Understanding Stress and the Quality of Life for Adolescent Children of Clergy: A Retrospective Study

Cynthia B. Wilson
UNDERSTANDING STRESS AND THE QUALITY OF LIFE FOR ADOLESCENT CHILDREN OF CLERGY: A RETROSPECTIVE STUDY

By

CYNTHIA B. WILSON

A Dissertation submitted to the Department of Family and Child Sciences in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Degree Awarded:
Spring Semester, 2010
The members of the committee approve the dissertation of Cynthia B. Wilson defended on February 23, 2010.

Carol A. Darling  
Professor Directing Dissertation

Gary Peterson  
University Representative

Marsha Rehm  
Committee Member

Received by:

Kay Pasley, Chair, Department of Family and Child Sciences

Billie J. Collier, Dean, College of Human Sciences

The Graduate School has verified and approved the above-named committee members.
I dedicate this to the one who has been my number one supporter, my number one fan, and to whom I owe my very life. I dedicate this project to my God and my Savior, Jesus Christ. He has opened the doors that were needed to bring me to this point, and has served as my source of strength and life. I love Him with all my heart, and am grateful to serve Him in life and in ministry. It is my sincere prayer that this project will bring honor to Him and serve as a resource to others who serve Him. It is to Him alone that I dedicate this project, for He alone is worthy.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Completing a project such as this has required a great deal of support from a number of organizations, faculty, colleagues, friends, and family. While it is impossible to name everyone who has supported me through this process, I would like to acknowledge the following people for helping me along the way.

First and foremost, I would like to thank my major professor, Dr. Carol Darling, for all of her support, assistance, and encouragement throughout the years. I met Dr. Darling when I was an undergraduate student when she served as my favorite professor and advisor, then became my major professor when I entered graduate school. She was the first one who introduced me to the topic of clergy family stress, allowing me to provide research assistance on several other projects involving clergy families. This allowed me to see the need for further research on clergy children, and provided a firm base from which to work. She also has served as a mentor to me through the years, serving as a source of encouragement and inspiration. Although my life circumstances slowed down the process at times, Dr. Darling was always patient, allowing me to work at the pace I needed to, but also continuing to hold me accountable to completing this project. I would also like to thank the other members of my dissertation committee, Dr. Gary Peterson and Dr. Marsha Rehm, and former committee member Dr. Robert Lee. Due to Dr. Lee’s retirement, Dr. Rehm graciously agreed to take his place. I sincerely appreciate the important feedback and suggestions that you all have provided during this project and for your willingness to serve on my committee. There are others who generously provided financial support for me while completing my doctoral studies and this project. I would like to thank the Florida State University, the College of Human Sciences, and the Department of Family and Child Sciences for the financial awards that I received. These included the College of Human Sciences Doctoral Fellowship Award and Scholar Award, FSU Doctoral Dissertation Award, and College of Human Sciences Dissertation Award. Additionally, I would like to thank the May Watson Connor Scholarship Fund and Florence Smith-McAllister Fellowship Fund for the generous financial support that was provided. I could not have completed my doctoral studies and this dissertation without the financial support provided by all of these sources.

Next, this project would not have been possible without a number of organizations proving access to participants for the study. First, I would like to thank the Turner Ministry Resource Center, a division of The Pastoral Institute, Columbus, Georgia, for providing the mailing list of clergy members for this study. This project would not have been possible without access to the clergy families. Their willingness to share this information and support this project allowed us to shed light on the needs of clergy children, and will allow The Pastoral Institute a new understanding of ways to support those in ministry. Next, I would like to thank Immanuel Baptist Church and Killearn United Methodist Church in Tallahassee, Florida, for their willingness to provide access to their members to serve as comparison sites for this study. Their participation and support of this project is greatly appreciated.

I would also be remiss if I did not properly thank the participants in the study, including the children of clergy and the comparison site participants. While they remain unknown to me individually, their collective responses to the survey are invaluable. Their willingness to take the time to answer a lengthy survey and share sensitive aspects of their lives is much appreciated. Although most clergy children will never have the opportunity to speak for themselves in regard to their life experiences, the input that was received from the participants in this study will serve
as a collective voice for children of clergy. It is my hope that this project will result in the betterment of the lives of children of clergy everywhere.

Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends who have served as a source of love, support, and strength along the way. I would like to say a special thanks to two very special pastors, Dr. Rich Kincl and Dr. Bruce Prindle, both of whom served as motivators and constantly held me accountable to finish what I had started. I would also like to thank my parents, Sam Bruce and Paula Fountain, who have loved me and supported me throughout the years, and encouraged me to finish my education. Last but certainly not least, I would like to thank my husband Mike, and my children Elizabeth, Brittany, and Cade. They have all served as my inspiration throughout my entire doctoral studies and this project. Being in ministry myself, my children know first-hand what it is to be “clergy children,” and could attest to the ups and downs to all that comes with that. I would like to especially thank my husband Mike, who may never fully realize what he has meant to me throughout this entire process. His love and support for me throughout the years has brought me through to this point, and I certainly would not be here were it not for his sacrifice, encouragement, and accountability. I pray this research helps me be the best clergy parent and wife I can be to my own little clergy family!
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES........................................................................................................................................ ix

LIST OF FIGURES ........................................................................................................................................ x

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS ......................................................................................................................... xi

ABSTRACT ................................................................................................................................................... xii

I. INTERRODUCTION .................................................................................................................................... 1
   Background of Problem .......................................................................................................................... 1
   Theoretical Perspective .......................................................................................................................... 5
      Family Stress Theory ......................................................................................................................... 5
      Psychosocial Development Theory ................................................................................................. 10
   Application of Theory .......................................................................................................................... 11
   Statement of the Problem ..................................................................................................................... 13
   Hypotheses and Research Questions .................................................................................................. 14
      Hypotheses ...................................................................................................................................... 14
      Research Questions ......................................................................................................................... 15
   Definitions .......................................................................................................................................... 15
   Assumptions ....................................................................................................................................... 16
   Limitations ......................................................................................................................................... 16
   Delimitations ...................................................................................................................................... 17

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ........................................................................................................... 18
   Overview of the Study .......................................................................................................................... 18
   Selection of Studies for Review .......................................................................................................... 18
   Family Stress ...................................................................................................................................... 19
      Clergy Family Stress .......................................................................................................................... 20
      Stressors of Clergy Children ............................................................................................................. 20
      Congregational Expectations ............................................................................................................ 21
      Boundaries ...................................................................................................................................... 22
      Lack of Privacy ................................................................................................................................. 23
      Parsonage Living ............................................................................................................................... 23
      Mobility ......................................................................................................................................... 24
      Family-Related Issues ....................................................................................................................... 24
      Stereotypes/Rebellion ......................................................................................................................... 25
      Financial Issues ............................................................................................................................... 26
   Coping Resources ............................................................................................................................... 26
   Definition of the Event/Perception ....................................................................................................... 28
   Quality of Life .................................................................................................................................... 30
      Quality of Life Among Children of Clergy ....................................................................................... 31
   Summary of Literature Review ......................................................................................................... 33
# III. METHODOLOGY

**Introduction** ................................................................. 34
**Sample** .................................................................................... 34
**Instrumentation** ........................................................................ 36

A—Stressor ............................................................................ 37
   A1—Individual Stress ......................................................... 37
   A2—Family Stress ............................................................... 37
B—Resources for Coping .......................................................... 38
   B1—Individual Coping ......................................................... 38
   B2—Family Coping ............................................................... 39
C—Definition of the Event ......................................................... 39
X—Crisis (Quality of Life) ......................................................... 40

Clergy Children Versus Non-Clergy Children .............................. 40

**Procedures** ........................................................................... 41
   Data Collection .................................................................... 41
   Data Analyses ...................................................................... 43

# IV. RESULTS

**Introduction** ........................................................................... 45
**Sample** .................................................................................... 45
**Research Hypotheses and Questions** ......................................... 49
   Description of the Variables ................................................. 49
   Research Hypotheses ............................................................ 50
      Hypothesis 1 Results ......................................................... 51
      Hypothesis 2 Results ......................................................... 53
**Path Analysis** ........................................................................ 55
   Research Question One ....................................................... 56
      Path Coefficients ............................................................. 57
      Effects Components for Quality of Life as Adolescents ......... 57
   Research Question Two ....................................................... 59
      Path Coefficients ............................................................. 59
      Effects Components for Quality of Life as Adults ............. 61
   Research Question Three ................................................... 61
      Path Coefficients ............................................................. 62
      Effects Components for Quality of Life as Adolescents and Adults
      When Modeled Together ............................................. 64

**Related Findings** ................................................................. 65
   Tests of Differences of Other Variables in Study ................. 65
      Demographic Variables ..................................................... 65
      Subscale Variables ........................................................... 67
   Rank Ordering of Subscales .................................................. 68
   Open-Ended Items ............................................................... 68
      Expectations for Behavior and Church Involvement ............ 70
      Family Problems ............................................................. 71
      Lack of Family Time/Church Demands ............................. 71
      Moving ........................................................................... 72
Finding Their Own Spiritual Path ........................................................... 73
Lack of Distress Among Many ................................................................. 73
Summary ........................................................................................................................... 74

V. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS ............................................................ 78
Purpose of the Study ................................................................................................. 78
Summary of the Study ...................................................................................................... 78
Discussion of the Findings ............................................................................................... 82
  Discussion of Methodology ......................................................................................... 82
  Discussion of the Hypotheses and Research Questions ............................................... 85
    Comparison of Children of Clergy and Children of Non-Clergy ................................ 85
  Research Questions .................................................................................................... 89
    Predictive Analyses for Quality of Life as Adolescents ............................................ 89
    Predictive Analyses for Quality of Life as Adults ..................................................... 91
    Predictive Analyses for Quality of Life as Adolescents and Adults When Modeled Together ................................................................. 93
Related Findings .......................................................................................................... 95
  Tests of Differences of Other Variables in Study ....................................................... 95
Discussion of Open-Ended Responses ...................................................................... 97
Theoretical Implications and Suggested Future Research ........................................... 98
  Implications for Theory ............................................................................................. 98
  Implications for Research ......................................................................................... 102
  Implications for Practice ........................................................................................... 103
Summary and Conclusions ......................................................................................... 107

APPENDICES ......................................................................................................................... 110

A. SURVEY ............................................................................................................................ 110
B. INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTERS ......................................... 133
C. INFORMED CONSENT AND COVER LETTERS ......................................................... 136
D. LETTERS OF PERMISSION ............................................................................................ 143
REFERENCES ....................................................................................................................... 149
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH ................................................................................................... 154
LIST OF TABLES

1. Erikson’s Psychosocial Development Theory ................................................................. 10
2. Survey Response Rate ........................................................................................................ 42
3. Demographic Characteristics of the Sample ............................................................... 46
4. Test of Differences of Major Variables in Study (Comparing Gender) ...................... 52
5. Test of Differences of Major Variables in Study (Clergy vs. Non-Clergy) .................. 54
6. Correlation Matrix, Means, and Standard Deviations for Major Variables in the Study .... 56
7. Direct, Indirect, and Total Effects for Quality of Life as Adolescents ......................... 59
8. Direct, Indirect, and Total Effects for Quality of Life as Adults .................................. 61
9. Direct, Indirect, and Total Effects for Quality of Life as Adolescents & Adults When Modeled Together .................................................................................................................................... 64
10. Related Findings—Tests of Differences of Other Variables in Study ....................... 66
11. Rank Ordering of Subscale Variables ........................................................................ 69
12. Summary of Analyses for Hypotheses and Research Questions ................................ 74
LIST OF FIGURES

1. Path Diagram of Hypothetical Model of Factors Predicting Quality of Life for Children of Clergy .............................................................................................................................. 12
2. Hypothetical Model Depicting Instrumentation to be Utilized for Study .............................. 36
3. Path Model for Quality of Life as Adolescents ....................................................................... 58
4. Path Model for Quality of Life as Adults ................................................................................ 60
5. Path Model for Quality of Life as Adolescents and Adults When Modeled Together........ 63
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

1. FILE: Family Inventory of Life Events and Changes (McCubbin & Patterson, 1987).
5. SWLS: Satisfaction With Life Scale (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985).
7. PK: Preacher’s Kid (colloquial term for child of clergy).
ABSTRACT

Children of clergy live within a unique family context that has been identified as having distinct needs based on the social environment in which they live. Although research has shown that clergy families experience a variety of stressors, very little attention has been given to children of clergy. Thus, it is important to better understand the various pressures that children of clergy experience and the impact these have on their perceived quality of life. The goal of this study was to examine the stressors that adult children of clergy experienced while growing up, and how the resources they had for coping, along with their perceptions of their experiences, affected their perceived quality of life they had as adolescents, as well as their current perceived quality of life as an adult. Gender differences were examined to determine if male and female children of clergy differ in their levels of stress, coping, perceptions, and quality of life. This project also sought to determine how identity formation would be affected by growing up in this unique context. Using the ABC-X model and Family Stress Theory, the interactive effect of individual and family stress, individual and family coping resources, and sense of coherence on overall perceived quality of life as adolescents (retrospectively) and currently as adults was examined.

The sample used for the study consisted of adult children of clergy whose parents were in ministry while they were growing up, along with a comparison sample of adult non-clergy children. Clergy members were randomly selected from a mailing list from a clergy support center that provides services to clergy members from all across the United States. Clergy members received a letter with information about the research project and a request to forward the letter to an adult child, which included a link to the online survey. The comparison sample received an email invitation to participate with the link to the survey. Respondents were asked to complete an online survey consisting of demographic items and six instruments used to measure the variables of interest to this study. Additional questions were provided at the end of the questionnaire for children of clergy only, which included additional demographic items and open-ended items. The Stressors of Clergy Children and Couples Scale was used to measure individual stress, and the Family Inventory of Life Events and Changes was used to measure family stress. The Adolescent Coping Orientation for Problem Experiences was used to measure individual coping, and the Family Crisis Oriented Personal Evaluation Scales was used to...
measure family coping. The Sense of Coherence scale was used to measure sense of coherence. Finally, the Satisfaction With Life Scale was used to measure perceived quality of life, both as adolescents (retrospectively) and currently as adults. Two hypotheses and three research questions were used in the study to examine the quality of life of children of clergy. The original null hypothesis was that there would be no observed difference between male children of clergy, female children of clergy, male children of non-clergy, and female children of non-clergy in terms of the variables of interest. However, during the path analyses, gender had no significant effects on the path model and was subsequently dropped. Therefore, a second null hypothesis was added to compare the totals of clergy and non-clergy children, without comparing gender.

Analysis of variance, along with Tukey’s post-hoc procedure, was used to determine if significant differences existed among the four different groups of children of clergy (when considering gender), and between total clergy versus total non-clergy. Analyses demonstrated that the quality of life of the clergy children studied was influenced not only by the intensity of the stressors they experienced, but also by their resources for coping and their sense of coherence about their situations. Children of clergy reported greater perceived retrospective levels of individual and family stress than children of non-clergy. No differences were found between children of clergy and children of non-clergy in terms of individual and family coping. However, children of clergy did report a lower sense of coherence than children of non-clergy. Children of clergy reported a lower quality of life as adolescents, but no differences were found in quality of life as adults.

Path analyses were conducted to examine the interactive effect of stressors, coping resources, and sense of coherence on quality of life as adolescents, as adults, and as adolescents and adults when modeled together. Significant direct relationships were found between perceived retrospective quality of life for adolescents and family stress, individual coping, and sense of coherence. Additionally, direct relationships were found between individual stress and quality of life as adolescents on quality of life as adults. Sense of coherence provided the greatest total influence on quality of life as adolescents, whereas quality of life as adolescents provided the greatest total influence on quality of life as adults.

Several implications for theory, research, and practice were discussed. This project provided a good example of the utility of Hill’s original Model of Family Stress, since it provided for the path modeling used in the predictive analysis of the study. The model also
highlighted the effect of mediating variables such as coping and sense of coherence between stress and quality of life in clergy children, since greater individual resources for coping and sense of coherence about their situation resulted in a higher quality of life. Implications for Erikson’s Theory of Psychosocial Development were also provided, which can be used to examine identity formation in the adolescent children of clergy, and how the quality of their lives was shaped by the unique social environment in which they were raised. Additional research is still needed to examine the validity of stereotypes, racial differences, denominational differences, and further exploration of identity formation in children of clergy. Implications were also provided for clergy families themselves, congregations, and helping professionals. These included balancing the demands of the family and church, examining the effect of expectations by families and congregations, providing additional support services, and enhancing the coping skills and perceptions necessary to improve the quality of life of children of clergy.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Background of Problem

Children of clergy (commonly known as “preacher’s kids,” “pastor’s kids,” or “PKs” for short) live within a unique family context that has been identified as having distinct needs based on the social environment in which they live (Lee & Balswick, 1989). Having a parent (usually the father) as a clergy member adds a level of complexity to their lives that is distinctive from other children. Although research has shown that the clergy family experiences a variety of stressors, the focus of most of the research performed on clergy families has been on the clergy members themselves, and perhaps the clergy spouses, with very little attention given to the children of clergy (Morris & Blanton, 1998). Children of clergy are often expected to endure many stressors that the family experiences without complaint, somehow assuming that these children are unique in their ability to endure stress. Yet a study of more than 100 children of clergy found these children have the same needs for individuality, respect, and privacy as everyone else (Lee, 1992).

In essence, children of clergy appear to be an unseen part of the population. An invisible barrier seems to exist that prevents this part of the population from having a voice. Perhaps it results from the idea that having a parent as a pastor should result in a picture-perfect life and those who speak out are scrutinized for doing so. Thus, it is important to better understand the various pressures that children of clergy experience and the impact these have on their quality of life. The goal of this project was to give voice to this unseen population by examining the various stressors that adult children of clergy perceived experiencing while growing up, and how the resources they had for coping, along with the perceptions of their experiences, affected the quality of life they had as adolescents, as well as their current quality of life as an adult.

Clergy play an important role in U.S. culture, from the obvious weekly demands of preaching and leading a church, to the often unseen demands of helping individual members of their congregations during troubling times. Far from having a typical 9 to 5 job, clergy are often called upon to work long, ambiguous hours that frequently infringe upon their families. The expectations placed on clergy by their congregations often result in their own family’s needs going unmet. In addition to the expectations placed on them by their congregations, clergy
families experience additional stressors including frequent moves, financial burdens, intrusive boundaries, and lack of social support (Morris & Blanton, 1998). As a result, clergy families typically experience high levels of stress. The following risk factors of pastors have been identified (London & Wiseman, 2003, p. 20):

- 90% work more than 46 hours a week.
- 80% believed that pastoral ministry affected their families negatively.
- 33% said that being in ministry is an outright hazard to their family.
- 75% reported they had a significant stress-related crisis at least once in their ministry.

Research has found that clergy families experience a variety of stressors, which have been categorized as either external or internal (Blanton, 1992). External stressors included expectations, family boundaries, compensation, social support, and mobility. Internal stressors experienced by clergy families included marital communication, role redefinitions, self-esteem, identity, and parent-child relationships. Although clergy families face some of the same issues that other families experience, there are unique aspects of clergy family life that affect the way in which these issues are experienced (Blanton, 1992).

Research focusing on children of clergy has demonstrated that they experienced these same family stressors, albeit from a different perspective. For example, children of clergy have been noted to experience the particular stressor of congregational expectations, wherein they perceive they are held to a higher standard of behavior than their peers who were not children of clergy (Anderson, 1998; Lee & Balswick, 1989; Stevenson, 1982). Additionally, children of clergy experienced problems with boundaries, noting the difficulty their families had with maintaining boundaries between professional and family life, and often experienced intrusions from congregations (Hill, Darling, & Raimondi, 2003; Lee & Balswick, 1989). Other stressors that clergy families experienced include a lack of privacy, parsonage living, mobility, family-related problems, stereotypes, rebellion, and financial issues (Anderson, 1998; Darling, Hill, & McWey, 2004; Hill, Darling, & Raimondi, 2003; Lee & Balswick, 1989; Mickey & Ashmore, 1991; Morris & Blanton, 1994a; Moy & Malony, 1987; Ostrander, Henry, & Fournier, 1994; Stevenson, 1982; Strange & Sheppard, 2001).

In addition to understanding the stressors that children of clergy experience, it is important to understand the resources that these individuals have for coping with and meeting the demands of living in this family context. Within a family context, coping is an affective,
cognitive, and behavioral process wherein family systems and the individuals within them manage stressful situations and events, rather than eradicate them (Boss, 2002). Family stress research has demonstrated the importance of resources in a family’s ability to cope with a stressful situation (Hobfoll & Spielberger, 2003).

Clergy families possess a variety of resources to meet the demands of ministry. For example, social support affects family-related stress in clergy families (Lee & Iverson-Gilbert, 2003). Specifically, minister’s overall well-being was positively correlated with the number of supportive relationships a minister possessed. Another resource that clergy families have is their denominational agencies. In response to the stressors that clergy families experience, many denominations provide clergy families support services (to varying degrees) that help them manage their situations (Morris & Blanton, 1994b, 1995). Although research has given us a basic understanding of the resources that clergy and clergy spouses have for dealing with life in ministry, very little research has been conducted that examines the resources of children of clergy. The present study attempted to fill this research gap.

In addition to understanding the stressors children of clergy experience and the resources they possess, it is important to identify how the children of clergy perceive the stressors in their lives. Family stress researchers agree that in order to understand the process of family stress management, you must consider the perception and meanings that families attach to their situations (Boss, 2002). Understanding a family’s perception of an event can explain why some families can manage a stressful situation well, while other families end up in a crisis state over a similar situation. According to Boss (2002), “the family’s perception of the event is the most important part of the stress equation for intervening with a situation that cannot be fixed. It is the most difficult to assess, however, because it is perceptual” (p. 70).

Lee and Iverson-Gilbert (2003) found support for the influence that perception has on quality of life in a clergy family. In their research on demand, support, and perception in family-related stress among Protestant clergy, they discovered that the minister’s well-being and life satisfaction was influenced more by their interpretation of boundary ambiguity than the actual frequency of congregational boundary violations. Likewise, the present study examined the ways in which children of clergy perceived the stressors that they experience, and how these perceptions affected their quality of life as adolescents and currently as adults.
By examining the stressors that children of clergy experience, along with their resources for coping and their perceptions, we can develop an understanding of their overall quality of life that resulted from growing up in this family context. Quality of life can be used to express the end result of the family after having gone through a stressful event or series of events. This end state has also been described in terms of the level of family adaptation, which falls between bonadaptation, or a positive result of the stressful event, and maladaptation, an unhealthy result (Ingoldsby, Smith, & Miller, 2004). Even with the many stressors that clergy families face, research has shown they have exhibited tremendous coping skills and levels of resiliency that can result in a high quality of life (Darling, Hill, & McWey, 2004).

Gender has also been a factor in examining stress management in individuals and families (Boss, 2002). Not only have women historically reported higher rates of psychological distress than men, but women tend to be more emotionally affected by stress than men. Current research suggests that a social construction of gender roles exists that results in gender differences in stress outcomes. The vulnerability of women when dealing emotionally may result from the intense and persistent stresses in women’s social roles. Women also appear to be more affected than men by the stressful experiences of those they care about, in addition to being affected emotionally by their own stressful experiences. When studying family stress, Boss (2002) suggested, “more research is needed on the specific circumstances of diverse subgroups of women and men” (p. 28). Therefore, when examining children of clergy, it is important to examine gender differences in how male and female children handled their stressors.

Finally, identity formation is of interest when studying children of clergy. Adolescence is generally described as a time of identity formation (Erikson, 1985), during which individuals examine who they are in the context of their family and the greater social world. In addition to the typical struggles with self-identity that accompany adolescence, children of clergy live within a larger, family-like context of the local congregation. The search to “find themselves” can be complicated for pastors’ children who live in what has been described as a “glass house” (Lee & Balswick, 1989). Within this unique social context of a church congregation, the clergy child is faced with even greater challenges with forming their self-identity due to the increased demands and expectations placed on them (Lee, 1992).

Children of clergy live within the unique context of the clergy family. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to determine how the quality of life of children of clergy (as
adolescents and currently as adults) has been influenced by the various stressors they experienced, and the resources they possessed, as well as the ways in which they perceived their experiences. Clergy families, and specifically their children, often do not have anyone to care for them in their time of need because they are so busy caring for others. By giving a voice to a typically unheard audience, clergy children will have their experiences examined and revealed so that they may in turn be supported. Hearing from adult children of clergy as they reflect back on their experiences as adolescents has provided a unique opportunity to understand this population.

Theoretical Perspective

This research project primarily used Family Stress Theory and the classic ABC-X model of family stress as the guiding theoretical perspective (McCubbin & Patterson, 1982, 1983; Hill, 1949). Additionally, concepts from Erikson’s Theory of Psychosocial Development were used to examine identity formation in the adolescent children of clergy and how the quality of their lives was shaped by the unique social environment in which they were raised (Erikson, 1985).

Family Stress Theory

Family Stress Theory and the classic ABC-X model of family stress have been frequently (and appropriately) used in previous research to examine the process of stress management in clergy families (Darling, Hill, & McWey, 2004; Hill, 1949; Lee & Iverson-Gilbert, 2003; McCubbin & Patterson, 1982, 1983; Morris & Blanton, 1994a; Ostrander, Henry, & Fournier, 1994). Family Stress Theory and the ABC-X model were used in the present study to facilitate understanding of stress and quality of life of children of clergy. This provided a useful framework for modeling the interaction of stressors, along with resources and perceptions, which resulted in the end state of the children of clergy as adolescents and currently as adults.

The foundation for Family Stress Theory is Hill’s (1949) ABC-X model of family stress. This model was developed from Hill’s research on how families adjusted to separation and reunion during wartime. In the classic ABC-X model, three integrated variables describe the level of organization in individuals and families that results from their experience of stressors: “A” (the stressor event) interacts with “B” (the family’s resources for dealing with the crisis) and interacts with “C” (the definition of the event by the family), which produces “X” (the crisis or end state) (McCubbin, Olson, & Patterson, 1983). According to Family Stress Theory, the way a family experiences stressors depends on a combination of these factors. The degree to which the outcome is a crisis for a family is determined by the family’s resources for dealing with the crisis.
and the definition that the family attaches to the event. The ABC-X model helps explain how some individuals and families are able to cope with ease during life's hardships, while others give up even when faced with apparent minor life stressors.

Since Hill's (1949) original model of family stress, other scholars have built upon this theory. Burr (1973) expanded the model to show the relationship between the stressor event and the amount of crisis. The Double ABC-X Model was then developed to redefine pre-crisis variables and account for post-crisis variables, including the pile-up of family life changes after a crisis (aA), adaptive resources that result from the crisis (bB), the family’s redefined perception of the event (cC), and the resulting family adaptation (xX) (McCubbin, Olson, & Patterson, 1983; McCubbin & Patterson, 1983). The next formulation of the model included the T-Double ABC-X Model, which expanded the Double ABC-X model to include family types and levels of vulnerability (McCubbin & McCubbin, 1987). The latest expansion of Family Stress Theory is Patterson’s (1988, 1989) Family Adjustment and Adaptation Response Model (FAAR), which expanded the previous theory to include more family system concepts. The FARR model focuses on a family’s efforts “to manage the demands it faces...with its capabilities for meeting demands...mediated by meanings...so as to achieve a balance in family functioning (called adjustment or adaptation)” (Patterson, 1989, p. 99). Patterson (2002) has also used the FARR model to integrate the concept of resilience into stress theory. Within a family context, the concept of resilience explains why some families do well in the face of adversity and risk while others do not.

Even with the adaptations to the original ABC-X model and Family Stress Theory described above, Hill’s basic ABC-X formulation has remained virtually unchanged (Ingoldsby, Smith, & Miller, 2004). Boss (2002) encouraged researchers to continue the use of Hill’s (1949) classic ABC-X model for heuristic purposes, in order to maintain parsimony and applicability. However, Boss suggested an adaptation to the model that is less linear. Therefore, the ABC-X model in its classic state, along with Boss’s adaptation, was used for the present study for hypothesis-testing purposes. The following describes each factor in the classic ABC-X model in detail, followed by an application of this model to this project.

“A” Factor

The initial factor in Hill’s ABC-X model is the “A” factor, which includes the stressor event. A stressor has been defined as, “a life event (e.g., death, purchase of a home, parenthood, etc.)
impacting upon the family unit which produces, or has the potential of producing, change in the family social system” (McCubbin & Patterson, 1983, p. 7). These changes may be in different areas of family life, such as its goals, values, boundaries, or patterns of interaction. Since situations or events are neutral prior to a person’s interpretation, the stressor event itself is neither negative nor positive. Stressors may be classified as either external or internal to the family, predictable or unexpected, ambiguous or clear, volitional or nonvolitional, chronic or acute, and cumulative or isolated (Boss, 2002). Given that Family Stress Theory addresses normative events and life transitions that can be potential sources of family stress, the notion of a pile-up of demands is also included since individuals and families seldom deal with only a single stressful experience (McCubbin & Patterson, 1983).

It is important to note that family stress and family crisis are not the same, and the terms are not to be used interchangeably. Family stress has been defined as “pressure on the family...a disturbance of the family’s steady state...change in the family’s equilibrium” (Boss, 2002, p. 61). As said previously, stress in itself is neutral; it is neither positive nor negative, it is simply change in the family system. Family stress becomes a family crisis when the family’s equilibrium is disturbed to the point that it is overwhelming to the family, or when the change is so severe that the family system is incapacitated, blocked, or immobilized. In essence, family crisis is “a point of acute disequilibrium” (p. 67).

“B” Factor

The “B” factor in the model includes the family’s resources for meeting the demands of hardships and stressor events, which affect the ability of the family to prevent a transition or event from becoming a disruption or crisis in the family (McCubbin & Patterson, 1983). Resources have also been defined in a general sense as “the strengths of individuals, families, or larger systems that are valued or that act as a vehicle for obtaining that which is valued” (Hobfoll & Spielberger, 2003, p. 146). Similarly, Boss (1987) defined family resources as “the sociological, economic, psychological, emotional, and physical assets on which the members can draw in response to a single stressor event or an accumulation of events” (p. 702). Resources can be either internal or external, as well as tangible or intangible, that individuals and families have available for coping with the stressor events. Described another way, resources may include (a) personal resources (i.e., individual characteristics such as knowledge, skills, self-esteem), (b) family system resources (i.e., communication, cohesion, and adaptability), and (c)
social support (i.e., resources outside the individual or family which can be accessed for care and love and provide a sense of belonging) (Lavee, McCubbin, & Patterson, 1985). In general, “the more resources you have available, the better you are able to cope” (Ingoldsby, Smith, & Miller, 2004, p. 140).

McCubbin and McCubbin (1986), in their review of research on resilient families, discussed the importance of family adaptability and social support to the resiliency of a family in the face of hardships. Their prior research with military families experiencing the stressor of an absent military member resulted in the awareness of the importance of maintaining family integrity, developing self-reliance and self-esteem, androgynous gender-role orientation, developing and maintaining social support, and developing family competencies and strengths. They found that family strengths and competencies, along with social support, appear to work as buffers against the stressors associated with being separated from their military family member. The importance of social support during this stressful time was also expressed, when they indicated “families are not isolated from the social context in which they live; survival of the family unit depends upon the quality of this relationship and particularly upon social support” (p. 81). They also described the benefits that families receive from social contacts they develop in direct contact with people, within programs, friendships in the community, and church affiliations.

“C” Factor

This factor refers to the subjective definition the family makes of the event or stressor. This factor reflects the family’s perceptions, meanings, or appraisals of the event or stressor (Boss, 2003). The family’s definition of the stressor reflects their previous experience in dealing with other stressors, as well as their family values (McCubbin & Patterson, 1983). The process of appraisal influences the thoughts and behaviors that are used to cope with stress (Ingoldsby, Smith & Miller, 2004). Thus, those who perceive their situation as manageable are better able to cope than those who see it as insurmountable. Boss (2003) indicated that perceptions are even more predictive than resources in determining how families manage stress and crisis, indicating that “whether or not a change is labeled as loss or as gain is determined by the subject’s perception” (p. 162). The definition of the event is an intervening variable that can transform a stressor event into a crisis (Hill, 1958).
The “C” factor has recently also been likened to the concept of sense of coherence, which comes from the work of Antonovsky (1979) (Boss, 2003; Lavee, McCubbin, & Patterson, 1985). Sense of coherence has been described as the family’s “general orientation to the overall circumstances” (Lavee, McCubbin, & Patterson, 1985, p. 813), as well as “the extent to which one sees one’s world as comprehensible, manageable, and meaningful” (Antonovsky & Sourani, 1988, p. 79). Comprehensibility refers to “the degree to which individuals perceive information about themselves and the social environment as not only understandable, but also as ordered, structured, and consistent” (Gana, 2001, p. 78). Manageability refers to “the degree to which individuals feel that the resources (one’s own or external resources) of which they dispose are sufficient to adequately meet the demands imposed by internal and external stimuli” (p. 78). Finally, meaningfulness refers to “the extent to which subjects feel that certain areas of life are worthy of time and effort, and to their degree of involvement in various life domains” (p. 78).

Sense of coherence serves as a buffer and a mediator between adversity and positive well-being.

“X” Factor

All of these combined factors produce the “X” factor, which is the resulting crisis or level of stress experienced by families. The “X” factor has been described as a continuous variable, depending on the amount of disorganization or disruptiveness in the family system. According to McCubbin and Patterson (1983), “stress may never reach crisis proportions if the family is able to use existing resources and define the situation so as to resist change within the family system” (p. 11). Boss (2002) has adapted Hill’s (1949, 1958) classic ABC-X model to define the “X” factor as the resulting degree of stress or crisis that the family experiences as an outcome of the process of dealing with the stressor event. Once again, it is important to distinguish between stress and crisis. Stress becomes crisis when the family lacks the necessary resources and defines the event as insurmountable, resulting in the family becoming incapacitated.

In the Double ABC-X model, the xX factor referred more to the level of adaptation that resulted following the post-crisis period that was on a continuum from bonadaptation to maladaptation (McCubbin & Patterson, 1983). Maladaptation is defined as “continued imbalance between the pile-up of demands and the family’s capabilities for meeting those demands” (Lavee, McCubbin, & Patterson, 1985, p. 813). Bonadaptation is defined as “a minimal discrepancy between the pile-up of demands and the family’s capabilities, so as to
achieve a balance in the family’s functioning. It is characterized both by maintenance or strengthening of family integrity and by family members’ sense of well-being” (p. 813).

**Psychosocial Development Theory**

Erikson’s (1985) Theory of Psychosocial Development was founded in the tradition of neo-Freudians. This theory focuses on the role of the ego development throughout the life cycle, which occurs throughout eight stages of human development. Within each stage, the individual confronts a crisis that can be resolved either successfully or un成功fully. Rarely are crises resolved totally successful or unsuccessful; rather, a balance is usually struck between the positive and negative. Table 1 describes Erikson’s stages or crises and associated outcomes (Phares, 1992, p. 70).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Successful resolution leads to</th>
<th>Unsuccessful resolution leads to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Trust vs. mistrust</td>
<td>Birth-1</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>Fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Autonomy vs. shame</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Will power</td>
<td>Self-doubt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Initiative vs. guilt</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Unworthiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Industry vs. inferiority</td>
<td>6-11</td>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>Incompetency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Ego identity vs. role confusion</td>
<td>12-20</td>
<td>Fidelity</td>
<td>Uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Intimacy vs. isolation</td>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>Love</td>
<td>Promiscuity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Generativity vs. stagnation</td>
<td>25-65</td>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Selfishness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. Ego integrity vs. despair</td>
<td>65-Death</td>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>Meaninglessness and despair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from this table, adolescents are typically in the stage of ego identity versus role confusion. Erikson describes this stage in the following way: “The growing and developing youths, faced with this physiological revolution within them, and with tangible adult
tasks ahead of them are now primarily concerned with what they appear to be in the eyes of others as compared with what they feel they are” (Erikson, 1985, p. 261). An adolescent who successfully masters this stage will develop a positive ego identity, which leads to a sense of fidelity, described as a faithfulness or devotion to one’s obligations or duties. Unsuccessful resolution of this stage could lead to role confusion, which leads to a sense of uncertainty about one’s identity.

According to Erikson, identity is formed in the adolescent by synthesizing and modifying earlier identifications that require them to organize and ascertain their needs, interests, abilities, and desires in such a way that they can be expressed in the greater social context (Papalia & Olds, 1998). During this stage, the adolescent mind is basically in a state of moratorium, caught between childhood and adulthood. An integration occurs in the ego that involves all the accrued experiences of one’s childhood up to this point, combined with a search for a new sense of continuity and sameness as an adult (Erikson, 1985). This moratorium allows for a search for commitments to which they can be faithful. These commitments may in turn shape their lives for years to come; hence, the outcome of fidelity that accompanies successful resolution of this stage (Papalia & Olds, 1998). The adolescent’s effort to develop a sense of self is part of the overall process of human development that is based on the achievement of earlier stages, all of which lay the groundwork for successful coping with the crises of adulthood.

Application of Theory

In the current study, Family Stress Theory and the ABC-X model were utilized to examine the stressors and quality of life of children of clergy (Boss, 2002; Hill, 1949, 1958). This model was used as a theoretical basis for examining the effects of “A” (stressors that children of clergy experience at both an individual and a family level), interacting with “B” (level of coping and resources, both family and individual), interacting with “C” (definition of the event/sense of coherence) on “X” (quality of life for children of clergy as adolescents and currently as an adult). In order to examine the effect of various stressors on the quality of life of children of clergy, it was important to not only examine the direct effect that these stressors have, but to also examine how these effects are moderated through the intervening variables of their resources for coping, as well as their sense of coherence about their experiences. Therefore, it was necessary to develop a model that allows for testing of direct and indirect effects of each of the factors in the ABC-X model of Family Stress. Figure 1 depicts the path diagram that shows
the hypothetical relationship between the factors that was used to predict quality of life in adult children of clergy based on these intervening variables. This model allowed the examination of the direct, as well as indirect, effects of the intervening variables (A, B, and C) on X (quality of life).

This empirical model was used for hypothesis testing, which enabled the simultaneous testing of relationships among the major variables of the ABC-X model using multiple indicators of theoretical constructs. It provided insight into the stressors that are experienced by children of clergy on both a personal and family level, as well as the resources that the family and the individual utilized to cope with the stressors. Finally, it allowed the examination of how sense of coherence mediates the effects of the stressors on the quality of life of the children of
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*Figure 1. Path Diagram of Hypothetical Model of Factors Predicting Quality of Life for Children of Clergy*
clergy. By assessing quality of life as an adolescent, as well as current quality of life as an adult, this project provided a unique, retrospective picture of the life of children of clergy while they were in the middle of their upbringing, as well as their current quality of life as an adult.

Family Stress Theory is already frequently used to explain the interacting factors that determine how a family experiences a stressful event or pile-up of stressors. The ABC-X model helps explain how some families are able to cope with ease during life's hardships, while others give up even in the face of minor stressors. Applying this model to clergy families, specifically children of clergy, was a natural fit since it can explain how children of clergy experience stress differently based on their resources for coping and their sense of coherence about the situation they are in. For example, some children of clergy come through the process of growing up in this environment with ease. They maintain close family ties, stay true to their faith, and grow up to be productive, responsible adults. Yet others rebel against their church, their family, and ultimately their faith.

Erikson's (1985) Theory of Psychosocial Development also aids in understanding the process of identity formation in adolescent children of clergy, and how this affected their quality of life growing up and currently as adults. As Erikson described, adolescent’s identity formation is affected by the social context in which they live. The clergy child’s search for identity is lived out in the unique context of the church congregation, which is affected by the added expectations and demands placed on them (Lee, 1992). While most adolescents’ search for identity is played out in the privacy of their homes, the clergy child plays out his or her search in a “glass house” where they live with the feeling that every move they make is witnessed and scrutinized by church members (Lee, 1992, p. 31).

Combining Family Stress Theory and Erikson’s Psychosocial Theory provided the opportunity to examine the factors that shape the quality of life of children of clergy as adolescents and as adults, while keeping in mind the stage of human development that adolescents are in and how this stage differs for the pastor’s child. This research project was foundational in building a model for predicting successful children of clergy so that practitioners can help build these strengths in children of clergy.

Statement of the Problem

In the past several decades there have been a number of studies that examined clergy and their families. However, most of the studies focused on the clergy members themselves and
sometimes their spouses. The research conducted on clergy families revealed a variety of stressors related to the children within this family context; yet there have been few, if any, systematic attempts to analyze the influence of this family context on the quality of life for the children of clergy. The purpose of this study was to examine the stressors of children of clergy, and how the resources that they have for meeting the demands of the stressors, along with their subjective definitions of the stressors, impacted their perceived quality of life. Quality of life was assessed for the children of clergy as adolescents (retrospectively) and currently as an adult. In addition, quality of life was compared for male and female children of clergy to assess gender differences in the experiences of growing up in this family context. A comparison sample of adult children of non-clergy was also used to examine if the resulting quality of life for adult children of clergy differs from children who did not grow up in this environment.

Hypotheses and Research Questions

Hypotheses

This project began with one primary null hypothesis ($H_{01}$) as follows: There will be no observed difference between male children of clergy, female children of clergy, male children of non-clergy, and female children of non-clergy in terms of the variables in question. However, during data analysis, examination of modification indices indicated that gender was not a meaningful variable; therefore, it was dropped from analysis. As a result, a second null hypothesis was later added to determine the differences in the variables without controlling for gender, resulting in the following null hypothesis ($H_{02}$): There will be no observed difference between children of clergy and children of non-clergy in terms of the variables in question. The following details each variable in question along with the instrument used to measure the variable:

a. Individual stress as measured by the Stressors of Clergy Children and Couples (SOCC) Scale (Ostrander, Ceglian, & Fournier, 1993).

b. Family stress as measured by the Family Inventory of Life Events and Changes (FILE) (McCubbin & Patterson, 1987).

c. Individual coping as measured by the Adolescent Coping Orientation for Problem Experiences (A-COPE) (Patterson & McCubbin, 1987).

d. Family coping as measured by the Family Crisis Oriented Personal Evaluation Scales (F-COPES) (McCubbin, Olson, & Larsen, 1987).
e. Definition of the event (sense of coherence) as measured by the Sense of Coherence Scale (SOC-13) (Antonovsky, 1987).

f. Quality of life as measured by the Satisfaction With Life Scale (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985). This scale will be given to the participants twice: 1) to determine quality of life as an adolescent (retrospectively), and 2) to determine quality of life currently as an adult.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study, which are based on the null hypothesis without gender (H02):

R1—When controlling for perceptions of clergy children versus non-clergy children, are individual and family stress (A) related to perceived retrospective quality of life (X) as adolescents (T) as mediated by individual and family coping (B) and definitions of the event/sense of coherence (C)? (A + B + C → X)

R2—When controlling for perceptions of clergy children versus non-clergy children, are individual and family stress (A) related to perceived current quality of life (X) as adults (A) as mediated by individual and family coping (B) and definitions of the event/sense of coherence (C)? (A + B + C → X)

R3—When controlling for perceptions of clergy children versus non-clergy children, are individual and family stress (A) related to perceived quality of life (X) retrospectively as adolescents (T) and currently as adults (A) when modeled together as mediated by individual and family coping (B) and definitions of the event/sense of coherence (C)? (A + B + C → X)

In general, when controlling for perceptions of clergy children versus non-clergy children, could a model that includes the level of stress, level of coping resources, and definition of the events (sense of coherence) be used to predict perceived quality of life retrospectively as adolescents and currently as adults? How comparable are these models across these groups?

Definitions

The following definitions are provided to clarify the terminology used in this project:

Clergy—Persons who are employed in religious service, as determined by their association with the clergy resource center that provided the sample for this study.
Stressor—A life event impacting upon the family unit which produces, or has the potential of producing, change in the family social system (McCubbin & Patterson, 1983) (“A” in the ABC-X model).

Family Stress—Pressure or tension in the family system—a disturbance in the steady state of the family (Boss, 2002).

Resources—The strengths of individuals, families, or larger systems that are valued or that act as a vehicle for obtaining that which is valued (Hobfoll & Spielberger, 2003) (“B” in the ABC-X model).

Definition of the event—The subjective definition the family makes of the event or stressor. This factor reflects the family’s perceptions, meanings, or appraisals of the event or stressor (Boss, 2003) (“C” in the ABC-X model).

Level of adaptation—The end state after having gone through a stressful event, which falls between bonadaptation, or a positive result of the stressful event, and maladaptation, an unhealthy result (Ingoldsby, Smith, & Miller, 2004) (“X” in the ABC-X model).

Quality of life—An individual’s overall evaluation of their life satisfaction (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985) (serving as “X” in the current study’s ABC-X model).

Assumptions

There were several primary assumptions underlying this project:

1. Respondents will have the ability to respond to the survey in an accurate manner to the best of their abilities.
2. Adult respondents can accurately recall their perceptions as adolescents.
3. Participants will freely and openly self-disclose.
4. The sample will be reflective of adult children of Protestant clergy and non-clergy in this geographic area.

Limitations

The accuracy of this study was limited by a number of factors:

1. Participation by the clergy and adult children of clergy and non-clergy will be totally voluntary.
2. Participants may be reluctant to disclose personal and private information.
3. The results may not be generalized to all children of clergy due to the low sample size coming from the difficulty with accessing this population.
4. The results may also not be generalized to all children of clergy in the U.S. due to the fact that the clergy sample came from 45 states in the U.S. and the comparison sample was only from two churches (Southern Baptist and United Methodist) in the same southeastern U.S. city (Tallahassee, FL).

5. Responses are based on participants' recollections of their perceptions of their experiences as adolescents, which may have changed over time due to limitations with recalling experiences as a person ages.

**Delimitations**

The present study was delimited by the following:

1. The sample was limited geographically to those adult children of clergy whose parents currently reside in the United States (45 different states).

2. The sample included only Protestant Christian denominations that are currently involved with the clergy support center from which the sample was drawn.

3. The comparison sample included only two Protestant denominations (Southern Baptist and United Methodist) from churches in Tallahassee, FL, a mid-size city in the southeastern United States. One should use caution when generalizing results from this study to other geographic locations.

4. The sample included only adult children over the age of 18 who reported retrospectively about their experiences while growing up.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter presents a review of the literature related to factors affecting the quality of life of children of clergy. It will begin with an overview of the current research project, followed by a discussion on the selection of studies chosen for this literature review. Next it will include a detailed review of the state of the research on the topic of clergy families in general, as well as issues specifically related to children of clergy. An overview of the literature on individual and family stress will then be provided, including literature on how resources and perception affect stress. The final section of this literature review will include research related to quality of life and its influencing variables.

Overview of the Study

The focus of the current research project was to examine the stress and quality of life of children of clergy, including the effects of individual and family coping, as well as sense of coherence. Family Stress Theory and an adaptation of the classic ABC-X model of family stress were used as the theoretical basis for this study (Hill, 1949; McCubbin & Patterson, 1982, 1983). The variables of this project evolve from this model and include the personal and family-related stressors associated with being a child of a clergy person (A factors), as well as personal and family coping skills (B factors) and the sense of coherence or definitions of the events (C factors) that affect their quality of life (X factor). This model facilitated an understanding of factors influencing the quality of life experienced by children of clergy that results from this unique family context.

Selection of Studies for Review

While many researchers have studied clergy families, only a few have focused specifically children of clergy, even though a recurring theme found in research on clergy families has to do with the effects of the ministry on children (e.g. Hill, Darling, & Raimondi, 2003; Mickey & Ashmore, 1991). Upon searching the existing literature, it was discovered that only two empirical articles have been published in the last decade specifically related to children of clergy (Anderson, 1998; Strange & Sheppard, 2001). One must go back to 1982 to find even baseline research on children of clergy (Stevenson, 1982). Therefore, this review of literature begins with the seminal work by Stevenson (1982) through today in terms of articles specifically
related to children of clergy. Research in the area of clergy families has been fairly active over the last few decades; therefore, articles published in the last 20 years on clergy families were included in this literature review if they discussed issues that specifically related to or affected children. Although the topic of children of clergy is still relatively unexplored, the articles that have been published to date have provided a good starting point for exploring the experiences of children of clergy, and how these affect their quality of life.

Family Stress

Within a family context, a stressor has been defined as, “a life event (e.g., death, purchase of a home, parenthood, etc.) impacting upon the family unit which produces, or has the potential of producing, change in the family social system” (McCubbin & Patterson, 1983, p. 7). These changes may be in different areas of family life, such as its goals, values, boundaries, or patterns of interaction. Since situations or events are neutral prior to a person’s interpretation, the stressor event itself is neither negative nor positive. Stressors may be classified as either external or internal to the family, predictable or unexpected, ambiguous or clear, volitional or nonvolitional, chronic or acute, and cumulative or isolated (Boss, 2002).

Families rarely experience a single demand, but instead tend to deal with a set of demands from individual members of their families, the entire family unit, and the community in which they live. As a result, families contend with two types of demands—stressors and strains. Stressors are “events that occur at a relatively distinct point in time and call for change” (McCubbin, 1998, p. 73). Strains are the “unresolved hardships of prior stressors or the inherent tensions of an ongoing role” (p. 73). Family Stress Theory addresses normative events and life transitions that can be potential sources of family stress, and includes this notion of a pile-up of demands since individuals and families seldom deal with only a single stressful experience (McCubbin & Patterson, 1983).

Family stress has been defined as “pressure on the family...a disturbance of the family’s steady state...change in the family’s equilibrium” (Boss, 2002, p. 61). It is important to note that family stress and family crisis are not the same, and the terms are not to be used interchangeably. Stress in itself is neutral; it is neither positive nor negative, it is simply change in the family system. Family stress becomes a family crisis when the family’s equilibrium is disturbed to the point that it is overwhelming to the family, or when the change is so severe that the family
system is incapacitated, blocked, or immobilized. In essence, family crisis is "a point of acute disequilibrium" (p. 67).

**Clergy Family Stress**

A number of studies of clergy families have been conducted over the past few decades in an effort to understand the unique context in which they live. Lee (1988) provided a useful theoretical framework for understanding clergy families. It was noted that although a literature review on the topic of clergy families turned up little substantive material, "the circumscription of the discussion regarding the minister's own family is legitimate" (p. 250). An ecological systems approach was presented that could be used to examine the unique social context of clergy families, borrowing concepts from General Systems Theory and Bronfenbrenner's Human Ecology Theory. This marked the beginning of an era of researchers who agreed that the topic of clergy families was worthy of investigation. Although limited research on clergy families had been conducted prior to Lee's (1988) article, he gave researchers a new theoretical framework for viewing the clergy family that sparked renewed interest in the topic.

Since then, a number of articles were published that identified stressors that were unique to the clergy family. One synthesis of the information available at the time on clergy families (including empirical as well as anecdotal and informal research) focused on the specific stresses that clergy families experience (Blanton, 1992). This review revealed that clergy families deal with external stressors related to expectations, family boundaries, compensation, social support, and mobility. Internal stressors experienced by clergy families included marital communication, role redefinitions, self-esteem, identity, and parent-child relationships. Based on this overview of stressors that clergy families experience, it was concluded that,

They deal with many of the same issues faced by other types of families. However, there appear to be some unique aspects of clergy family life that affect the ways in which these issues are experienced. Research is sorely needed with representative and multidenomination samples of clergy families to more clearly understand the context of clergy families (Blanton, 1992, p. 326).

**Stressors of Clergy Children**

An examination of the literature on this topic revealed a number of major themes related to specific stressors that children of clergy face. The following presents a summary of these
major themes that emerged from the present examination of the literature performed for this study.

*Congregational Expectations*

Perhaps the greatest theme that emerged from the literature dealt with the role expectations that are placed on the children of clergy by their congregations (Lee & Balswick, 1989). Children of clergy faced this particular problem of the burden of expectations from both the congregation and peers. When asked to rank the stressors in the minister’s family, the children ranked their number one stressor as “unrealistically high expectations for them” (p. 196).

The religious commitment of the adult child of a minister is also affected by their experience of growing up in a minister’s home and the expectations placed on them (Anderson, 1998). When asked what area the minister’s child liked least, the number one answer was “the extra expectations.” “Expectations” was positively correlated with all measures of religious commitment, and this variable was one of the best predictors of actual and felt rebellion, intrinsic motivation, and religious experience. A similar study found that clergy children reported their lives were stressful and this stress was due in large part to the perception that people were watching their actions closely and had high expectations of them (Strange & Sheppard, 2001).

Expectations for children of clergy originated more from the congregation than the children’s own families (Stevenson, 1982). Approximately 50% of their participants perceived their families did not have different rules than their friend’s families, yet 64% perceived they were treated differently by others because their parents were ministers, and 73% believed they received more attention for their actions because they were a minister’s child.

Expectations of a congregation have also been noted to affect the clergy themselves. The demand, support, and perception in family-related stress among protestant clergy was previously examined, indicating the more the congregation required of the minister, the lower his life satisfaction and well-being, and the greater risk of burnout (Lee & Iverson-Gilbert, 2003). Although that study was performed specifically on the clergy and not their children, certainly the burdens placed on the clergy has a systemic affect on their children, since a pastor’s overall well-being and life satisfaction would be experienced in the home life.

These findings were echoed in a book designed to help pastors’ kids through their identity crisis, where it was noted that minister’s children struggle with congregational
expectations (Lee, 1992). A poignant quote in this book illustrates clergy children’s struggle with expectations, when one minister’s daughter said, “How can the kids realize that they don’t have to live up to everybody else’s expectations, that they can be normal children” (Lee, 1992, p. 103)? It was suggested that clergy children need to be treated like any other member of the congregation, and should receive the same support and guidance. Clergy children should be respected as individuals and not be expected to function as surrogate pastors or ideal role models, since “they are, after all, normal people like everyone else” (p. 103).

**Boundaries**

Boundary problems was as another major theme that minister’s families, and particularly minister’s children, face (Lee & Balswick, 1989). Minister’s children reported that it was difficult for their families to maintain boundaries between professional and family life, and they often felt the intrusions of their parent’s work. They also reported often being caught in triangles involving the larger congregational family, as well as their own family. A number of boundary problems occurred in clergy families, and these influenced the clergy children’s search for identity (Lee, 1992). The following summarizes each of the boundary violations noted:

1. Expecting too much of the clergy family’s time and energy by congregations.
2. Neglecting to maintain clear boundaries with their congregations by clergy.
3. Letting the demands of the pastor’s professional role and image contaminate the parent-child relationship.
4. Idolizing the clergy family.
5. Making clergy responsible for their children’s actions, and clergy children responsible for their parents’ actions.
6. Pulling clergy children into conflicts that have nothing to do with them.

Six key boundary-related themes were also found to affect the stress of clergy families: time, mobility, congregational fit, space, isolation, and intrusions (Hill, Darling, & Raimondi, 2003). A model was developed that included the six boundary-related stressors and their external influence on the core family relationships, noting a buffer zone of coping strategies that is situated between the core family unit and the external boundary stressors. It was concluded that boundary-related stress was the source (either directly or indirectly) of most of the stress clergy families experienced.
Family boundary intrusions have been found to be a significant predictor for husbands' marital and parental satisfaction (Morris & Blanton, 1994a). Likewise, when examining predictors of family functioning among clergy and spouses, family boundary intrusiveness influenced family functioning for both husbands and wives (Morris & Blanton, 1998).

**Lack of Privacy**

A related theme to the issue of boundaries had to do with children of clergy’s perceived lack of privacy. Lack of privacy was found to be a theme for the clergy and their children in a number of studies (Anderson, 1998; Lee, 1992; Lee & Balswick, 1989; Mickey & Ashmore, 1991; Mickey, Wilson, & Ashmore, 1991). When denominational variations on the role of the clergy family were examined, comparing differences in perceptions between liberal and conservative churches, privacy was more of a problem for liberal clergy (who tended to be “profession-oriented”) than it was for conservative clergy (who tended to be “call-oriented”) (Mickey, Wilson, & Ashmore, 1991, p. 288). The conservative, call-oriented clergy experienced lower levels of theological stress and confusion because they perceived a clear calling from God into ministry that included certain expectations for the roles of their spouse and children in the local church’s life. Consequently, they perceived rewards from ministry itself that outweighed their personal family lives. Conversely, the liberal, professional-oriented group tended to be more management-focused and, therefore, experienced conflict over the financial and social limitations that the ministry placed on its family.

The experience of living in a clergy home has been ascribed to living in a “glass house” (Lee & Balswick, 1989). Members of the clergy family household “share the vague discomfort of feeling as if the walls are transparent, that there is no firm sense of boundary between inside and outside” (p. 74). They reported that a consistent theme in the literature on clergy families is this sense of intrusion that results from unclear boundaries between the congregation and the clergy family. Privacy is a definite concern to the minister’s child, noting that they often believed that the “clergy’s family life is everyone’s business” (Lee, 1992, p. 33).

**Parsonage Living**

Perhaps one of the reasons that lead to this lack of privacy centers on parsonage living. Many challenges result from the clergy family residing in a home that is owned by the church and physically located near or adjacent to the church. The stress of living in the church parsonage was “one of the most prevalent themes in the literature relating to ministers’ families”
Parsonage living includes two types of intrusion: physical and psychological. From a physical standpoint, church members believe they have the right to enter the parsonage whenever they please. Psychological intrusions were related to the feeling that the family members were constantly monitored by the congregation. Parsonage living creates boundary-related stress that comes from intrusions of church members and a general lack of privacy (Hill, Darling, & Raimondi, 2003). Clergy desired their homes to be a place where they could escape from the stresses of ministry, yet their parishioners did not appear to agree, with some parishioners showing up on the clergy’s doorsteps at any time, and some even feeling like they could decorate the parsonage.

**Mobility**

Clergy families are often called upon to move much more frequently than the average family. One researcher found that the mode and median number of moves for adult children while growing up in a minister’s home was five, with the mean number of moves being eight (Anderson, 1998). When asked which area they least liked about being a clergy child, the second least liked area was moving. The adult children in this study reported that their teenage years were the most difficult, with top reasons being due to moving, changing schools, and having to leave friends. In an earlier examination of children of the parsonage, the mode number of moves was three, followed by two and four moves (Stevenson, 1982). There were differences in this study in how the children viewed the trauma of the moves, yet all experienced a sense of loss from the moves. Minister’s children are set apart from their peers due to their frequent moving, which makes it difficult for them to establish stable peer networks that could be relied on for emotional support (Lee, 1992). Other studies have found that clergy had difficulty in making friends due to increased mobility (Hill, Darling, & Raimondi, 2003). Other issues related to mobility were pressures related to changing school systems and the effects of mobility on family functioning (Mickey & Ashmore, 1991; Morris & Blanton, 1998).

**Family-Related Issues**

Relationship challenges between the children of clergy and their parents, as well as problems surrounding family time, have resulted from this unique family context. For example, work-related stressors were inversely related to parental, marital, and life satisfaction for clergy and their spouses (Morris & Blanton, 1994a). The levels of family adaptability and cohesion have also been examined in ministers’ children and families (Moy & Malony, 1987).
Differences were found in the way that parents and children perceived their relationships, with the children perceiving the family to be more separated and flexible, whereas parents perceived the family to be more connected and flexible. Both parents and children desired their families to be more emotionally cohesive.

When examining the relationship between the religious commitment of the adult child of a minister and the different experiences of growing up in a minister’s home, intimacy with mother and father was positively correlated with all measures of religious commitment (Anderson, 1998). Intimacy with mother and father was also one of the best predictors of actual and felt rebellion, intrinsic motivation, and religious experience in the adult child. Qualitative results from that study revealed that the clergy children believed the biggest influence on their religious choices was their parents.

Many of the problems with parent-child relationships are related to boundary issues and family time (Lee, 1992). With the relentless demands of ministry, pastors’ children often felt neglected. Having too much to do and too little time to accomplish it all was another concern, and one can see how this would affect the relationship between the parents and children in this family context (Hill, Darling, & Raimondi, 2003). Other family-related issues included struggles with their spouses and children in the context of their ministry, negotiating the spouse’s role in the church, and being separated from extended family.

Not having enough time with the family was a problem for a majority of the liberal and conservative clergy, as congregational needs often take priority over family time (Mickey, Wilson, & Ashmore, 1991). Consequently, pastors often experienced an overwhelming sense of guilt about the effects their work had on their children, and believed they had insufficient time to spend with the family (Mickey & Ashmore, 1991). The most frequent complaint concerned children who had become alienated from church.

**Stereotypes/Rebellion**

Many children of clergy experience stereotypes about what a clergy child is like. Children of clergy are often stereotyped as either “little rebels or little saints” (Lee, 1992, p. 71). They are often treated differently as soon as they are identified as ministers’ children, feeling as if others put them in “mental boxes” of either the perfect saint or the defiant rebel (p. 72). Children of clergy often feel the pressures to be perfect, and this expectation is felt more intensely by the clergy than the non-clergy child since the clergy child is often idealized by their
congregations (Lee & Balswick, 1989). Even though it was hypothesized that clergy children are negatively stereotyped, results from one study indicated that overall, a positive stereotype of clergy children exists, even when the children supposedly have bad behavior (Strange & Sheppard, 2001).

Perhaps any negative stereotype that may exist is rooted in some truth, as many clergy children have earned the stereotype of the rebelling minister’s child. When clergy and their spouses were surveyed, one area of stress for the family was rebellious children (Mickey & Ashmore, 1991). Anderson (1998), who examined the experience of growing up in a minister’s home, found that approximately half of his participants had rebelled against the church at some period of time while growing up, with over two-thirds reporting having felt rebellious against the church.

Financial Issues

In the literature on clergy and their spouses, an often-recurring theme has to do with the financial burdens associated with being clergy (e.g., Darling, Hill, & McWey, 2004; Lee & Balswick, 1989; Mickey, Wilson, & Ashmore, 1991; Morris & Blanton, 1998; Ostrander, Henry, & Fournier, 1994). However, literature that specifically dealt with minister’s children did not demonstrate finances as a salient theme mentioned by the children. Although the children in the family system would certainly be affected by the financial status of the family, it is interesting that this was not a major concern to clergy children.

Coping Resources

Resources have been defined in a general sense as “the strengths of individuals, families, or larger systems that are valued or that act as a vehicle for obtaining that which is valued” (Hobfoll & Spielberger, 2003, p. 146). Resources can be either internal or external, as well as tangible or intangible, that individuals and families have available for coping with stressor events. Resources include the abilities, characteristics, or traits of the community, family system, or individual family members that can be used to meet the pile-up of demands, and may include personal resources, family system resources, and community resources. Personal resources refer to the characteristics of individual family members that may be called upon in times of crisis, including education, health, and knowledge. Family system resources refer to the family’s ability to shelter itself from the impact of stressors and to adapt during crises, including income, family mutual support, family cohesion and adaptability, and understanding.
Community resources refer to the abilities of sources outside the family that the family can call upon when dealing with demands, including social support (Lavee, McCubbin, & Patterson, 1985, McCubbin, 1998). In general, “the more resources you have available, the better you are able to cope” (Ingoldsby, Smith, & Miller, 2004, p. 140).

Family resources have been defined as “the sociological, economic, psychological, emotional, and physical assets on which the members can draw in response to a single stressor event or an accumulation of events” (Boss, 1987, p. 702). Family stress research has demonstrated the importance of resources in a family’s ability to cope with a stressful situation (Hobfoll & Spielberger, 2003). A family’s resources affect the ability of the family to prevent a transition or event from becoming a disruption or crisis in the family (McCubbin & Patterson, 1983). The ability to cope well with stress is one of the most valuable resources a family possesses. Within a family context, coping is an affective, cognitive, and behavioral process wherein family systems and the individuals within them manage stressful situations and events, rather than eradicate them (Boss, 2002).

Research on resilient families reveals the importance of family adaptability and social support to the resiliency of a family in the face of hardships (McCubbin & McCubbin, 1986). Prior research with military families experiencing the stressor of an absent military member resulted in the awareness of the importance of maintaining family integrity, developing self-reliance and self-esteem, androgynous gender-role orientation, developing and maintaining social support, and developing family competencies and strengths. Family strengths and competencies, along with social support, appeared to work as buffers against the stressors associated with being separated from their military family member. “Families are not isolated from the social context in which they live; survival of the family unit depends upon the quality of this relationship and particularly upon social support” (p. 81). Families also received benefits from social contacts they develop in direct contact with people, within programs, friendships in the community, and church affiliations.

Olson’s Circumplex Model of Marital and Family Systems describes how certain types of family systems are better equipped to cope with crises (Olson, 2000). The Circumplex Model includes three main dimensions: family cohesion, flexibility, and communication. *Family cohesion* is defined as “the emotional bonding that family members have toward one another” (p. 145). This construct includes how family systems balance togetherness versus separateness of
their members. Four potential levels of cohesion exist, ranging from disengaged, to separated, to connected, to enmeshed. Families who are at the central or balanced levels of cohesion (separated and connected) function better than those who are disengaged or enmeshed. *Family flexibility* refers to the “amount of change in its leadership, role relationships and relationship rules” (p. 145). This construct describes how systems balance stability versus change, and ranges from rigid, to structured, to flexible, to chaotic. Families at the central or balanced levels of flexibility (structured and flexible) function better than those at the rigid or chaotic extremes. *Communication* is considered a facilitating dimension in the Circumplex Model, as it facilitates movement on the other two dimensions of cohesion and flexibility.

In general, the Circumplex Model describes how balanced families are better equipped to cope with stress and crisis because they possess the skills and resources needed to shift their system in response to demands on the family system (Olson, 2000). In contrast, unbalanced families will have more difficulty adapting to stress and crisis because they typically do not have the resources needed to change.

**Definition of the Event/Perception**

In order to understand the process of family stress management, perception and meanings that families attach to the situations must be considered (Boss, 2002). Understanding a family’s perception of an event can explain why some families can manage a stressful situation well, while other families end up in a crisis state over a similar situation. A family’s appraisal of a situation can vary greatly, from viewing circumstances negatively as unmanageable or hopeless, to viewing a situation as a challenge and an opportunity for growth (McCubbin, 1998). Family perception has been the most important part of the stress equation, especially when dealing with a situation that cannot be fixed (Boss, 2002). However, it is the most difficult to assess, because it is perceptual.

The family’s definition of the stressor reflects its previous experience in dealing with other stressors, as well as the family’s values (McCubbin & Patterson, 1983). The process of appraisal influences the thoughts and behaviors that are used to cope with stress (Ingoldsby, Smith & Miller, 2004). Thus, those who perceive their situation as manageable are better able to cope than those who see it as insurmountable. Perceptions are even more predictive than resources in determining how families manage stress and crisis; “whether or not a change is labeled as loss or as gain is determined by the subject’s perception” (Boss, 2003 p. 162). The
definition of the event is an intervening variable that can transform a stressor event into a crisis (Hill, 1958).

Another factor that affects how individuals or families perceive stress is sense of coherence, which comes from the work of Antonovsky (1979, 1987). Sense of coherence has been defined as:

A global orientation that expresses the extent to which one has a pervasive, enduring though dynamic feeling of confidence that (1) the stimuli deriving from one’s internal and external environments in the course of living are structured, predictable, and explicable; (2) the resources are available to one to meet the demands posed by these stimuli; and (3) these demands are challenges, worthy of investment and engagement (Antonovsky, 1987, p. 19).

Sense of coherence is the family’s “general orientation to the overall circumstances” (Lavee, McCubbin, & Patterson, 1985, p. 813), as well as “the extent to which one sees one’s world as comprehensible, manageable, and meaningful” (Antonovsky & Sourani, 1988, p. 79). Comprehensibility is “the degree to which individuals perceive information about themselves and the social environment as not only understandable, but also as ordered, structured, and consistent” (Gana, 2001, p. 78). Manageability is “the degree to which individuals feel that the resources (one’s own or external resources) of which they dispose are sufficient to adequately meet the demands imposed by internal and external stimuli” (Gana, 2001, p. 78). Finally, meaningfulness refers to “the extent to which subjects feel that certain areas of life are worthy of time and effort and to their degree of involvement in various life domains” (Gana, 2001, p. 78).

Through this sense of coherence and the appraisal process, families are able to reduce the intensity of emotional burdens resulting from stressors and strains, clarify stressors so they can view them as more manageable, and encourage the family system to fulfill its duty of promoting the emotional and social development of individual members (McCubbin, Thompson, Thompson, Elver, & McCubbin, 1994).

Sense of coherence serves as a buffer and a mediator between adversity and positive well-being. For example, using structural equation modeling, psychological well-being was not directly affected by stressful experiences and adversity, but rather indirectly through the sense of coherence (Gana, 2001). Likewise, when examining critical resiliency factors of African-American enlisted families, the military member’s sense of coherence about the family’s fit into
the Army lifestyle was found to be the most important variable in explaining the variance in adaptation (McCubbin, 1998). This “fit” into the community was also affected by community resources for managing stress.

Quality of Life

In general, the literature on quality of life and its related terms has focused on the positive ways in which people experience their lives. *Quality of life* has been described in a number of different ways, and has a variety of related terms. One related term is *subjective well-being*, which has been defined by a number of differing criteria. The first criterion defines well-being in terms of external criteria such as holiness or virtue, or by possessing some desirable quality (Coan, 1977). The second way in which well-being has been defined is labeled *life satisfaction*, which describes the individual’s subjective cognitive appraisal. Life satisfaction has also been defined as “a global assessment of a person’s quality of life according to his own chosen criteria” (Shin & Johnson, 1978, p. 478). Thirdly, well-being has been defined in terms of *affective balance*, which refers to the extent to which an individual’s positive affect outweighs the negative affect (Bradburn, 1969). All of these criteria for defining well-being include the idea that it is subjective, includes positive measures, and includes a global assessment of the person’s entire life (Diener, 1984).

Another related term is *psychological well-being*, developed by Ryff (1989) as an alternative method of measuring well-being. Ryff constructed a measure of well-being around six subscales: Autonomy, Environmental Mastery, Positive Relations With Others, Purpose in Life, Personal Growth, and Self-Acceptance. *Autonomy* includes such attributes as internal locus of control, independence, and self-determination. *Environmental Mastery* refers to the ability to “choose or create environments suitable for his or her psychic conditions” (p. 1071). *Positive Relations With Others* was defined as strong feelings of affection and empathy with others that includes trusting, warm interpersonal relations. *Purpose in Life* includes having a clear understanding of life’s purposes, intentionality, and sense of directedness. *Personal Growth* includes the ability to grow and expand as a person and to develop one’s potential. Finally, *Self-Acceptance* refers to “holding positive attitudes towards oneself” (p. 1071).

The concept of quality of life may also be likened to the resulting “X” factor in Hill’s (1949) ABC-X model of family stress. This “X” factor has been described as a continuous variable, depending on the amount of disorganization or disruptiveness in the family system. The
family's end result after going through a stressful event is affected by its ability to use existing resources and its definition of the situation (McCubbin & Patterson, 1983). The family's quality of life as an end result to a stressful event has also been referred to as level of adaptation, which is on a continuum from bonadaptation to maladaptation (McCubbin & Patterson, 1983).

Maladaptation is defined as “continued imbalance between the pile-up of demands and the family’s capabilities for meeting those demands” (Lavee, McCubbin, & Patterson, 1985, p. 813). Bonadaptation is defined as “a minimal discrepancy between the pile-up of demands and the family’s capabilities, so as to achieve a balance in the family’s functioning. It is characterized both by maintenance or strengthening of family integrity and by family members’ sense of well-being” (p. 813).

Whatever you call it, the related concepts of quality of life, subjective well-being, satisfaction with life, or psychological well-being are frequently used as outcome measures in research and as goals for therapy, yet these concepts themselves have seldom been researched or critiqued. In fact, it has been argued that these concepts hold within them cultural and historical biases based on Euro-American contexts that make it difficult to assess in non-Western cultures (Christopher, 1999). Christopher argued that these concepts are also based on “individualistic moral visions of the good or ideal person” (p. 142) and may not be relevant to persons who are not of Euro-American culture.

**Quality of Life Among Children of Clergy**

Although most of the literature on clergy families focused on the stressors of this particular family context, several studies focused on the quality of life as perceived by the children of clergy. For example, after researching children of the parsonage, Stevenson (1982) concluded, “my impression of these young people is that they feel they are managing their lives quite well. While a significant portion of them are distressed with one or more problem areas, the majority are coping to their satisfaction with parsonage life” (p. 185). The majority of participants agreed that overall, they like being a minister’s child, and they were often pleased that their parent was a minister.

Despite the stressors that they experience, many children of clergy and their families generally report a positive quality of life (Anderson, 1998; Darling, Hill, & McWey, 2004; Strange & Sheppard, 2001). What appeared to affect their quality of life were not so much the stressors they experience, but the coping skills they possessed, their perception of the stressors,
and the social supports they received. Clergy families use a variety of coping methods to deal with their stressors, including seeking spiritual support, reframing, passive appraisal, mobilizing the family to seek help, and seeking social support (Darling, Hill & McWey, 2004). Using path analysis, it was found that the greatest total effect on clergy’s quality of life was spiritual resources, followed by a sense of coherence and physiological stress. For clergy spouses, spiritual resources also had the greatest total effect on quality of life, followed by physiological stress and sense of coherence. When dealing with boundary-related stress, clergy families use a number of coping strategies, including compatibility with congregation, time management, seeking community support, and having a positive perspective of ministry (Hill, Darling, & Raimondi, 2003).

The demandingness of the congregation greatly affected the pastor’s well-being and life satisfaction, often resulting in higher burnout (Lee & Iverson-Gilbert, 2003). Social support also was a significant predictor of life satisfaction for clergy (Morris & Blanton, 1994a). Despite the importance of social support on the clergy family quality of life, only a minority of denominations are actually providing support services to help clergy families manage their stress (Morris & Blanton, 1994b, 1995).

There is also an apparent paradox to the existence of children in clergy families and the effect they have on the quality of life of clergy and clergy spouses (Darling, McWey, & Hill, 2006). Clergy families with children present in the home experienced more stress than clergy families without children in the home. Yet when quality of life was compared between clergy families with and without children in the home, the quality of life was found to be similar. The paradox resulted from the finding that although clergy families with children in the home experienced more conflict and complexity, they also experienced more meaning and rewards.

Lastly, gender has been shown to affect the experience of growing up as a clergy child and the resulting stress and quality of life. Social norms that result in double standards in how parents treat sons and daughters have resulted in differences in the clergy child’s experience, even for siblings in the same family and congregation. For example, female children of clergy were found to experience more public concern for their social life, and also perceived that their parents were more restrictive with them than their brothers. However, the double standard worked the other way as well, with male clergy children perceiving criticism from their peers for behavior that was not considered “masculine,” such as overt religious devotion (Lee, 1992).
Summary of Literature Review

The focus of the current study was to examine the stress and quality of life of children of clergy, including the effects of individual and family coping, as well as sense of coherence. A review of literature related to factors affecting the quality of life of children of clergy was conducted. This included a detailed review of research on the topic of clergy families and children, as well as an overview of the literature on individual and family stress and how resources and perception affect stress. Finally, the literature review included research related to quality of life and its influencing variables.

The review of literature revealed that while many researchers have studied clergy families, only a few have focused specifically on children’s factors. However, research on clergy families has demonstrated that children of clergy experienced specific stressors as a result of living in this unique family context. These included congregational expectations, boundaries, lack of privacy, parsonage living, mobility, family-related issues, stereotypes/rebellion, and finances. Quality of life for clergy families and children was affected by the coping skills possessed and perceptions of the stressors. It was clear from the review of literature that additional research is needed to examine the stress and quality of life of children of clergy. This study attempted to fill that gap.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Family Stress Theory and the ABC-X Model were used as the empirical model for assessing quality of life among children of clergy. Specifically, the effect of individual and family stress, individual and family coping resources, and definition of the event (sense of coherence) on quality of life for children of clergy as adolescents (retrospectively) and currently as adults were examined. Quality of life for male and female children of clergy was compared, as well as quality of life for children of clergy versus children of non-clergy. In general, the study was quantitative in nature and consisted of a survey design, with some open-ended questions that provided qualitative results for illustrative purposes. The following discussion describes the sample, instrumentation, data collection and data analyses methodology that were employed for this study.

Sample

A random sample of adult children of clergy in the United States was incorporated. The population consisted of adult children (18 or older) of Protestant clergy who had a parent who was a clergy member while they were growing up. Adult children of clergy were selected to participate since they were able to best reflect back on their childhood and report the stressors they experienced. Protestant clergy families were only studied since children of other religions (e.g. Jewish, Muslim, Mormon) may have their own set of unique stressors that would best be examined separately.

The sampling frame was based on a mailing list from a clergy support center that provides various information and resources to Protestant clergy and their families who live in the United States. Forty-five different states were represented in the sampling frame. The sample was selected from the sampling frame of all Protestant clergy in the support center’s database, which included 10 different denominations, including Anglican, Baptist, Christian, Church of God, Church of Christ, Church of Nazarene, Holiness, Lutheran, Presbyterian, and United Methodist. It was important to determine a sufficient sample size needed in order to have adequate statistical power for this study. According to guidelines for selecting sample size, it was determined that a minimum sample size of 218 respondents would be sufficient (Tabachnick &
Fidell, 2001). According to these guidelines, the following formula may be used to determine required sample size: 

\[ N \geq 50 + 8m \]  

(where \( m \) is the number of IVs) for testing multiple correlation and 

\[ N \geq 104 + m \]  

for testing individual predictors. The current study included five independent variables (individual stress, family stress, individual coping, family coping, and sense of coherence). Therefore, 

\[ 50 + (8)(5) = 90 \]  

cases were needed to test regression and 

\[ 104 + 5 = 109 \]  

cases were needed for testing individual predictors. When both multiple correlation and individual predictors are being tested, it is recommended that \( N \) be calculated both ways and then choosing the larger number of cases. Therefore, a total of 109 cases for each predictor was determined to be adequate. Since predictions for males and females were included, a total of 218 (109 X 2) cases was required.

As will be explained below under the Data Collection section, an electronic survey was utilized for this study. Electronic surveys have a reported average response rate ranging from 28.5 percent (with a single contact) to 57 percent (for three or more contacts) (Schaefer & Dillman, 1998). Even though this study was to include multiple contacts, a conservative estimate of a 30% response rate was anticipated. Therefore, in order to ensure that at least 30% of all questionnaires were returned for analysis (to obtain the desired 218 responses), a minimum of 727 survey invitations needed to be sent to the respondents.

Since it would be difficult to obtain addresses of the adult children themselves, the clergy members were first contacted by regular mail (e-mail addresses were not available), requesting that they forward the letter to their adult child, which included an invitation to participate in the study and a link to the online survey. Since it was anticipated that approximately 30% of clergy members would respond and actually forward the letter to their adult children, the plan was to send a total of 2,423 letters to the clergy members in order to end up with 727 potential clergy children needed for the study. Although this method of sampling did not provide an internationally representative sample, it attempted to represent Protestant clergy children in the United States.

The comparison sample of children of non-clergy initially was to consist of adult members of local congregations of four different Protestant denominations (Southern Baptist, Anglican, United Methodist, and Presbyterian). However, after multiple attempts to request participation by local congregations, only two denominations agreed to participate in the study (Southern Baptist and United Methodist). The goal was to obtain a comparable sample size of
218 children of non-clergy. This would be accomplished by requesting a list of e-mail addresses for all adult members of the congregations, and contacting the members via e-mail to request their participation in the study.

Instrumentation

A survey research design was utilized that included a combination of various scales that measured the variables of interest (those indicated in the ABC-X model). A self-administered online questionnaire was developed that included the scales indicated below along with questions to measure the demographic characteristics of the sample (Appendix A—Items 1-17). The following depicts the hypothetical model used for this study along with the instruments that were utilized to examine each variable in the model:

Figure 2. Hypothetical Model Depicting Instrumentation Utilized for Study
The following describes each variable in this model, along with its associated instrument:

**A—Stressor**

**A1—Individual Stress**

The “Stressors of Clergy Children and Couples Scale” (SOCC) was utilized to measure the unique stressors that children of clergy experience (Ostrander, Ceglian, & Fournier, 1993) (Appendix A—Items 18-36). This 19-item scale, which is divided into three subscales, was designed to measure the perceptions of stress among the children of clergy. The three subscales reflect the three general types of stressors that the instrument is designed to measure: the family’s public life, expectations, and family isolations. Questions are on a Likert scale of 1 to 6, where respondents are to answer how upset they were about this when it happened to them (no—didn’t happen, not upset, little upset, somewhat upset, quite upset, very very upset). In Ostrander et al’s (1993) reliability study, the Chronbach alpha for the overall instrument yielded a reliability of 0.80. Chronbach alphas for the subscales were not available; however, percent variables accounted for by each subscale were reported as 23.1% for the Family’s Public Life Subscale, 8.1% for the Expectations Subscale, and 7.3% for the Family Isolation Subscale. Reliability and validity of this instrument in Ostrander et al’s study was established through the use of principal components factoring followed by varimax rotation functions in SPSS. Within this study the reliability for the full scale was .860 (Chronbach alpha). The reliabilities for the subscales were .749 for the Family’s Public Life, .718 for Expectations, and .582 for Family Isolation.

**A2—Family Stress**

The Family Inventory of Life Events and Changes (FILE) was utilized to measure the children of clergy’s perceptions of family stressors and life transitions (McCubbin & Patterson, 1987) (Appendix A—Items 37-107). The FILE scale was designed to record the normative and non-normative life events and changes experienced by a family in the past year. It is a 71-item scale that includes nine subscales (intrafamily strains, finance and business strains, work-family transitions and strains, illness and family care strains, transitions ‘in and out,’ losses, marital strains, pregnancy and child-bearing, and family legal violations). The original FILE scale asked participants to indicate whether or not their family had experienced a particular family life change in the last 12 months. The scale has been modified to a Likert-type scale, which allows participants to rate from 1 (no stress) to 4 (high stress) how stressful each of the life events had
been while they were growing up (Darling, Hill, & McWey, 2004). In Darling, et al’s study, this scale had a reliability (Chronbach’s Alpha) of 0.92. In the original scale by McCubbin and Patterson (1987), the scale had an overall reliability of 0.81, with subscale scores varying from 0.73 to 0.30. Reliability and validity of the scale was established from studies of several samples of families who had a chronically ill child. Discriminant analyses were performed between low conflict families and high conflict families who had a child with cerebral palsy or myelomeningocele. Additional validity checks were made by correlating the ten FILE scales with the Family Environment Scales (Moos, 1974), and by assessing predictive validity by correlating the eight categories of total life changes and events with the health status of 100 children with cystic fibrosis. Within this study the reliability for the full scale was .929. The reliabilities for the subscales were .883 for Intra Family Strains, .716 for Marital Strains, .826 for Pregnancy and Childbearing Strains, .821 for Finance and Business Strains, .791 for Work-Family Transitions and Strains, .742 for Illness and Family Care Strains, .619 for Losses, .707 for Transitions In and Out, and .753 for Family Legal Violations.

B—Resources for Coping

B1—Individual Coping

The “Adolescent Coping Orientation for Problem Experiences” (A-COPE) was utilized to measure individual coping (Patterson & McCubbin, 1987) (Appendix A—Items 108-161). The A-COPE was designed to identify behaviors adolescents find helpful in managing difficult situations or problems. The A-COPE is a 54-item scale that includes 12 subscales of coping patterns by adolescents (ventilating feelings, seeking diversions, developing self-reliance and optimism, developing social support, solving family problems, avoiding problems, seeking spiritual support, investing in close friends, seeking professional support, engaging in demanding activity, being humorous, and relaxing). The items are scored on a five-point Likert-type scale (never, hardly ever, sometimes, often, or most of the time). Higher scores indicate a higher frequency of utilization of those coping behaviors. The following item numbers from the A-COPE instrument were reverse-scored in this study: 114, 115, 126, 131, 133, 135, 149, 153, and 156. The reported alpha reliabilities of each of the 12 subscales ranged from 0.50 to 0.76 (Patterson & McCubbin, 1987). Reliability and validity of the instrument were determined through the use of three separate samples of adolescents in which responses were factor analyzed to determine the underlying structure of A-COPE, followed by factor analysis using the SPSS.
principal components, varimax rotation method. Additionally, concurrent validity of A-COPE was determined by examining in relationship to use of liquor, beer, wine, cigarettes, and marijuana among adolescents 13-18 years of age. Within this study the reliability for the full scale was .843. The reliabilities for the subscales were .140 for Ventilating Feelings, .632 for Seeking Diversions, .604 for Developing Self-Reliance, .616 for Developing Social Support, .707 for Solving Family Problems, .505 for Avoiding Problems, .687 for Seeking Spiritual Support, .481 for Investing in Close Friends, .401 for Seeking Professional Support, .686 for Engaging in Demanding Activity, .772 for Being Humorous, and -.067 for Relaxing.

B2--Family Coping

The “Family Crisis Oriented Personal Evaluation Scales (F-COPES)” was utilized to measure the adult children’s perception of family coping (McCubbin, Olson, & Larson, 1987) (Appendix A—Items 162-191). The F-COPES were designed to record behavioral and problem-solving strategies families utilize in problematic or difficult situations. The F-COPES is a 30-item, Likert-type scale with five subscales including acquiring social support, seeking spiritual support, mobilizing the family to acquire and accept help, reframing, and passive appraisal. Responses range from a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Higher scores indicate that families are operating with more coping behaviors and, as such, will adapt more successfully to stressful situations. The following item numbers from the F-COPES instrument were reverse-scored for this study: 173, 178, 187, and 189. The reliability (Chronbach’s Alpha) for the total scale was 0.86. The reliability (Chronbach’s Alpha) for the subscales ranged from 0.63 to 0.83 (McCubbin, Olson, & Larsen, 1987). Reliability of the scale was determined through a pilot instrument that was given to a sample (N=119) of University of Minnesota Extension students, followed by factor analysis with varimax rotation. Test-retest reliability was assessed by giving the instrument four to five weeks after its first administration. Within this study the reliability for the full scale was .898. The reliabilities for the subscales were .873 for Acquiring Social Support, .862 for Reframing, .828 for Seeking Spiritual Support, .708 for Mobilizing Family to Acquire and Accept Help, and .530 for Passive Appraisal.

C—Definition of the Event

This variable was measured with the “Sense of Coherence” scale (SOC-13) (Antonovsky, 1987, 1998) (Appendix A—Items 192-204). Specifically, this scale incorporates questions that measure such constructs as manageability, comprehensibility, and meaningfulness, all
collectively known as sense of coherence. The SOC-13 scale includes 13 Likert-type questions with responses ranging from 1 (rarely or never true) to 7 (true most of the time). Higher scores indicate a greater sense of coherence, which indicates a greater sense of manageability, comprehensibility, and meaningfulness about their situation. The following item numbers in the SOC-13 instrument were reverse-scored for this study: 192, 193, 194, 198, and 201. The overall Chronbach’s Alpha for the SOC-13 has ranged from 0.74 to 0.91 (Antonovsky, 1998). The original SOC questionnaire was first field tested, in Hebrew, with an Israeli national sample, in which factor analysis was performed. It has since been found to be highly reliable and can be used cross-culturally. Within this study the reliability for the full scale was .877. The reliabilities for the subscales were .764 for Comprehensibility, .698 for Manageability, and .660 for Meaningfulness.

**X—Crisis (Quality of Life)**

The “Satisfaction With Life Scale” (SWLS) was used to measure the level of organization in the life of the children of clergy as adolescents (retrospectively) as well as currently as adults (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985) (Appendix A—Items 205-214). Level of organization can range from bonadaptation to maladaptation. This scale includes five Likert-type items that assess the individual’s perception of his/her life satisfaction, with responses ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The reliability of this scale has been reported at 0.87 (Diener, et al, 1985). The initial scale was pilot tested with a sample of 176 undergraduates at the University of Illinois who were enrolled in an introductory psychology class. The scale was then readministered to 76 of the same students two months later to determine the test-retest correlation coefficient (.82) and coefficient alpha (.87). Factor analysis was conducted on the initial scale, followed by a comparison of the SWLS with a number of other well-being measures. Within this study the reliability for the scale was .938 for adolescent quality of life and .898 for adult quality of life.

**Clergy Children Versus Non-Clergy Children**

A control variable of clergy children versus non-clergy children was included in the analyses to determine differences between the two groups. This was determined by the answer provided in the demographic portion of the survey, which asked which parent was employed as a clergy while they were growing up. This variable was dummy-coded, with clergy children given the code of “1,” and non-clergy children given the code of “0.”
Procedures

Data Collection

Prior to data collection, approval was obtained by the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Appendix B includes the IRB application and approval letter. After IRB approval was received, the respondents were chosen by deselecting every 3rd clergy member from the total of 3,620 members on the mailing list, to obtain a remaining total of 2,418 randomly selected participants. Letters were then mailed through the U.S. postal service to the clergy members selected from the sampling frame (Appendix C). The letter explained the purpose of the study and requested that they forward the letter to an adult child. If they had more than one adult child, they were asked to forward the letter to their oldest child. The letter also included an invitation for the adult child to participate in the study, as well as a link to the online survey. At the same time, a total of 1,623 e-mails were sent via the Internet to the children of non-clergy that were used for the comparison sample (821 were sent to a Southern Baptist congregation and 802 were sent to a United Methodist congregation) (Appendix C). These e-mails explained the purpose of the study, requested their participation, and assured anonymity. Appendix D includes the letters of permission received from the primary sample (clergy support center) and the comparison samples (two churches).

Methods were utilized from Dillman’s (1978) Total Design Method for mail surveys, along with Dillman’s (2000) Tailored Design Method for Internet surveys to ensure the best possible response rate. A reminder postcard was mailed to all clergy member recipients exactly one week after the first mailing, to express appreciation to those who had already responded and to remind those who had not yet responded. A reminder e-mail was also sent to the comparison sample one week after the initial e-mail invitation was sent.

After the initial 2,418 invitation letters were sent to the clergy members and an adequate response time had passed, it was determined that an insufficient number of participants had responded to the invitation. Therefore, an additional 1,202 letters were sent to the remaining clergy members on the mailing list to increase the number of responses. Of the total 3,620 invitations sent to clergy members, 44 were returned for insufficient address. Of the total 1,623 invitations sent to non-clergy members, 253 were returned for insufficient address. A total of 5,243 invitations were sent, with a total of 297 returned for insufficient address. The final sample consisted of 220 surveys and a total response rate of 4.45%. Of the surveys received, 86
(39.1%) were from children of clergy and 134 (60.9%) were from children of non-clergy, with response rates of 2.40% and 9.78%, respectively. Table 2 provides a summary of the final sample and response rates.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>No. Requests</th>
<th>No. Corrected Requests</th>
<th>No. Responses</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 1</td>
<td>2418</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 2</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Clergy</td>
<td>3620</td>
<td>3576</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Clergy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Baptist</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Methodist</td>
<td>802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Clergy</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>9.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5243</td>
<td>4946</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>4.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The original estimated response rate for this study was 30%, which would have been optimal. However, the actual response rate was considerably less than anticipated. The low response rate may be due to a number of reasons, including inaccuracy of addresses of the clergy members on the mailing list, inclusion of some clergy members that were no longer employed at that location or were deceased, inclusion of clergy members who did not have eligible children for the study (adult children only) or who had no children, the use of a bulk mailing service, and the length and complexity of the survey. Twenty-eight surveys were not used due to being filled out incompletely. Finally, possible perceptions of the study may have reduced the likelihood that individuals would participate. Some clergy members may have been hesitant to forward the letter to their children out of a sense of self-preservation or privacy.

Recipients had the option of either completing the survey online or printing the survey, completing it by hand, and mailing it back. However, all surveys were completed online. The survey was hosted by an online survey company and was set as an open survey that could be
accessed through a link provided on the survey invitation. Once all surveys were completed, the
data were downloaded into a statistical package (SPSS) for subsequent analysis.

*Data Analyses*

The data analyses employed in this study included various statistical techniques that
described the results of the study in an attempt to answer the research questions. Data were
subjected to basic statistical analyses by SPSS, including frequency distributions, measures of
central tendency and dispersion, correlation, F-tests, significance tests, and analysis of variance
(ANOVA). Post-hoc tests (Tukey HSD) were also conducted to determine differences in means
between the different groups among the major variables in the study. Analyses also included a
comparison of surveys that were completed by children of clergy versus adult children of non-
clergy.

Additionally, path analyses were performed to determine the causal relationships among
the variables [stressors (A), resources for coping (B), definition of the event (C), and perceived
quality of life (X)]. Path analysis techniques allowed the inclusion of multiple independent
variables in the same model to estimate the unique direct and indirect effects of the independent
variables on the dependent variable through the intervening variables (Lavee, McCubbin, &
Patterson, 1985). The path model was analyzed by Amos, which enabled the analysis of the
causal model with multiple variables, measurement errors, nonrecursive causation, and
correlated residuals.

After preliminary analysis and descriptive statistics were conducted, path analysis was
performed. The hypothesized path model was estimated and tested using confirmatory factor
analysis. An assessment of fit of the model to the data was conducted, which resulted in revisions
to the model as necessary to achieve the desired goodness of fit. Once revisions were made to the
model, which included adjustments of the paths, a new estimation of parameters and evaluation
of the resulting model was conducted, which considered the fit of the model to the data.
Additional revisions based on theoretical credibility and modification indices were made until
the desired goodness of fit was achieved. The estimation of causal relationships among the latent
variables in the structural model was performed based on maximum likelihood statistical theory.
Various measures were used to determine the goodness of fit of the model, include the goodness-
of-fit index, AGFI, and root mean square residual).
Due to the lower than anticipated response rate, a control variable of clergy versus non-clergy children was used as a moderating variable in the analyses rather than running separate analyses for the two groups. The control variable was dummy-coded for analysis, with clergy children assigned the number 1 and non-clergy children assigned the number 0. Additionally, during the analyses, examination of modification indices indicated that gender was not a meaningful variable, and it was subsequently dropped from analysis. Therefore, the models were finally run without gender as a variable. This resulted in path models in three different versions: quality of life as adolescents, quality of life as adults, and quality of life as adolescents and adults when modeled together. This modification also changed the research questions to reflect the removal of gender as a variable.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the stressors of children of clergy, and how the resources that they have for meeting the demands of the stressors, along with their subjective definitions of the stressors, impacted their perceived quality of life. Quality of life was assessed for the children of clergy as adolescents (retrospectively) and currently as an adult. A comparison sample of adult children of non-clergy was also used to examine if the resulting quality of life for adult children of clergy differs from children who did not grow up in this environment.

This chapter has been organized into four sections. The first section includes information related to the sample, including descriptive statistics and demographic characteristics of the sample. The second section describes statistical results related to the null hypothesis and research questions. The third section provides findings of the path modeling and related findings. The fourth section summarizes all of the statistical analyses and findings.

Sample

Table 3 provides the demographic characteristics of the sample in terms of clergy versus non-clergy children, as well as a breakdown of the respondents by their marital status, number of children, education, race, family religion, current religion, current religious attendance, and which parent (if any) was a clergy member. The percentages of all demographic data are provided for the portion of the total number of respondents by category. The final sample consisted of a total of 220 participants: 86 (39.1%) adult children of clergy and 134 (60.9%) adult children of non-clergy (comparison sample). The surveys were divided into four basic groups: clergy children males, clergy children females, non-clergy children males, and non-clergy children females. However, demographics are provided only for the total clergy children and total non-clergy children.
### Table 3

**Demographic Characteristics of the Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Clergy</th>
<th>Non-Clergy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabiting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Education</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D./Doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-Div. or similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.Min. or similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3, continued

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>Clergy Children N</th>
<th>Clergy Children %</th>
<th>Non-Clergy Children N</th>
<th>Non-Clergy Children %</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Ethnic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episcopalian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episcopalian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Clergy children ranged in age from 19 to 65, with a mean age of 38 and a median age of 37. Non-clergy children ranged in age from 20 to 75, with a mean age of 47 and a median age of 47. In terms of marital status, 65% of the total sample reported they were married (18.6% clergy children, 46.4% non-clergy children). Twenty percent of the total sample reported being never-married (15% clergy children, 5% non-clergy children). With regard to number of children, 30.5% of the total sample reported having no children (20.9% clergy children and 9.5% non-clergy children), 13.6% of the total sample reported having one child (2.7% clergy children and 10.9% non-clergy children), 36.4% of the total sample reported having 2 children (10.5% clergy children, 25.9% non-clergy children), with the remaining 19.6% of participants stating they had 3 or more children.

The majority (73.2%) of the total sample had a Bachelor’s degree or higher (31.3% clergy children, 41.9% non-clergy children), with 26.8% of the total sample reporting only having a high school education (7.7% clergy children, 19.1% non-clergy children). The vast
majority (93.2%) of the sample was Caucasian (36.8% clergy children, 56.4% non-clergy children), with the second most frequent race being African American (2.7% of total sample; 1.8% clergy children, 0.9% non-clergy children). Only 4% participants reported other races.

In terms of participants’ family of origin religion, the clergy children’s religious backgrounds primarily included Methodist (13.2%), Presbyterian (12.7%), and Baptist (6.4%). The non-clergy children’s religious backgrounds primarily included Baptist (32.7%), Methodist (11.4%), and Presbyterian (4.1%). Children of clergy participants’ current religion primarily included Methodist (11.4%), Presbyterian (7.7%), Baptist (5.0%), and None (5.0%). Children of non-clergy’s current religion primarily included Baptist (41.8%) and Methodist (16.4%), primarily because these were the congregations from which the comparison sample was drawn. The majority of the clergy children (84.9%) reported their father was the clergy member in their family, with 7% reporting their mother was a clergy member, and 8% reporting that both parents were clergy members.

Research Hypotheses and Questions

Description of the Variables

There were two dependent variables for this study: perceived quality of life as adolescents and perceived quality of life at their current adult age. There were five predictor variables thought to influence the quality of life: Individual Stress, Family Stress, Individual Coping, Family Coping, and Definition of Event/Sense of Coherence. These predictor variables and their associated instruments were selected because they reflected the constructs within the ABC-X Model of Family Stress, where “A” represents stressors, “B” represents coping, “C” represents definition of event/sense of coherence, and “X” represents level of adaptation or quality of life. Stressors and coping were assessed at both the individual and family level for the respondents. A control variable of clergy children versus non-clergy children was used to compare the two groups, which was dummy-coded so that “1” represented clergy children and “2” represented non-clergy children.

The first independent variable representing the “A” factor was Individual Stress, as measured by the Stressors of Clergy Children and Couples (SOCC) Scale (Ostrander, Ceglian, & Fournier, 1993). The level of individual stress was a measure of the perceived experience of being a child of a clergy member as stressful by the individual respondent. Higher scores on the SOCC indicated higher levels of individual stress. The second independent variable representing
the “A” factor was Family Stress, as measured by the Family Inventory of Life Events and Changes (FILE), which measured the participants’ perceptions of family stressors and life transitions (McCubbin & Patterson, 1987). The FILE inventory records the normative and non-normative life events and changes experienced by a family in the past year. Higher scores on the FILE indicated greater levels of perceived family stress by the respondents.

The first independent variable representing the “B” factor was Individual Coping, as measured by the Adolescent Coping Orientation for Problem Experiences (A-COPE), which focuses on coping patterns by adolescents (Patterson & McCubbin, 1987). Higher levels on the A-COPE scale reflect the individual’s higher coping skills. Coping skills at the family level were assessed by the Family Crisis Oriented Personal Evaluation Scale (F-COPES) (McCubbin, Olson, & Larsen, 1987). Greater scores on the F-COPES indicate greater utilization of family coping resources among the respondents.

The “C” factor included only one independent variable, the individual’s Definition of the Event, or Sense of Coherence, which was measured by the Sense of Coherence Scale (SOC-13) (Antonovsky, 1987, 1998). The SOC-13 is designed to measure such constructs as manageability, comprehensibility, and meaningfulness, all collectively known as sense of coherence. Higher scores on the SOC-13 scale indicated a greater sense of comprehension, manageability, and meaningfulness of life for the respondents.

The “X” factor, level of adaptation, was hypothesized to be assessed by the quality of life of the respondents as adolescents and currently as adults. Quality of life was measured with the Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS), which was designed to assess the participant’s satisfaction with life as a whole (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985). Participants were asked to answer the scale twice: retrospectively as adolescents and currently as adults. The higher the score on the SWLS, the greater their quality of life.

Research Hypotheses

The original null hypothesis (H₀) for this study was as follows: There will be no observed difference between male children of clergy, female children of clergy, male children of non-clergy, and female children of non-clergy in terms of the variables in question. However, during data analysis, examination of modification indices indicated that gender was not a meaningful variable; therefore, it was dropped from analysis. As a result, a second null hypothesis was later added to determine the differences in the variables without controlling for
gender, resulting in the following second null hypothesis (H02): There will be no observed difference between children of clergy and children of non-clergy in terms of the variables in question. The following lists the variables in question along with the instruments used to measure these variables:

a. Individual stress as measured by the Stressors of Clergy Children and Couples Scale (Ostrander, Ceglian, & Fournier, 1993).
b. Family stress as measured by the Family Inventory of Life Events and Changes (FILE) (McCubbin & Patterson, 1987).
c. Individual coping as measured by the Adolescent Coping Orientation for Problem Experiences (A-COPE) (Patterson & McCubbin, 1987).
d. Family coping as measured by the Family Crisis Oriented Personal Evaluation Scales (F-COPES) (McCubbin, Olson, & Larsen, 1987).
e. Definition of the event (sense of coherence) as measured by the Sense of Coherence Scale (SOC-13) (Antonovsky, 1987).
f. Quality of life as adolescents (retrospectively), as measured by the Satisfaction With Life Scale (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985).
g. Quality of life as adults, as measured by the Satisfaction With Life Scale (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985).

Hypothesis 1 Results

ANOVA was performed to determine if significant differences existed between the mean scores of the major variables in the study when taking gender into account. Post-hoc tests (Tukey HSD) were conducted to determine differences in means between the different groups among the major variables in the study (female clergy children, male clergy children, female non-clergy children, male non-clergy children). Table 4 summarizes the findings from the ANOVA analyses, and also indicates differences between the specific groups that were determined through post-hoc tests. Significant differences were found between the groups in terms of individual stress, individual coping, and sense of coherence.

Hypothesis 1a. The test of hypothesis 1a yielded significant differences among the four groups in terms of individual stress. Post-hoc analyses indicated that female clergy children experienced greater stress than male clergy children, female non-clergy children, and male non-
## Table 4

### Test of Differences of Major Variables in Study (Comparing Gender)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Male (n=58)</th>
<th>Female Clergy (n=27)</th>
<th>Female Non-Clergy (n=89)</th>
<th>Male Non-Clergy (n=45)</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Stress</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>abc</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Stress</td>
<td>114.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>113.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>106.8</td>
<td>103.7</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Coping</td>
<td>169.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>169.6</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>172.6</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>161.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Coping</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Coherence</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life as</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life as</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05

a-c = To identify variables with differences at p ≤ .05, look for pairs with matching letters.

### Potential scale ranges for each variable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Ranges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Stress</td>
<td>Stressors of Clergy Children &amp; Couples</td>
<td>19-114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Stress</td>
<td>Family Inventory of Life Events</td>
<td>71-284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Coping</td>
<td>Adolescent Coping Orientation for Problem Experiences</td>
<td>54-216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Coping</td>
<td>Family Crisis Oriented Personal Scales</td>
<td>30-150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Coherence</td>
<td>Sense of Coherence Scale</td>
<td>13-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td>Satisfaction with Life Scale</td>
<td>5-35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
clergy children. No significant differences were found when comparing male clergy children and female non-clergy children, male clergy children and male non-clergy children, and female non-clergy children and male non-clergy children. The null hypothesis for the differences in individual stress between the groups was rejected.

**Hypothesis 1b.** The test of hypothesis 1b resulted in no significant differences between clergy and non-clergy children in terms of family stress when gender is taken into account.

**Hypothesis 1c.** The test of hypothesis 1c resulted in significant differences between the groups in terms of individual coping. Post-hoc tests on the four groups resulted in significant differences between the female non-clergy children and male non-clergy children, in that female non-clergy children had a higher level of coping than male non-clergy children. The null hypothesis for the differences in individual coping between the groups was rejected.

**Hypothesis 1d.** The test of hypothesis 1d resulted in no significant differences among the four groups in terms of family coping.

**Hypothesis 1e.** The test of hypothesis 1e resulted in significant differences between the groups in terms of sense of coherence. Post-hoc tests on the four groups resulted in significant differences being found between the female clergy children and male non-clergy children, with female clergy children having a higher sense of coherence than male non-clergy children. The null hypothesis for the differences in sense of coherence between the groups was rejected.

**Hypothesis 1f.** The test of hypothesis 1f resulted in no significant differences among the four groups in terms of quality of life as adolescents.

**Hypothesis 1g.** The test of hypothesis 1g resulted in no significant differences among the four groups in terms of quality of life as adults.

**Hypothesis 2 Results**

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was also performed to determine if significant differences existed between the mean scores of the major variables in the study between the total clergy children and total non-clergy children, without examining gender differences. Table 5 summarizes the findings from the ANOVA analysis, along with potential scale ranges for each variable. Table 5 indicates results that were significant at both the p≤.05 as well as the p≤.01 levels. Due to any potential for family-wise error, results are shown at both levels of significance, with a primary focus on results that fell within the p≤.01 level. Effect sizes (in Cohen’s d) are included in the table to provide a standardized measure of effect. Significant
differences were found between the clergy and non-clergy children in terms of individual stress, family stress, sense of coherence, and quality of life as adolescents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Total Mean (n=85)</th>
<th>Non-Clergy Mean (n=134)</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F sig</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Effect Size (Cohen's D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Stress</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>28.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
<td>15.02</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Stress</td>
<td>113.9</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
<td>24.31</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Coping</td>
<td>169.3</td>
<td>168.8</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>20.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Coping</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>17.36</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Coherence</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
<td>13.59</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life as Adolescents</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life as Adults</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Potential scale ranges for each variable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Ranges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Stress</td>
<td>Stressors of Clergy Children &amp; Couples</td>
<td>19-114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Stress</td>
<td>Family Inventory of Life Events</td>
<td>71-284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Coping</td>
<td>Adolescent Coping Orientation for Problem Experiences</td>
<td>54-216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Coping</td>
<td>Family Crisis Oriented Personal Scales</td>
<td>30-150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Coherence</td>
<td>Sense of Coherence Scale</td>
<td>13-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td>Satisfaction with Life Scale</td>
<td>5-35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 2a. The test of hypothesis 2a yielded significant differences between clergy and non-clergy children in terms of individual stress, with clergy children showing greater levels of individual stress than non-clergy children. The null hypothesis for the differences in individual stress between clergy and non-clergy children was rejected.

Hypothesis 2b. When testing hypothesis 2b, significant differences were also found between clergy and non-clergy children in terms of family stress, with clergy children showing higher levels of family stress than non-clergy children. The null hypothesis for the differences in family stress between clergy and non-clergy children was rejected.

Hypothesis 2c. The test of hypothesis 2c yielded no significant differences between clergy and non-clergy children in terms of individual coping.

Hypothesis 2d. Likewise, when testing hypothesis 2d, no significant differences were found between clergy and non-clergy children in terms of family coping.

Hypothesis 2e. When testing hypothesis 2e, significant differences were found in terms of sense of coherence scores between clergy and non-clergy, with non-clergy children scoring higher than clergy children. The null hypothesis for the differences in sense of coherence between clergy and non-clergy was rejected.

Hypothesis 2f. The test of hypothesis 2f yielded significant results in terms of quality of life as adolescents between clergy and non-clergy children, showing that clergy children had a lower quality of life than non-clergy children. The null hypothesis for the difference in quality of life as adolescents between clergy and non-clergy children was rejected.

Hypothesis 2g. When testing hypothesis 2g, no significant differences were found between clergy children and non-clergy children in quality of life as adults.

Path Analysis

The three research questions in this study were considered when conducting the path analyses to assess the relationships among all of the variables in the hypothetical model. A variable of clergy children versus non-clergy children was used as a control variable in the analyses rather than running separate analyses for the two groups. This resulted in path models in three different versions: quality of life as adolescents, quality of life as adults, and quality of life as adolescents and adults when modeled together, all of which included clergy versus non-clergy as control variables. For the path models, each path analysis yielded a coefficient (β) and measure of explained variability for the model ($R^2$). Goodness-of-fit (GFI) indices were also
determined for each path model based on the Pearson $\chi^2$ statistic. When assessing goodness of fit, a GFI of 0.9 or above was considered optimal for fitting the data to the hypothetical model (Tate, 1998).

The correlation coefficients, means, and standard deviations for the major variables in the study are presented in Table 6. Significant correlations were found between quality of life as an adolescent and all of the other variables in the study except gender. Quality of life as an adolescent was most highly correlated with sense of coherence, followed by quality of life as an adult and family coping. Quality of life as an adult was also found to be significantly correlated to a number of other variables, including individual stress, family stress, family coping, sense of coherence, and quality of life as adolescents. Quality of life as an adult was most highly correlated with quality of life as adolescents, followed by sense of coherence and individual stress. Multi-collinearity was not perceived to be a problem.

### Table 6

**Correlation Matrix, Means, and Standard Deviations for Major Variables in the Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Clergy vs. NonClergy</th>
<th>Indiv</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Indiv</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Sense</th>
<th>QOL</th>
<th>QOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NonClergy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy vs. NonClergy</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.341**</td>
<td>0.165*</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>-0.207**</td>
<td>-0.172**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.147*</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.154*</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>-0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Stress</td>
<td>0.341**</td>
<td>0.147*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.580**</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>-0.177*</td>
<td>-0.531**</td>
<td>-0.408**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Stress</td>
<td>0.165*</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.580**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>-0.135</td>
<td>-0.384**</td>
<td>-0.377**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Coping</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.164*</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.568**</td>
<td>0.169*</td>
<td>0.400**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Coping</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>-0.177*</td>
<td>-0.135</td>
<td>0.568**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.286**</td>
<td>0.413**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Coherence</td>
<td>-0.207**</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>-0.531**</td>
<td>-0.384**</td>
<td>0.160*</td>
<td>0.286**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.630**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life as Adol</td>
<td>-0.172*</td>
<td>-0.090</td>
<td>-0.408**</td>
<td>-0.377**</td>
<td>0.400**</td>
<td>0.413**</td>
<td>0.630**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life as Adult</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>-0.319**</td>
<td>-0.219**</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.171*</td>
<td>0.360**</td>
<td>0.428**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>169.0</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviations</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.  **p < .01.  #dummy coded variable where 1 = clergy children and 0 = non-clergy children
Research Question One

R1—When controlling for perceptions of clergy children versus non-clergy children, are individual and family stress (A) related to perceived retrospective quality of life (X) as adolescents (T) as mediated by individual and family coping (B) and definitions of the event/sense of coherence (C)? (\( A_T + B_T + C_T \rightarrow X_T \))

Path Coefficients. Figure 3 depicts the path model with beta coefficients for perceived quality of life as an adolescent. Path coefficients were significant for a number of the paths. Perceived quality of life as adolescents was directly related to sense of coherence, individual coping, and family stress. A positive direct relationship existed between sense of coherence and quality of life as adolescents, meaning that those with a higher sense of coherence also had a higher perceived quality of life as adolescents. A positive direct relationship also existed between individual coping and quality of life as adolescents, indicating that higher levels of individual coping led to a higher perceived quality of life as adolescents. A direct inverse relationship existed between family stress and quality of life as adolescents, meaning that greater levels of family stress resulted in lower perceived quality of life as adolescents. There was also a direct inverse relationship between individual stress and family coping, indicating that higher levels of individual stress resulted in lower levels of family coping. Additionally, a direct positive relationship existed between clergy status and family coping, indicating that clergy children tended to have higher levels of family coping as adolescents. An indirect relationship existed between quality of life as adolescents and individual stress. Individual stress was mediated by sense of coherence in relationship to perceived quality of life as adolescents. Lower levels of individual’s stress resulted in a greater sense of coherence, which in turn led to a greater perceived quality of life as an adolescent.

Effects Components for Quality of Life as Adolescents. The direct, indirect, and total effects for quality of life as adolescents are provided in Table 7. The top three independent variables that had the greatest total effect on quality of life as adolescents were sense of coherence, individual coping, and individual stress. The explained variance for the model was \( R^2 = .523 \). Goodness of fit indices suggested a good fit of data to the model (GFI=.999, AGFI=.989, RMSEA=.000), \( \chi^2=.787, df=3, p=.853 \).
*Significant at p ≤ .05 as indicated by bold lines

**Clergy status = control variable dummy coded where
0 = Non-clergy child & 1 = Clergy child

\[ R^2 = .523 \]

*Figure 3. Path Model for Perceived Quality of Life as Adolescents*
Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Direct Effects</th>
<th>Indirect Effects</th>
<th>Total Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clergy vs. Non-Clergy</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.025 *</td>
<td>.025 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Stress</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>-.216 *</td>
<td>-.296 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Stress</td>
<td>-.136 *</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>-.212 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Coping</td>
<td>.268 *</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.322 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Coping</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Coherence</td>
<td>.462 *</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.462 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2 = .523</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

Research Question Two

R2—When controlling for perceptions of clergy children versus non-clergy children, are individual and family stress (A) related to perceived current quality of life (X) as adults (A) as mediated by individual and family coping (B) and definitions of the event/sense of coherence (C)? \( (A_A + B_A + C_A \rightarrow X_A) \)

Path Coefficients. Figure 4 depicts the path model with beta coefficients for quality of life as an adult. Path coefficients were significant for a number of the paths. Perceived current quality of life as adults was directly related to sense of coherence and individual stress. A positive direct relationship existed between sense of coherence and quality of life as adults, meaning that having a greater sense of coherence as an adolescent led to a higher perceived quality of life as an adult. A direct inverse relationship existed between individual stress and quality of life as adults, indicating that a higher level of individual stress as an adolescent resulted in a lower perceived quality of life as an adult. A direct inverse relationship also existed between individual stress and family coping, meaning that higher levels of individual stress as
Figure 4. Path Model for Perceived Quality of Life as Adults

*Significant at p ≤ .05 as indicated by bold lines

**Clergy status = control variable dummy coded where

0=Non-clergy child & 1=Clergy child

\[ R^2 = .162 \]
adolescents led to lower levels of family coping as adolescents. Additionally, a direct positive relationship existed between clergy status and family coping, indicating that clergy children tended to have higher levels of family coping as adolescents. An indirect relationship also existed between quality of life as adults and individual stress. Individual stress was mediated by sense of coherence in relationship to quality of life as adults. The lower the individual's stress as adolescents, the greater their sense of coherence, which in turn led to a greater quality of life as an adult.

Effects Components for Quality of Life as Adults. The direct, indirect, and total effects for quality of life as adults are provided in Table 8. Individual stress and sense of coherence had the top two greatest total effects on perceived quality of life as adults.

The explained variance for the model was $R^2 = .162$. Goodness of fit indices suggested a good fit of data to the model (GFI=.996, AGFI=.959, RMSEA=.008), $\chi^2=3.042$, df=3, $p=.385$).

Table 8

Direct, Indirect, and Total Effects for Perceived Quality of Life as Adults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Direct Effects</th>
<th>Indirect Effects</th>
<th>Total Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clergy vs. Non-Clergy</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.008 *</td>
<td>.008 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Stress</td>
<td>-.183 *</td>
<td>-.108 *</td>
<td>-.291 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Stress</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Coping</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Coping</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Coherence</td>
<td>.235 *</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.235 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2 = .162$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p<.05$

Research Question Three

R3—When controlling for perceptions of clergy children versus non-clergy children, are individual and family stress (A) related to perceived quality of life (X) retrospectively as adolescents ($T_l$) and currently as adults ($A$) when modeled together as mediated by individual and family coping (B) and definitions of the event/sense of coherence (C)? ($A_{TA} + B_{TA} + CTA \rightarrow X_{TA}$)
Path Coefficients. Figure 5 depicts the path model with beta coefficients for quality of life as adolescents and adults when modeled together. Path coefficients were significant for a number of the paths. A number of direct relationships existed between the variables when perceived quality of life as adolescents was integrated into the model to explain current quality of life. Quality of life as an adult was directly related to quality of life as an adolescent and individual stress as an adolescent. A positive relationship existed between quality of life as an adult and quality of life as an adolescent. In other words, those who reported a higher quality of life in their youth were more likely to report a higher current quality of life as an adult. An inverse relationship existed between individual stress and quality of life as an adult, meaning that a higher level of individual stress as an adolescent led to a lower perceived quality of life as an adult.

Quality of life as an adolescent was directly related to sense of coherence, individual coping, and family stress. A positive relationship existed between sense of coherence and quality of life as adolescents. In other words, individuals who reported a higher sense of coherence were more likely to report a higher quality of life as adolescents. A positive relationship existed between individual coping and quality of life as adolescents, indicating that a higher level of individual coping resulted in a higher perceived quality of life as an adolescent.

An inverse relationship existed between family stress and quality of life as an adolescent, meaning that a lower family stress level led to a higher quality of life as an adolescent. An inverse relationship also existed between individual stress and family coping, meaning that higher levels of individual stress led to lower levels of family coping as adolescents. Additionally, a direct positive relationship existed between clergy status and family coping, indicating that clergy children tended to have higher levels of family coping as adolescents.

When quality of life as adults and quality of life as adolescents were modeled together, quality of life as adolescents served as a mediating variable to quality of life as adults for a number of variables, including sense of coherence, individual coping, and family stress. Additionally, individual stress was mediated by sense of coherence in relationship to quality of life as adolescents. In other words, the lower the individual’s stress, the greater their sense of coherence, which in turn led to a greater quality of life as an adolescent. It should be noted that when quality of life as adults and quality of life as adolescents were modeled together, sense of
Clergy Vs. Non-Clergy
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.*Significant at p≤.05 as indicated by bold lines
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R² (Adolescent) = .523
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Figure 5--Path Model for Quality of Life as Adolescents & Adults When Modeled Together
coherence was no longer directly related to quality of life as adults as it was in Figure 4, but instead was mediated by quality of life as adolescents. This would indicate that a higher sense of coherence in adolescence led to a higher perceived quality of life in adolescence, which in turn resulted in a higher perceived quality of life as adults.

*Effects Components for Quality of Life as Adolescents and Adults When Modeled Together.* The direct, indirect, and total effects for quality of life as adolescents and adults when modeled together are provided in Table 9. The total effects of quality of life as adolescents were identical to those of quality of life as adolescents when modeled separately (see Table 8 and related section above for results). However, the total effects of quality of life as adults changed when it was modeled together with quality of life as adolescents. Quality of life as adolescents and individual stress had the greatest total effect on quality of life as adults. The explained variance for the model was $R^2 = .523$ for quality of life as adolescents and $R^2 = .212$ for quality of life as adults. Goodness of fit indices suggested a good fit of data to the model ($GFI=.995$, $AGFI=.973$, $RMSEA=.000$), $\chi^2=4.110$, $df=7$, $p=.767$).

Table 9

*Direct, Indirect, and Total Effects for Perceived Quality of Life as Adolescents & Adults When Modeled Together*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Life as Adolescent:</th>
<th>Direct Effects</th>
<th>Indirect Effects</th>
<th>Total Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clergy vs. Non-Clergy</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.025 *</td>
<td>.025 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Stress</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>-.216 *</td>
<td>-.296 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Stress</td>
<td>-.136 *</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>-.212 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Coping</td>
<td>.268 *</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.322 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Coping</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Coherence</td>
<td>.462 *</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.462 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2 = .523$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05
Table 9, continued

Direct, Indirect, and Total Effects for Perceived Quality of Life as Adolescents & Adults When Modeled Together

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Direct Effects</th>
<th>Indirect Effects</th>
<th>Total Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clergy vs. Non-Clergy</td>
<td></td>
<td>.009 *</td>
<td>.009 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Stress</td>
<td>-.145 *</td>
<td>-.133 *</td>
<td>-.278 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>-.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Coping</td>
<td></td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Coping</td>
<td></td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Coherence</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life as Adolescent</td>
<td>.317 *</td>
<td></td>
<td>.317 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2 = .212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Related Findings

A number of related findings were found that were of interest to the study. Table 10 summarizes the related findings associated with tests of differences of other variables in the study. Comparisons between total clergy children and total non-clergy children scores were made using one-way ANOVA to test for significant differences between the means of the two groups. Table 10 indicates results that were significant at both the p < .05 as well as the p < .01 levels. Due to any potential for family-wise error, results are shown at both levels of significance, with a primary focus on results that fell within the p < .01 level. Effect sizes (in Cohen’s d) are included in the table to provide a standardized measure of effect.

Tests of Differences of Other Variables in Study

Demographic Variables

Demographic variables were compared between the total clergy and total non-clergy children groups and several yielded significant differences in means. In regard to their current relationship with their father, clergy children reported a better relationship with their father than non-clergy children. When questioned about their current religious attendance, non-clergy children reported a higher frequency of religious participation than non-clergy children.
However, this result could be explained by the fact that the comparison sample of non-clergy children was drawn from a set of individuals who are presently regular church attendees.

Table 10

*Related Findings—Test of Differences of Other Variables in Study*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Total Mean (n=86)</th>
<th>Total Mean (n=134)</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F sig</th>
<th>Std. Dev. (Cohen’s d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Relationship with Father</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Relationship with Mother</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Religious Attendance</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>23.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>17.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Stress</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family’s Public Life</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>31.88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>8.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Isolations</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>21.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Stress</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-Family Strains</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>9.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Family Transitions &amp; Strains</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Coping</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventilating Feelings</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>16.27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding Problems</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking Professional Support</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxing</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sense of Coherence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensibility</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>5.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manageability</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  **p<.01

Note: Higher scores are shown in bold for each variable.
**Related Findings—Test of Differences of Other Variables in Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Living in a parsonage frequently created problems for me while growing up (clergy children only)</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not live in parsonage</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage Strongly agree or agree (of those living in parsonage) 37.3%

**Subscale Variables**

Test of differences between several subscale variables were also conducted, with a number of them showing significant differences. Within the major variable of individual stress, the total clergy children scores were higher than total non-clergy children for the subscales of family’s public life, expectations, and family isolations, indicating that all three of these are areas of greater stress for clergy children. In regard to family stress, clergy children experienced greater family stress than non-clergy children for the subscales of intra-family strains and work-family transitions and strains, indicating that clergy children experience greater stress in these two areas than non-clergy children. Within the major variable of individual coping, overall clergy children reported lower usage of the coping skills of ventilating feelings and avoiding problems, but higher usage of seeking professional support and relaxing. In regard to sense of coherence, clergy children reported lower levels of comprehensibility and manageability than non-clergy children.

One other related finding of interest concerned clergy children’s reported experience of living in a parsonage. When asked whether living in a parsonage frequently created problems for them while growing up, 37.25% either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement.
Interestingly, an equal percentage responded that they either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, indicating that living in a parsonage resulted in a range of experiences for children of clergy.

**Rank Ordering of Subscales**

Subscale variables were rank-ordered for all groups of clergy and non-clergy to determine the frequency with which each group experienced individual and family stressors, utilized various individual and family coping resources, and appraised their situations. Rankings were computed by dividing the group subscale means by the number of subscale items and then placed in order by the total group rankings. Table 11 summarizes the rank ordering of the subscale variables for all possible groups, including total clergy children and total non-clergy children.

In terms of individual stressors, the greatest reported stressor for both groups (clergy and non-clergy children) was the family's public life. When examining family stressors, both groups reported the same three areas as the greatest areas of stress: intra-family strains, work-family transitions and strains, and transitions in and out. Individual coping scores showed more variability between the groups. Clergy children reported their top three individual coping resources as avoiding problems, relaxing, and being humorous. Non-clergy children also reported avoiding problems as their top individual coping resource, but this was followed by ventilating feelings and developing self-reliance. When examining family coping resources, both groups reported the same top three resources: seeking spiritual support, reframing, and passive appraisal. Both groups ranked similarly on the sense of coherence scale, with meaningfulness scores ranking highest between the three subscales.

**Open-Ended Items**

Four open-ended questions were provided at the end of the survey for children of clergy respondents. These questions were provided to give these respondents an opportunity to offer details regarding the stressors they experienced in their churches and in their families while growing up, as well as the stressors they currently experience as adult children of clergy. Several themes emerged from the qualitative responses that provided a greater depth to the quantitative data. The following provides sample quotations from the open-ended responses for each of these major themes.
# Table 11

**Rank Ordering of Subscale Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Non-Clergy</th>
<th>Likert Scale</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family's Public Life</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Isolations</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Stress</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-Family Strains</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Family Transitions &amp; Strains</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions In &amp; Out</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Business Strains</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Losses</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illness &amp; Family Care Strains</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Strains</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Legal Violations</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy &amp; Childbearing Strains</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Coping</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding Problems</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventilating Feelings</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Self-Reliance</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Humorous</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxing</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Social Support</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investing in Close Friends</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in Demanding Activity</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solving Family Problems</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11, continued

**Rank Ordering of Subscale Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Total Clergy Children</th>
<th>Total Non-Clergy Children</th>
<th>Total Clergy Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seek Spiritual Support</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking Diversions</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking Professional Support</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Coping</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking Spiritual Support</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reframing</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Appraisal</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring Social Support</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilizing Family to Acquire and Accept Help</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sense of Coherence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningfulness</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manageability</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensibility</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Higher scores are shown in bold for each major scale.

**Expectations for Behavior and Church Involvement**

The most prominent theme that emerged from the qualitative responses related to expectations that clergy children experienced both in their churches and in their homes, including expectations for behavior as well as expectations for involvement in their church.

- “Behavioral expectations of me by my parents that were intended to present a "perfect" face to our church members and community.”

- “How everyone else thought I should be or act. What they thought I should do with my life instead of what I wanted.”
• "Expectations of church members that I would be involved with church activities beyond my interest and beyond the time I had to offer; expectations that as a clergy kid I would behave like an adult rather than 'goof off' or rebel like the other teenagers in church."

• "Having to be in the church whenever the doors were open. Having Dad's calling be extended through our lives...a minister's call extends through his wife and children and is not his or hers alone."

• "Lingering neuroses from personal, familial, and community high expectations...I'm a perfectionist trying to learn to put the right perspective on my achievements and accomplishments rather than constantly attempting to achieve more."

*Family Problems*

The second most frequently reported theme related to problems within the family, and quite often the secrecy that surrounded such problems.

• "Pretending that things were great in our family to present to the members of the church."

• "Hiding all the problems that my family had from the church such as the fact that my mother was an addict from the time that I was 5 years old. They were in a very conservative southern church and she played the piano and sang every Sunday. It was a real accomplishment each week."

• "My parents' divorce was most stressful due to the extreme lack of privacy surrounding the situation...I often felt like I was unable to talk to other people in the church (like youth leaders for example) if I was upset, because I tried to keep my family matters private."

• "My mother had emotional problems and I think that because we were the minister's family, it prohibited us from seeking help."

• "Both my sister and I were abused mentally, physically, and sexually. That has a great deal to do with why we have no relationship with him. To this day he refuses to admit that he ever did anything wrong. It is very sad for a man of God to look his two little girls in their 40s in the eye and say he never did anything wrong, and still call himself a man of God and be an active minister."

*Lack of Family Time/Church Demands*

The third theme that emerged was the stress associated with a lack of family time related to church demands on the clergy parent's time.
• “My father was so preoccupied with the people of the church and Bible studies in our home that he had little time to develop close relationships with me and my two brothers.”

• “Our father spent a lot of time at the church and with church members instead of being home every evening. We couldn't go away for the weekend because Dad had to preach every Sunday and we weren’t allowed to skip services.”

• “I think the most stressful thing my family had to deal with was the constant uncertainty of any plans that we would make; with both my parents as ministers there was an almost never-ending demand on one of them from one of their congregation, such as a death of someone in the church or community. We would have to make plans knowing that they may change at any time, without warning. Another stressor was always holidays such as Christmas & Easter. In our house these times were the opposite of calm, relaxing, and fun—just the opposite. My parents had different churches and different schedules and holidays were/are always very demanding, sermons to figure out, bulletins to do, people to see, these were normal daily/weekly realities, but during the holidays they were always magnified 10-fold and that made the whole house engulfed in stress and a sense of “grin and bare it, soon it will pass, and after these holidays we'll ‘breathe.’”

• “Even though my father was the minister, my mother was often also called on by church members. It became a family affair. And in many ways, I feel as if that little time I had to spend with them was stolen from me by the demands of others.”

Moving

Stress associated with moving was also frequently reported in the open-ended responses.

• “Trying to fit in to the high school scene while being a preacher’s kid. Moving often to new schools/with new peer groups during my high school years.”

• “Not staying all that long in one place and, therefore, not being able to develop very many long-term friendships.”

• “Moving was hard, period, because we always stayed long enough to get a lot of close friends, then we would leave.”

• “Moving, and all it entailed. After my freshman year of high school (and my brother's sixth-grade year), we moved halfway across the country because our father had been made a bishop; after he became a bishop, we very rarely saw him.”
Finding Their Own Spiritual Path

In terms of stressors specific to being adult children of clergy, one theme emerged that highlighted the stress of finding their individual spiritual path that may be different than their parents’ faith.

• “Finding my own path of faith.”
• “Not following the exact spiritual path of my Father.”
• “Maintaining positive, close relationships with my parents while having an agnostic, humanist worldview.”
• “My personal spirituality is very different than that of my father and I feel stress that he is unwilling to have conversations about my spirituality with me in an adult-to-adult kind of way.”

Lack of Distress Among Many

One final interesting theme that emerged was the apparent lack of distress reported by many of the clergy children, most of whom reported a positive sense of coherence about their family situation and a faith in God that provided them strength.

• “Most kids don't get the perks of being a PK and I think they need to be noted. As a kid a perk I liked most was the additional POSITIVE attention given to me by both the congregations and community. I never needed to worry about being taken care of because there was a huge extended family always willing to help in someway. There was never a shortage of love and concern for me and my family.”
• “As challenging as it is to be a PK, it is completely worth it. I've moved every eight years of my life and you see a different side of the church. We all have struggles and difficulties in life, but it's easier to embrace them.”
• “My parents taught us from a very young age that this was a "calling" on our lives. God put my father in ministry for a reason. This was God's plan and purpose for us. It was never viewed as something negative. We were always very proud to be the preacher's kids.”
• “My father went out of his way to make sure we knew he loved us. He didn't neglect his duties as a minister, but he knew that we were as important as any church member. He may have been gone at odd times for his duties but when we needed him, he was ALWAYS available.”
"I am thankful that God gave me such a wonderful family to grow up in. There was not one day that I was not told that I was loved by my parents. The church was and is our extended family. Many of the grown ups I grew up with I thought of as my aunts and uncles. I have been very blessed and I thank God for it."

Summary

The final section of this chapter will provide a summary of the results of the analyses of the hypotheses and research questions for this study. A minimum standard of p≤0.05 was used when making decisions about accepting or rejecting elements of the null hypothesis. Table 12 summarizes these analyses and related null hypothesis decisions, as well as significance levels for the hypotheses tested. For the research questions, each path model’s resulting beta (β) coefficient is provided, along with the model R$^2$ and significance levels for each coefficient.

Table 12

Summary of Analyses for Hypotheses and Research Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis Tested</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypotheses #1 (including gender)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{01}$ = There will be no observed difference between male children of clergy, female children of clergy, male children of non-clergy, and female children of non-clergy in terms of the variables in question:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Individual Stress</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Family Stress</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Individual Coping</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Family Coping</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Sense of Coherence</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Quality of Life as Adolescents</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Quality of Life as Adults</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotheses #2 (without gender)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{02}$ = There will be no observed difference between children of clergy and children of non-clergy in terms of the variables in question:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Individual Stress</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Family Stress</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12, continued

Summary of Analyses for Hypotheses and Research Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis Tested</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c) Individual Coping</td>
<td>0.85 Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Family Coping</td>
<td>0.45 Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Sense of Coherence</td>
<td>0.00 Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Quality of Life as Adolescents</td>
<td>0.02 Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Quality of Life as Adults</td>
<td>0.74 Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question #1

When controlling for perceptions of clergy children versus non-clergy children, are individual and family stress (A) related to perceived retrospective quality of life (X) as adolescents (\( \beta \)) as mediated by individual and family coping (B) and definitions of the event/sense of coherence (C)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clergy Vs. Non-Clergy to Family Coping ( \beta = .159^* )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Stress to Individual Coping ( \beta = .080 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Stress to Family Coping ( \beta = -.211^* )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Stress to Quality of Life as Adolescent ( \beta = -.079 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Stress to Sense of Coherence ( \beta = -.452^* )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Stress to Individual Coping ( \beta = -.063 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Stress to Family Coping ( \beta = -.042 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Stress to Quality of Life as Adolescent ( \beta = -.136^* )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Stress to Sense of Coherence ( \beta = -.106 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Coping to Sense of Coherence ( \beta = .116 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Coping to Quality of Life as Adolescent ( \beta = .268^* )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Coping to Sense of Coherence ( \beta = .126 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Coping to Quality of Life as Adolescent ( \beta = .096 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Coherence to Quality of Life as Adolescent ( \beta = .462^* )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 = .523 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question #2

When controlling for perceptions of clergy children versus non-clergy children, are individual and family stress (A) related to perceived current quality of life (X) as adults (\( \beta \)) as mediated by individual and family coping (B) and definitions of the event/sense of coherence (C)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clergy Vs. Non-Clergy to Family Coping ( \beta = .159^* )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Stress to Individual Coping ( \beta = .080 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 12, continued

Summary of Analyses for Hypotheses and Research Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question #2</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Stress to Family Coping</td>
<td>$\beta = -0.211^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Stress to Quality of Life as Adult</td>
<td>$\beta = -0.183^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Stress to Sense of Coherence</td>
<td>$\beta = -0.452^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Stress to Individual Coping</td>
<td>$\beta = -0.063$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Stress to Family Coping</td>
<td>$\beta = -0.042$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Stress to Quality of Life as Adult</td>
<td>$\beta = -0.020$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Stress to Sense of Coherence</td>
<td>$\beta = -0.106$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Coping to Sense of Coherence</td>
<td>$\beta = 0.116$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Coping to Quality of Life as Adult</td>
<td>$\beta = 0.126$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Coping to Sense of Coherence</td>
<td>$\beta = 0.020$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Coherence to Quality of Life as Adult</td>
<td>$\beta = 0.235^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2 = 0.162$</td>
<td>$^*p \leq 0.05$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question #3

When controlling for perceptions of clergy children versus non-clergy children, are individual and family stress (A) related to perceived quality of life (X) retrospectively as adolescents (r) and as currently adults (x) when modeled together as mediated by individual and family coping (B) and definitions of the event/sense of coherence (C)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clergy Vs. Non-Clergy to Family Coping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Stress to Individual Coping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Stress to Family Coping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Stress to Quality of Life as Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Stress to Quality of Life as Adolescent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Stress to Sense of Coherence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Stress to Individual Coping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Stress to Family Coping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Stress to Quality of Life as Adolescent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Stress to Sense of Coherence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Coping to Sense of Coherence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Coping to Quality of Life as Adolescent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12, continued

Summary of Analyses for Hypotheses and Research Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question #3</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Coping to Sense of Coherence</td>
<td>$\beta = .126$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Coping to Quality of Life as Adolescent</td>
<td>$\beta = .096$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Coherence to Quality of Life as Adult</td>
<td>$\beta = .084$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Coherence to Quality of Life as Adolescent</td>
<td>$\beta = .462^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life as Adolescent to Quality of Life as Adult</td>
<td>$\beta = .317^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent $R^2 = .523$</td>
<td>$^{*}p &lt; .05$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult $R^2 = .212$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the stressors of children of clergy, and how the resources that they have for meeting the demands of the stressors, along with their subjective definitions of the stressors, impacted their perceived quality of life. Quality of life was assessed for the children of clergy as adolescents (retrospectively) and currently as an adult. In addition, quality of life was compared for male and female children of clergy to assess gender differences in the experiences of growing up in this family context. A comparison sample of adult children of non-clergy was also used to examine if the resulting quality of life for adult children of clergy differs from children who did not grow up in this environment. This chapter provides pertinent findings for discussion.

Summary of the Study

Family Stress Theory and the ABC-X model of family stress were used as the guiding theoretical perspectives in the study (Hill, 1949; McCubbin & Patterson, 1982, 1983). An online questionnaire design was used to test the model predicting the influence of the different variables in the ABC-X model, including individual and family stress (A), individual and family coping (B), and sense of coherence (C) on quality of life (X) for children of clergy and a comparison sample of children of non-clergy. Path analyses was performed to assess the relationships among all of the variables in the hypothetical model. Additionally, elements from Erickson's (1985) Theory of Psychosocial Development were used in the discussion of results to understand the process of identity formation in adolescent children of clergy, and how their identity formation may have been affected by their experiences of growing up in a clergy family.

This study incorporated a sample of adult children of clergy in the United States. The population for this study consisted of adult children (18 years or older) of Protestant clergy who had a parent who was a clergy member while they were growing up. The sampling frame for the study was based on a mailing list from a clergy support center that provides various information and resources to clergy and their families who live in the United States.

Two different rounds of sampling were conducted. The first round consisted of taking a random sample of the total 3,620 clergy members in the mailing list, to obtain a total of 2,418
selected participants. Clergy members were mailed a letter explaining the study, and requesting that they forward the letter to an adult child. The letter included an invitation to participate, informed consent, link to an online survey, and instructions. At the same time, a total of 1,623 e-mails were sent via the Internet to the children of non-clergy that were used for a comparison sample (821 were sent to a Southern Baptist congregation and 802 were sent to a United Methodist congregation) (Appendix C). These e-mails explained the purpose of the study, requested their participation, and assured anonymity.

A reminder postcard was mailed to all clergy member recipients exactly one week after the first mailing, to express appreciation to those who have already responded and to remind those who have not yet responded. A reminder e-mail was also sent to the comparison sample one week after the initial e-mail invitation was sent. After responses were received from the initial round of sampling, an additional 1,202 letters were sent to the remaining clergy members on the mailing list to attempt to increase the response rate. The final sample consisted of 220 surveys (86 were from children of clergy and 134 were from children of non-clergy).

The questionnaire consisted of 17 demographic items and a total of 197 items that were taken from the six instruments used to measure the variables of interest to this study. There were also questions at the end of the questionnaire that were only to be answered by children of clergy, which included four demographic items and four open-ended items. The variables in the study were measured with the following instruments. The Stressors of Clergy Children and Couples Scale was used to measure individual stress, and the Family Inventory of Life Events and Changes was used to measure family stress (McCubbin & Patterson, 1987; Ostrander, Ceglian, & Fournier, 1993). The Adolescent Coping Orientation for Problem Experiences was used to measure individual coping, and the Family Crisis Oriented Personal Evaluation Scales was used to measure family coping (McCubbin, Olson, & Larsen, 1987; Patterson & McCubbin, 1987). The Sense of Coherence scale was used to measure sense of coherence (Antonovsky, 1987, 1998). And finally, the Satisfaction With Life Scale was used to measure the quality of life, both as adolescents (retrospectively) and currently as adults (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985).

Two hypotheses and three research questions were used in the study to examine the quality of life of children of clergy. The original null hypothesis ($H_0$) in the study was that there would be no observed difference between male children of clergy, female children of clergy, male
children of non-clergy, and female children of non-clergy in terms of the variables of interest (i.e. levels of individual stress, family stress, individual coping, family coping, sense of coherence, and quality of life both as adolescents and adults). The original null hypothesis (H01) was based on these four comparison groups. However, due to the lower than anticipated response rate, a second null hypothesis (H02) was added to compare the totals of clergy and non-clergy children, without comparing gender. Analysis of variance, along with Tukey’s post-hoc procedure, was used to determine if significant differences existed among the four different groups of children of clergy (when considering gender).

The research questions for the study were as follows:

R1—When controlling for perceptions of clergy children versus non-clergy children, are individual and family stress (A) related to perceived retrospective quality of life (X) as adolescents (T) as mediated by individual and family coping (B) and definitions of the event/sense of coherence (C)? (A + B + C → X)

R2—When controlling for perceptions of clergy children versus non-clergy children, are individual and family stress (A) related to perceived current quality of life (X) as adults (A) as mediated by individual and family coping (B) and definitions of the event/sense of coherence (C)? (A + B + C → X)

R3—When controlling for perceptions of clergy children versus non-clergy children, are individual and family stress (A) related to perceived quality of life (X) retrospectively as adolescents (T) and currently as adults (A) when modeled together as mediated by individual and family coping (B) and definitions of the event/sense of coherence (C)? (A + B + C → X)

Path analyses were conducted to address the research questions in order to assess the influence of the independent variables in the models (levels of individual stress, family stress, individual coping, family coping, and sense of coherence) on the dependent variables (quality of life as adolescents and currently as adults).

The results of this study indicated that differences exist between children of clergy and children of non-clergy in terms of the level of stress, sense of coherence, and quality of life for this sample of children of clergy. Children of clergy experienced greater levels of individual and family stress than children of non-clergy. Children of clergy also had a lower sense of coherence about their lives than children of non-clergy. This study also indicated that these differences
influenced the quality of life as adolescents, with children of clergy experiencing a lower quality of life as adolescents than children of non-clergy. However, no significant differences were found in levels of coping as adolescents and quality of life as adults between children of clergy and children of non-clergy.

This study also examined the differences in the variables when accounting for gender, resulting in four groups studied (female children of clergy, male children of clergy, female children of non-clergy, male children of non-clergy). In terms of individual stress, significant differences were found for all four groups, with male children of clergy experiencing the greatest level, and male children of non-clergy reporting the least level of individual stress. No significant differences were found between the four groups in terms of family stress. In terms of individual coping skills, significant differences were only found between female children of non-clergy and male children of non-clergy, with females reporting greater levels of individual coping skills. No significant differences were found among the four groups in terms of family coping. When examining sense of coherence, significant differences were only found between female children of clergy and male children of non-clergy, with the latter reporting a greater sense of coherence. In terms of quality of life as adolescents, no significant differences were found between the groups except when comparing female children of clergy and male children of non-clergy, with female children of clergy reporting a lower quality of life. No significant differences were found between the groups in terms of quality of life as adults when gender was a factor.

Path analyses were conducted to determine separate path models for quality of life as adolescents, quality of life as adults, and quality of life as adolescents and adults when modeled together. The variable of children of clergy versus non-clergy was used as a control variable in order to run the three path analyses. The variables predicting quality of life as adolescents and adults were children of clergy versus non-clergy, individual stress, family stress, individual coping, family coping, and sense of coherence. When examining quality of life as an adolescent, the variables that showed significant direct and indirect influences on quality of life were lower individual stress, lower family stress, higher individual coping, and higher sense of coherence. The variables that showed significant direct and indirect influences on quality of life as adults included lower individual stress and higher sense of coherence. The variables that showed direct and indirect influences on quality of life as adolescents and adults included lower individual stress, lower family stress, greater individual coping, and greater sense of coherence.
Additionally, having a higher quality of life as an adolescent resulted in a higher quality of life as an adult. Notably, the quality of life as adolescents and adults was not influenced by family coping. The model $R^2$ for the quality of life as adolescents was larger, indicating greater explained variance in quality of life. The goodness-of-fit indices for all three models indicated a good model fit of the data resulting from observations of the variables.

**Discussion of the Findings**

**Discussion of Methodology**

A number of limitations to this study existed that resulted in a lower than optimal response rate. The limitations were primarily based on the difficulty related to gaining access to this population. While clergy members themselves were accessible through the mailing list from the clergy support center, the study was dependent upon the clergy members forwarding the survey invitation letter to their adult children. When sending the invitation letters to the clergy members, there was no way of knowing whether or not those individuals were currently at that same address, or whether or not the clergy member was even still alive. Some recipients of the letters indicated the individual to whom the letter was addressed was no longer employed there or was deceased; however, there could have been many more intended recipients who were also unavailable and never received the letter. There were also very likely many clergy members who did not have eligible children for the study, either because they had no children at all, or their children were still minors. Nevertheless, on the positive side, clergy children from many states and denominations were represented in the sample.

The use of a bulk mailing service may have also contributed to the lower response rate due to individuals being less likely to open mail with a bulk mailing rate. Additionally, possible perceptions of the study may have reduced the likelihood that individuals would participate. Some clergy members may have been hesitant to forward the letter to their children out of a sense of self-preservation or privacy. In particular, clergy members who came from problematic families may have been especially reluctant to pass on the letter to their adult children in an effort to preserve the image of the clergy family. There was no way of knowing how many clergy members actually forwarded the letter to their adult children.

Of those that actually received the survey invitation forwarded from their clergy parent, there may have been further explanations for the small response rate. First, children of clergy may have been reluctant to complete the survey due to a sense of privacy and family protection.
The length and complexity of the survey may have also reduced the likelihood that a participant would complete the survey. The survey took approximately 30 to 45 minutes to complete, so some participants may have been unwilling to invest the amount of time required to fully complete the survey. Several of the respondents began the survey but did not fully complete the survey, resulting in those responses being of no use for most analytical purposes.

Additionally, the response rate may have been lowered due to the inability to send a follow-up postcard to the adult children of clergy themselves. While a reminder postcard was sent to the clergy members, the actual addresses of the children of clergy were unknown, so a reminder postcard was not able to be sent to them. Dillman (2000) suggests sending a pre-notice prior to sending the actual survey, followed by reminder notices. However, this was not possible due to a data collection methodology that involved a dependency on the clergy members themselves forwarding the invitation letter to their adult children. This two-phase system was problematic, but the only way to access this special group of respondents.

For the comparison sample, limitations existed related to the use of e-mails to solicit participation for the study. Some people may not have been willing to even open the e-mail, and even fewer may have been willing to open a link to the online survey out of fear that might introduce a computer virus or direct them to an unwanted site. Additionally, only individuals within the congregation that had e-mail addresses were given the opportunity to participate in the sample.

A final limitation related to the low response rate may have been the lack of incentive for participation. Subjects were not given a monetary incentive for participation due to a lack of funding. Therefore participants only incentive would be out of a sense of obligation to further the understanding of the quality of life of children of clergy.

In addition to issues with the response rate, other limitations existed that may serve as potential threats to internal validity. First, there were differences in the mean age of the clergy children sample compared to the non-clergy children comparison sample. Clergy children had a mean age of 38, while non-clergy children had a mean age of 47. The difference in age between the groups may have affected the respondents' ability to accurately reflect back on their adolescent experiences. Older respondents may lack the ability to recall specific events from their childhood and may have simply forgotten their adolescent experiences. Older respondents have also had more time to mature and filter their adolescent experiences through their adult
experiences, which may result in different perspectives of their younger years. Other threats to internal validity relate to group differences in the clergy children and non-clergy children samples in terms of backgrounds such as education and denomination that may have affected the ability to accurately compare the two groups. The clergy children tended to be more highly educated than the non-clergy sample. Additionally, the clergy children sample was primarily from Methodist and Presbyterian backgrounds whereas the non-clergy sample was primarily from Baptist and Methodist backgrounds. These background differences resulted in non-equivalent groups which may have compromised the accuracy of the results.

Sampling issues also affected the internal validity of the study. Due to the process by which both the main clergy sample and the comparison clergy sample were obtained, this resulted in two different sampling methodologies. The clergy sample was obtained through letters mailed through the U.S. postal service, whereas the non-clergy sample was obtained through e-mails. Differences in how people respond to e-mail versus regular mail may have affected who actually responded. This resulted in dramatically different response rates between the clergy children and non-clergy children samples, with a much higher response rate from the comparison sample of non-clergy children.

Threats to the external validity occurred that affect the ability to generalize the results. External validity refers to the ability for the sample to represent a certain criterion group. Due to the multiple tiers of sampling required to obtain access to the clergy sample, the results may not be representative of all clergy children in the U.S. Since the comparison sample was drawn exclusively from two churches (Southern Baptist and United Methodist) from the same Southeastern U.S. city (Tallahassee, FL), additional caution should be exercised before the results are generalized to the entire population of clergy children in the U.S. Additionally, since the sample size was so low, the ability to generalize the results was compromised.

There were other issues related to the power of the results that stemmed from the low sample size. As stated previously, gender was dropped as a variable because it was not demonstrated to be a significant variable. However, a Type II error could have occurred when dropping that variable since there was not enough power to accurately answer that research question. It is possible that a larger sample size would have provided enough power to demonstrate gender differences among the variables.
Although there were limitations in the study, it should be noted that this was the first study of its kind that focused primarily on children of clergy in a quantitative manner. Even though the sample was small, the methodology of the study provided for meaningful results and served as a good starting point for future research of clergy children.

Discussion of the Hypotheses and Research Questions

Comparison of Children of Clergy and Children of Non-Clergy

This study included an analysis of data from a sample of children of clergy and a comparison sample of children of non-clergy to determine differences in levels of individual and family stress, individual and family coping, and sense of coherence, and how those affected their quality of life as adolescents and as adults. Significant differences were found between children of clergy and non-clergy children in terms of individual stress, family stress, sense of coherence, and quality of life as adolescents. Children of clergy were observed to have greater levels of individual stress and family stress, lower reported sense of coherence, and lower quality of life as adolescents. No significant differences were found between children of clergy and children of non-clergy in terms of individual coping, family coping, and quality of life as adults.

In terms of individual and family stress, an examination of the rank ordering of subscale variables provides further insight into the stressors experienced by children of clergy and children of non-clergy. Both children of clergy and children of non-clergy reported the “family’s public life” as the highest source of individual stress, with the second greatest source of individual stress being “expectations.” The greatest sources of family stress reported by both children of clergy and children of non-clergy were “intra-family strains,” “work-family transitions and strains,” and “transitions in and out.” Although these scores indicate that children of clergy and children of non-clergy reported the same top individual and family stressors, children of clergy experience them from unique sources that stem from their relationship to the church. For example, clergy children have higher expectations for church attendance and participation, as illustrated by one survey respondent when they said that one of the most stressful things they experienced as a clergy child was “being an example for church members and having to work in all church functions.” Additionally, clergy children have reported expectations for their behavior based on them being a “PK,” such as one clergy child who stated, “I was expected by all to be a ‘goody goody’.”
The difference in stress levels between children of clergy and children of non-clergy is consistent with previous findings that indicated that clergy families deal with unique external as well as internal stressors (Blanton, 1992). Clergy families deal with external stressors related to expectations, family boundaries, compensation, social support, and mobility. Internal stressors experienced by clergy families included marital communication, role redefinitions, self-esteem, identity, and parent-child relationships (Blanton, 1992). Children of clergy have been found to have the unique stressors of congregational expectations, boundary problems, lack of privacy, parsonage living, mobility, family-related problems, stereotypes, rebellion, and financial issues (Anderson, 1998; Bayer, Kent, & Dutton, 1972; Darling, Hill, & McWey, 2004; Lee & Balswick, 1989; Morris & Blanton, 1994a; Strange & Sheppard, 2001). Clergy families with children present in the home have also been shown to experienced more stress than clergy families without children in the home (Darling, McWey, & Hill, 2006).

When examining coping skills between the two groups, the lack of significant differences between clergy and non-clergy children in terms of individual and family coping was surprising. However, it should be noted that no prior research study conducted on children of clergy actually included a comparison sample of children of non-clergy to test differences in coping skills between the two groups. When the subscale variables were rank-ordered, the highest-ranked method of individual coping for both children of clergy and children of non-clergy was avoiding problems, with the lowest-ranked method being seeking professional support. This would indicate that regardless of whether you are a child of clergy or not, individuals are most likely to avoid problems as their top method of coping with stress, and use professional support only as a last resort to dealing with problems. Perhaps social desirability factors affect an individual’s willingness to seek professional support. Many clergy families have been found to not admit to role strain, role insufficiency, and role overload due to social desirability factors (Rayburn, Richmond, & Rogers, 1986).

The coping method of “seeking spiritual support” was ranked toward the bottom in both children of clergy and children of non-clergy as an individual coping method. Even though both groups had access to spiritual support, either through familial ties to the church (children of clergy) or current ties to the church (children of non-clergy), both groups were less likely to use this coping resource at an individual level than most of the other resources listed. For children of clergy, this does not come as a surprise, since the children may not have wanted to go to their
parent or anyone else in the church for spiritual support. Perhaps this is because they resented the church and how it impacted their family, and were, therefore, less likely to turn to the church for support. Additionally, children of clergy may be perceived as being “problem-free” and, therefore, people inside the church may be less likely to offer support.

However, when the family coping subscale was rank-ordered, both children of clergy and children of non-clergy ranked “seeking spiritual support” as their top method of family coping. It appears, then, that while individuals may be less likely to seek spiritual support and more likely to avoid problems, when placed in their family context, they were more likely to seek spiritual support than any other coping method. This finding leads to the question of where clergy families may turn for spiritual support, since they are the ones giving spiritual support in their own churches. Perhaps clergy families access their own spiritual resources such as their family’s faith systems for spiritual support, rather than turning to social agencies or others in their environment for help with coping with stress. Clergy families may be embarrassed to seek help from outside sources since they are seen as the support system for their congregation. However, clergy families need a support system from outside their congregation such as through non-denominational agencies that can serve as ministers to ministers.

These findings are consistent with previous research that indicated that clergy families use a variety of coping methods to deal with their stressors, including seeking spiritual support, reframing, passive appraisal, mobilizing the family to seek help, and seeking social support (Darling, Hill & McWey, 2004). Clergy families’ resources for coping have also been shown to affect their quality of life. For example, the greater number of supportive relationships in a minister’s life, the greater their reported well-being and life satisfaction (Lee & Iverson-Gilbert, 2003). In a study by Darling, Hill, & McWey (2004) on clergy and clergy spouses, quality of life was directly and positively related to spiritual resources, finding that clergy who possessed greater spiritual resources experienced a higher quality of life. At an individual level, there is a general lack of empirical data that shows specifically how children of clergy cope with their stressors; therefore there is no way to compare the current results with previous research.

In terms of children of clergy’s perceptions about their situations, this study showed clergy children to have a reported lower sense of coherence about their situation than the comparison sample of non-clergy children. Sense of coherence is an indication of one’s ability to manage their situation and find meaningfulness from their circumstances. Sense of coherence serves as a
buffer and a mediator between adversity and positive well-being. For example, in one study psychological well-being was not directly affected by stressful experiences and adversity, but rather indirectly through the sense of coherence (Gana, 2001).

In the present study, a lower sense of coherence among clergy children indicates that overall they had a lower feeling of comprehensibility, manageability, and meaningfulness about their lives than the comparison sample of non-clergy children. Additionally, a strong positive correlation existed between sense of coherence and quality of life as adolescents and as adults, meaning that a lower sense of coherence led to a lower quality of life. In other words, the less able they are to handle things, the lower their quality of life tended to be. Therefore, it is not surprising that this study indicated children of clergy have a lower sense of coherence, since it has been positively related to quality of life in previous research and in the current study. Since children of clergy reported a lower quality of life as adolescents, it makes sense that their sense of coherence as adolescents would be low as well.

The question of why clergy children's sense of coherence is so low must be addressed. Perhaps with all of the expectations and restrictions placed on clergy children, they are not given the opportunity to learn how to effectively manage their situations for themselves. If clergy parents are too controlling of their children’s behavior because they want them to be socially appropriate, the children will not develop a sense of coherence because they feel a lack of control over their own situation. If a primary element of sense of coherence is a feeling of manageability, yet a child has no ability to manage their own situation or to develop a sense of mastery, this would in turn lead to a low sense of coherence. Sense of coherence is also affected by the resources one has to meet the demands posed by stimuli deriving from one’s internal and external environments (Antonovsky, 1987). Therefore, given the finding that coping resources were the same for children of clergy and non-clergy, it would appear that although children of clergy experience greater stressors than non-clergy children, they do not have the additional resources to cope with these additional stressors. This could lead to feeling overwhelmed by their situation, which would affect their overall sense of coherence.

When examining the results of quality of life as adolescents and as adults between clergy and non-clergy children, it is interesting that while children of clergy reported a lower quality of life than children of non-clergy as adolescents, no significant difference was found in terms of quality of life as adults. Although the children of clergy reported significantly lower quality of
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life as adolescents than their non-clergy peers, by the time they reached adulthood, these differences had dissipated. Perhaps once the children of clergy were no longer living in a clergy household and experiencing the daily stressors of that lifestyle, their quality of life improved, resulting in similar scores in quality of life as children of non-clergy.

The difference in quality of life between clergy families and non-clergy families has been examined in previous research. One study in particular examined the differences in psychological adjustment between minister’s families and a normative group (Moy & Malony, 1987). Using Olson’s Circumplex Model, the study found that minister’s families had more families in the “extreme” range of family type and more families in the “chaotic” range of adaptability than the normative comparison group (Olson, Sprenkle, & Russell, 1979). Additionally, a higher percentage of minister’s children scored in the “clinical range” of the Achenbach Child Behavior Checklist than the normative group (Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1983). These results are consistent with the present study’s findings that children of clergy have a lower quality of life while living in the minister’s family context than their non-clergy children comparison group.

Research Questions

Path analyses were conducted using Amos to assess the influence of the independent variables in the models (levels of individual stress, family stress, individual coping, family coping, and sense of coherence) on the dependent variables (quality of life as adolescents and currently as adults). The path analyses resulted in three different versions of path models: quality of life as adolescents, quality of life as adults, and quality of life as adolescents and adults when modeled together, all with clergy versus non-clergy as a moderator variable. The analyses procedures included calculations for regression coefficients (β) for each path in the three models. The analyses also provided an explained variance (R²) and goodness-of-fit indices for each of the three models, as well as direct, indirect, and total effects of the predictor variables on quality of life for each group.

Predictive Analyses for Quality of Life as Adolescents. The path model for quality of life as adolescents showed significant direct relationships for sense of coherence, individual coping, and family stress on quality of life. Analyses indicated that the higher their sense of coherence, the greater their quality of life was as adolescents. In fact, sense of coherence provided the greatest total influence on quality of life as adolescents, and served as a mediator between
individual stress and quality of life as adolescents. The lower the individual’s stress, the greater their sense of coherence, which in turn led to a greater quality of life as an adolescent.

The effect of sense of coherence on quality of life has been established in prior research that demonstrated that the more an individual views his world as comprehensible, manageable, and meaningful, the greater their ability to reduce the intensity of emotional burdens resulting from stress (McCubbin, Thompson, Thompson, Elver, & McCubbin, 1994). Through their sense of coherence and appraisal process, families are able to reduce the intensity of emotional burdens resulting from stressors and strains, clarify stressors so they can view them as more manageable, and encourage the family system to fulfill its duty of promoting the emotional and social development of individual members. One survey respondent illustrated the effect of having a positive perspective on their situation:

My parents taught us from a very young age that this was a ‘calling’ on our lives. God put my father in ministry for a reason. This was God’s plan and purpose for us. It was never viewed as something negative. We were always very proud to be the preacher’s kids.

Path analyses also resulted in a positive relationship between individual coping and quality of life as an adolescent, signifying that the higher the individual’s ability to cope, the greater their quality of life was as adolescents. It is clear from previous research that coping resources are critical to the individual’s overall quality of life. Coping affects the ability of the family to prevent a transition or event from becoming a disruption or crisis in the family (McCubbin & Patterson, 1983).

Predictive analyses also demonstrated a direct inverse relationship between family stress and quality of life as adolescents, indicating that the greater the family stress level, the lower the quality of life was as adolescents. This result is not surprising given the number of stressors and strains that clergy families have been found to deal with from individual members of their families, the entire family unit, the congregation in which they serve, and the community in which they live. As a result, clergy families contend with unique stressors and strains that could result in a pile-up of stressors that affect individual family members’ overall quality of life.

In examining the path model for quality of life as an adolescent, whether or not the adolescent was a child of clergy only resulted in a direct effect on family coping resources. A positive relationship existed between clergy versus non-clergy and family coping, indicating that
clergy children tended to have higher family coping resources than non-clergy children. It is interesting that the path model showed a direct relationship between clergy versus non-clergy and family coping, yet the correlation matrix did not show a significant correlation between these two variables. Additional analyses should be conducted in the future to examine whether or not this was a Type I error or if there is indeed a relationship between these two variables that was not demonstrated in the correlation matrix in the presence of the other variables. The direction of the relationship is also of interest, since it indicated that clergy children have higher family coping than non-clergy children. Given the high number of stressors that clergy families deal with, perhaps this results in the development of greater coping skills within their family in order to meet the demands of the stressors. It is also interesting that the variable of “clergy versus non-clergy” only had a significant effect on family coping. It would appear that overall the same processes for handling stress occur regardless of whether or not you are in a clergy family, with the exception of family coping. Previous research has found that the contexts families are within will influence their ability to manage stress and serve as a mediator to resilience (Boss, 2002). The current study demonstrates that while the process for stress management is essentially the same for clergy and non-clergy children, the context of being in a clergy family did result in higher stress levels and lower sense of coherence as adolescents, and a resulting lower quality of life as adolescents. The variables in this path model accounted for 52.3% of the explained variance in quality of life scores, which indicated the proportion to which this model accounts for the variation of the data set.

**Predictive Analyses for Quality of Life as Adults.** The path model for quality of life as adults showed significant direct relationships for sense of coherence and individual stress on quality of life. Sense of coherence provided the greatest direct effect on perceived quality of life as adults, indicating that the higher their sense of coherence as adolescents, the higher their quality of life was as adults. This finding is consistent with previous research within clergy families, where quality of life has been shown to be directly and positively related to sense of coherence, with those clergy families who had greater sense of meaning in their lives reporting a higher quality of life (Darling, Hill, & McWey, 2004). Sense of coherence also served as a mediator between individual stress as adolescents and their perceived quality of life as adults. The lower the individual’s stress as adolescents, the greater their sense of coherence as adolescents, which in turn led to a greater perceived quality of life as an adult. It seems that
clergy children who had more individual stressors as adolescents were less likely to perceive their lives as manageable, which in turn resulted in a lower quality of life as adults.

When indirect effects are accounted for, individual stress provided the greatest total effect on perceived quality of life as adults. Individual stress had a direct inverse relationship to perceived quality of life as adults, indicating that greater levels of individual stress as adolescents resulted in a lower perceived quality of life as adults. What is interesting about this finding is the residual affect of individual stress as adolescents on the resulting perceived quality of life as adults. This was illustrated by one survey respondent who stated that he or she still deals with “lingering neuroses from personal, familial and community high expectations...I'm a perfectionist trying to learn to put the right perspective on my achievements and accomplishments rather than constantly attempting to achieve more.” Another respondent summarized the lasting effects of the stress of growing up in a clergy family by stating,

I believe my eating disorder (unknown to my family) is significantly related to my experiences growing-up in the church. I love my church and my family (and God!) but I wish I hadn't felt so silenced growing up--trying to maintain expectations of the church, behave well, fulfill the "good kid" role all the while living in a fishbowl! I think I would have learned to use my voice (rather than my body) if I had felt permitted to speak more.

It is also of interest to compare the model of quality of life as adults with quality of life as adolescents. In the predictive analyses for quality of life as adolescents, there were no significant direct affects of individual stress on quality of life, yet there were significant direct affects of family stress on quality of life as adolescents. However, in contrast, in the predictive analyses for quality of life as adults, the reverse occurred. An inverse direct relationship existed between individual stress and quality of life as adults, yet there were no significant direct affects of family stress on quality of life as adults. These results would appear to indicate that the family stressors had more of an immediate effect on quality of life as adolescents, yet those stressors dissipated as the adolescent grew into adulthood. However, the individual stressors, while not appearing to have an immediate effect on quality of life as adolescents, had more of a delayed effect on quality of life as adults. Perhaps once the individual is out of the family context as an adult, the stressors they experienced inside the family are left behind and what remains are the results of the individual stressors they experienced.
In examining the path model for quality of life as an adult, whether or not the adult was a child of clergy only resulted in a direct effect on family coping. A positive relationship existed between clergy versus non-clergy and family coping, indicating that clergy children tended to have higher family coping. This finding was similar to the path model for quality of life as adolescents, which also found that the variable of “clergy versus non-clergy” only had a significant effect on family coping. It would appear that overall the same processes for handling stress occur regardless of whether or not you are in a clergy family, with the exception of family coping, even when the model was run with “quality of life as an adult” as the end result.

The variables in this model accounted for 16.2% of the explained variance in quality of life scores. It is interesting that such a low percentage of variance was explained with this model. This low number would seem to indicate that running the model with “quality of life as an adult” as the lone outcome was perhaps not the most effective method for understanding the data. Therefore, the predictive analyses for quality of life as adolescents and adults when modeled together might better serve as a tool for understanding the data.

Predictive Analyses for Quality of Life as Adolescents and Adults When Modeled Together. Modeling quality of life as adolescents together with quality of life as adults enabled the examination of all of the variables together, as well as an examination of the effect of perceived quality of life as adolescents on quality of life as adults. The combined path model showed significant direct relationships for sense of coherence, individual coping, and family stress on perceived quality of life as adolescents. Additionally, significant direct relationships were shown for quality of life as adolescents, as well as individual stress on quality of life as adults.

Quality of life as adolescents served as a mediating variable between quality of life as an adult and sense of coherence, individual coping, and family stress as adolescents. It is interesting that when quality of life as adults and quality of life as adolescents were modeled together, sense of coherence was no longer directly related to quality of life as adults as it was in Figure 4, but instead was indirectly related as it was mediated by quality of life as adolescents. This would indicate that when adolescents have higher levels of comprehensibility, manageability, and meaningfulness about their situations as adolescents, they were more likely to perceive a higher quality of life at the time, and this feeling endured into adulthood. Likewise, those who felt like their lives were unmanageable or meaningless perceived a lower quality of life, which in turn
resulted in a lower quality of life as adults. These findings highlight the lingering effect of adolescent experiences on adult quality of life. What happens in adolescence appears to be a major factor in quality of life as adults.

In terms of quality of life as adolescents, sense of coherence provided the greatest total effect. Once again, this underscores the effect that sense of coherence has on quality of life. Boss (2003) indicated that perceptions are even more predictive than resources in determining how families manage stress and crisis. In this particular study, “perception” is defined specifically by “sense of coherence,” which is the perception that “I can handle this.” Therefore, when clergy children had the feeling that they could handle the stressors in their lives, they were more likely to experience a greater quality of life as adolescents. Sense of coherence served as a mediating variable between individual stress and quality of life as an adolescent. This finding is consistent with previous research which has shown that sense of coherence plays a buffering role between stressful experiences and well-being (Gana, 2001). Stressful experiences and adversity do not affect psychological well-being directly, but do so through the mediator of sense of coherence.

When quality of life as adolescents was integrated into the model to explain current quality of life as an adult, the variable that provided the greatest total effect on quality of life as adults was quality of life as adolescents. Once again, this finding highlights the residual affect of quality of life as adolescents on their resulting quality of life as adults. It would seem that although the adult clergy child is no longer physically living in the clergy household, their overall experience of growing up in a clergy family remain with them throughout their adult lives. Likewise, the model also demonstrated that the other direct, yet inverse effect on quality of life as an adult was individual stress as an adolescent. This would also underscore the pervasive effects of individual stress on an adolescent that remain with them into adulthood. This may be explained by the fact that although the adult is no longer living in the context of the clergy family, they still are indeed a “clergy child,” and carry all the burdens associated with this title. This was illustrated by one adult clergy child when they stated,

I have found it incredibly difficult to learn to be a part of the church normally, without being automatically known and/or ‘special’ by being a part of a clergy family. I am struggling to learn that I am a valuable member of the church just by being myself and not because I fill a role.
The variables in this model accounted for 52.3% of the explained variance in quality of life as adolescent scores, and 21.2% of the explained variance in quality of life as adult scores. The explained variances that resulted from modeling quality of life as adolescents with quality of life as adults together demonstrated that this model provided a better fit of the data.

Related Findings

Several related findings were of interest to this study. Analyses were performed to compare differences between the clergy and non-clergy children in terms of several demographic variables as well as specific subscale variables.

Tests of Differences of Other Variables in Study

Demographic variables were compared between the total clergy and total non-clergy groups and several yielded significant differences in means. In regard to their current relationship with their father, clergy children reported a better relationship with their father than non-clergy children (no differences were reported between clergy and non-clergy children regarding their relationship with their mother). This result is somewhat surprising given that one of the major expressed stressors of clergy families is a lack of quality time together. However, perhaps since clergy families tend to report feelings of isolation and a lack of social support, this may result in families turning to each other for support and may result in closer family relationships. When questioned about their current religious attendance, non-clergy children reported a higher frequency of religious participation than non-clergy children. However, this result could be explained by the fact that the comparison sample of non-clergy children was drawn from a set of individuals currently associated with a particular church. Previous research has examined the relationship between the religious commitment of the adult child of a minister and the different experiences of growing up in a minister’s home. Intimacy with mother and father was positively correlated with all measures of religious commitment, with clergy children reporting that the biggest influence on their religious choices was their parents (Anderson, 1998).

When examining subscale variables, several interesting findings were discovered. Within the major variable of individual stress, the total clergy scores were higher than total non-clergy scores for the subscales of family’s public life, expectations, and family isolations, indicating that all three of these are areas of greater stress for clergy children. This is no surprise given that the clergy family generally experiences a lack of privacy, where they live with the feeling that every move they make is witnessed and scrutinized by church members (Lee & Balswick, 1989).
Additionally, higher feelings of family isolation could be related to the greater mobility of clergy families, which make it more difficult to form lasting attachments with individuals outside the family. In regards to family stress, total clergy scores were higher than total non-clergy scores for the subscales of intra-family strains and work-family transitions and strains, indicating that clergy children experience greater stress in these two areas than non-clergy children. This result is not surprising given the nature of the unique work strains that clergy experience, from the obvious weekly demands of preaching and leading a church, to the often unseen demands of helping individual members of their congregations during troubling times. The expectations placed on clergy by their congregations often result in their own family’s needs going unmet (Morris & Blanton, 1998).

Within the major variable of individual coping, overall clergy children reported lower usage of the coping skills of ventilating feelings and avoiding problems, but higher usage of seeking professional support and relaxing. It should be noted that, although the overall reliability for the ACOPE instrument measuring individual coping was good, the individual subscale reliabilities were inconsistent and caution should be taken when interpreting results from the subscales. With that said, perhaps the reason for the lower usage of ventilating feelings is that clergy children are often expected to endure the many stressors that the family experiences without complaint, somehow assuming that these children are unique in their ability to endure stress. Yet clergy children have the same needs for individuality, respect, and privacy as everyone else (Lee, 1992). It is interesting that children of clergy reported a higher usage of professional support services; however, this may be the result of clergy children experiencing higher levels of individual and family stress than non-clergy children, requiring more assistance with those stressors.

One other related finding of interest concerned clergy children’s reported experience of living in a parsonage. When asked whether living in a parsonage frequently created problems for them while growing up, 37.25% either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Interestingly, an equal percentage responded that they either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. These results indicated that living in a parsonage resulted in a range of experiences for children of clergy, with some experiencing it as problematic while others not experiencing significant problems.
Discussion of Open-Ended Responses

The open-ended responses in this study were provided to give respondents an opportunity to offer details about the stressors they experienced in their churches and in their families while growing up, as well as the stressors they currently experience as adult children of clergy. Several themes emerged from the qualitative responses that provided a greater depth to the quantitative data (see Chapter 4 for selected quotes illustrating the themes). The major themes were: expectations for behavior and church involvement, family problems, lack of family time/church demands, moving, finding their own spiritual path, and lack of distress among many.

These themes that emerged from the open-ended responses verified the information provided by the quantitative data, which suggested that children of clergy experience greater levels of individual and family stress than non-clergy children due to the unique family context that they were raised in. For example, one respondent discussed the stressor of boundary violations during the vacations and holidays:

I think the most stressful thing my family had to deal with was the constant uncertainty of any plans that we would make. With both my parents as ministers there was an almost never-ending demand on one of them from one of their congregation, such as a death of someone in the church or community. We would have to make plans knowing that they may change at any time, without warning. Another stressor was holidays like Christmas & Easter. In our house these times were the opposite of calm, relaxing, and fun-- just the opposite. My parents had different churches and different schedules and holidays were always very demanding: sermons to figure out, bulletins to do, people to see. These were normal daily/weekly realities but during the holidays they were always magnified 10-fold and that made the whole house engulfed in stress and a sense of 'grin and bare it, soon it will pass, and after these holidays we'll 'breath.'

Boundary violations in clergy families have been reported in previous research, with minister's children reporting difficulty for their families in maintaining boundaries between professional and family life, and the feeling of constant intrusion of their parent's work (Lee & Balswick, 1989). “Intrusions” were among six boundary-related stressors that were found to affect the stress in clergy families, in addition to mobility, congregational fit, space, isolation, and time (Hill, Darling, & Raimondi, 2003).
It was also interesting to hear the struggles that come as adult children of clergy as they attempt to find their own spiritual path, which in some cases may be different than the one they grew up with. This was illustrated by one clergy child, when they stated, “My personal spirituality is very different than that of my father and I feel stress that he is unwilling to have conversations about my spirituality with me in an adult to adult kind of way.” When an adult child chooses a faith that differs from their clergy parent, this could add to the stressors within that family. Some adult clergy children also reported feeling pressure to follow in their parent’s footsteps, such as when one described the stress of congregation members “expecting me to follow in my dad’s shoes...I’m going to school for nursing ...isn’t that enough?”

Finally, the open-ended responses illustrated the finding that while overall children of clergy report a lower quality of life, there are still a significant number that were satisfied with their experience as a clergy child. Many of those comments illustrated the effect that perception had on their overall experience of growing up as a clergy child, demonstrating that those with a greater sense of coherence experienced a higher quality of life.

Theoretical Implications and Suggested Future Research

The findings from this study add to the body of knowledge in Family Stress Theory by offering an application of this theory to the experience of growing up as a clergy child. Additionally, implications for research and practice may be derived from the data. Although the results of this study should be treated with caution due to some of the limitations previously discussed, the study did supply sufficient information to apply the findings to the theoretical framework and to suggest recommendations for future research and practice. The following discussion summarizes these implications and suggestions.

Implications for Theory

There were several theoretical implications that resulted from this study. This study primarily used Family Stress Theory and the classic ABC-X model of family stress as the guiding theoretical perspectives (Hill, 1949; McCubbin & Patterson, 1982, 1983). Additionally, concepts from Erikson’s Theory of Psychosocial Development will be discussed in this section to examine identity formation in the adolescent children of clergy (Erikson, 1985).

The ABC-X Model of Family Stress was utilized with its four factors of stress, resources for coping, definition of the event (sense of coherence), and crisis or level of stress (quality of life) (Hill, 1949). This study was a good example of the utility of Hill’s original Model of Family
Stress, since it provided an easy fit for the path models used in the predictive analysis for the study. Results from the study are consistent with the principles of the ABC-X Model of Family Stress, which explains how a family will experience stressors dependent upon a combination of their resources for coping and their sense of coherence about the situation. The degree to which the outcome is a crisis for a family is determined by the family’s resources for dealing with the crisis and the definition that the family attaches to the event (McCubbin, Olson, & Patterson, 1983). The following describes the theoretical implications of using the ABC-X model as they relate specifically to the clergy family context.

In the context of the clergy family, the ABC-X model of family stress helped explain how some children of clergy and their families are able to cope with ease during life’s hardships, while others seem to be overwhelmed by the unique stressors they encounter. All families experience stress to differing degrees. Clergy children experience stressors that are unique to their particular family context. This study found that clergy children also experienced individual and family stress to a greater degree than non-clergy children. However, the ABC-X model helps explain that other factors in addition to the level of stress contribute to a person’s overall quality of life. The model highlighted the effect of mediating variables such as coping and sense of coherence between stress and quality of life in clergy children.

According to Family Stress Theory, the greater an individual’s resources for coping, the higher their quality of life will be. In terms of clergy children, this study demonstrated the effect of individual coping on quality of life, showing that clergy children who had a higher level of individual coping also had a higher quality of life as an adolescent. However, in terms of family coping, the path analyses did not find a significant direct or indirect relationship between family coping and quality of life of adolescents. This finding is interesting in light of Family Stress Theory that stresses the importance of the family’s resources in meeting the demands of stressor events. Additional analyses could be conducted to determine if a Type II error occurred during the original data analyses. This may have resulted in failing to observe a difference when in truth there is one, which may have indicated poor sensitivity in testing using the F-COPES instrument (McCubbin, Olson, & Larsen, 1987). Additionally, given the fact that the clergy children and non-clergy children samples were relatively homogeneous in terms of religiosity, family coping differences could have been masked. Future studies could further examine the role of family coping in clergy children’s quality of life.
Family Stress Theory also highlights the effect of sense of coherence on quality of life. In this study, sense of coherence served as a mediating variable between individual stress and quality of life as an adolescent as well as an adult. Individuals with a lower level of stress had a higher sense of coherence, which in turn led to a greater quality of life as an adolescent as well as an adult. Measuring all of these variables and modeling them using the ABC-X components helped improve our understanding of the interactive processes among stress levels, resources for coping, sense of coherence, and quality of life for clergy children.

This study provided a good illustration of the utility of the ABC-X model of family stress and adds to the general body of knowledge for Family Stress Theory by offering an application of this framework to the context of clergy children. However, additional theoretical implications for Family Stress Theory could be concluded. Family Stress Theory has experienced a number of changes and additions over the past several decades, resulting in a more multifaceted model called the Family Adjustment and Adaptation Response Model (Patterson, 1988, 1989, 2002). Such a model, with its complex multiple-tiered approach to modeling, has created the need for larger sample sizes to meet the requirements for causal modeling. This study illustrated the utility of Hill’s original ABC-X model with its four factors of stress, coping, definition of the event, and crisis, which allowed the variables in the current study to be analyzed even with a relatively small sample size.

Another theoretical implication that can be drawn from this study related to the ability of the ABC-X model to measure quality of life over time. The model resulted in a higher explained variance when used for quality of life as adolescents as compared to quality of life currently as adults. This could be due to the fact that the primary factors in the model focused on stress, coping, and sense of coherence as adolescents, so these factors were a better predictor of quality of life at adolescents than currently as adults. Future research on clergy children would perhaps be more effective if conducted on clergy children while they are still adolescents, even though this does create additional challenges with studying minors. This would allow respondents to answer as they are currently feeling, instead of having to answer retrospectively, as time has way of changing one’s perspective on their experiences. Follow-up studies could then be conducted on that same sample 10 and 20 years later as adults, which could provide more reliable results for how quality of life is affected over time.
This study also provided implications for Erikson’s Theory of Psychosocial Development, which can be used to examine identity formation in the adolescent children of clergy, and how the quality of their lives was shaped by the unique social environment in which they were raised (Erikson, 1985). Adolescents are typically in the stage of ego identity versus role confusion, wherein the youth is faced with “what they appear to be in the eyes of others as compared with what they feel they are” (p. 261). An adolescent who successfully masters this stage will develop a positive ego identity, which leads to a sense of fidelity, described as a faithfulness or devotion to one’s obligations or duties.

Adolescents’ identity formation is affected by the social context in which they live. The pastor’s child’s search for identity is lived out in the unique context of the church congregation, which is affected by the added expectations and demands placed on them (Lee, 1992). While most adolescents’ search for identity is played out in the privacy of their homes, the pastor’s child plays out his or her search in a public forum, where they live with the feeling that every move they make is observed and judged by church members (p. 31). Since clergy families live in such a public forum, social desirability may also occur, causing the parents to want their children to be viewed as favorable among the congregation and in the community (Darling, McWey, & Hill, 2006). This could result in greater demands for behavior placed on children of clergy than their non-clergy peers.

This theory also explains how an adolescent clergy child who successfully mastered this stage would experience a higher quality of life due to their positive ego identity. However, unsuccessful resolution of this stage could lead to role confusion, which leads to a sense of uncertainty about one’s identity. This could explain the lingering effect of the individual stressors experienced by children of clergy on their quality of life as adults, since their adolescent years were filled with such intense stressors. Likewise, this theory explains the theme that emerged from the qualitative data that illustrated the clergy child’s struggle to find their own spiritual path as an adult, which resulted from role confusion as an adolescent.

Although this study allowed the use of Erikson’s Theory of Psychosocial Development to explain the process of identity formation and resulting quality of life in clergy children as adolescents, future studies could focus more on this process in clergy children. For example, future studies could examine how clergy children develop their identity within their unique
family context, and which variables determine the outcome of such development as either positive ego identity or role confusion.

**Implications for Research**

A number of implications for research resulted from this study. This study provided a better understanding of the unique family context within which children of clergy live. Although a number of studies have focused on clergy members and spouses, fewer studies have specifically focused on children of clergy, with virtually no other study focusing on the interactive processes that occur between their stress, coping, sense of coherence, and quality of life (Blanton, 1992). Additionally, few studies provided comparison samples between children of clergy and children of non-clergy to examine the differences in stress and quality of life. Additional research is still needed that compares children of clergy to children of non-clergy to see what differences in life experiences actually exist that account for the higher levels of stress found among clergy children. For example, empirical research could be conducted to examine the validity of stereotypes of children of clergy as either rebellious or highly compliant. Although some research has examined clergy children stereotypes, more work could be done to determine if such stereotypes are valid (Bayer, Kent, & Dutton, 1972; Strange & Sheppard, 2001). It would also be of interest to examine what factors lead clergy children to either rebel or excel.

This study was limited by the fact that respondents were asked to reflect back on their adolescence and answer questions retrospectively. As stated under the previous section, future research could focus on clergy of children at various ages, such as when they are adolescents and at various points in adulthood. Additionally, limitations resulted from the mean age of the clergy children being 9 years less than the non-clergy children comparison group, which may have resulted in differences in their ability to accurately recall their experiences. Future research could control for age to determine if age served as an intervening variable.

The sample included any individuals who had a clergy parent, regardless of position within the church. Future research could examine differences between clergy children whose parents were senior pastors as compared to other ministerial staff within the church, since senior pastors often carry different stress loads than other staff. Comparisons could also be drawn between children of full-time versus part-time staff, or even bi-vocational staff. The current
sample was primarily Caucasian. Therefore, racial differences could also be examined to determine if stress and quality of life differs between various racial groups.

Another possible area for future research would be to compare different denominations of clergy children using the variables in this model, which would provide greater understanding of the influence of denominational differences. Several studies have been conducted on denominational differences in clergy families; however, additional research is needed to examine how different denominations view children of clergy and what support services are offered specifically for the children (Mickey, Wilson, & Ashmore, 1991; Morris & Blanton, 1994b). The current study was also limited by the comparison sample, which only included two Protestant denominations: Southern Baptist and United Methodist, both of which were in the same city. Future research could include a more diverse comparison sample comprised of individuals from more denominations, as well as individuals not affiliated with churches at all, and from individuals in different locations around the country.

This study highlighted the effect of individual coping on quality of life. Further exploration is needed into the differences in personal coping strategies between children of clergy versus children of non-clergy to find out more about the ways that clergy children cope with the unique stressors they are faced with. Such findings could provide practitioners with effective ways to increase personal coping in clergy children.

Finally, future research could examine the career aspirations of clergy children as adolescents compared to what they actually become as adults. Several of the open-ended responses illustrated the pressure that some clergy children experienced as adolescents to follow their parent’s example by also becoming a clergy member. It would be interesting to further explore those pressures to determine the actual career choices of clergy children as adults. Additionally, birth order influences could be examined to determine if that affects a clergy child’s choice to become a clergy member as an adult.

**Implications for Practice**

Several apparent implications for practice have resulted from this study, including implications for clergy families themselves, implications for congregations, implications for helping professionals, and implications for denominations. Perhaps the best hope for dealing with the stressors of clergy life comes from clergy families themselves. When examining the rank ordering of subscale variables, the two greatest family stressors were intra-family strains.
and work-family transitions and strains. This could serve as an indicator of a lack of quality family time among clergy families, and a lack of boundaries between work and family. Clergy families, and in particular the pastors themselves, need to be aware of the effect that the demands of their jobs have on family life, which make it difficult for them to have time together with their families. As stated by London and Wiseman (2003), “pastors are the only change agents who are aware enough to correct the problem. And no other group is likely to feel the problem so keenly or have more interest in finding a solution” (p. 295). This was illustrated by the qualitative results of the current study, where many children of clergy expressed that the demands of the church often supersede the demands of the family, leaving the needs of the clergy family unmet. Therefore, clergy families need to focus on balancing the demands of church and family, and set aside time that is solely focused on the family. For example, clergy families should take regularly-scheduled time off, starting with one day each week to be with the family apart from church duties, as well as extended family vacations each year, and should take advantage of periodical sabbaticals to replenish their physical, spiritual, and emotional resources. Clergy families also need to maintain boundaries during these times off, such as allowing telephone calls to go to voice mail, and allowing other staff members to respond to crises that may occur during their times off. Pastors also need to learn the power of delegation, and focus on leadership development of other staff members as well as with lay people in the church so that they can give ministry away to other leaders instead of keeping it all to themselves. Clergy members also need to recognize that there will always be work that is left to be done at the church, but their children will only be young once.

In examining the rank ordering of subscale variables, the top two sources of individual stress were the family’s public life and expectations. This would indicate that clergy families need to examine the standards of behavior they may have set for their children to determine if they are realistic. Such unrealistic demands for behavior cause undue stress on children of clergy, who are already dealing with so many other stressors associated with being in a clergy family. As has already been stated, “PKs” seem to often have a reputation for being the most troubled children in the church. Perhaps this is because pastors place the most pressure on their families to maintain the best possible reputation, and feel that they must model the happy, successful, Christian family. As a result, a disconnect occurs between who they appear to be and who they really are, resulting in role confusion. Unrealistic expectations and pressure placed on
clergy children may also cause them to rebel, which in turn reinforces the negative reputation that many clergy children have. Instead, clergy parents should be realistic about their expectations, and demonstrate the same type of grace and mercy they show their congregations to their own children when they fail to meet these expectations. Perhaps by receiving grace and mercy from their own parents, children of clergy would be less likely to live up to the rebellious reputation that many of them experience.

Second, a number of implications for congregations came as a result of this study. Congregations should be aware of the expectations that they place on children of clergy and the pressure that this places on them. The demands that are placed on clergy children by congregations to live up to a set of unrealistic expectations leads to additional stress and can push them to rebel from the church. Congregations need to understand that children of clergy are not perfect, and are going through the same process of role identification as their peers who happen to not be in clergy families. Instead of acting as judge to the clergy child, congregations need to support clergy children, offering to build relationships with them that are authentic and based on realistic standards for behavior. Congregations also need to evaluate the expectations they have on the clergy member, and how those affect the clergy family’s time and energy. Clergy families are often expected to be available every hour of every day, be at every function, and perform every unassigned task in the church (Lee, 1992). Although many demands of congregation members arise from legitimate needs, congregations also need to recognize that clergy families have a legitimate need to be together, and they should respect this need and reduce intrusions on family time.

Third, implications for helping professionals resulted from this study. For those in counseling relationships with clergy families and their children, this study provides a new perspective on the processes of dealing with their stress, and the interplay of coping resources and sense of coherence on the resulting quality of life. By providing clinicians with a better understanding of the stressors, coping, and appraisal factors that affect quality of life in children of clergy, they will be better equipped to help such individuals enhance the skills necessary to improve their quality of life. This study demonstrated that individual stress had a direct effect on quality of life as adults and an indirect effect on quality of life as adolescents as it was mediated by sense of coherence. These results highlight the importance of helping adolescent children of clergy reduce the number of individual stressors that they experience, as well as helping them
develop a healthy sense of coherence about their situation. Additionally, path analyses found that individual coping had a positive, direct effect on quality of life as adolescents. Research has shown that in general, “the more resources you have available, the better you are able to cope” (Ingoldsby, Smith, & Miller, 2004, p. 140). Therefore, counselors can help clergy children develop the personal coping skills needed to manage their situations. Personal resources could include individual characteristics such as knowledge, skills, and self-esteem (Lavee, McCubbin, & Patterson, 1985). Counselors could help clergy children develop such characteristics through therapy that focuses on development of self-esteem and self-discovery. Additional personal coping strategies could also be taught such as setting boundaries, meditation/prayer, journaling, and using relaxation techniques to cope with stressors.

The current study found that sense of coherence was one of the greatest contributors to quality of life as both adolescents and adults. Because sense of coherence serves as a buffer and a mediator between adversity and positive well-being, counselors can also guide children of clergy to reframe their circumstances and help them develop a sense of comprehensibility, manageability, and meaningfulness in their family situations and lives in general (Gana, 2001). This could be done by structuring specific interventions such as cognitive restructuring that may help clergy children replace negative definitions of their family situations with more positive definitions. This study also highlighted the affect on role identification that these stressors have on clergy children. Therefore, counselors can assist clergy children with their search for identity so they can successfully master this stage of development and come away with a positive ego identity. Counselors can also help clergy children navigate the added demands and expectations that are being placed on them by their families as well as their congregations, helping them develop positive coping strategies rather than self-destructive ones.

Implications for practice relate to denominations and their role in provide support services to clergy families and children. This study highlighted the importance of having appropriate coping resources, with one of them being having access to support services. While denominations may have some understanding of the demands that clergy families face, denominational awareness has been partial, at best (Morris & Blanton, 1994b). Denominations need to understand the unique stressors that clergy families experience, and undergird clergy families by providing the necessary support systems to strengthen them. A broader scope of services is needed for clergy families and their children, including at the denominational,
congregational, and familial levels. Support services traditionally have only been provided for clergy members, ignoring the needs of the children; yet this study highlighted the effects of stressors on the clergy children themselves. Denominations should provide services for clergy families and children, including counseling, education, and enrichment activities such as retreats. One survey responded addressed this need when they stated, "I believe that ministers should be offered counseling and other assistance to help them keep the stability in their own homes. I believe the family members would not be as stressed if the minister was less stressed."

Church staff other than the senior pastor may also serve as support systems to the clergy children while they are growing up, including children and student pastors. Staff members can provide emotional support to deal with the stressors and demands of clergy life as well as spiritual support as children of clergy seek to discover their own spiritual path in life. Clergy members should help facilitate such relationships between their own children and other staff members, rather than undermining those relationships out of self-preservation.

Lastly, denominations may heed the advice of one survey respondent who offered a suggestion for training for clergy:

I think they should teach a course in Seminary about keeping family relationships as the most important aspect of the ministry. If ministers would realize that the home is the most important mission field, I believe there would be less rebellion among "preacher's kids."

Summary and Conclusions

In conclusion, results from this research demonstrated that the quality of life of the clergy children studied was influenced not only by the intensity of the stressors they experienced, but also by their resources for coping and their sense of coherence about their situations. When asked to reflect back on their adolescence, children of clergy reported greater levels of individual and family stress than children of non-clergy. Key to understanding how these stress levels affected their resulting quality of life was the factors of individual and family coping and sense of coherence. No differences were found between children of clergy and children of non-clergy in terms of individual and family coping. However, children of clergy did report a lower sense of coherence than children of non-clergy, which included the factors of manageability, meaningfulness, and comprehensibility in life. Perceived quality of life was measured both as adolescents and adults for the clergy and non-clergy groups. Children of clergy reported a lower
quality of life as adolescents, but no differences were found in quality of life as adults between clergy children and non-clergy children. Perceived quality of life as adolescents was affected directly but inversely by level of family stress, and positively by sense of coherence and individual coping. Quality of life as adults was directly and positively affected by quality of life as adolescents and inversely affected by individual stress as adolescents. Sense of coherence provided the greatest total affect on quality of life as adolescents, whereas quality of life as adolescents provided the greatest total affect on quality of life as adults.

These findings highlight the importance of helping children of clergy develop a healthy sense of coherence about their lives, which can be aided by their families, congregations, denominations, and clinicians. This study also demonstrated the residual affect that quality of life as adolescents has on the resulting quality of life as adults. As such, it is important to help children of clergy experience their formative years in a positive manner, because it is evident that these experiences stay with them for a lifetime.

A greater understanding was needed of the key components that most influence the quality of life of children of clergy. This study focused much-needed attention on the processes that affect the quality of life of children of clergy. Although a number of studies have focused on quality of life of clergy members, clergy spouses, and their families as a whole, few researchers have focused specifically on quality of life of the children themselves (Blanton 1992; Darling, Hill, & McWey, 2004; Hill, Darling, & Raimondi, 2003; Lee & Iverson-Gilbert, 2003). Yet it is apparent from this study that children of clergy experience the systemic effect of the stressors that their parents experience, as well as their own set of individual stressors. By reducing the number of stressors that clergy children experience, their quality of life would improve. Additionally, by providing support services to help children of clergy cope on a personal level, quality of life would improve. Therefore, clergy families, congregations, denominations, and other helping professionals should heed these results and strive to increase support services for children of clergy. While some support services exist for clergy members, additional services are needed for the children themselves.

The lingering effect that quality of life as adolescents had on the resulting quality of life as adults was evident from several responses to the open-ended questions in this survey. These responses perhaps provide the greatest concluding statements to this study:
Even as a 45 year old professional, I still filter everything in life through the colander of being raised in the home I was raised in... Even at 45, I am still the little preacher's daughter who wants everyone to like her and feels responsible for making sure everyone also likes her dad, mom, and brother. This has led me to battle being a "performer" every day."

After 25 years, I still am lacking a relationship with my father because of his need to dedicate his time to the church. While I still have a strong faith and belief in God, organized religion disgusts me. The hardships the spouse and children of a member of the clergy go through can only begin to be explored by this study. If the church did not equate hiring someone with owning them, my life and the lives of millions of families would be significantly different today.

By giving a voice to this typically unheard audience, this study examined the experiences of clergy children so that they may in turn be supported. Hearing from adult children of clergy as they reflected back on their experiences as adolescents has provided a unique opportunity to understand this population and highlight the key factors that affect their quality of life.
APPENDIX A
SURVEY
Stressors & Quality of Life of Clergy Children

1. What is your age?

2. What is your gender?

3. What is your present marital status?

4. If married, how many years have you been married to your current spouse?

5. How many children do you have?

6. How many children currently live in your home?

7. What is your highest educational level?

8. How many hours a week are you involved in paid employment OUTSIDE the home?

9. How many hours a week are you involved in paid employment INSIDE the home?

10. Which of the following best describes your racial/ethnic background (mark all that apply)?

   - [ ] White/Caucasian
   - [ ] Black/African American
   - [ ] Hispanic/Latino
   - [ ] Native American/American Indian
   - [ ] Asian American
   - [ ] Other
11. What was the predominant religious denomination of your family while growing up?

12. What is your current religious denomination?

13. Which of the following best describes the number of times per year that you currently attend religious services?

14. Are you or your spouse currently employed as clergy?

15. Which parent was employed as a clergy while you were growing up?

16. How would you describe your current relationship with your father?

17. How would you describe your current relationship with your mother?

If any of the things on the list below happened to you WHEN YOU WERE AN ADOLESCENT, please indicate how upset you were when it happened. If something on the list did not happen to you, please mark "no."

Use the following scale when answering these questions:
1--No (Didn't happen)
2--Not Upset
3--Little Upset
4--Somewhat Upset
5--Quite Upset
6--Very Very Upset

18. The death of a close relative
   1 2 3 4 5 6

19. The time our family spends praying/reading the Bible together.
   1 2 3 4 5 6
20. The parents in our family fight
   1 2 3 4 5 6

21. One parent in our family is gone a lot on weekends and on evenings when the children and other parent are home
   1 2 3 4 5 6

22. Lack of privacy for our family
   1 2 3 4 5 6

23. How our town/neighborhood think ministers' families should behave
   1 2 3 4 5 6

24. Whether or not our family practices what they preach
   1 2 3 4 5 6

25. Another family member's emotional or mental health
   1 2 3 4 5 6

26. Moving
   1 2 3 4 5 6

27. Being criticized
   1 2 3 4 5 6

28. Both parents work because we need the money
   1 2 3 4 5 6

29. Both parents work
   1 2 3 4 5 6

30. Whether or not I can ask for help if I feel sick
   1 2 3 4 5 6

31. The way I am or am not allowed to be angry or show any other negative emotions (sadness, anger, hatred, or such)
32. Being told how to act by people in the church or community
   1 2 3 4 5 6

33. Feeling all alone or different from other people my age
   1 2 3 4 5 6

34. The parents in our family are divorced or talk about getting a divorce
   1 2 3 4 5 6

35. Not having a really good, close friend
   1 2 3 4 5 6

36. Whether or not the church or the family is more important to our family
   1 2 3 4 5 6

Indicate the level of stress experienced by your family WHILE YOU WERE AN ADOLESCENT. Use the following scale:
1--None
2--Low
3--Moderate
4--High

37. Increase of father's time away from family.
   1 2 3 4

38. Increase of mother's time away from family.
   1 2 3 4

39. A member appeared to have emotional problems
   1 2 3 4

40. A member appeared to depend on alcohol or drugs.
   1 2 3 4

41. Increase in conflict between husband and wife.
42. Increase in arguments between parent(s) and children.
   1 2 3 4

43. Increase in conflict among children in the family.
   1 2 3 4

44. Increased difficulty in managing teenage child(ren).
   1 2 3 4

45. Increased difficulty in managing school-age children (6-12 years old)
   1 2 3 4

46. Increased difficulty in managing preschool child(ren) (2 1/2-6 years old).
   1 2 3 4

47. Increased difficulty in managing toddler(s) (1-2 1/2 years old).
   1 2 3 4

48. Increased difficulty in managing infant(s) (0-1 yr old).
   1 2 3 4

49. Increase in the amount of "outside activities" which the child(ren) are involved in.
   1 2 3 4

50. Increased disagreement about a member's friends or activities.
   1 2 3 4

51. Increase in number of problems or issues which don't get resolved.
   1 2 3 4

52. Increase in the number of tasks or chores which don't get done.
   1 2 3 4
53. Increased conflict with in-laws or relatives.
   
   Scale: 1—None 2—Low 3—Moderate 4—High

54. Parent was separated or divorced.

55. Parent had an affair.

56. Increased difficulty in resolving issues with a "former" or separated spouse.

57. Increased difficulty with sexual relationship between husband and wife.

58. A family member had an unwanted or difficult pregnancy.

59. An unmarried member became pregnant.

60. A member had an abortion.

61. A member gave birth to or adopted a child.

62. Took out a loan or refinanced a loan to cover increased expense.

63. Went on welfare.
Scale: 1--None  2--Low  3--Moderate  4--High

64. Changes in conditions (economic, political, weather) which hurt the family business.
   1 2 3 4

65. Changes in Agriculture Market, Stock Market, or Land Values which hurt family investments and/or income.
   1 2 3 4

66. A member started a new business.
   1 2 3 4

67. Purchased or built a new home.
   1 2 3 4

68. A member purchased a car or other major item.
   1 2 3 4

69. Increased financial debts due to over use of credit cards.
   1 2 3 4

70. Increased strain on family "money" for medical/dental expenses.
   1 2 3 4

71. Increased strain on family "money" for food, clothing, energy, home care.
   1 2 3 4

72. Increased strain on family "money" for child(ren)'s education.
   1 2 3 4

73. Delay in receiving child support or alimony payments.
   1 2 3 4

Scale: 1--None  2--Low  3--Moderate  4--High

74. A member changed to a new job/career.
1 2 3 4

75. A member lost or quit a job.
1 2 3 4

76. A member retired from work.
1 2 3 4

77. A member started or returned to work.
1 2 3 4

78. A member stopped working for extended period (e.g., laid off, leave of absence, strike).
1 2 3 4

79. Decrease in satisfaction with job/career.
1 2 3 4

80. A member had increased difficulty with people at work.
1 2 3 4

81. A member was promoted at work or given more responsibilities.
1 2 3 4

82. Family moved to a new home/apartment.
1 2 3 4

83. A child/adolescent member changed to a new school.
1 2 3 4

Scale: 1--None  2--Low  3--Moderate  4--High

84. Parent/spouse became seriously ill or injured.
1 2 3 4

85. Child became seriously ill or injured.
1 2 3 4
86. Close relative or friend of the family became seriously ill.
   1 2 3 4

87. A member became physically disabled or chronically ill.
   1 2 3 4

88. Increased difficulty in managing a chronically ill or disabled member.
   1 2 3 4

89. Member or close relative was committed to an institution or nursing home.
   1 2 3 4

90. Increased responsibility to provide direct care or financial help to husband's and/or wife's parents.
   1 2 3 4

91. Experienced difficulty in arranging for satisfactory child care.
   1 2 3 4

92. A parent/spouse died.
   1 2 3 4

93. A child member died.
   1 2 3 4

94. Death of a husband's or wife's parents or close relative.
   1 2 3 4

95. Close friend of the family died.
   1 2 3 4

Scale: 1--None 2--Low 3--Moderate 4--High

96. Married son or daughter was separated or divorced.
   1 2 3 4
97. A member "broke up" a relationship with a close friend.
   1 2 3 4

98. A member was married.
   1 2 3 4

99. Young adult member left home.
   1 2 3 4

100. Young adult member began college (or post high school training).
   1 2 3 4

101. A member moved back home or new person moved into the household.
   1 2 3 4

102. A parent/spouse started school (or training program) after being away from school for a long time.
   1 2 3 4

103. A member went to jail or juvenile detention.
   1 2 3 4

104. A member was picked up by police or arrested.
   1 2 3 4

105. Physical or sexual abuse or violence in the home.
   1 2 3 4

106. A member ran away from home.
   1 2 3 4

107. A member dropped out of school or was suspended from school.
   1 2 3 4

Use the following scale to indicate how often you did these things

http://www.hostedsurvey.com/takesurvey.asp
WHEN YOU WERE ADOLESCENT when you faced difficulties or felt tense, or as a way to cope with problems:

1--Never
2--Hardly Ever
3--Sometimes
4--Often
5--Most of the time

NOTE: Anytime the words parent, mother, father, brother, or sister are used, they also mean step-parent, step-mother, etc.

108. Go along with parents' requests and rules.
   1  2  3  4  5

109. Read
    1  2  3  4  5

110. Try to be funny and make light of it all
    1  2  3  4  5

111. Apologize to people
    1  2  3  4  5

112. Listen to music--stereo, radio, etc.
    1  2  3  4  5

113. Talk to a teacher or counselor at school about what bothers you.
    1  2  3  4  5

114. Eat food
    1  2  3  4  5

115. Try to stay away from home as much as possible
    1  2  3  4  5

116. Use drugs prescribed by a doctor
    1  2  3  4  5

117. Get more involved in activities at school
1 2 3 4 5

118. Go shopping; buy things you like
   1 2 3 4 5

Scale: 1--Never  2--Hardly Ever  3--Sometimes  4--Often  5--Most of the time

119. Try to reason with parents and talk things out; compromise
   1 2 3 4 5

120. Try to improve yourself (get body in shape, get better grades, etc.)
   1 2 3 4 5

121. Cry
   1 2 3 4 5

122. Try to think of the good things in your life
   1 2 3 4 5

123. Be with a boyfriend or girlfriend
   1 2 3 4 5

124. Ride around in the car
   1 2 3 4 5

125. Say nice things to others
   1 2 3 4 5

126. Get angry and yell at people
   1 2 3 4 5

127. Joke and keep a sense of humor
   1 2 3 4 5

128. Talk to a minister/priest/rabbi
   1 2 3 4 5
129. Let off steam by complaining to family members
   
   Scale: 1—Never  2—Hardly Ever  3—Sometimes  4—Often  5—Most of the time

130. Go to church
   
131. Use drugs (not prescribed by a doctor)
   
132. Organize your life and what you have to do
   
133. Swear
   
134. Work hard on schoolwork or other school projects
   
135. Blame others for what's going wrong
   
136. Be close with someone you care about
   
137. Try to help other people solve their problems
   
138. Talk to your mother about what bothers you
   
139. Try, on your own, to figure out how to deal with your problems or tension
Scale: 1--Never 2--Hardly Ever 3--Sometimes 4--Often 5--Most of the time

140. Work on a hobby you have (sewing, model building, etc.)
1 2 3 4 5

141. Get professional counseling (not from a school teacher or school counselor)
1 2 3 4 5

142. Try to keep up friendships or make new friends
1 2 3 4 5

143. Tell yourself the problem is not important
1 2 3 4 5

144. Go to a movie
1 2 3 4 5

145. Daydream about how you would like things to be
1 2 3 4 5

146. Talk to a brother or sister about how you feel
1 2 3 4 5

147. Get a job or work harder at one
1 2 3 4 5

148. Do things with your family
1 2 3 4 5

149. Smoke
1 2 3 4 5

Scale: 1--Never 2--Hardly Ever 3--Sometimes 4--Often 5--Most of the time

150. Watch T.V.
151. Pray

1 2 3 4 5

152. Try to see the good things in a difficult situation

1 2 3 4 5

153. Drink beer, wine, liquor

1 2 3 4 5

154. Try to make your own decisions

1 2 3 4 5

155. Sleep

1 2 3 4 5

156. Say mean things to people; be sarcastic

1 2 3 4 5

157. Talk to your father about what bothers you

1 2 3 4 5

158. Let off steam by complaining to your friends

1 2 3 4 5

159. Talk to a friend about how you feel

1 2 3 4 5

160. Play video games, pool, pinball, etc.

1 2 3 4 5

161. Do a strenuous physical activity (jogging, biking, etc.)

1 2 3 4 5

Decide how well each statement describes your FAMILY'S attitudes
and behavior in response to problems or difficulties. Indicate your level of agreement with each statement using the following scale:

1--Strongly Disagree
2--Moderately Disagree
3--Neither Agree Nor Disagree
4--Moderately Agree
5--Strongly Agree

162. Sharing our difficulties with relatives
   1 2 3 4 5

163. Seeking encouragement and support from friends
   1 2 3 4 5

164. Knowing we have the power to solve major problems.
   1 2 3 4 5

165. Seeking information and advice from persons in other families who have faced the same or similar problems.
   1 2 3 4 5

166. Seeking advice from relatives (grandparents, etc.)
   1 2 3 4 5

167. Seeking assistance from community agencies and programs designed to help families in our situation
   1 2 3 4 5

168. Knowing that we have the strength within our own family to solve our problems
   1 2 3 4 5

169. Receiving gifts and favors from neighbors (e.g. food, taking in mail, etc.)
   1 2 3 4 5

170. Seeking information and advice from the family doctor
   1 2 3 4 5

171. Asking neighbors for favors and assistance
172. Facing the problems "head-on" and trying to get solution right away

173. Watching television

174. Showing that we are strong

175. Attending church services

176. Accepting stressful events as a fact of life

177. Sharing concerns with close friends

178. Knowing luck plays a big part in how well we are able to solve family problems

179. Exercising with friends to stay fit and reduce tension

180. Accepting that difficulties occur unexpectedly

181. Doing things with relatives (get-togethers, dinners, etc.)

Scale: 1--Strongly Disagree  2--Moderately Disagree  3--Neither Agree nor Disagree  4--Moderately Agree  5--Strongly Agree
Agree nor Disagree  4--Moderately Agree  5--Strongly Agree

182.  Seeking professional counseling and help for family difficulties
        1 2 3 4 5

183.  Believing we can handle our own problems
        1 2 3 4 5

184.  Participating in church activities
        1 2 3 4 5

185.  Defining the family problem in a more positive way so that we do not become too discouraged
        1 2 3 4 5

186.  Asking relatives how they feel about problems we face
        1 2 3 4 5

187.  Feeling that no matter what we do to prepare, we will have difficulty handling problems
        1 2 3 4 5

188.  Seeking advice from a minister
        1 2 3 4 5

189.  Believing if we wait long enough, the problem will go away
        1 2 3 4 5

190.  Sharing problems with neighbors
        1 2 3 4 5

191.  Having faith in God
        1 2 3 4 5

Please mark the number which expresses your answer, with numbers 1 and 7 being the extreme answers. Answer the following questions AS YOU WOULD HAVE ANSWERED AS AN ADOLESCENT.

192.  Do you have the feeling that you don’t really care about what goes
on around you?
Very seldom or never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very often

193. Has it happened in the past that you were surprised by the behavior of people whom you thought you knew well?
Never happened 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Always happened

194. Has it happened that people whom you counted on disappointed you?
Never happened 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Always happened

195. Until now your life has had:
No clear goals or purpose at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very clear goals and purpose

196. Do you have the feeling that you're being treated unfairly?
Very often 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very seldom or never

197. Do you have the feeling that you are in an unfamiliar situation and don't know what to do?
Very often 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very seldom or never

198. Doing the things you do every day is:
A source of deep pleasure and satisfaction 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 A source of pain and boredom

199. Do you have very mixed-up feelings and ideas?
Very often 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very seldom or never

200. Does it happen that you have feelings inside you would rather not feel?
Very often 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very seldom or never

201. Many people—even those with a strong character—sometimes feel like sad sacks (losers) in certain situations. How often have you felt this way in the past?
Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very often

202. When something happened, have you generally found that:
You overestimated or You saw things in
203. How often do you have the feeling that there's little meaning in the things you do in your daily life?

Using the scale below, indicate your agreement with each item by marking the appropriate number.

1=STRONGLY DISAGREE
2=DISAGREE
3=SLIGHTLY DISAGREE
4=NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE
5=SLIGHTLY AGREE
6=AGREE
7=STRONGLY AGREE

First, answer these five questions AS YOU WOULD HAVE AS AN ADOLESCENT.

205. In most ways my life is close to my ideal.

206. The conditions of my life are excellent.

207. I am satisfied with my life.

208. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.

209. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.

Next, answer these same five questions AS YOU CURRENTLY FEEL.
**AS AN ADULT.**

210. In most ways my life is close to my ideal.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

211. The conditions of my life are excellent.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

212. I am satisfied with my life.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

213. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

214. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.
   Strongly disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Strongly agree

**Answer the remaining questions ONLY IF YOU WERE A CHILD OF A CLERGY MEMBER:**

215. While you were growing up, how far did you live from the church where your parent was employed?

216. Living in a parsonage frequently created problems for me while growing up.

217. How many years was your parent employed in ministry while you were growing up (birth-18 yrs old)?

218. Which of the following best describes the average church size (in attendance) in which your parent was employed?

219. What were the most stressful things you have had to deal with in your CHURCH as a child of a clergy while you were growing up?
220. What were the most stressful things you have had to deal with in your FAMILY as a child of a clergy while you were growing up?

221. What are the most stressful things you currently have to deal with as an adult child of a clergy?

222. Is there anything else you feel we should know?

PREVIEW / TEST MODE
Your Responses Will Not Be Permanently Saved.
Contact your survey administrator if you were directed to this INACTIVE version of the survey.
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APPROVAL MEMORANDUM

Date: 9/19/2007

To: Cynthia Wilson
121 Goose Creek Trail
Tallahassee, FL 32317

Dept.: FAMILY & CHILD SCIENCE

From: Thomas L. Jacobson, Chair

Re: Use of Human Subjects in Research
Understanding Stress and the Quality of Life for Adolescent Children of Clergy: A Retrospective Study

The forms that you submitted to this office in regard to the use of human subjects in the proposal referenced above have been reviewed by the Human Subjects Committee at its meeting on 3/14/2007. Your project was approved by the Committee.

The Human Subjects Committee has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals which may be required.

If the project has not been completed by 3/13/2008 you must request renewed approval for continuation of the project.

You are advised that any change in protocol in this project must be approved by resubmission of the project to the Committee for approval. The principal investigator must promptly report, in writing, any unexpected problems causing risks to research subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the chairman of your department and/or your major professor is reminded that he/she is responsible for being informed concerning research projects involving human subjects in the department, and should review protocols of such investigations as often as needed to insure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with DHHS regulations.

This institution has an Assurance on file with the Office for Protection from Research Risks. The Assurance Number is IRB00000446.

cc: Carol Anderson Darling,
HSC No. 2007.785
Office of the Vice President For Research  
Human Subjects Committee  
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2742  
(850) 644-8633 · FAX (850) 644-4392

REAPPROVAL MEMORANDUM

Date: 4/15/2008

To: Cynthia Wilson  
121 Goose Creek Trail  
Tallahassee, FL 32317

Dept.: FAMILY & CHILD SCIENCE

From: Thomas L. Jacobson, Chair

Re: Reapproval of Use of Human subjects in Research:  
Understanding Stress and the Quality of Life for Adolescent Children of Clergy: A  
Retrospective Study

Your request to continue the research project listed above involving human subjects has been approved  
by the Human Subjects Committee. If your project has not been completed by 4/9/2009 please request  
renewed approval.

You are reminded that a change in protocol in this project must be approved by resubmission of the  
project to the Committee for approval. Also, the principal investigator must report to the Chair promptly,  
and in writing, any unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the Chairman of your department and/or your major professor are  
reminded of their responsibility for being informed concerning research projects involving human  
subjects in their department. They are advised to review the protocols of such investigations as often  
as necessary to insure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with  
DHHS regulations.

Cc: Carol Anderson Darling,  
HSC No. 2008.0248-R
APPENDIX C
INFORMED CONSENT AND COVER LETTERS
October 8, 2007

Dear Clergy Member:

As a Minister of Children and Families at a Protestant church in Tallahassee, Florida, and a Doctoral student at Florida State University, I am conducting a study on the stress and quality of life of children of clergy. This study is being conducted in conjunction with the staff of the D.A. & Elizabeth Turner Clergy Center of the Pastoral Institute, who provided their mailing list of clergy members. You are receiving this letter because you are on their mailing list of clergy persons.

I would like to ask for your help in conducting this study by forwarding this letter to one of your adult children so that we may invite them to participate in this study. The study will involve answering an online questionnaire designed to examine the unique stressors and quality of life of children of clergy. The questionnaire will take approximately 20-30 minutes to complete. As an adult child of clergy, their answers to this questionnaire will help support vital research in understanding what it was like to grow up in this unique environment. Their responses will help shed light on their experiences, and will hopefully provide future direction for resources for clergy families.

I hope that you will take minute to forward this letter to one of your adult children (18 or older). If you have more than one adult child, please choose the oldest child.

INFORMATION FOR PARTICIPANTS:

To participate in the online questionnaire, please go to the following website:


The questionnaire will be available online until November 15, 2007.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not to participate, there will be no penalty. The questionnaire is anonymous. The results of the study may be published but your name will not be known. Information obtained during the course of the study will remain confidential, to the extent allowed by law.

If you have any questions concerning the research study, please contact me at 850/591-6027 or cbw9991@fsu.edu, or Dr. Carol Darling at 644-4429 or cdarling@fsu.edu. Completion of the online questionnaire will be considered your consent to participate. Your help will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Cynthia B. Wilson, CFLE
Doctoral Candidate
Florida State University
October 23, 2007

Dear Clergy Member:

I recently sent you a letter requesting your help with a study I am conducting in conjunction with the staff of the D.A. & Elizabeth Turner Clergy Center of the Pastoral Institute on the stress and quality of life of children of clergy. I asked you to please forward the letter to one of your adult children so they could take the online questionnaire. Thank you to those of you who have already done this. If you have not done so already, please forward this postcard to one of your adult children (18 or older). If you have more than one adult child, please choose the oldest child.

INFORMATION FOR PARTICIPANTS:

To participate in the online questionnaire, please go to the following website:


The questionnaire will be available online until November 15, 2007.

Your participation in this study will support vital research in understanding the lives of children of clergy. If you have any questions, please contact me at cbw9991@fsu.edu or 850/591-6027.

Sincerely,

Cynthia B. Wilson
Doctoral Candidate
Florida State University
November 21, 2007

Dear Clergy Member:

As a Minister of Children and Families at a Protestant church in Tallahassee, Florida, and a Doctoral student at Florida State University, I am conducting a study on the stress and quality of life of children of clergy. This study is being conducted in conjunction with the staff of the D.A. & Elizabeth Turner Clergy Center of the Pastoral Institute, who provided their mailing list of clergy members. You are receiving this letter because you are on their mailing list of clergy persons.

I would like to ask for your help in conducting this study by forwarding this letter to one of your adult children so that we may invite them to participate in this study. The study will involve answering an online questionnaire designed to examine the unique stressors and quality of life of children of clergy. The questionnaire will take approximately 20-30 minutes to complete. As an adult child of clergy, their answers to this questionnaire will help support vital research in understanding what it was like to grow up in this unique environment. Their responses will help shed light on their experiences, and will hopefully provide future direction for resources for clergy families.

I hope that you will take minute to forward this letter to one of your adult children (18 or older). If you have more than one adult child, please choose the oldest child.

**INFORMATION FOR PARTICIPANTS:**

To participate in the online questionnaire, please go to the following website:


The questionnaire will be available online until December 31, 2007.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not to participate, there will be no penalty. The questionnaire is anonymous. The results of the study may be published but your name will not be known. Information obtained during the course of the study will remain confidential, to the extent allowed by law.

If you have any questions concerning the research study, please contact me at 850/591-6027 or cbw9991@fsu.edu, or Dr. Carol Darling at 644-4429 or cdarling@fsu.edu. Completion of the online questionnaire will be considered your consent to participate. Your help will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Cynthia B. Wilson, CFLE
Doctoral Candidate
Florida State University
December 5, 2007

Dear Clergy Member:

I recently sent you a letter requesting your help with a study I am conducting in conjunction with the staff of the D.A. & Elizabeth Turner Clergy Center of the Pastoral Institute on the stress and quality of life of children of clergy. I asked you to please forward the letter to one of your adult children so they could take the online questionnaire. Thank you to those who have already done this. If you have not done so already, please forward this postcard to one of your adult children (18 or older). If you have more than one adult child, please choose the oldest child.

INFORMATION FOR PARTICIPANTS:

To participate in the online questionnaire, please go to the following website:


The questionnaire will be available online until December 31, 2007.

Your participation in this study will support vital research in understanding the lives of children of clergy. If you have any questions, please contact me at cbw9991@fsu.edu or 850.591.6027.

Sincerely,
Cynthia B. Wilson
Doctoral Candidate
Florida State University
Dear Cindy,

As a Minister of Children and Families at a Protestant church in Tallahassee, Florida, and a Doctoral student at Florida State University, I am conducting a study on the stress and quality of life of children of clergy. This study is being conducted in conjunction with the staff of the D.A. & Elizabeth Turner Clergy Center of the Pastoral Institute. As part of this study, I am using a comparison sample of adults who did not have a clergy parent. You are receiving this e-mail because your church has agreed to assist with this research by forwarding this survey on to its members.

I am requesting your participation, which will involve taking a few minutes of your valuable time to respond to a questionnaire designed to examine the stress and quality of life that you experienced while growing up. The questionnaire will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. Your responses will be compared to adult children of clergy and will help support vital research in understanding what it was like to grow up in their unique environment. Your responses will help shed light on their experiences, and will hopefully provide future direction for resources for clergy families.

Below is a link to this survey. You have the option of linking directly to the questionnaire and answering it online, or you may print the questionnaire, complete it by hand, and mail it back to me at the address below.

I hope that you will take a few minutes to complete this survey. Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time, there will be no penalty. The questionnaire is anonymous. The results of the study may be published but your name will not be known. Information obtained during the course of the study will remain confidential, to the extent allowed by law.

If you have any questions concerning the research study, please contact me at 850/591-6027 or cbw9991@fsu.edu, or Dr. Carol Darling at 644-4429 or cdarling@fsu.edu. Completion of the online survey will be considered your consent to participate. Your help will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Cynthia B. Wilson
Doctoral Candidate
Florida State University

Survey URL: http://www.hostedsurvey.com/takesurvey.asp?c=Stress122559&rc=1

If you would prefer to print the survey and mail it in, please send it to:

Cynthia B. Wilson, Doctoral Candidate
College of Human Sciences
Department of Family & Child Sciences
225 Sandels Building
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306-1491

This email was sent to cbw9991@fsu.edu by mail@hostedware.com.

If you have questions about this email or do not wish to receive additional emails, please reply or contact the survey administrator.
APPENDIX D
LETTERS OF PERMISSION
Cindy Wilson

From: John Adams [jadams@pilink.org]
Sent: Friday, April 06, 2007 10:28 AM
To: cindy@immanuelonline.com
Cc: Margaret Wooden
Subject: Requested list...
Attachments: Research Clergy Mailing 4-4-07.xls

4-6-07

Cindy Wilson:
We received your request for a list of clergy affiliated with the Turner Ministry Resource Center. You will find an attachment of over 3000 names and address information. We are positive of some duplication. Unfortunately, the Excell format is the ONLY way we can provide this information. Some of the information is dated and/or incorrect, as you can imagine in an extensive list of this nature. However, we do hope that you will find enough support for your project.

It is our understanding that the information will be used in a confidential manner and that we will receive a copy of the results of your study. Please credit the Turner Ministry Resource Center, a division of The Pastoral Institute, Columbus, Georgia, as appropriate.

Thank you for your interest and commitment to clergy and clergy families. We extend every good wish for your project.

SHALOM

John B. Adams, M. Div.
Director of Administration & Congregational Care
D.A. & Elizabeth Turner Ministry Resource Center
Pastoral Institute, Inc.
2022 Fifteenth Avenue
Columbus, GA 31901
706-649-6360 x 1258
Fax 706-649-6363
jadams@pilink.org
www.pilink.org

4/6/2007
Subject: RE: RE: FSU Survey

From: Billy Vinson <bvinson@kumconline.org>

Date: Monday, November 5, 2007 10:38 am

To: cbw9991@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

Cindy,

You're welcome! I don't hesitate to tell you that I had some trepidation before sending this email. The fears and doubts sometime immobilize us. The email actually went to 802 addresses.

Good luck on your dissertation.

Blessings,

Billy

-----Original Message-----
From: cbw9991@garnet.acns.fsu.edu [mailto:cbw9991@garnet.acns.fsu.edu]
Sent: Saturday, November 03, 2007 2:47PM
To: Billy Vinson
Subject: RE: RE: FSU Survey

Billy,

Sorry for the late reply. I've been on a staff retreat the last few days. Thank you SO much for your help with this!! I cannot express how much this will help and how much I appreciate KUMC's willingness to be a part of my study!

In Christ,

Cindy

Quoting Billy Vinson <bvinson@kumconline.org>:

> Cindy,
> > The mass email to our membership is running as I write this email to
> > you.
> > > It selected over 1500 records for the email. That probably translates
> > into 800 email addresses.
> > > Have a blessed day,
> > > Billy
> > >
> > ----Original Message-----
> > From: Cynthia Wilson [mailto:cbw9991@fsu.edu]
> > Sent: Wednesday, October 24, 2007 3:25 PM
> > To: Billy Vinson
> > Subject: Re: RE: FSU Survey
> >
> > Billy-
> > Thank you for getting back with me on this. We are also doing this
> > survey at Immanuel, with full staff support. They all agreed that this
> > is a worthy study. My dissertation committee really wanted me to have
> > a
> > diversity of denominations represented in the study, which is why I
> > was
> > getting churches other than just Immanuel to participate. I understand
> > completely about the sensitivity of sending e-mails out. People are
> > completely inundated with spam these days. But this project is not
> > spam,
It is an empirical study that just happens to be delivered via e-mail.
The project's methodology has been reviewed and approved by FSU's Human Subjects Committee. So far our church members have been very receptive to participating in a legitimate research project that will aid in understanding and ministering to minister's children. And the nice thing about this is, there is absolutely no pressure to participate. Those that receive the e-mail have the option to participate or to ignore the request.

If you would be willing to help, my survey will be available online until November 15. Whatever you can do to help will be greatly appreciated.

In Christ,
Cindy Wilson, Doctoral Candidate
Minister of Children & Families
Immanuel Baptist Church

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Billy Vinson <bvinson@cumconline.org>
Date: Wednesday, October 24, 2007 2:50 pm
Subject: RE: FSU Survey
To: Cynthia Wilson <cbw9991@fsu.edu>

>> Cynthia, 
>> I'm quite concerned about sending this to our entire membership. Many people would have questions about why the church agreed to do this (spamming them). I'm not even comfortable with the idea of using our database information for surveys not related to our own church issues. 
>> Are you doing this in your church?
>> 
>> Additionally, right at this point in time I'm very busy with KUMC and United Methodist annual requirements. What is your deadline?
>> 
>> I would prefer to send this to a select group of people rather than to everyone.
>> 
>> Thanks, 
>>
>> Billy Vinson
>> Church Administrator

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Cynthia Wilson <cbw9991@fsu.edu>
Sent: Friday, October 19, 2007 4:02 PM
To: Billy Vinson
Subject: FSU Survey

Melanie Calloway told me that you will be helping me with my FSU dissertation study. I really appreciate your help with this! I am resending the e-mail with the invitation to participate directly to you. It will come shortly in a separate e-mail. You can use this to then forward this to your congregation members who are 18 and older. Your church members should be able to use this to then link directly to the survey and complete it online. If you have any questions, please let me know! Thanks again!

In Christ,
Cynthia Bruce Wilson-

You have my permission to use Immanuel Baptist Church as a comparison site for your dissertation on the stress and quality of life of children of clergy. It is my understanding that you will send an e-mail to all adult members of Immanuel inviting them to participate in an online survey. It is also my understanding that participation is voluntary, and results from the study will be completely confidential.

Sincerely,
Rick Stewart
Minister of Education & Administration
Immanuel Baptist Church
Tallahassee, Florida
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