a "crusader with a social welfare orientation."

The clergyman's "master role" (Blizzard, 1958b) is the way the minister sees himself vis à vis the social system, the culture, and other occupations. For example, the minister may define himself as a mediator between God and man or, instead, as a servant of Christ. Or, he may have a more functional viewpoint, with a social service orientation or he may view himself as an inspiring example for parishioners. The minister might hold two or more of these views simultaneously.

Campbell and Pettigrew's focus on the clergy role was more specific: the clergyman who faced the "moral dilemma" of racial crisis. They (1959a:85–108, 1959b) drew on three reference systems to reconcile clergy attitude and behavior in the Little Rock, Arkansas racial crisis of 1957. The minister's stand on the crisis was affected by the professional, membership, and self-reference systems. The self-reference system included the possibility of guilt from not acting in a way consistent with one's own racial attitude. According to the authors (1959b:515), the role structure works against a social actionist orientation: "the minister is required to be a cohesive force, . . . to show a progressive increase in the membership of his church . . . and to encourage maximum annual giving and to plan for the improvement and expansion of the plant." The minister is compelled "to base his self-image . . . on his success in managing his church."

Campbell and Pettigrew (1959b:515) criticized the Blizzard article (1956a) in which the six practitioner roles were presented on the grounds that "Blizzard [did] not find a 'community reformer' or 'social critic' role in the ministry. . . ." It is unfortunate that they were publishing at about the same time as Blizzard, because they were explicitly interested in the normative system encouraging or discouraging a social actionist stance on the part of the Little Rock clergyman. The pertinent article by Blizzard on this subject was that on integrative (1958a) rather than practitioner (1956a) roles. As already noted, the community problem solving role as seen by Blizzard included a social actionist orientation and particularly "organizer" means. That their interests overlapped is evidenced from one of Campbell and Pettigrew's concluding hypotheses (1959a:124): "The minister whose orientation is primarily to his parish is less likely to support desegregation than the minister who is oriented to the community at large" (italics deleted). They basically identified (1959b:515; 1958a, b) the work of the minister as social change agent as residing in an educating role geared to gradual change.

In summary, Campbell and Pettigrew portray a powerful image of the constraints acting on ministers in their attempts to help implement the faith in the daily lives of adherents. Their important study documents the workings of the reference system in the social action conduct of ministers. Yet the question lingers: Why are there so many avowed social actionists?

A partial answer, we felt, would be found in Blizzard's work. His framework included the community problem solving role, and he
explicitly indicated that the minister with this orientation would assume either a prophetic or social welfare stance.

Our strategy was to develop an instrument to measure clergy role orientation by using factor analysis to identify roles of an integrative nature. An examination of these roles might indicate a minister's social actionist orientation. The clergy roles could also be related to attitudes and behaviors of a protest nature (especially including civil rights). We would expect the community problem solving (or social actionist) role to be positively related to receptivity to protest. Finally, other variables can be included in the analysis (for reasons to be explained later): political viewpoint, theological position, age, and education of the minister. Our attention, then, is focused on predicting protest behavior and attitude of Protestant clergymen.

The Data and the Measure of Receptivity Toward Protest

From the church section of the Yellow Pages of the telephone books for the five cities already named, one thousand churches were selected (two hundred per city). Churches were numbered, the interval distances calculated, and random starts selected. Of the thousand churches selected, forty were ineligible due to a lack of sufficient address or (rarely) for other reasons (for example, an error in numbering which caused a church executive rather than a church to be selected). Of the 960 Protestant clergymen sent questionnaires (in the name and address of the local church), 443 returned completed questionnaires (46.1 percent completion rate). Included with the questionnaire was a postcard to be returned at the same time, signifying identification of those who had cooperated, but not permitting the respondent to be linked with the specific questionnaire returned.

The cities were selected to give a wide range of denominations. An analysis of completion rate by city indicated that from most to least cooperative were ministers of: Minneapolis, Boston, Pittsburgh, Atlanta, and Los Angeles. The percentages ranged from 60.0 to 32.1 for completion rate by city. An analysis of completion rate by denomination indicated that the lowest percentage rate was 40.1 (Baptist), while the highest was 64.0 (Lutheran).

Finally, it might be noted that using the Yellow Pages for sampling would give results more representative than one might think. Glock and Stark (1966:220) indicated that most of even the smallest sectarian congregations appeared in the church section of the Yellow Pages in their four-county California sample. The questionnaires in our study were mailed in November, 1971; and one followup letter was employed.

The major dependent variable in this study was receptivity toward protest, and four items were used to construct an index to measure protest. Two items were behavioral and two attitudinal:

1. Have you ever practiced civil disobedience (risked arrest to symbolize protest) as part of a civil rights, peace, or other movement?
2. How would you characterize your participation in social action events (political activities, demonstrations, civil rights protest etc.) over the past six or seven years or so?
3. Do you approve or disapprove of clergymen participating in civil rights protests?
4. Looking back on the decade of the 1960's, do you wish that the church had been more involved in the Civil Rights Movement, about as involved . . . as it was, or less involved . . .

Without collapsed categories, the inter-item correlations for the responses to these items ranged from +.35 through +.63; and the item-total coefficients ranged from +.57 through +.90. The value for coefficient alpha was .73. (In addition, a factor analysis of the data gave only one factor, with loadings in excess of +.65.) The index was therefore assessed as having internal reliability.

The collapsing of responses in summing the score was: Yes (1 point, for 14.3 percent of the respondents who were assigned scores) versus No. (0 points); Very or somewhat active (40.4 percent of the respondents) versus not very active; Strongly approve or approve (63.4 percent) versus undecided, disapprove or strongly disapprove; and More involved (with 41.2 percent of the clergymen so responding) versus about as involved as it was and less involved than it was. Thirteen respondents replied that they had too recently entered the ministry to answer the second question. These thirteen and respondents not replying to one or more questions were not assigned scores. Of the 443 respondents re-
Factor Analysis of Clergy Role Items

Fifty-six items were included in the questionnaire to tap the ministers’ role orientations. Most of the items were written by the first author who, as he prepared them, kept the Blizzard article (1958a) on integrative roles firmly in mind. This article included several short quotations of ministers’ responses selected by Blizzard as typical of the integrative roles. The items were then reviewed by the three authors together with a consultant (Blizzard) and modified. The fourteen roles were not represented by the same number of items.

The responses to the fifty-six items were subjected to a principal component solution factor analysis with orthogonal rotation. A lower limit of 1.00 was used for the appropriate eigen-values in order to terminate the extraction of factors. Items with factor loadings less than .40 were then discarded. In addition, the first factor included seventeen items loading .40 and above. An examination of the first factor indicated that it consisted of items traditionally associated with the ministry, and therefore only six items were selected (two each for Blizzard’s believer-saint, evangelist, and father-shepherd) for inclusion in the reanalysis. The responses to twenty-three items were then again subjected to factor analysis, and the results appear summarized in Table 1.

The first six items comprise the traditional role. The sixth item best fits under the first factor—the traditional role—but it also loads under the community problem solver role. (A factor analysis of a second set of data collected in June, 1972, and using the twenty-three items on clergy roles gave results very similar to those shown in Table 1, except that this sixth item clearly loaded under both Factors I and IV. The second set of data were collected from a nationwide sample of United Presbyterian ministers.)

Items 7 through 11 have in common a counseling role, or the interpersonal relations specialist role in Blizzard’s terminology. The tenth item also loads under Factor IV—the community problem solving role, which would include series of conferences with people with crucial problems (probably of a social rather than personal nature).

Items 12 through 17 comprise the third factor which is a church administration orientation, or in Blizzard’s phrase, the “parish promoter.” (The sixteenth item shifted to the fifth factor, or the educating role, for the Presbyterian data). The seventeenth item cuts across several factors; it is included in the first factor (the traditional role would include encouraging a comforted congregation). It was placed under the third factor in part because it was written to represent that orientation. (For the Presbyterian data, it loads heaviest under the third factor). It also loads (- .36) under the fourth factor, with the community problem solver apparently seeing some advantage in conflict in a congregation, since conflict might sometimes be a necessary ingredient for discussing and solving social problems.

Items 18 through 21 are interpreted as representing the community problem solving role described by Blizzard. It can be seen that this role includes social action. An examination of the items reveals that social criticism of the community and society are part of this role.

Finally, items 22 and 23 make up the educator role. Remember that at least one earlier item (16) had a measurable loading (.37) on this factor.5

---

5 A brief comment might be made about Blizzard’s (1958a) assessment of the distribution of his respondents across the fourteen integrative roles. We have already stated that our traditional role included his father-shepherd, believer-saint, and evangelist integrative roles (these comprise 36.7 percent for his sample). His interpersonal relations specialist role can be equated with our counseling factor (16.7 percent), and his parish promoter integrative roles is an almost direct match for our administrator role (14.3 percent). The community problem solver roles are virtually identical and comprise 16.7 percent of his sample. Finally, the educator role of his sample constitutes 40 percent. He notes that the general practitioner role consists
### Table 1. Ministerial Role Items, With Factor Loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ministerial Role Items</th>
<th>Factor Loadings$^1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I try to be a person who preaches the Word to save souls.</td>
<td>.84 .04 .09 -.15 .17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The minister should be prayerful in all things.</td>
<td>.82 .06 .02 -.05 .03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My ministry is especially concerned with the salvation of souls.</td>
<td>.82 .10 .08 -.18 .15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am the servant of Christ, a shepherd to my church members.</td>
<td>.73 .07 .12 -.05 .06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The minister is an example of the fruits of the Christian life.</td>
<td>.70 .18 .22 -.06 .07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I try to fight for what is right and help my members overcome evil.</td>
<td>.68 -.02 .01 .30 .04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I find that counseling people is the most important function of the Church.</td>
<td>.08 .79 -.04 .10 .16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am willing to devote most of my time to counseling.</td>
<td>.11 .79 -.08 -.05 .21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I get closest to the spiritual concerns of my people when I'm counseling with them.</td>
<td>.19 .75 -.00 -.01 .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My ministry tends to be a series of conferences with people with crucial problems.</td>
<td>-.00 .57 .07 .37 -.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I think of myself as a lay psychiatrist.</td>
<td>-.04 .48 .34 .08 .22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am an organization man and I make no bones about it.</td>
<td>.04 -.12 .74 .02 .11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I like to run my church as a smooth, well-oiled organization.</td>
<td>.32 .01 .69 -.17 .15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I feel rewarded when attendance is high, membership is expanding, and the budget is oversubscribed.</td>
<td>.08 -.01 .68 .03 -.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that for the remainder of the paper we have assigned role scores to respondents in two ways. From the factor analysis we produced factor scores for each factor.$^6$ These scores were then transformed to a set of scores with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. This transformation was executed solely for processing convenience and in no way altered the shape of the distribution. These scores were used when clergy roles were utilized as dependent variables. The transformed scores were also collapsed with four categories for each role, with the matrix. A regression estimate of factor scores was computed using the formula: $S = ZR^{-1}F$, where $S$ = the matrix of factor scores; $Z$ = the standardized data matrix; $R$ = the inverse of the correlation matrix; and $F$ = the rotated factor loading matrix. For a discussion of this approach, see Rummel (1970:437-41).

---

$^6$ The factor analysis used a principal component solution with an orthogonal rotation of the factor scores.


Table 1--Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ministerial Role Items</th>
<th>Factor Loadings¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My major tasks are the making of plans, the recruiting of leaders, and the supervising of groups.</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. One of my major tasks is the recruitment of personnel for the church (Sunday) school.</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I try to keep conflict at a minimum in my congregation.</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I feel called by God to speak out on social ills.</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I continually seek ways to strike harder at problems like war and racism.</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I am a servant of the community who identifies problems that Christians can work toward solving.</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I find that I sometimes think of myself as an Old Testament prophet, a social critic to the community.</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. The major goal of the church should be religious education.</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I most enjoy Christian Education, whether it is with youth or adults.</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹The five factors are identified as involving the following roles:
I. Traditional
II. Counseling
III. Administrator
IV. Community Problem Solving
V. Christian Education

N=435. The responses by eight additional individuals were not subjected to analysis because they did not respond to three or more items. Other "no responses" were assigned to the middle (third) response; these were infrequent and were distributed fairly evenly over the 23 items.

quartile values as the cutting points. These scores were used when role orientations were predictor variables.

Clergy Roles Related to Theological and Political Views

In comparing positions taken by liberal, neo-orthodox, and conservative ministers on six public issues, Johnson (1967:441) concluded that while "theology is a good predictor of the political attitudes and behavior of ascetic Protestant pastors and laymen" there are "grounds for rejecting theology as the sole or even the major source of these norms." Johnson observed the heterogeneity in beliefs among modern theologies, and he concluded that "it seems plausible that the major source of the political views of liberal religious leaders is simply their common commitment to humanistic social values and their common interest in translating these values into policy positions on specific issues."

The ministers in our study were asked to rate themselves on both their theological and political positions.⁷ The two variables were

⁷ Stark and Foster (1970:390–2) report the analysis of the relationship between ministers' theological self-conception (fundamentalist, conservative, neo-orthodox, and liberal) and their index for orthodoxy (including items for belief in a personal God, divinity of Jesus, authenticity of Biblical miracles, and existence of the Devil). They report (p. 391)
positively correlated (r = .44), with ministers who rated themselves theologically liberal also tending to rate themselves politically liberal. This relationship supports Johnson’s conclusion that theological outlook is a good predictor of political viewpoint.

Using Multiple Classification Analysis (on MCA see Andrews et al., 1967), with theological and political views as predictor variables and each clergy role as the dependent variable (in five separate analyses), we tested the validity of our two major clergy roles: traditional and community problem solving. Prior to the analysis we predicted that the traditional role especially should have a theological base, whereas the community problem solving role should be more related to political outlook. As expected, ministers scoring high on the traditional role tended to be conservative theologically, and ministers scoring high on the problem solving role were politically liberal. In comparing eta and beta coefficients, one may observe that the data bear out our expectations: in predicting the traditional role, the beta value for the theological variable remains at a high level, whereas the beta value for political outlook is greatly diminished. In predicting community problem solving scores, the beta value of the political variable remains at a high level, while the beta value for the theological stance is greatly diminished. The results from these five analyses are shown in Table 2. In conclusion, our belief that the traditional role would be especially linked with a conservative theological base is confirmed. Similarly, we have shown that the community problem solving role is linked with a liberal political outlook.

Clergy Roles Related to Protest Orientation

Now we turn to the relationships between clergy roles and receptivity to protest. In Table 3 we show the eta and beta coefficients for the effects of the five clergy roles on protest orientation. The beta values do not especially differ from the eta values for each clergy role (you will recall that the role scores were assigned through factor scaling with rotation; while the data are not shown, separate analyses indicated no significant relationships among clergy roles). From Table 3 it can be observed that two roles especially are associated with protest orientation. The traditionally oriented minister (who tends to be theologically conservative) is likely to score low on protest, while the community problem solving oriented clergyman (who tends to be politically liberal) is likely to evidence high protest orientation. This is as predicted, since without the introduction of other predictor variables, clergy roles (with theological and political bases) were expected to be related to protest orientation.

Next we introduce other predictors in our analysis of the data. The relationship of each clergy role is assessed in separate analyses; each analysis includes other (non-role) predictor variables. The results from these additional twenty analyses are shown in Tables 4 and 5. Table 4 shows the effects of the clergy roles on protest, with additional predictors being theological view (analysis 1), political view (analysis 2), theological and
Using appropriate F-test:  

\[ \text{a} P > .05 \quad \text{b} P < .05 \quad \text{c} P < .01 \]

1Where possible, directions have been assigned to the coefficients from an examination of means across categories. The table shows the results of five separate MCA analyses. Self-reporting of theological position included four positions: fundamentalist, conservative, neo-orthodox, and liberal. Political categories were: very conservative, somewhat conservative, middle-of-the-road, somewhat liberal, and very liberal.

N=409

political views (analysis 3), and theological and political views together with education and age (analysis 4). This strategy was repeated separately for each clergy role as a predictor of protest (for a total of twenty analyses). While the relationships of education and age with the clergy roles will be reported elsewhere, note that age was included since younger ministers are more protest-oriented (see Campbell and Pettigrew, 1959:123) and since ministers with low levels of education (generally serving sectarian bodies) are less protest-oriented.

Our attention is especially focused on the effects of the traditional and community problem solving roles. With the introduction of theological view as a predictor along with the traditional role, the effect of the tradi-

Table 2. Effects of Theological and Political Views on Clergy Roles

| Dependent Variable: Clergy Role | Theological View | | | | Political View | | | | R |
|------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Traditional                  | -.59c           | -.48c            | -.49c           | -.18c           | .600             |                           |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Counseling                   | .06a            | .06a             | .10a            | .11a            | .057             |                           |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Administrator                | -.12a           | -.08a            | -.16b           | -.16b           | .124             |                           |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Problem Solving              | .33c            | .15c             | .44c            | .41c            | .444             |                           |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Christian Education          | .19c            | -.23c            | .18c            | .18c            | .226             |                           |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |

Using appropriate F-test:  

\[ \text{a} P > .05 \quad \text{b} P < .05 \quad \text{c} P < .01 \]

1Role scores resulted from factor scaling (with rotation). Here categories of low, moderately low, moderately high, and high have been assigned using quartile values as cutting points. Shown are means on the protest index; the mean values are not adjusted for the effects of other predictors (the remaining four clergy roles).

2There is possible interaction with race here. The means for whites only are 1.48, 1.40, 1.63, and 1.44. The means for blacks are 2.89, 3.00, 2.71, and 1.47.

N=406  R=.675
Table 4. Effects of Clergy Roles (and Additional Predictors) on Protest Orientation (Beta Coefficients)\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clergy Roles</th>
<th>Effect of Role (Introduced Singly) on Protest, With Following Additional Predictors:</th>
<th>Theological View</th>
<th>Political View</th>
<th>Theol. &amp; Pol. Views</th>
<th>Theol. &amp; Pol. Views Education, and Age(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>-0.14(^b)</td>
<td>-0.15(^c)</td>
<td>-0.08(^a)</td>
<td>-0.05(^a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>0.11(^a)</td>
<td>0.09(^a)</td>
<td>0.08(^a)</td>
<td>0.08(^a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>-0.15(^c)</td>
<td>-0.12(^c)</td>
<td>-0.11(^b)</td>
<td>-0.09(^a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>0.42(^c)</td>
<td>0.30(^c)</td>
<td>0.31(^c)</td>
<td>0.31(^c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Education</td>
<td>0.07(^a)</td>
<td>0.04(^a)</td>
<td>0.06(^a)</td>
<td>0.04(^a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using appropriate F-test: \(^{aP>.05}\) \(^{bP<.05}\) \(^{cP<.01}\)

\(^1\)Where possible, directions have been assigned to the coefficients from an examination of means across categories. Values for eta coefficient can be seen in Table 3. Values for eta and beta coefficients for other predictors utilized in these analyses can be seen in Table 5.

\(^2\)Values for R, in order (by roles), are: 0.727, 0.730, 0.731, 0.778, and 0.726.

...tional role drops from -0.41 (eta coefficient, which can be seen in Table 3) to -0.14 (beta coefficient, which can be observed in Table 4). A similar drop occurs for the traditional role with the introduction of political position. With the introduction of both theological and political viewpoints, the ability of the traditional role to predict protest orientation falls to a level perhaps due to chance alone (P > .05).

With the introduction of the theological variable along with the community problem solving variable, the effect of the community problem solving variable on protest is only slightly diminished, with eta = +.52 and beta = +.42. There is a greater decline in coefficient, however, with the introduction of the political variable, with beta = +.30. This level remains for the ability of the community problem solving role to predict protest, when both theological and political viewpoints are used as predictors (and also with education and age added as additional variables). As Table 4 shows, the only clergy role which is significantly related to protest, with theological and political viewpoints, education, and age used as additional predictors, is the community problem solving role.

Table 5 is really a continuance of Table 4 in that it indicates the effects of theological and political viewpoints as well as education and age on protest orientation. The beta coefficients which are reported for these variables are modal values since there were five separate analyses employing this set of predictors. Only the values for political outlook evidenced variability depending on the predictors used in the analysis. The modal value for the effect of political view (with the introduction of the other predictors) was +.53; but in the analysis employing the community problem solving role the value was +.42. In other words, both the community problem solving role and the political position were important variables in predicting protest orientation.

Conclusions

An analysis of the items comprising the five roles of the Protestant clergy that we identified and a comparison with the description by Blizzard of his fourteen roles led us to conclude that almost nine-tenths of Blizzard's respondents would have been measured by our instrument. Together with theological and political viewpoints, age, and education, the five clergy roles were used as predictors of protest orientation. With theological and political viewpoints, age, and education used together with a single clergy role, only community problem solving among the clergy roles was significantly related to protest. With the effects of other predictors not con-
trolled, both community problem solving and the traditional roles were related to protest. Traditional ministers tended to score low on protest, while ministers scoring high on community problem solving tended to score high on protest. Clergy endorsing a protest orientation tended to be theologically and politically liberal. From most to least important as predictors were: political viewpoint, community problem solving role, theological position, age (with younger respondents being more protest oriented), and education (the more protest-oriented clergy were at the two middle levels of education).

In summary, Blizzard's community problem solving role was demonstrated to include social action. Campbell and Pettigrew had expressed surprise that some Little Rock ministers would be active integrationists even though their reference system included powerful deterrents for such action. We have located support for such a social action role as stemming, at least in part, from the self-reference system: the clergyman's own clergy role orientation as well as his political viewpoint. The influence of clergy role might also be assigned to the professional reference system in that clergymen acquire role orientations in part through socialization in seminary training and through contact with fellow clergymen (for an examination of structural effects of seminaries in socialization, see Carroll, 1971).

At least in reference to one public issue (civil rights), Johnson's finding that both theological and political perspectives would be related to outlook on public issues, but that the former would not be the "major source" of public affairs outlook, was also supported by the findings of our study.

Johnson observed (p. 441) that black denominations tend to be theologically traditionalist, but that the black vote tends to be Democratic; and thus "theology has not alone been responsible for the political norms of these Protestant groups." While only forty-six of our respondents identified themselves as black (and 386 as white), analyses of the data by race indicated that black clergymen scored higher on both the traditional and community problem solving roles and higher on protest as well. Our analysis would indicate that the crucial variables for predicting protest are political outlook and

---

**Table 5. Effects of Additional Predictors (See Table 4) on Protest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Predictor</th>
<th>Eta Coefficient for All Analyses</th>
<th>Beta Coefficient (Modal Value) for All Role Analyses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theological View</td>
<td>+.56</td>
<td>+.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political View</td>
<td>+.69</td>
<td>+.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1These coefficients result from the five analyses (utilizing each role in singular fashion) using role, theological and political views, education, and age. The effects of role on protest, as determined by these analyses, are shown in the extreme right column of Table 4. All coefficients shown in Table 5 are significant at the .01 level, as determined by the appropriate F-test.

2Education was coded as (1) some seminary, but degree not completed, or less; (2) 3 or 4-year seminary degree; (3) graduate work, but no advanced degree; and (4) master's degree or more. Age was collapsed into four categories, with the three breaking points at 40, 50, and 60.

3The values for all beta coefficients did not vary more than .02 from these four modal values, with the exception of the value for political view which was .42 for the analysis with community problem solving utilized for clergy role.

4From a visual inspection of means on the protest index across education categories, it was observed that individuals at the two middle levels on education were more protest-oriented than those who were either high or low on education.
orientation to the community problem solving role. Johnson's statement and our findings are, then, in accordance.

We suggest that clergy preference for a community problem solving role can be identified at least in part as a commitment to a humanistic Christianity, with a concomitant desire to identify those social and political problems at the community and societal level which can be changed for the better. This orientation exists to some degree apart from political outlook. The acquisition of such an orientation remains to be explored.

Johnson has reiterated (p. 440) the observation that liberalism within the Church has attempted to shift the emphasis, especially within Protestantism, away from the older, more conservative concerns with individual salvation, and toward a greater concern for modifying the present conditions of life. He also suggested that Protestant conservatives tend not to imput religious significance to social issues and, by implication at least, that religious liberals tend to identify certain social issues as religious and moral questions. We might presume, therefore, that political liberalism might be a political result of the social concerns already noted, while the community problem solving role might be the occupational outgrowth of the same concerns. One's theological position might provide a rationale for both political liberalism and the community problem solving role.

The entire question might be placed in a slightly different perspective by suggesting that (religious) conservatives might well tend to identify "religion" itself with theology, while (religious) liberals might tend to identify it with ethics (Hadden [1969:98] and others have taken a similar position, relating the "new theology" with concern for social action in this world rather than for otherworldly religious doctrine). Thus, we might even suggest that for the liberal pastor the significant fact about his vocation is that it is one institutional arrangement (among others) which allows him to work out his ethical objectives. Had the liberal pastor perceived some other institutional arrangement (early in his career) as more effectively fostering those ethical objectives, it seems reasonable that he might have followed other career possibilities (Jud et al. [1970:51, 72] report that one-fourth of the United Church of Christ ex-pastors in their study left "to work in greener pastures because . . . [of being] disillusioned or angry about the church's irrelevance" and that ex-pastors were more likely than pastors to report having enjoyed "giving leadership to the community on crucial social issues"). For the conservative pastor the one special institutional arrangement that can satisfy his quest for personal salvation (for himself and others) is the Church.

Other analysts have suggested that religious liberals and conservatives also perceive the character of sin (and hence, of salvation) somewhat differently, for liberals tend to identify "sin" with societal problems (war, segregation, etc.); while conservatives tend to identify it with personal problems (lying, swearing, drinking, etc.). H. Richard Niebuhr (1929) has described the character of the religious movement as being more strongly related to its definition of sin than to its concept of salvation. We therefore suggest that the problem solving role orientation and political liberalism stem from a common ethical concern and that the pastor's theological position represents an effort to provide an "explanation" for his ethical concerns within a religious context (we should note the similarity between theological position as explanation and Blizzard's conception of the master role).

Whether any given individual would enter the ministry (rather than social work, for example) to satisfy his ethical concerns would undoubtedly be a function of his earlier socialization experiences. His decision to remain in the ministry could then be construed to be at least a partial function of the extent to which the Church actually provided an arena in which those ethical concerns could come to some fruition (for an analysis of support for such action vis à vis denominational polity, see Wood, 1970). There is, then, a convergence of evidence that the problem solving role and political and theological liberalism are substantively related to protest orientation and that these variables explain a substantial amount of the variance in rates of protest.
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