THE LEGITIMATION OF CLERICAL AUTHORITY:

THE CASE OF THE CONFERENCE OF MENNONITES IN CANADA

Judith Pamela Wilson
Bachelor of Theology, Canadian Mennonite Bible College, 1974
Bachelor of Arts, University of Lethbridge, 1985

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT

OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department

of

Sociology

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

[redacted]
T. Rennie Warburton, Ph.D.

[redacted]
Mary J. Gallant, Ph.D.

[redacted]
Phyllis M. Senese, Ph.D.

[redacted]
N. Ross Crumrine, Ph.D.

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA

1988

ISBN 0-315-46499-2

Supervisor: T. Rennie Warburton

ABSTRACT

After 200 years of moving to avoid confrontation with "the world," members of the Conference of Mennonites in Canada have become fairly comfortable and successful in their environment. Having given up the fight to remain separate, they face new identity problems as a religious group without the trappings of ethnicity. They are hesitant about joining the religious mainstream and operate under the awkward congregational polity. A newly awakened concern with the issue of clerical authority has brought about lively debate and some changes within the organization.

The legitimation of authority is of particular interest in terms of ministers because of their link to the supernatural and their serving a diminishing constitutency. A four-cell model was proposed by Hammond, Salinas and Sloane (1978). The cells were formed by the intersecting of two dichotomies: the sacred versus profane nature of authority, and the office versus person location of authority. Believing routinized charisma to be an anachronism, they tested for only three authority types in a ten-denomination study. Patterns emerged showing that formality, social involvement, professional involvement and social problems were viewed variously by pastors holding the three remaining views of legitimate clerical authority. Authority was pronounced a useful independent variable in understanding the clergy.

A correlation has been shown to exist between the form of an organization and the ways in which authority is legitimated within that organization. It was felt that routinized charisma might be located among small post-sectarian groups such as the Mennonites.

Pastors of the Conference of Mennonites in Canada, the largest of the Mennonite groups in this country, were approached through a mail survey. Eighty-one per cent (N=117) returned completed questionnaires. Seventy-one per cent identified most closely with routinized charismatic authority. Legal-rational authority was soundly rejected. No patterns of significance were found in the way ministers reported carrying out their tasks, nor did any of six possible predictor variables show a strong association with the distribution of authority preferences.

Authority and group identity are not synonymous but each reflects the other to a high degree. Routinized charisma is a suitable mode of authority legitimation for a group that has only recently accepted acculturation. It is appropriate to a group that is struggling with such issues as separation from the world and exclusivity which affect its place on the sect-denomination-church continuum. Authority recognized and authorized by others is consistent with both congregational polity and the rhetoric of a priesthood of all believers.

The location of authority in the process of being routinized was found among a religious group that is itself undergoing considerable change.

Examiners: [redacted]

T. Rennie Warburton, Ph.D.

[redacted]

Mary J. Gallant, Ph.D.

[redacted]

Phyllis M. Senese, Ph.D.

[redacted]

N. Ross Crumrine, Ph.D.

CONTENTS

TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My indebtedness extends beyond the span of these two years spent at the University of Victoria. I owe my family, both parents and siblings, first mention. Their confidence in me and interest in my career has been unfailing.

Professors at undergraduate universities are generally unsung heroes. Drs. Bibby, Boldt, Letkeman, Mann and Weaver of the University of Lethbridge introduced me to sociology and encouraged me to consider graduate studies. Each exemplified some ideal trait to strive to emulate.

My thesis supervisor will be remembered for his courtesy, consistency and scholastic integrity. I count myself privileged to have been guided through this process by someone who was at once demanding and encouraging, accessible but not overbearing.

A special thanks to my committee members who interrupted their personal work to so carefully read my thesis. Each highlighted areas to which I had become blind.

The computing consultants provided invaluable assistance at every stage of this research project. Special thanks are due Mike Doyle for his help with the questionnaire and Mary Sanseverino for her constant availability throughout both the statistical and editing stages.

Finally, a heartfelt thanks to my husband, Lloyd, who adjusted his life so my dream could come true. He, more than anyone, lived through the emotions of this project with me.

DEDICATION

To my parents,

Elwin and Olga Epp;

and

to my husband,

Lloyd.

Chapter 1

AUTHORITY AS A PROBLEM FOR ORGANIZATIONS

"Not only do I want you to have this book: God wants you to have this book." In an era when movie stars often endorse products, a television evangelist hawked his newest book by appealing to the "biggest name in the business." This same man went on, later in the broadcast, to dictate detailed notes for his "congregation" to write in the margins of their Bibles. His presumed knowledge of both the mind of God and the needs of his hearers was delivered with utmost earnestness.[1]

Why is this man so confident? Who does he think he is? And who gave him the right to tell anyone how to live? These questions reflect more than the ire of the Sunday afternoon channel-switcher. They are questions of sociological significance. The "right" of the evangelist or any individual to tell others how they ought to live is addressed sociologically as the question of authority and is a viable topic for discussion wherever a collectivity with goals exists. Even as mundane an activity as a family planning a picnic seems to require a certain assymetry of privilege. Not everyone can go where they would like; one or several must defer to others' wishes.

---

[1] The evangelist in question was Kenneth Copeland and I "stumbled across" his broadcast by accident in the summer of 1987.

The privileged may achieve compliance through either power or authority. Power is the ability to coerce, to force the weaker party to perform against its will. Voluntary compliance is granted the authority figure when his or her quest for power is seen as legitimate: i.e. when he or she has been "authorized" to exercise power.

While the issue of authority pervades all coordinated human activity, there is a sense in which it is particularly crucial in the field of organized religion. Because of the supernatural element that is inherent to religious activity, authority can be claimed to have been conferred directly by God and thus to be beyond question. Churches are voluntary organizations and as such provide an excellent focus for the study of how authority is negotiated and ultimately legitimated. The pastor, who is often the only full-time employee of a local congregation, is the particular interest of this research. He or she is in the peculiar situation of being both the employee of a diverse group of persons and the spokesperson for the Almighty. To satisfy the demands of both roles calls for a careful negotiation of whatever authority is claimed by, or conversely expected from, the minister.

Parish pastors' experiences as holders of authority vary. The minister of a group that professes to believe in the priesthood of all believers is caught in a "status contradiction" as Wilson (1959) showed. He or she has little claim to unique authority, yet is expected to provide spiritual leadership. In some churches the minister may be discouraged, perhaps prohibited, from certain social involvement, because the congregation has defined the role rather stringently.

That clerical authority is of interest to the laity is illustrated by two recent letters to editors of church papers. The first is from a woman in the United Church of Canada, arguing that her denomination proceed with ordaining homosexuals to the ministry. She writes:

> If we believe that ministry is a call from God, then who are we to deny a person the opportunity to fulfill God's plan? If on the other hand we believe ministry is a job, then what right do we have to deny a person employment on the basis of their sexual orientation? (United Church Observer, July 1988:6)

The second letter is in reference to a couple who were dismissed from their jobs as co-administrators of a home for seniors. One couple felt that the fact that ministers were on the board affected the way the decision was viewed by many lay people. They write:

> There can be a problem when pastors sit on the boards of church-run institutions. Pastors take to these boards their extraordinary authority, power, prestige and a reputation for doing only good. People find it almost unthinkable that a board with pastors on it could do something that is wrong. . . . Those who were dismissed were dismissed not only by their brothers and sisters in the church, but also by two pastors whose high reputation for doing what is right gave the board almost unchallengeable prestige and power. (Mennonite Reporter, July 25, 1988:7)

Justifying and negotiating authority may be a particular problem in modern times. It is no secret that, in Canada and in all advanced industrial societies except the United States, religion is not as important to the majority as it once was (Wilson 1982, Bibby 1983). In fact, belief in a supernatural power has become the object of derision in an age of science. Although a minority persists in belief, our age has sometimes been labelled the post-Christian era. In sociology the sweeping changes that have taken place in the relationship between religion and society have been addressed in the discussion of secularization.

1.1 Secularization

A most sophisticated theory of secularization has been advanced by Martin (1978). In addition to exploring worldwide patterns of secularization, he outlines three phases in the tension and collusion of Christianity and society. Phase One, the Constantian collusion has obviously exhausted itself. Christianity is no longer comfortably wed to the social system, but has become a marginal structure of legitimation. In Phase Two the world is more worldly and the religious more religious. A sort of "fortress mentality" characterizes the religious enterprise. Phase Three is characterized by segmented, voluntary associations. Not only the church, but every voluntary association struggles to maintain its "diminished active constituency" (Martin 1978:278ff). Martin's three phases were not meant to represent discrete stages of development, nor was he proposing an irreversible process.

Wilson (1982) argued that religion is in decline; that religious thinking, practice and institutions are losing social significance. The most conspicuous change is in the realm of thought where scientific explanation has supplanted belief in a supernatural being. Attendance at church is also on the decline and religious institutions are becoming more and more like their secular counterparts.

Drawing on research, mainly census and survey statistics from a range of industrial societies, Wilson (1982) was able to show that religious belief, practice and organization are in decline in most of the western world. Following his lead, Bibby (1979, 1983, 1987), through twenty years of research, has documented secularization in Canada particularly in terms of decline in religious participation. In his most recent book he writes:

> Canadians are drawing very selectively on religion, and the dominant religious groups are responding with highly specialized items--isolated beliefs, practices, programs and professional services, notably weddings and funerals. . . religion, instead of standing over against culture, has become a neatly packaged consumer item--taking its place among other commodities that can be bought or bypassed according to one's consumption whims (Bibby 1987:1,2).

For many groups, who at one time lived and died in rural enclaves, Wilson's poignant description of the collapse of community expresses one of their own fears:

> What is there to celebrate when the community that sleeps together is not the community that works together or plays together? . . What good is custom when we have discovered a faster, cheaper, quicker way to go about things? (Wilson 1982:160,162)

Secularization has changed the role and function of religious practitioners (Bocock 1970; Martin 1978; Wilson 1982). The decline of the sacred, the rise of science and the increasing growth of new professions based on the social sciences have caused problems for clergy who now

> appear to be amateurs working in areas for which professional training of some kind is necessary and which clergy are lacking. On the other hand, . . . clergy are perceived by the general public to be of most value insofar as they contribute to helping people with problems and by being of use to the community. (Bocock 1970:536).

Ministers have not been sufficiently trained to be part of the so-called helping professions. They are trained to be religious specialists in a society that devalues the supernatural. At the same time, they are expected to provide sound general as well as spiritual, guidance to their parishioners and to be available to all in crisis situations. Achieving the right blend of supernatural and humanistic legitimation for what one does as a minister becomes a critical assignment.

1.2 Authority and Forms of Protestant Organizations

It is to Max Weber's pioneer elaboration of the legitimation of authority that most sociological discussions return. Weber (1968:215) delineated three grounds of legitimate authority: legal-rational, traditional, and charismatic. Legal-rational authority rests on rules and regulations; traditional authority on belief in time-honoured practices and charismatic authority on devotion to the extraordinary character of the individual incumbent.

The legitimation of authority was understood by Weber to be a dynamic process. Matheson (1987) describes a rather orderly transition from charismatic to traditional to legal-rational legitimation of authority. Dissatisfaction with the permanent institutionalized structures of legal-rational authority may generate conditions suitable for the emergence of charisma; and the cycle may start over again. This interpretation implies movement in a particular direction but always with the possibility of a revolutionary outbreak--a fresh start.

Charisma is seen as the elementary form of authority. It arises in a period of radical change and upheaval, often to protest the impersonal stagnation of legal-rational authority (see Barnes 1978). Charismatic authority is negotiated between a crowd and a single individual who is followed or believed in because of his or her extraordinary behaviour. Partly because the maintainance of that activity becomes a primary goal of the movement, persons who possess the earlier genuine charisma are sought to succeed to the leadership. In time, leaders come to be measured against a remembered standard. The final, most highly developed, stage of authority legitimation occurs when the organization and its leadership have a legal-rational agreement that ratifies the leader's claim to authority.

These steps, however, do not represent an inevitable route to organizational maturity.

The development can be interrupted as is shown by two recent studies. Palmer (1988) outlined seven phases in the career of Bhagwan Shree Rajneesh, and showed him to have been struggling to maintain charisma amidst the inevitable movement towards institutionalization. Rather than see his movement become an "ism" he abdicated authority and maintained his personal charisma as the inexplicable Bhagwan. Kniss (1988) interpreted the failure of the Anabaptist movement to produce a competitive ideology as being the result of its denying the charisma of office. The Bhagwan "revolted" against his own "ism" and the Anabaptists appear to have "stalled" somewhere in the routinization process. Neither movement is extinct; the Bhagwan remains the patron saint, as it were, of The Friends of Rajneesh and modern Mennonites continue in the Anabaptist tradition.

Weber argued that the mode of claiming authority determined the structure of domination; i.e. the pattern of expectations regarding role performances. Charisma, since it resides in the person, requires no structure. Legal-rational authority requires a bureaucratic administration in order to maintain itself. Matheson (1987) insisted Weber got it backwards; that the type of organization of a movement limits or calls forth a particular type of authority. He would argue, for example, that when one is in a position of leadership in a bureaucratic organization, one legitimates authority through rational and legal means. While the individual may have a trite personal charisma it is not enough to keep him or her in office. A loosely bound group, on the other hand, may need a charismatic

individual to act as a catalyst for activity. The argument need not be resolved here. What is important is the close relationship between organizational form and the legitimation of authority.

1.3 Polity

In the realm of organized religion, major differences in structure are described under the rubric of polity, of which there are three ideal types (Wood 1970). In an episcopal polity authority flows from the top downwards and congregations (at the bottom) relate to the hierarchy individually. In a synodal or presbyterian polity, authority flows in both directions and laterally at the different levels. Congregations relate primarily to other congregations within their presbytery. The congregational or free polity is one in which power flows upwards from the congregations; again they relate to the hierarchy individually. The way in which polity is often operationalized is by asking whether the local congregation hires its own minister (Wood 1970).

As early as 1952 Smith studied a small sample of clergy from two polities, episcopal and congregational, and found fourteen differences in pastor-congregation relations over the matter of the authority structure. The recurring pattern separated the sacramentalist Episcopalians from the instrumentalist Congregationalists. It highlighted the institutional protection afforded by episcopalian polity in contrast to the isolation of the congregationalist minister who must always be concerned about his popularity. The effect of congregational polity on individual ministers is to isolate them both socially and organizationally.

Congregational polity represents an attempt at being an idealistic democracy. However, it has an unwieldiness when its practitioners meet to debate and implement policy change (Takayama 1975).

1.4 Weber's Church-Sect Typology and its Modifications

Polity is the term used to describe the distribution of authority within a religious denomination. Another major index of religious groups is the church-sect typology. It is both a subjective and objective measure of how the group fits into the religious picture as a whole.

The church-sect typology was introduced by Weber who dichotomized religions based on their "mode of membership" (Weber 1968:56). Persons were born into the church, while sect membership was voluntarily chosen. His associate, Troeltsch, expanded the typology to include mysticism. Troeltsch said that each religious type emphasized a different part of the New Testament and that each had a definite lifespan (Steeman 1975). The church, of which Roman Catholicism was the archetype, emphasized the universality of God; the sect emphasized the ethical demands of the Sermon on the Mount and consequently was restricted to a small group of faithful believers; and mysticism emphasized the personal relationshp one could have with God and Jesus. Troeltsch also discussed what he called the Free Churches, which were voluntary groups with a church-like orientation to society, or what has been known as the denomination in North America (Steeman 1975:195).

Niebuhr (1929) contributed the insight that sects are short-lived, as the young are socialized into the religion of their elders and do not need to choose

sectarianism. Comfort and prosperity lead to denominationalism, a religious movement becoming just another religious option.

Wilson (1967) highlighted the diversity of sectarian religion and pointed out that only those which seek to increase by conversion of outsiders necessarily become denominations. The others remain sects or die.

The denomination as a unique group has been discussed by Martin (1962). He made it clear that the denomination is a type of its own and neither a failed nor advanced sect. He differentiated between sect and denomination in some detail. Pertinent to this discussion of denominations is an outlook of toleration coupled with a spirit of cooperation or ecumenism. The denomination tends to be more interested in religious experience than in religious dogma; the sacraments, for example are merely instruments for the celebration of grace and no particular form of observation is intrinsic to their utility. Individualism is fundamental to the denomination--individual sin, individual salvation, individual accountability before God.

Sects and sectarians have received the most attention from sociologists. A proliferation of identifying traits for modern sects has grown up.[2] What was once a dichotomy has come to be a continuum with most groups being assigned by sociologists to "stations" between the ideal, separated sect and the ideal, universal state church. Yinger (1961) and Swatos (1975) have provided two particularly helpful models of this nature. In Canada, at least since the fall of New France, the "church" as a state church has never been established in Canada. Pluralism

---

[2] See Knudsen, Earle and Schriver (1978:57, 58) for a comparison of the characteristics used by fourteen different writers to define a group as sectarian.

has been the norm for religion as well as culture.[3]

Churches are organizations and it is the organizational interpretation of church-sect theory that has the potential to be applied universally. Coleman (1968:63) made a strong case for the church-sect typology as a measure of organizational precariousness. He portrays Weber and Troeltsch as asking, "Why do bureaucratic churches so often break down?" and Niebuhr as asking "Why do charismatic groups evolve into something else?". While the struggles of these two kinds of group are distinct from each other, they occur in similar areas of concern, Coleman argued. Neither group has "arrived"; both are struggling. Each organization is precarious; the matter of legitimate authority is crucial for both.

While the progression from sect to denomination is not inevitable, it is a common trend. Social histories, as accounts of that type of progressive development of religious groups, have been provided on the Old Colony Mennonites (Redekop 1974), the Mormons (O'Dea 1954), Methodism (Brewer 1952; Chamberlayne 1964), English Quakers (Isichei 1964) and Holiness groups (Warburton 1966). While both Redekop (1974) and Warburton (1967) had misgivings about the utility of the typology for the group each had chosen to study, both works involved application of the typology as a dynamic model.

---

[3] Troeltsch in particular proposed a typology based on the Judeo- Christian tradition. More recently, however, the typology has been applied fruitfully to other religious traditions as well. Janosik (1974) showed that the typology has utility when applied to black African sects, Hertel (1977) that it can be applied to Hinduism, and Wallis (1975) that it can suitably be used to describe the development of Scientology.

1.5 The Legitimation of Authority: Relevant Sociological Literature

Despite his **three** types of authority, Weber distinguished **four** types of social action. Each type of social action was coordinated with a legitimating basis for its social order. Three of these pairs were matched up with a particular authority type, as the following diagram illustrates:

Distinction Among Types

Type of Social Action	Legimating Basis of an Order	Legitimating Basis of Domination (Authority)
Purposive-rational	Legal	Legal-rational
Value-rational	Value-rational	? ? ? ?
Affectual	Affectual	Charismatic
Traditional	Traditional	Traditional

(Source: Willer 1967:234)

The "missing type" has been an on-going problem for analysts. Willer (1967) and Hammond, Salinas and Sloane (1978) felt that when charismatic authority takes on organizational form, it becomes in Weber's terms "value rational," although Weber spoke of the routinization of charisma. What Weber spoke of as a process is today generally labelled as an accomplished feat. Routinized charisma is viewed as a discrete mode of legitimating authority and as the fourth type necessary to complete Weber's scheme.

That there are two degrees of charisma was emphasized by Greenfeld (1985). According to her, genuine charisma refers to an individual's ability to generate and express intense excitement. It comes from outside of, or beyond, the

individual and is inexplicable in mundane terms. Routinized charisma is a measure of someone's proximity to the ultimate values of a society. It is an attempt on the part of the holder to embody an ideal.

Parsons, in his introduction to Weber's The Theory of Social and Economic Organization (Weber 1947), suggested that the concept of traditional authority was not particularly well developed by Weber himself. The difference between it and legal-rational authority lies in the way each is justified or explained. Legal-rational authority exists where a society or organization has developed to the point of formalizing its operation. In an ideal sense it is found in bureaucratic organizations where the rights and obligations are spelled out for each level of a hierarchy. Traditional authority, on the other hand, appeals to time-honoured practices that are not spelled out. As new circumstances for which no traditions exist arise, the leader exercises a free will.

Paul Harrison (1959) coined the term rational-pragmatic authority to describe traditional authority as he saw it practised in the American Baptist Convention. Although adhering to an anti-authoritarian stance, as a goal-oriented organization the Baptist Convention needed the efficiency of authority in order to meet those goals. Thus the leaders "obtained an expediential authority" (Harrison 1959:14). It was rational, but pragmatic rather than legal. The leaders had few of the trappings of legal authority; instead they acquired a sort of charisma from the results of their work.

Harrison essentially replaced traditional authority with this new category (1959:65f). His lead has been followed by two theoretical works on clerical authority, those of Hammond, Salinas and Sloane (1978) and Carroll (1981).

Thus, we have two charismas and two rational authorities. The poles on which the continua rest were named sacred-profane and office-person by Hammond, Salinas and Sloane (1978:243) who then suggested the following four-cell model:

	The Source of the Authority is in the:	
The Nature of the Authority is:	OFFICE	PERSON
PROFANE	legal-rational	rational-pragmatic
SACRED	routinized charisma	charisma

Carroll (1981) spoke of the base of authority, in terms of whether the incumbent has an especially intimate relationship with the Divine or whether he or she possesses special skills and expertise. He positioned this base opposite the degree of institutionalization of the authority and produced the identical four-cell model. Carroll also went on to examine the ways in which authority may be exercised through a discussion of the scope and the relational aspects of authority.

Bartholomew (1981) argued that authority is both a sociological and theological issue. Religious leaders attempt a balance between the authority of scripture ("purely" sacred) and the authority of tradition (which may be contaminated). A further tension, according to Bartholomew, is the authority of the person versus the authority of the office. While he did not refer to the model used by Hammond, Salinas and Sloane (1978) and Carroll (1981), it is not difficult to superimpose their sociological model on Bartholomew's more theological one.

Falbo, New and Gaines (1987) did not follow Harrison's lead in replacing traditional authority with rational-pragmatic authority. Part of their study included a replication of Hammond, Salinas and Sloane's (1978) test of their four-cell model. However, instead of adding routinized charisma to complete the model, they replaced rational-pragmatic authority with traditional authority. They claimed that Weber portrayed traditional authority as the routinization of charisma "through the establishment of ritualistic traditions and methods of selecting new leaders" (Falbo, New and Gaines 1987:500). Their research interest was in the correspondence between authority and the power strategies used by the authority holder to reinforce that authority. They expected traditional authority to be associated with conducting services in an appropriate manner and upholding strict religious traditions--pretty much what would be expected of rational-pragmatic authority (Harrison 1959; Hammond, Salinas and Sloane 1978; Carroll 1981). Although their study was based on their reading of Weber, the bulk of the small body of literature they covered came from fields other than sociology, notably psychology and organizational dynamics.[4]

The four types of authority as discussed by Hammond, Salinas and Sloane (1978) and Carroll (1981) have received uneven attention in the sociology of religion. Most studies of religious groups or their clerics have found a particular style of leadership to correlate with either polity or denomination. More generally, Greenfeld (1985) and Carroll (1981) pointed to limits placed on the

---

[4] A recurring difficult with terminology must be addressed before going further. I believe that Falbo, New and Gaines (1987) treated traditional authority as synonymous with the traditional legitimation of authority. This is not quite accurate. Traditional authority may be authority that has been unchanged and unchallenged for as long as anyone can remember, but that does not mean it is legitimated on those grounds. Authority legitimation on legal-rational grounds, after all, is already a tradition in many organizations.

exercise of charisma by societal change from the time when society was integrated by face to face relationships to the time when integration is achieved by the coordination of roles (the change from **Gemeinschaft** to **Gesellschaft**). Rational-pragmatic authority (Harrison 1959; Ingram 1980, 1981; Takayama 1975; Houghland and Wood 1979) is often found in congregational polities. Although the priesthood seems the ideal type for routinized charisma, I found routinized charisma to be lacking in documentation. Hammond, Salinas and Sloane (1978) attributed this lack to confusion over Weber's "missing type." Legal-rational authority may be less intriguing than the non-legal authorities as it too is undocumented in the sociological literature.

Schreuder (1970) concludes his review of 485 clerical studies with a call for more analyses of personal beliefs and basic values as only 8% of the works reviewed touched on the topic. The legitimation of the minister's authority, its sources, scope, and consequences falls into this area of renewed interest in ministers' personal beliefs and values.

One of the criticisms of Weber's discussion of authority is that it is ruler-centric (Matheson 1987), i.e. it discusses the phenomenon only from the perspective of the power holder seeking legitimation. Although the fact that authority is both achieved and ascribed is often remarked on, very little has been written about the negotiation of authority or its consequences from the standpoint of those subject to another's authority, exceptions being analyses of charismatic authority by Worsley (1968) and Greenfeld (1985). Studies of clerical authority, and the present no less than any other, tend to perpetuate the problem. In my literature search I found no study of lay perceptions of ministerial authority.

Several empirical studies have been carried out regarding changes in clerical authority in the Roman Catholic church following Vatican II, when lay participation and authority were increased. One study claimed that the strength of the Catholic Church is its "unity maintained by a sacramental hierarchy" (Ference, Goldner and Ritti 1971). They stressed that although lay members are becoming more active, the Roman Catholic Church will never become an organization like the Protestant denominations, because it will still be a hierarchy. On a related note, they argued that priests are not professionals per se, but that the priesthood as an organization is a profession. Authority does not rest in the priest, but is mediated through the priesthood. In another study Szafran (1976) compared the post-Vatican II diocesan priests with officers in four non-church organizations, and found priests to be under the control of the organization more so than professionals in other settings. The priests' view of ideal authority was one where there was less power over them and where they would have more influence over the laity--professional autonomy.

The problematic study by Falbo, New and Gaines (1987) has already been discussed briefly. It merits a second mention despite its theoretical shortcomings. They surveyed Southern Baptist ministers and Roman Catholic priests and found a correspondence between charismatic authority and strategies used to influence people to accept the pastor's legitimacy. Examples of charismatic strategies included reminding people of the sacred authority of the Bible, showing people their own good nature and sincerity and providing a good example. Legal-rational authority holders were found to be least likely to use any strategies and charismatics to report using the greatest number of total strategies.

The promising, theoretically and empirically balanced, work by Hammond, Salinas and Sloane (1978), whose four-cell model has already been presented formed the background for the research done for this thesis. In their pre-test respondents seemed unable to recognize routinized charisma; thus, they assumed its obsolescence, an assumption they came to regret (Hammond, Salinas and Sloane 1978:244). Their sample of 250 ministers was drawn from ten Christian denominations in Arizona. In a telephone interview respondents were asked questions regarding their work and were asked to rate their identification with three hypothetical ministers each of whom represented one of the remaining authority types. Preference for the three types of authority was found to be variously associated with different denominations and theological positions. Beyond the complex interactions between authority, denomination and theology, two basic patterns emerged. In the first pattern, legal-rational authority and charismatic authority were at the extremes, with rational-pragmatic authority somewhere in between. Legal-rational authority was associated with a formal, high-church orientation, and with a wide breadth of social involvement. Charismatic authority was associated with informal low-church orientation, with little social involvement outside the church.

The second pattern of relationships found rational-pragmatic authority at one extreme, with charismatic at the other and legal-rational in between. This pattern was found in regards to attitude towards social problems and professional involvement. Rational-pragmatic pastors held a more liberal or political-action orientation and were most interested in professional affairs; both in direct contrast to the charismatic pastors.

The study of religious professionals has generally looked at denomination and theology as the most basic descriptive characteristics. Hammond, Salinas and Sloane (1978) showed that in some situations a minister's perception of his or her authority has a greater determining power over behaviour than either denomination or theology. They thus concluded that authority could be included among the measures used in studying religious professionals.

1.6 Conclusion

Authority is difficult to define. It is the process whereby power becomes recognized and legitimized. It is, even in its more oppressive forms, a balance between power and weakness. It is a **negotiated reality,** but as Sennett points out:

> . . .authority is not a thing. It is an interpretive process which seeks for itself the solidity of a thing (Sennett 1980:19).

Authority is precarious. Much as either party may wish for it to be a concrete thing, it remains constantly open to change through abuse, erosion or attack.

The history of organized religion can be seen as the history of authority relationships both within a particular group and between it and other religious bodies and the wider political and societal context. The 463-year history of Mennonites now living in Canada provides an ideal case for the examination of changes in authority legitimation. The story of the group and its responses to its changing status in society forms the bulk of the next chapter.

Chapter 2

MENNONITES IN CANADA

There are more than twenty "kinds" of Mennonites in Canada, a consequence of the sectarian propensity to split rather than compromise (Reimer 1983). The Conference of Mennonites in Canada (hereafter, the CMC) whose ministers are the subject of this study, is the largest of the groups. Perhaps because it has retained few ethnic peculiarities, it has not received the attention paid its religious "cousins," the Amish, Hutterites and Old Order Mennonites. All of these groups trace their histories to the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century.

There are, in a sense, two histories that bring the issue of authority in the Conference of Mennonites in Canada into focus. The first is the history of the Mennonites as a social group--from a separated people to an acculturated minority. The second history is a history of one of several organizations formed by Canadian Mennonites. Each history will be sketched and discussed in turn. To close this chapter one Mennonite historian's interpretation of the total Mennonite story in terms of authority arrangements will bring the current crisis in authority and the concerns of this thesis into focus.

2.1 The Mennonite Story

2.1.1 A Separated People

In an illegal Bible study and prayer meeting in Zollikon, Switzerland on January 21, 1525, George Blaurock requested re-baptism from Conrad Grebel.[5] This done, he re-baptized several others present. They had grown impatient with Luther's and Zwingli's more cautious attempts at reform and were prepared to boldly follow their own consciences. Refusing to have their newborns baptized into church membership and state citizenship and continuing to study the Bible on their own were flagrant acts of disobedience. City councils, princes, bishops and popes saw the movement for what it was--a non-recognition of civil and ecclesiastical authority. There was no alternative but to root out so fundamental a threat to the homogeneity, unity and serenity of Roman Catholic Europe.

The civic authorities interpreted the new baptism as anarchy and reacted forcefully. Parents not permitting baptism of their infants were first fined and then exiled if they did not comply. More drastic measures soon followed--Manz, Blaurock, and Hubmaier were executed as Grebel would likely have been had he not died of the plague. By 1529 Anabaptism was outlawed throughout the empire. Even harbouring so dangerous a criminal as an Anabaptist fugitive became a capital offence.

---

[5] See C.J. Dyck, An Introduction to Mennonite History, Kitchener:Herald Press, 1981, for a comprehensive overview of the Mennonite story worldwide. Materials for this summary were taken primarily from histories of Mennonites in Canada (Epp 1962, 1974), of the General Conference Mennonite Church (Pannabecker 1975; Sawatsky 1987) and of the Conference of Mennonites in Canada (Petkau 1978).

Part of the attraction of the new movement doubtless lay in its challenge to authority and it grew in numbers. Despite devastating opposition from both Catholics and Reformers, the radical ideas of the fledgling group advanced into various parts of Switzerland, Germany, Austria and the Low Countries. Although the essentials of the faith were preserved, the fugitive members had little time for systematic theologizing as they responded to the exigencies of day to day life during the years of the Peasants' Revolt.

The first Anabaptist group to coalesce around the leadership of a systematic thinker soon became known as "Mennists" and later "Mennonites" after Menno Simons, their ex-priest leader. Although introduced as a pejorative nickname, the word "Mennonite" came to signify a desirable tenant in the eyes of some rich landholders, because the group was known to live a simple, non-violent, obedient and industrious lifestyle. With the assistance and protection of these wealthy landholders Mennonites themselves advanced from being serfs to managers to land owners. They prospered and were able to procure large tracts of land in Prussia, and later Russia. The latter was at the invitation of the Tsarina, Catherine the Great, who promised freedom of religion, including non-participation in warfare, in return for settling land recently seized from the Turks.

The early years in Russia were extremely difficult but gave way to remarkable prosperity. The development of Black Sea ports made possible the export of hard winter wheat, for which the rich Ukrainian soil was ideally suited. The original 10,000 settlers increased to 34,500 from 1798 to 1859 with very little increase in landholdings (Dyck 1981:173). Government regulations prohibited subdividing the original 176-acre plots allotted each family. Soon many were

landless, and thus disenfranchised. (The vote was based on land holding but taxes were based on population.) Daughter colonies were eventually established after a landless group appealed to St. Petersburg and permission to procure more land was granted.

A curious development that makes it difficult to sort out the motivation for leaving Russia is that in 1870 Prussian Mennonites still saw Russia as the land of opportunity. The last immigrants arrived in Alexandertal in 1870, as the first contingent was readying itself for the move to North America. Events that triggered the latter's decision included a new law to be introduced that seemed to threaten military exemption, although it did allow for alternative service in the medical and forestry services. The pressure to assimilate with the Russian population and the shortage of land caused by a high birth rate also contributed to the move.

While the United States had better available farm land, the Canadian government was prepared to allow both military exemption and block settlement. Of the 18,000 Mennonites who came to North America between 1873 and 1884, 8,000 settled in southern Manitoba on lands reserved for them.

Meanwhile, the Russian reform and nationalization program increasingly affected the Mennonites who had remained behind. A new threat lay in the requirement that Russian be taught in all schools. Since many Mennonites did not speak Russian, the state provided teachers for the schools where no qualified Mennonite was available.

Prosperity continued to be theirs and many Mennonites hired Russian labourers as the language barrier receded. Then came the Bolshevik Revolution.

Not only were the Mennonites persecuted because they spoke German and would not participate in the war effort; but they lived on the battlefront, a battlefront that moved back and forth across some Mennonite areas as many as twenty-three times (Dyck 1981:182). The devastation of war, followed by the famine of 1921 to 1923 and an outbreak of typhus decimated a way of life. By 1923 a steady flow of immigrants was on its way to Canada. Twenty-one thousand were destined for reserved land in Saskatchewan, although some found employment in Ontario and did not go on.

The final wave of immigrants, 8,000 refugees of World War II, were scattered widely from Ontario to British Columbia. They had been part of approximately 35,000 Russian Mennonites evacuated to Poland and Western Europe by the German army following the Battle of Stalingrad in 1943. Some 23,000 were forcibly repatriated and nearly 5,000 located in South America because they did not meet Canada's more stringent health requirements. Ironically perhaps, many of those who came to Canada bought the farms of Mennonite families leaving for Paraguay and Mexico because of the Canadian government's "interference" with their school system. The more urbanized of the refugees settled directly in the cities.

A ripple of immigrants which has slightly changed the ethnic composition of Canadian Mennonites was the coming of the Indo-Chinese refugees in the 1970s.

2.1.2 An Acculturated Minority

Maintenance of German culture, block settlements and military exemption were three catalysts for the first migrations from Russia. Each of these was seen as part and parcel of remaining faithful believers. After more than 100 years in Canada the German culture has become a relic for many Mennonites. While ethnic Mennonites still populate the block settlement areas many more have moved to the cities. And, over forty years after conscription, it is unclear whether military exemption is still a burning issue. If these concerns were faith concerns, does acculturation equal secularization? How can modern Mennonites be characterized?

In the 1970s Kauffman and Harder (1975) collected data from some 3600 members of five Mennonite and Brethren in Christ denominations. The five groups were the (Old) Mennonite Church, the Mennonite Brethren Church, the General Conference Mennonite Church,[6] the Evangelical Mennonite Church (an American denomination, although there is one by the same name in Canada), and the Brethren in Christ. It is not possible to condense their 400-page book into a few short paragraphs, but some general points can be made.

Although the majority of Mennonites lived in rural areas in 1975, less than one-third (27%) of the employed males were farmers. While Mennonites had left the farm only 19% lived in cities larger than 25,000 (only 9% in cities over 250,000). Forty per cent of the General Conference respondents were urbanites living in centres of more than 2,500. According to the 1970 Canadian census, 72% of the general population lived in urban centres at that time (Kauffman and

---

[6] The Conference of Mennonites in Canada is a member of the General Conference Mennonite Church, organizations which will be discussed shortly.

Harder 1975:54f). Mennonites, generally then, preferred a country setting to live in even when their incomes were not from the land.

In terms of educational attainment, the General Conference respondents had both the highest median number of years completed (12.6) and the highest percentage of members who had "some college" and "a graduate degree." The United States census reported a median of 12.1 years for all persons age 25 or older in 1970, and 11.3% of the white population were reported to have completed college. Eighteen and a half per cent of the General Conference Mennonites and 20.7% of the total sample in Kauffman and Harder's study have attained this level (Kauffman and Harder 1975:59).

Occupationally, Mennonite males have preferred the professions (26.7%). This was twice the proportion for white males in the United States. For women, the difference was even greater: 38.4% of Mennonite women compared to 14.8% in the white population were in professional positions. The professions have come to rival farming as the chosen occupation of North American Mennonites. Only small proportions were labourers and service workers (Kauffman and Harder 1975:61).

The median income for General Conference Mennonites was the lowest, just slightly above the 1971 median income for all households in the United States (Kauffman and Harder 1975:63).

Education, occupation and income are three variables that taken together provide an estimate of socioeconomic status. The General Conference Mennonites ranked highest on education and lowest on income in Kauffman and Harder's comparison. Occupation was not broken down by denomination.

A closer look at Mennonite occupations was undertaken by Vogt (1980). He suggested that the growing popularity of the professions, the skilled trades and the self-employed and managerial work roles is because of the autonomy inherent in each of these situations. Consciously or unconsciously Mennonites have chosen situations which enable them to

> withdraw at least partially from the urban class struggle while simultaneously permitting them to affect the appearance of being concerned and involved because as professionals they are judges and evaluators of society (Vogt 1980:144).

He demonstrated, using data from Kauffman and Harder's files, that professionals, business people, farmers and blue collar workers hold different positions on social issues. Farmers hold to more traditional Anabaptist views. Professionals are more liberal on world development issues and blue collar workers are more likely to favour union membership. Business people, those most in contact with "the world", show the greatest flexibility.

Harder's earlier data showed that teaching was the preferred profession of members in the CMC. Forty-one per cent of his sample were teachers with an additional 3% being professors. Thirty-one per cent of the sample were nurses and 3% doctors (Harder 1971:17). Teaching, healing and ministry have long been viewed as proper careers to aspire towards, appropriately enough for a religious group with a strong service ethic. The fact that law and the arts are missing from Harder's list, plus my suspicion that the professor group was comprised of members of only certain disciplines, may say something about modern Mennonites' response to the world. There is still a sort of withdrawal from the difficult areas where their values may clash with the majority's. Mennonites seem hesitant to confront the dominant culture at the ideological level; rather they attempt to witness to it through autonomous professions.

On a related note, Wiebe (1980) said that while there are Mennonite academics in Canada, it is difficult to find "the thinker" in Mennonite circles. He drew on his own Mennonite Brethren experience to document actual anti-intellectualism. This weakness was also documented by Enns' (1972) study of CMC pastors. Among other things he asked what authors were helpful in sermon preparation and pastoral work. Only three (of thirty-six) pastors named Mennonite writers. A diverse list was compiled; at most five persons drew inspiration from any one author. The religious identity of the group may be in jeopardy on both counts: first, there is a shortage of Mennonite writers to articulate the intricacies of faith; and second, the faith that is being taught has been influenced by a diversity of other traditions.

Kauffman and Harder (1975) found that Mennonites in general scored highly on general orthodoxy (nearly as high as Southern Baptists), affirmed the doctrines of American fundamentalism to a high degree, and substantially supported the particular teachings of their sixteenth century forbears. The General Conference Mennonites were found to embrace the broadest spectrum of theological positions, expressed the most liberal theology and the least evangelical piety. On their scales the General Conference members were also the most socially conscious and the least likely to let Washington (or Ottawa) determine the good and the true. General Conference Mennonites may be seen to be discriminating when it comes to easily accepting statements of faith. Conversely, they may be seen to be sadly lacking in conviction.

In regards to religious practice, Reimer (1983) offered a balanced comparison of twenty-five Mennonite groups in Canada. She divided them into five

categories. At one extreme the Old Order Amish worship in homes and use the **Ausbund**, a German hymnal from the sixteenth century. The men wear beards, but not mustaches. Clothing is fastened with hooks and eyes. Women wear long dresses in pastel shades and horses and buggies are used for farm work and travel. These Mennonites are the most traditional group in Canada.

Six conferences make up the most highly acculturated group at the other extreme. In describing the unique emphases of these groups, Reimer described programs and budgets with one exception, the Church of God in Christ, Mennonite (the Holdeman). The two largest groups are the Mennonite Brethren and the Conference of Mennonites in Canada. Each operates schools, has an archives facility, publishes several papers and is reasonably comfortable in society. Qualities that make a difference are difficult to document. The Mennonite Brethren are in the process of discussing dropping "Mennonite" from their name because they see it as a hindrance to witness. Many of their churches are presently called "community" churches" (as in Saanich Community Church in Victoria), as innocuous a label as can be found.

The historical differences between the CMC and the Mennonite Brethren are fading. Although he may have trivialized the situation, one Mennonite Brethren pastor explained the difference to a group of CMC students as reflecting different patterns of development. In a humourous vein he said, "You had televisions when we still thought they were sinful. But we were the first to get colour television."[7]

Because the CMC is a member of the General Conference Mennonite Church and because the seminary and, until recently, all the publishing houses were located in the United States, much of what has been written generalizes to both

---

[7] A paraphrase of Rev. Peter Nickel, speaking at Swift Current Bible Institute.

groups. But some uniquely Canadian traits have developed. Canada has had a theological training centre since the 1940s and it has been an approved teaching centre of the University of Manitoba since the 1960s. Systematic theology has thus fared better in Canada and there is not the strong anti-creedal bias found among American General Conference Mennonites (Sawatsky 1987:73).

Private high schools, Bible institutes and the Bible college in Canada have provided a wide range of religious training geared towards, but not exclusively to, church work. Generally speaking, Canadian lay ministers and congregation members tend to have more religious education than their American counterparts (Pannabecker 1975:179). That this religious training is not exclusively geared towards producing ministers was illustrated in the Canadian Mennonite Bible College president's report to the CMC in 1987. After forty years in operation, 849 students had been graduated. 125 were pastors, 19 pastor's spouses, 6 chaplains and 150 in church-related employment (Conference of Mennonites in Canada 1987:88). This leaves a large number of religiously-educated lay people, particularly since many more attend the college than graduate. To this day there is no American equivalent to the Canadian Mennonite schools; Mennonite liberal arts colleges in the United States replace, rather than supplement, state-funded education (Sawatsky 1978). American Mennonites are able to earn "Mennonite" degrees in agriculture, nursing, history, psychology etc., as well as in religion, while Canadian Mennonites who pursue non-religious studies must attend secular institutions or travel to the United States for part of their programmes.

In 1978 the Canadian Journal of Sociology devoted one issue to analyzing the similarities and differences between Canada and the United States in regards to

the social situations of several religious groups. Sawatsky's profile on the Mennonites has already been referred to. In addition he pointed out that Canadian Mennonites are more urbanized than American Mennonites (Sawatsky 1978:240) and have established a degree of institutional completeness in the form of nursing homes, schools, credit unions and, rather recently, retirement communities. Canadian Mennonites are

> both more comfortable and more visible (read powerful!) in their adoptive country then their American brethren (Sawatsky 1978:241; parenthetical comments in original).

There are, for example, several Mennonite MPs in Ottawa: while no Mennonite has ever reached the American Congress.

There are three factors which likely fostered the differential development, each of which is tied to a particular wave of immigrants. The first wave was able to negotiate with the government before taking up residence. Even before they were established on the land, they had established an identity in Ottawa. Spokesmen for the block settlements were necessary in order to maintain the promised privileges. Thus, the first wave of immigrants opened the door to political involvement. Block settlements, and the colonies in Russia before them, were institutionally complete. Russian Mennonites who chose to settle in the United States did not settle in (institutionally complete) blocks, nor were they the first Mennonites to arrive in that country. They were the minority in terms of ethnic Mennonites.

During the interim between the first and second waves of migration, Mennonites in Russia became actively involved in education. Even when Russian schooling was mandatory, they were able to teach German as a language and

provide religious instruction in German in the colony schools. According to Urry (1983) the Mennonite schools at the turn of the century were much admired by the Russians. The arrival of a sizeable group of Mennonites who favoured higher education provided a need and an opportunity for private schools to thrive (see Epp 1962:315).

The third wave of immigrants came as refugees of World War II. While many of them bought farms, many also settled in cities where they could earn a living through the skilled trades. Winnipeg, Calgary, Vancouver and Saskatoon soon had Mennonite churches and became the cities Mennonite youth gravitated towards when they left the farm.

In 1978 the CMC published a scrapbook to celebrate the seventy-fifth anniversary of its founding. Along with photographs, excerpts from the minutes, and comments by leaders, the musings of an anonymous member reflect a degree of ambivalence as these two quotations illustrate:

> Just when we were becoming embarrassed with peace, the whole of non-Mennonite society seemed to be turning pacifist.
>
> Just when we had completed, more or less, a most difficult language transition from German to English, we were told, on the one hand to adopt French as our second language, and, on the other hand, that multi-lingualism and multi-culturalism were now the in thing in Canada. (Petkau 1978:unpaginated)

2.2 The Conference of Mennonites in Canada

2.2.1 The CMC as an Organization

Divisions within the Mennonites have almost always been based on practices rather than beliefs. Among the more conservative groups disputes over telephones, rubber tires and chrome bumpers have split churches and families. Yet there is a core of beliefs that have been held to across the years.

While the Bible is seen to be the primary authority for faith and life, hermeneutics have been a problem. "Infallible" was chosen over "inerrant" in 1962 to officially describe the General Conference stance on the nature of biblical authority. Pacifism, the non-swearing of oaths, believers' (i.e. adult) baptism, and the disciplined church are core elements of faith based on reading the New Testament in particular.

The Conference of Mennonites in Canada is both an autonomous organization and a member of the General Conference Mennonite Church. This group traces its roots to John H. Oberholtzer and events within both the Mennonite community and larger society. The mid-nineteenth century was a time of turning: from a village to a town mentality, from a rather medieval to a more modern worldview and from a sectarian to a denominational style (Sawatsky 1987:7).

Oberholtzer questioned the established forms of worship and community life but not the basic doctrines of voluntary baptism, discipleship and non-resistance. His two greatest offences were his "excursions" outside of Mennonite circles and his change of ministerial attire (Epp 1975:139). He exchanged the "round coat," a long-tailed, straight-collared, no-lapel coat for one with no tails, fewer buttons and a high collar that formed a lapel exposing the shirt. He also called for a constitution to regulate decision-making procedures in the association of Mennonite churches that existed without benefit of any record-keeping or charter.

By 1860 a split from the (Old) Mennonite Church had been formalized. The resulting General Conference saw itself as a unifying structure in the midst of diversity. Three tenets have been preserved as an acronym: ULL-- **unity** in the essentials, **liberty** in the non-essentials, and **love** over all. Theological unity was seen as a non-essential. The resultant diversity may be seen as both a liability and an asset (Epp 1975:142).

Included in the first constitution were new standards for the ministry. Qualifications included the ability to teach, speaking talents and pulpit presence. Obligation for financial remuneration to the minister was also recognized (Pannabecker 1975:23). The lot remained in effect for the selecting of ministers but only from those deemed capable. Such persons were encouraged to indicate their readiness, possibly by engaging in religious study.

Congregations in Canada had collegial ties with the General Conference Mennonite Church before the CMC was established in 1903. Two main items were on the agenda of the CMC's first annual session. There was a motion to ask all congregations to take up a collection to assist the group at Rosthern, Saskatchewan in the building of a church and a committee was struck to draw up a constitution for the new conference. The CMC has met annually since 1903. The emphasis has been on lay involvement with one delegate being allowed for each thirty church members or portion thereof. In addition all members of CMC churches in attendance have floor privileges. To further promote lay participation and to approximate equity in travel costs, the annual sessions are held on a loosely rotating basis among the five westernmost provinces.

In 1961 an executive secretary was appointed. The conference presently has a central office in Winnipeg and an operating budget for 1988 of $3,465,294 (Conference of Mennonites in Canada 1987:118). There are 153 member congregations, most of which are also members of the General Conference. There are 28,734 members in these congregations plus 458 members in conference-related, but not member, congregations.

A rather recent development has been the joining of the CMC congregations in Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick with the (Old) Mennonite Church to form a new entity: The Mennonite Conference of Eastern Canada (MCEC). Some 60 congregations of the MCEC which had been members of the other conference prior to the merger were granted associate membership in the CMC at the 1988 conference (Mennonite Reporter July 15, 1988:B6). It is hoped that these congregations will individually join the CMC over the next five years.

The polity of the Conference of Mennonites in Canada is congregational. Each congregation is autonomous and joins conferences individually (at provincial, Canadian and General Conference levels). While lists of available pastors and of churches with openings are kept at the Winnipeg office, congregations do their own hiring. Although they may request assistance from the Winnipeg personnel, local decisions are made and implemented locally. Organizational power does not reside in the general secretary but in the local congregation whose members authorize the hierarchy to carry out programs on its behalf.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to assign the CMC into a neat-fitting box. In less than three decades the CMC's bureaucracy has grown from one bishop-like executive secretary (who returned to pastoral duties after a time) to an office

staffed with secretaries and business executives, several of whom have never been pastors. The move from farm to city has represented for many exactly that "collapse of community" that Wilson (1982) described. Much of the fortress mentality of Martin's Phase Two of secularization has been dropped, most notably in the switch from German to English as the language of worship.

At one time in its 85 years in Canada most congregations of the CMC would have satisfied many researchers as being sectarian. They have had, and continue to have, lay ministers who are not formally trained for ministry. They have criticized the social environment, most notably on the issue of public schooling (Ens 1980). The exclusiveness of the sectarian attitude was shown in the tenacity with which they clung to the German language. The priesthood of all believers rhetoric is alive even though paid ministers are in place. Tension between the sect and the larger society was experienced by the Mennonites in a particular way during the two world wars when non- resistance and speaking German were seen to indicate lack of patriotism.

One area of tension within the CMC is that of ecumenism. The CMC has observer status with both the Evangelical Fellowship of Canada and the Canadian Council of Churches. The intention is that some day, possibly soon, it will join both groups. Identifying with both organizations simultaneously provides evidence of a deliberate denominational spirit. But a certain sectarian spirit of distrust of other religious expressions is also evident: after observing for at least four years, the move to join has not been endorsed by the membership.

Most would agree that the CMC as a modern, progressive group could be granted at least qualified denominational status. When did it change from sect to denomination?

While Oberholtzer may have emphatically rejected sectarianism and boldly embraced denominationalism 125 years ago (Sawatsky 1987:75), separation from the world has been a primary concern of generations of Mennonites. Nonconformity has found expression in geographic separation, simplicity of dress, and the use of German and German dialects. As long as worship services were held in German the CMC had a formidable border around "the faithful." Language is not one of the characteristics of sectarianism, but exclusiveness is. Shutting "the English" out may not have been part of the religious programme of CMC congregations, but rather a way of keeping members mindful of both their religious tradition and their place in society. The latent but potent result was that the CMC had to be seen as a sect at least until English became the language of worship. Using that single measure of exclusion, some congregations were sectarian into the 1980s.

2.2.2 Clerical Authority in the CMC

The term "leader" as commonly defined was foreign to the vocabulary of the early Anabaptists. They spoke of the roles of teacher, preacher, minister and shepherd, but not of leaders as such. They emphatically rejected distinctions between clergy and laity in favour of a priesthood of all believers. It was not a matter of a church without clergy; rather, in stark contrast to Roman Catholicism, Anabaptism represented a church without laity. Historian Franklin Littell claimed this to be the first attempt at government by consensus (Kauffman and Harder 1975:184).

By 1551 a three-fold multiple lay ministry was in place. All males were possible candidates for selection by lot for the tasks of deacon, minister and elder

or bishop. Initially the word bishop was avoided because of its use by the Catholic Church, but as time went on the term became appropriate to the developing role. The bishop made himself available to congregations or groups of congregations until they could choose their own leader. He officiated at nominations, elections, ordinations, baptisms, marriages, funerals, communions and business meetings. The bishop came to occupy the top of the local church hierarchy in the eyes of both the members and the outside community. Bishops, ministers and deacons continued to earn their livelihood elsewhere while serving the church. Humility dictated that no one indicate a sense of calling and that no one act unilaterally as leader as had been the case among the early Anabaptists. The "priesthood of all believers" rhetoric was preserved, but for the sake of order certain persons were chosen for certain functions.

The lot was used to select ministers as it was interpreted as leaving the choice in God's hands. Baptismal vows included a promise of willingness for such service for men (willingness to be a minister's wife for women), and ordination often immediately followed selection. Unfortunately some poorly endowed ministers, lacking in education and possibly time for preparation, were ordained. When selection came to be made from nominees rather than from the entire male membership, the desires of family and friendship cliques made it necessary for bishops to approve the nominations beforehand.

Having a minister to preach and a bishop to officiate was integral to the existence of Mennonite settlements in Canada. Church services were held in homes and barns as frequently as ministers were available. When churches were organized they often included several congregations which continued to meet

separately while sharing a pool of ministers. Mennonites living outside of established settlements were subjects of concern to first the General Conference Mennonite Church and then the Conference of Mennonites in Canada.[8] Isolated families were individually visited by travelling ministers. Group homes for Mennonite women, complete with houseparents, were set up in Winnipeg (1926), Saskatoon (1931) and Vancouver (1935) to provide a community for those who went to the cities to work as domestics. By 1937 there were two such homes in each of the three cities, serving 800 young women of General Conference and Mennonite Brethren churches (Epp 1962:314). Weekday worship services had to be arranged for them as most worked Sundays.

The trend towards urbanization formed the basis of city missions under the sponsorship of the CMC. This marked the beginning of the end for the three-fold leadership pattern and the start of the mono- pastoral system (Epp 1984).

The traditional flow of authority was easily understood. Ministers and deacons were interdependent members of the team, chosen by lot from among the congregation. Today the deacon has lost status nearly everywhere. The office of bishop in many cases withered and died with the passing of the older generation. Since the 1960s ministers in the CMC have been ordained to both preach and officiate in one ordination.

---

[8] The diary of F. F. Enns, elder of the Whitewater Church in Manitoba, records the following summary of services rendered from November 6, 1927 to December 31, 1928 when he was already 55 years old: preached 192 times at 69 places, served communion to 1267 souls at 16 places, baptised 32 souls at 4 places, ordained 3 preachers and 1 deacon, attended at 3 elections, visited 424 families at 69 places, travelled 1596 miles by wagon and sleigh, 5832 miles by train and 27 miles on foot, performed 4 marriages and gave medicines to 273 persons. This work required that he be away from home 206 days. His son points out that the 69 places were not 69 different places as the elder visited some places fairly regularly (Enns 1979:65).

Today ministers can

> select themselves, get their own education, and seek places to minister far away from their home congregations. . .[They are] importers of many new ideas, interpretations and practices. (Juhnke 1984:3)

Despite these overtones of autonomy and power, today's minister is dependent, an employee who knows little or nothing about the history of the congregation and has little stake in the life of the community.

> That is why pastors appear to have considerable power when things are going well, but when pastors cannot meet congregational expectations their authority and power have eroded. (Epp 1984:42)

The result is often involuntary termination, a process that frequently repeats itself for both the pastor and the congregation.

In addition to vestiges of the traditional form of ministry, and the solo practitioners, new styles of ministry are being experimented with. Team leadership and an emerging form of "undesignated leadership," particularly in small fellowships, represent new models currently being forged in the CMC (Epp 1984:67).

There seems to be a degree of uncertainty about the direction in which ministry should move. An anonymous Mennonite reflected on the situation ten years ago and observed:

> Just when we had finally and fully accepted the salaried ministry of the respectable churches, we found that they were . . .(Petkau 1978:unpaginated)

The unfinished sentence, although it undoubtedly was a printing error, can be seen as pointing to the CMC's agenda for the 1980's.

2.3 The Current Authority Crisis in the CMC

In 1983, Sawatsky, a Mennonite historian, presented his "Autonomy and Accountability" paper to the CMC delegates. In order to focus the discussion of the issue he summarized the history of the CMC in terms of three eras in the development towards what he described as "excessive congregationalism" (Sawatsky 1983:B1). The charismatic era (1523-1561) was brief and eventful. In 1527 the Schleitheim Confession set out guidelines for church leadership, including qualifications and duties as well as charging the congregation to provide financially for the minister so that he may "live of the Gospel." Menno Simons emerged in the 1540s, partly of his own conviction but also upon the urging of six or more individuals. Over time he became the leading bishop of the Netherlands and North Germany. He worked hard to foster pastors of blameless character and orthodox theology and to this end he called upon ministers to serve without remuneration.

The next 400 years were years of traditional authority.[9] Each church had a bishop. One church generally included numerous congregations and these shared a pool of ministers. Deacons served their own immediate congregation. In Canada a second phase developed in the 1920s and 1930s as distances between congregations became too great (recall the influx of 21,000 immigrants at this time). More bishops were ordained. Ministers and even bishops became settled in a single congregation. Whereas earlier the polity had been a mixture of congregational and episcopal polity, now it became increasingly an exclusively

---

[9] Sawatsky is a historian, and while his writings demonstrate an appreciation for sociology, he is not applying Weber's typology as a sociologist might. While I believe that authority was both traditional (in the general sense) and legitimated by appeal to tradition ("We do it this way, because we've always done it this way), Sawatsky uses the term without explanation.

congregational polity.

Sawatsky dated the rational-pragmatic era as beginning in 1961, the year the first executive secretary for the CMC was appointed. By that time the salaried, trained minister had been accepted in many, if not most, congregations. Authority today, Sawatsky said, is legitimated on functional grounds, i.e. on the basis of fulfilling particular duties. Administration of the congregation has shifted from the ordained ministry to lay, elected councils. The hired pastor sits as just another member of this council. Bishops have disappeared and ordained-for-life deacons have lost status as that role, too, has become functionary.

Modern Mennonites were described by Sawatksy (1987) as being ambivalent about ordination. In order to encompass both the priesthood of all believers and the special calling of the person singled out for ordination, the focus has moved to the tasks the ordained will do. What Sawatsky called functional authority and Harrison (1959) called rational-pragmatic authority, makes no special claim to God's call beyond that of any other church member.

The result is that the CMC has no structure to address its doctrinal and organizational concerns. The three official boards of the CMC are program boards, administering the college, ministries to Canadian natives, and resources for congregations. There is no board of faith concerns and only recently has a committee been struck to concern itself with ministry. While tasks continue to be carried out, the collapse of the three-fold ministry signals an identity crisis, particularly for the local pastor who is

> unsure as to his or her authority to deal with issues of faith and order, being but a hireling subject to a periodic popularity vote of the congregation. . . Hired by the congregation, frequently ordained

> by the congregation, and subject to the whims of the congregation, . . .What happens when problems arise? Currently no one has any authority to intercede in a congregation unless invited by that congregation. The dangers of individualism are now structurally confirmed . . .(Sawatsky 1983:B3)

Just as individual Mennonites have achieved professional status while avoiding the thorny areas of ideology, congregations and the conference have become skilled in dealing with the life and work of the church while allowing faith and order to erode. Stressing the bad experiences of pastors in the modern era, and the necessity of a better structure to insure that youth consider pastoral ministry in the future, as well as the internal well-being of the CMC and its mandate to build a polity suitable to the "body of Christ," Sawatsky called for accountability in place of autonomy. Among his suggestions was a call to congregations to provide support teams for the minister to deal with both the "life and work" and the "faith and order" issues on the local scene. He called on all provincial conferences to appoint conference pastors and to empower them to be bishops in the traditional sense, that is to authorize them to intervene in local disputes at their own discretion rather than by invitation only. And he called on the CMC to augment its work and life orientation with a faith and order committee, or possibly two committees--one to work at theology and the other to focus on ministerial leadership.

Sawatsky's diagnosis and prescription for the ills of excessive congregationalism proved a catalyst for further debate. Early in 1985 a study conference convened in Winnipeg to discuss the issue further. In response to the continuing interest, and to foster even more discussion, the Committee on Ministerial Leadership of the CMC engaged Helmut Harder, Professor of Theology

and Christian Education at Canadian Mennonite Bible College, to write a congregational study guide on the issue of accountabiltiy in the church. The long-range purpose of the six sessions was

> for the Conferences and for their member churches to consider possible changes to the way in which authority and leadership practices are understood and implemented in the Conferences (Harder 1985: introduction).

Although more congregations may have used the study guide, twenty-nine sent reports back to the Winnipeg office. According to the findings report prepared by a staff member, ordination, women in leadership and the accountabiltiy/authority of the minister were the three issues of greatest concern and diversity.

At the 1985 delegate sessions of the CMC workshops were held to discuss the ordination of women and the use of liturgy in the Mennonite church. John Esau's paper, "Ordinal," was presented for discussion at the 1986 sessions and is in the process of being prepared for use as a policy guideline statement so that ordination by the Toronto United Mennonite Church and the Hoffnungsfelder Mennonite Church (Mayfair, Saskatchewan) may be seen equally as ordination for ministry in the General Conference Mennonite Church. Among the resolutions passed by the delegates at Clearbrook in 1987 was one which promoted a particular form of pastoral "calling" (see Appendix A).

Sawatsky may have triggered more than just talk. A Committee on Ministerial Leadership had already been struck by the CMC in the late 1970s; for the past several years there has been a part-time director working out of the Winnipeg office. At the time of writing all provincial conferences have a conference pastor, each of whom is a member of the national Committee on Ministerial Leadership. In at least one of the provinces (Alberta), candidates are

interviewed by a provincial committee prior to ordination. Several provinces hold annual ministers' retreats and/or Bible conferences. And finally, this fall the Canadian Mennonite Bible College will welcome its first students in a new service education program. In addition to this one-year program designed for students who already have a bachelor's degree, students in the present Bachelor of Theology program will now be able to choose a service education emphasis.

2.4 Summary

What mode of authority legitimation can we expect the CMC ministers to prefer? Sawatsky (1983, 1987) identified rational-pragmatism in the CMC. He also called for a re-assessment of authority arrangements in the CMC, and his challenge did not fall on deaf ears. The discussion continues and changes are being implemented. In closing his latest book, he lamented the un-sacred nature of functional, task-oriented authority and cited the most recent edition of the Minister's Manual where a new ordination service is presented, one that is a corrective for excessive functionalism. The benediction and charge reads:

> The Lord fill you with the Holy Spirit for the **office** and work of a minister in the church of Christ. . . Take **authority** as a minister of Jesus Christ to preach the word, to administer the ordinances as directed in the Scriptures, and to lead this congregation (Sawatsky 1987:92; emphasis Sawatsky's).

Functionalism (or rational-pragmatism) is not enough, there is also a "special way, although definitely not an exclusive way" (Sawatsky 1987:92) in which the minister is the voice of God to the people. Routinized charisma recognizes both the sacred and the office dimensions of authority and I embarked on this study expecting it to be the dominant mode of legitimating authority in the CMC.

This impression of CMC authority began to form for me before Sawatsky's book was off the press. A resolution on ministry was passed by the CMC in 1987 (see Appendix A). It linked ministry and other service assignments in the church. The resolution called on parents to encourage their children to consider service and ministry, upon congregations to recognize and encourage those with gifts suitable for the task, and upon the conference to provide education in the provinces for those with limited mobility in order to test and develop ministerial gifts. The **recognition of gifts** implies that there is a common ideal against which candidates are assessed. This "proximity to the ultimate values of a society" is exactly how Greenfeld (1985) described routinized charisma.

The resolution also stressed the importance of training for ministers and because of the functionalism which Sawatsky highlighted, I expected that legal-rational authority might also have supporters in the CMC. Legal-rational authority is not incompatible with the priesthood of all believers ideology; and as more and more of the laity choose professional careers a well-educated minister who is a religious specialist may be the ideal peer to an increasing number of members in the pews.

Given the diversity of the CMC, its excessive congregationalism, and its possible weakness in areas of faith and order, all four authority types may be present. Five years after Sawatsky opened the topic to the delegates seemed a good time to see where things stand in the CMC.

Chapter 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 The Population

There are 153 member congregations in the Conference of Mennonites in Canada. A great diversity exists as to how ministerial duties are carried out. Fourteen churches did not have a leading minister in 1987 (Conference of Mennonites in Canada 1987:13-66). In some instances churches were "between pastors." In others, often small churches or fellowships, being without a minister may have been a financial necessity or a matter of preference. Three congregations in northern Saskatchewan share one leading minister; they form the last church of the CMC to be composed of three congregations. In three other congregations, a married couple shares the leading minister role. One man was listed as a "Pastoral Care Worker" and I counted him as equivalent-to-minister.

In addition to the 144 leading or solo pastors, there are 152 other active ministers and 80 retired ministers listed in the Yearbook. Congregational practice varies. One congregation differentiated associate and assistant ministers; many list all other ministers simply as ministers. The ten who are listed as lay ministers presented another ambiguity, as at least some of the leading ministers were expected to be unpaid. The five institutional chaplains listed include several who are ordained and have served as leading ministers in the past.

In the interest of simplicity and economy, the 144 who held (possibly with a spouse) the position of leading minister were surveyed. Although the additional 239 ministers would have added breadth to the study, many of the retired ministers were expected to have problems with the English language. The historical dimension that the past generation of clergy could have provided was unfortunately lost, although year of birth was asked for in the questionnaire.

Since the population, as defined, numbered only 144, each pastor was sent a questionnaire.

3.2 The Instrument

The questionnaire is included as Appendix B. It was not possible to preserve the pagination. The actual format was a booklet made up of three double-sided white sheets.

There are sixty items, the majority of which required choosing the appropriate response from the selection given. Dillman (1978:55) "tentatively concludes" that eleven pages or 125 items represents the upper limit beyond which response rate can be expected to be negatively influenced by the instrument length. While this questionnaire was twelve pages long, most pages had a lot of white space and could be quickly completed.

3.3 Implementation

Dillmans' "Total Design Method" was the model this study initially followed in implementation (Dillman 1978). Five ministers from diverse denominations in Victoria agreed to pre-test the questionnaire and made valuable suggestions that

led to improvements. The initial packages (cover letter, stamped return envelope, questionnaire) were sent out on February 2, 1988. A follow-up post card was mailed to all a week later. It thanked those who had responded and encouraged the others to do so quickly.

In accordance with the Total Design Method a replacement package **should have been** mailed on February 9. By that time responses from 63% of the pastors had been received. Analysis of the returns by province indicated that nearly one-half of Manitoba's and three-quarters of Ontario's returns were outstanding. Assigning responsibility to the postal system and the distance factor, the decision was made to wait one more week before mailing out replacement packages.

By March 1, four weeks from the start, a 75% return had been achieved. This was considered to be satisfactory progress and no further appeal was made. The final return rate stands at 81%.[10]

3.4 The Question of Authority

Clerical perceptions of authority formed the central focus of this study. Although they introduced the four-cell model of authority types described earlier (see page 14), Hammond, Salinas and Sloane (1978) believed routinized charisma to be an anachronism and thus tested for only the three remaining types. Because I believed that authority that is sacred in source and residing in an office, that is routinized charisma, is not an anachronism but rather the ideal for Mennonite ministers I returned it to complete the model.

---

[10] One person, the Pastoral Care Worker, returned his questionnaire with a note saying that he was not really the minister and nobody else in their group was either. Perhaps the decision to include him was a poor one. One bonafide leading minister returned his questionnaire, saying he was too busy to fill it out.

Briefly reiterated, the authority model expresses the legitimation of authority as being the product of the dimensions of two dichotomies. Authority may be seen as either sacred or profane in nature, and as residing in either the person or the office. Legal-rational authority is profane authority residing in an office; rational-pragmatic authority is also profane but resides in a person. Sacred authority residing in a person is charismatic; it is called routinized charisma when it resides in an office.

Since my intention was to expand or complete the model I retained Hammond, Salinas and Sloane's (1978) descriptions for the first three of the four hypothetical ministers with only minor changes. I removed gender-specific nouns and pronouns and added "and does not depend on one's holding an office or title" to their description of charisma. This distinguishing phrase was particularly essential in light of the newly-added description of routinized charisma. The four descriptions as they appeared in this study (See Appendix B; Part IV), but with highlighting and the appropriate label added, were as follows:

1. The first clergymember feels that authority comes as a **result of training,** which is recognized by the church in ordination. In a way, this person regards him or her self as a **religious specialist** as a result of thorough training in theology and other subjects . [Legal-rational authority]

2. The second clergymember feels that authority must be **demonstrated regularly.** The right to preach, to lead worship and so forth, disappears if she or he fails to be effective. Therefore, authority is **dependent on effectiveness.** [Rational-pragmatic authority]

3. The third clergymember regards authority as **coming directly from God.** A Divine call was received and remains in force. Authority is a direct gift of grace and **does not depend on one's holding an office or title.** [Charismatic authority]

4. The fourth clergymember feels that authority is **conferred in recognition of one's God-given gifts and abilities.** Ordination is the process whereby one enters the **office in which authority resides.** [Routinized charisma]

Both the Hammond, Sloane and Salinas (1978) and Falbo, New and Gaines (1987) studies asked respondents to rate their sympathies for each position on a scale. Both then used a complicated scoring system to assign respondents to the appropriate cell. This study asked pastors only to choose the hypothetical ministers **most** and **least** like themselves. Each of these methods of assigning ministers to an authority type is rather arbitrary. Hammond, Salinas and Sloane dropped from their study 167 pastors who did not show strong enough support for one type above the others. I could not afford to lose one third of my sample and thus asked forthrightly which description best matched their feelings. Some respondents doubtless felt much more strongly than others and I have no idea which these were.

3.5 The Hypotheses

Thirteen hypotheses regarding clerical authority were tested. The survey instrument is included as Appendix B. For each hypothesis the questionnaire items pertaining to it are identified by section and item number. (For example, III.24 refers to section III, item 24.)

A word about statistical measures used is perhaps appropriate here. The four authority types were measured at the nominal level of measurement and this restricts one in choosing procedures for analysis. The usual approach with nominal data would be to display the results in a crosstabulation and to measure the strength of the association with the Chi-square statistic. With four categories in

the independent variable alone and a relatively small sample, this would have resulted in too many cells having fewer than five cases. Chi-square would therefore have been meaningless.

Since many of my dependent variables can be interpreted at the interval level of measurement, I chose to do a comparison of mean scores across the four categories wherever possible. This procedure provides a succinct summary of the information one would gather from the crosstabulation. It is a summary of the table but only useful when the dependent variable is one where the mean represents a meaningful measure of central tendency. In those instances where the dependent variable is not suitably interpreted at the interval level, I used the crosstabulation alternative.

The F-test statistic was used to determine significance where the hypotheses were tested by a comparison of means. The F-test statistic expresses the ratio of the variance between groups to the variance within each group. Large F-values lead to small p-values, which indicate a small likelihod of the results having occured by chance alone.

Because of the small sample size it was not possible to do a test for statistical significance when crosstabulations were resorted to. Cramer's V-squared was used as a measure of association. It ranges from 0 to 1, or from no association to perfect association. It does not allow one to infer these results to another population because no estimate of chance is made. It simply measures the strength of the associaton, that is, how much of the variance in the dependent variable can be explained by knowledge of the independent variable.

The hypotheses, the aspects of authority to which they refer, and the justification of items measured are discussed individually in the following pages.

3.5.1 Formality

H1: That pastors holding a legal-rational interpretation of authority will score highest on a formality scale.

H2: That pastors holding a charismatic interpretation of authority will score lowest on a formality scale.

This was one of the major patterns to emerge in the Hammond, Salinas and Sloane (1978) study. Legal-rational authority holders showed a strong preference for formality and charisma holders rejected formality.

In their study Hammond, Salinas and Sloane (1978:247) measured the "formality of churchmanship" on six dimensions. They asked pastors to describe the manner in which they dressed for services and those who reported at least a stole and alb were counted as formal. Likewise, those who wore a clerical collar in public and felt the recitation of creeds to be important were labelled as formal. Those who felt congregational participation in the form of testimonies was important and who preferred to be called "Mr." or "Pastor" over "Rev." or "Father" were labelled informal.

Hammond, Salinas and Sloane (1978) also inquired as to typical sermons and those who felt inspirational sermons were important were rated formal. They did not discuss this measure in their text, but I found myself wondering if there was a typographical error. Greenfeld (1985:20) said explictly that it is the "excitement," not the message which makes one charismatic. Also, Wilson's Pentecostalist minister and Conley's observations of a Baptist church minister both support the

stereotype which Hammond, Salinas and Sloane so lightly pass over (Wilson 1959; Conley 1982). I considered dropping the measure completely in order to avoid irresponsible replication. After a great deal of vascillation during which time I once chose to follow their lead and achieved statistically "better" results, I decided to retain the typical sermon measure. However I felt better able to theoretically defend the instructional sermon as being formal in nature than to defend replication for the sake of replication alone. Typical instructional sermons here receive points towards formality.

Formality here was measured in regards to worship services (II.21-25), preference for titles (II.27), preferred dress (II.28, 29), and the typical sermon (II.30-31). To get a composite picture of the degree of formality favoured by each individual respondent, the scales devised to measure the several aspects of formality were:

Formality in Worship Services (II.21-25)
*if responsive readings are used weekly, add 2 points

*if responsive readings are used once a month or more, add 1 point

*if testimonies are never part of worship service, add 2 points

*if testimonies infrequently part of worship service, add 1 point

*if following a liturgy is favoured, add 1 point

*if more than 10 church holidays observed, add 2 points

*if 5-10 church holidays observed, add 1 point

Formality of Titles (II.27)
*if "Rev." preferred form of address, add 2 points

*if "Pastor" preferred form of address, add 1 point

Formality in Dress (II.28, 29)

*if clerical robes favoured, add 1 point

*if suit and tie seen as mandatory dress, add 1 point

Formal Sermons (II.30-31)
*if sermons are typically instructional, add 1 point

A formality score of 12 could be attained by the most formal minister.

The four authority types were measured at the nominal level of measurement and the formality scale at the interval level. The **Means** procedure of SPSS-PC[11] was used to compare the mean formality score for the four authority types.

3.5.2 Workloads

H3: That pastors who accept rational-pragmatic authority will assume the greatest workload.

The central thrust of Ingram's (1980) paper on pastoral power in a congregational polity is that the clergy tend towards dominance, in fact control, over many aspects of church life. He based his analysis on participant observation in Baptist congregations and looked for manifestations of rational-pragmatic authority because Harrison (1959) had earlier identified it as operative for the American Baptist Convention. Among the characteristics of the pastors he studied he found:

1. The pastor is the gateway to church membership, symbolically for certain.

2. Leadership of the worship service enhances the pastor's visibility and prestige.

3. The pastor often directs the daily operation of the church building itself.

4. The pastor participates on almost every committee.

---

[11] SPSS-PC is the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences--Personal Computer version.

5. The pastor is frequently the only representative to external functions (Ingram 1980).

Ingram argues that rational-pragmatic leaders are success-oriented or power-oriented, rather than service-oriented (1980:41), and portrays the rational-pragmatic minister as being involved in virtually every aspect of the work of the church.

Most of Part II of the questionnaire deals with the pastor's role in the congregation. In addition to measures based on Ingram's observations, I asked whether the pastor was the sole employee. Secretarial and custodial duties were named by Blizzard (1955) as tasks that commonly default to the rural minister who is generally the sole employee. I also asked what proportion of worshippers each greets after the worship service and whether follow-up with newlyweds is undertaken.

The workload scale was as follows:

*if pastor sole employee, add 1 point

*if pastor member of every committee, add 1 point

*if pastor always calls committee meetings, add 2 points

*if pastor sometimes calls committee meetings, add 1 point

*if pastor drops in on meetings, add 1 point

*if pastor is sole representative to CMC, add 2 points

*if pastor is one of representatives to CMC, add 1 point

*if pastor is delegate to provincial conferences, add 1 point

*if pastor is usually worship leader, add 1 point

*if pastor greets as many as possible each week, add 2 points

*if pastor is accessible each Sunday, add 1 point

*if pastor keeps in touch with newlyweds, add 1 point

*if pastor teaches Sunday School or catechism, add 1 point

*if pastor teaches Sunday-School and catechism, add 2 points

*if pastor interviews candidates for baptism, add 1 point

*if pastor has sole responsibility for baptism, add 1 point

A score of 16 was the highest attainable. Again, a comparison of means score by authority group was used to test this hypothesis.

3.5.3 Outside Involvement

H4: That rational-pragmatic clergy will show the highest degree of involvement in ministerial activities and in the council of churches.

H5: That legal-rational clergy will respond most favourably to non-church involvement in the community.

Both of these hypotheses are based on Hammond, Salinas and Sloane's (1978) study. Regarding professional involvement they probed formal general involvement (i.e. ministerial association), time spent with clergy of their own denomination and time spent with clergy of other denominations. I asked simply about the degree of involvement in the local ministerial association (III.3). The expectation that rational-pragmatics will be most involved also follows from Ingram's (1980) assertion that they seek success and power and to increase their personal visibility.

Hammond, Salinas and Sloane (1978) asked respondents about their degree of involvement in organizations such as Kiwanis, United Way and the PTA. Mennonites, traditionally, have had an aversion to membership in outside societies of any sort, whether sacred or secular, secret or public. Church membership was

meant to be all inclusive (Epp 1974:142). To broaden the scope of community involvement so that coaching a minor hockey team, serving as mayor or reeve and involvement in a local recycling initiative could all conceivably be included, I used the term "community service groups not sponsored by any religious group" (III.7). I encouraged differentiation between private citizen involvement and professional "witness," but tested the hypothesis by attributing both to a positive attitude towards secular involvement. Both positive responses received a score of 3; the "too busy" were given a score of 2; those who prefer non-involvement a score of 1; and those whose conscience urged separation from the community scored 0.

Both hypotheses were tested by a comparison of mean scores by authority type.

3.5.4 The Office-Person Dimension

H6: That legal-rational and routinized charisma pastors will be most likely to see marriage as belonging to the church.

One of the dimensions of the guiding typology had to do with where the authority resides--in the office or in the person. Officiating at marriage ceremonies is one instance where clergy feel this particular tension. When asked to perform a marriage ceremony does he or she do so as a person of authority or as a holder of office authority? In a congregational polity ministers are often "installed" at the beginning of a term of employment. This rite may be seen as the congregational members' recognition of the incumbent as the official administrator of all future rites in that particular church. Some pastors may see these rights as exclusively theirs. By definition, then, they would not perform a wedding ceremony in another congregation as that would be infringing on another

minister's territory. Couples, however, often choose a minister who means something to them as a person and in a congregational polity where pastors tend to be mobile, he or she may no longer be residing in the couples' community (Epp 1984; Smith 1952). This presents a particular dilemma.

Item II.17 addressed the problem from the minister's standpoint. Four responses were offered, ranging from "glad to do so" to "refuse to do so." Respondents were divided into two groups to test the hypothesis. Those preferring legal-rational and routinized charisma authority (office authority) formed one group. Holders of charismatic and rational-pragmatic authority (personal authority) formed the second. A crosstabulation was then used to test for the desired association.

3.5.5 The Sacred-Profane Dimension

H7: That charismatic and routinized charisma pastors will be most likely to marry only couples with some church connection.

"By the power vested in me by God and this province" is the familiar preface to the traditional marriage proclamation. It also illustrates the dual sacred and profane dimensions of the marriage ceremony. For whom, or in what context, do ministers offer this service? And where do they draw the line?

Question 16 in Section II provided six responses ranging from requiring both parties be active in the church to marrying anyone who asks. Response 7, "other," was available for written comments. Respondents were again divided into two groups, this time based on the sacred/profane criterion. SPSS-PC procedure **Means** was used to compare the mean scores of the two groups.

3.5.6 Factors Related to Authority Preferences

Understanding what ministers believe about their authority and how they exercise it was the major intent of this study. In a practical sense these findings could be of use if more objective variables could be shown to correlate with the authority types. For example, a pastoral search committee can usually learn the applicant's age, educational level, and which schools were attended without having to actually meet and interview the candidate. Theological orientation and prior socialization into the ministry may also provide clues as to what kind of minister to expect. Authority which was the independent (or causal) variable in the earlier tests becomes the dependent variable for the remaining six hypotheses.

3.5.6.1 Age

H8: That charismatic authority will be associated with older ministers.

Having argued that charismatic authority is the authority of the unorganized social movement and that it is also often associated with sectarian religious groups, I expected that the older ministers in this study would be the ones to prefer to see their authority as charismatic. The CMC has become a bureaucratic organization during the careers of the older ministers and they may remain as vestiges of the earlier era. The younger ministers, furthermore, were expected to have availed themselves of more education and thus to be more favourably disposed towards rational authority.

3.5.6.2 Education in Years

H9: That the greater the educational attainment, the greater a minister's sympathy for legal-rational authority.

General Conference Mennonites have been shown to be well-educated and involved in the professions and business (2.1.2 above). Advanced education is a hallmark of the bureaucratization and secularization processes. The "experts" with more education were expected to prefer the more rational authority. That is, authority from profane sources was expected to be favoured by those with more education and sacred source authority by those with fewer years of education.

3.5.6.3 Religious Training

H10: That pastors who prefer rational types of authority are more likely to have undertaken religious training.

Bible schools, colleges, and seminaries, respectively socialize the prospective minister to an increasingly greater sense of being "set apart." The combined exposure to Bible study, church history, theology and, more significantly, higher criticism, "provides the minister with a fund of knowledge seldom possessed by others in the congregation" (Ingram 1981:121). While one might expect saturation in religious training to lead to intense religiosity, the introduction to higher criticism of scripture has a definite "profane" element to it. Viewing the Bible, for instance, as a cultural artifact can be seen as a threat to accepting its authority. The liberalizing of one's views may be reflected in preference for rational authority.

One could argue the same point from the other side, as it were. Berg, in making a point about the educational qualifications for churchly versus sectarian ministers argues that the more sectarian the group

> the more pronounced the tendency to view professional training as useless without a calling and superfluous with it (Berg 1969:2).

Pastors with a personal calling (those who chose charisma) and to a lesser extent those whose gifts have been recognized (routinized charisma) were expected to have engaged themselves in less formal religious study than those who prefer a rational type of authority.

3.5.6.4 Mennonite Education

H11: That holders of routinized-charisma authority will have the most training in Mennonite schools.

Mennonites have long insisted on the peculiarity of their tradition and in Canada this has translated to operating schools at virtually every level. Since the elementary schools are relatively new, this survey limited itself to post-high schools and to schools whose primary function is the promotion of religion.

The CMC's recent resolution on recruitment for ministry (see Appendix A) calls upon congregations to "discern the gifts" of potential ministers. Since this statement was believed to reflect the CMC's preferred model, it was expected that Mennonite educators would reinforce this interpretation.

3.5.6.5 Theological Orientation

H12: That a relationship between authority and theology will be found.

Jeffries and Tygart (1974) heralded theological position as a powerful predictor of pastors' stands on social issues. Different views of God and humanity were found to be translated to different views on the virtue of self-reliance versus the collective responsibility for members of society. How mutual the measures of theology and authority are is the question of interest.

Eighty-three per cent of the fundamentalists in Hammond, Salinas and Sloane's (1978) sample chose the charismatic description, as did 65% of the conservatives. The neo-orthodox and liberals preferred rational-pragmatic authority, closely followed by legal-rational authority. The neo-orthodox were the least likely of all groups to choose charismatic authority.

Theological orientation is a composite of beliefs and has most often been operationalized by asking a series of questions regarding those beliefs and then by placing each respondent into a suitable category. Since these were all ministers, I expected them to have feelings about which theological camp they best fit into. Thus, I provided a choice from four categories: liberal, neo-orthodox, conservative, and fundamentalist.

If the reason faith and order issues are not receiving attention in the conference is because of the diversity of theological influences, and if the authority crisis is a faith and order crisis, this relationship could be an especially worthwhile one to document.

Although these four types can be understood to range along a continuum, they were measured at the nominal level of measurement and no direction could be predicted.

3.5.6.6 Clergy Fathers

H13: That ministers whose fathers' were ministers will prefer one view of authority in greater proportion than those whose fathers' were not clergymen.

The interest here is in whether growing up close to the church makes a difference in how one perceives the authority of his or her position as a minister. Perhaps the pastor's children learn that the holder of charisma has "feet of clay" and thus reject the personal sacred calling. Perhaps, knowing of long hours spent labouring over sermons, they recognize the "religious expert" role more easily than persons distanced from that aspect of a clergyperson's role. Perhaps their observance of church politics has led them to be overly concerned about effectiveness, a trait of the rational-pragmatic type of authority. Whether or not they see themselves as carrying on the family business, they could very well view their authority differently as a result of their home life and socialization.

Here again, exploration rather than testing was the intent. No particular authority type was expected to be favoured.

Chapter 4

FINDINGS

4.1 General Characteristics of CMC Clergy

Tables 1 and 2 present some of the characteristics of the respondents. Men greatly outnumber women (113 to 4), and 97% of the sample are married. The average age is 48 years.

Although nearly 60% of the sample reported that their family income comes solely from the church, there are also some leading ministers who work without remuneration (6%) or who receive less than half of their household income from the church (an additional 7%).

Not all ministers in the CMC have the same educational background. The mean number of years spent in school was 17.03, but the standard deviation of 3.2 years indicates a large spread in educational background. There are three levels of religious training avilable to Mennonite ministers: institute, college, and seminary. Nearly 9% of the respondents had not availed themselves of any of these opportunities; 39%, 36% and 16%, respectively, had elected to enroll at one, two or three schools of religious education.

Over the years there have been a number of Bible institutes operated by the provincial conferences of the CMC; and a Bible college, affiliated with the University of Manitoba, is owned and operated by the CMC. The General Conference, of which the CMC is a member, owns and operates a seminary in

Indiana. Thus it is possible for a minister to receive a strictly General Conference education. Six per cent of this sample did exactly that. One quarter attended two Conference-related schools and one third attended one such school. In addition to those who have no religious training, 26.5% received whatever religious training they have from other than the denomination's own schools.

Table 1: AGE AND EDUCATION OF THE RESPONDENTS

	Mean	Std Dev	Range
Age in Years	48.28	12.05	23-76
Education in Years	17.03	3.20	8-22

Table 2: GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

	N	Per Cent
Gender		
Male	113	96.6
Female	4	3.4
Totals	117	100.0
Marital Status		
Married	112	96.6
Not Married	4	3.4
Totals	116	100.0
Proportion of Family Income from the Church		
None	7	6.0
Less Than Half	8	6.9
About Half	5	4.3
More Than Half	29	25.0
All	67	57.8
Totals	116	100.0
Number of Religious Schools Attended		
None	10	8.5
One	46	39.3
Two	42	35.9
Three	19	16.2
Totals	117	99.9
Number of General Conference Schools Attended		
None	41	35.0
One	39	33.3
Two	30	25.6
Three	7	6.0
Totals	117	99.9

4.2 The Authority Question

Although I did not present a hypothesis on the distribution of perceptions of authority, this study was precipated at least in part by my belief that routinized charisma would find acceptance among Mennonite pastors. In direct contrast to Hammond, Salinas and Sloane's (1978) pre-test sample, these pastors had no difficulty recognizing routinized charisma (see Table 3). Seventy-one per cent of the sample chose it as most closely representing their position. Charisma ranked second, and rational-pragmatic authority third, but they were distant followers at 16% and 13%. Nobody recognized themselves in the legal-rational description.

Table 3: CLERGY RESPONSE TO THE AUTHORITY POSITIONS

Authority Type Selected

Authority Type	N	Per Cent
Legal-rational	0	0
Rational-pragmatic	14	13.1
Routinized charisma	76	71.0
Charismatic	17	15.9
Total	107	100.0

Authority Type Rejected

Authority Type	N	Per Cent
Legal-rational	60	56.1
Rational-pragmatic	21	19.6
Routinized charisma	1	0.9
Charismatic	25	23.4
Total	107	100.0

Although forcing respondents to indicate which one of the four hypothetical clergy was least like themselves was meant to be a disciplinary tactic to insure careful thought, the results were most intriguing. Legal-rational authority was rejected by 56% of the sample, rational-pragmatic authority by 20% and charisma by 24%. Only one person rejected the highly-favoured routinized charisma.

One of the options available for crosstabulations in SPSS-PC allows one to compare the observed cell frequency with the expected frequency if the variables were totally independent (see Table 4). The Cramer's V-squared indicates a negligible association between individual respondent's most and least favoured positions and tells us nothing about the nature of the association.

The diversity of positions on the authority question is highlighted by the fact that the largest group, resulting from the crosstabulation, contains only 38 (or 36.5%) of the 104 responses to these two questions. The 71% who favoured routinized charisma were divided on the grounds on which they based their choice. Of the 73, 38 rejected legal-rational authority. They chose the sacred source-office combination while rejecting the profane source-office combination (refer to schema in 1.5, above) Schematically, their choice placed them in the left half of the schema but restricted to the lower quadrant. The other 35 rejected personal authority, (schematically, the right half of the diagram) 17 when it had a profane or rational source and 18 when its source was sacred.

Table 4: OBSERVED AUTHORITY FREQUENCIES AND EXPECTED FREQUENCIES IF CHOICES WERE INDEPENDENT

(Note: Expected frequencies are in parentheses.)

	Type Rejected			
	Leg-rat	Rat-pragm	Charisma	Rout char
Type Chosen				
Rat-prag (n=14)	6 (7.8)	0 (2.7)	7 (3.4)	1 (0.1)
Rout char (n=17)	38 (0.7)	17 (14.0)	18 (17.5)	0 (0.7)
Charisma (n=73)	14 (9.5)	3 (3.3)	0 (4.1)	0 (0.2)
Total	58	20	25	1

Cramer's V-squared=.099

Note:Leg-rat=legal-rational;
Rat-pragm=rational-pragmatic;
Rout char=routinized charisma;
Charisma=charismatic.

Choosing which minister was most like and least like themselves proved difficult and the missing cases deserve mention. Thirteen persons in all (11%) did not answer both parts. Representative of their frustrations were these comments:

> My my--who are these people?! I'm not sure I can find myself here.
>
> I believe, and at the same time reject, parts of each.
>
> combination of all four with emphasis on 2 [rational-pragmatic]

4.3 Formality

It was predicted (see H1 and H2: p 53) that legal-rational authority would be associated with a high degree of formality and charisma with a low degree of formality. The formality score was computed from the answers to nine questions. Some pastors failed to answer every item and thus their cases were dropped from the computation. This reduced the usable sample size to 79 for testing these particular hypotheses..

Table 5 shows the results of the comparison of means by authority preferences. The grand mean of 5.1 on a scale of 0 to 13 indicates that CMC ministers, in general, are not especially formal. Rational-pragmatic respondents scored above the grand mean and charisma below. The variance between groups, however, is not enough to reject the null hypothesis of equal means at an alpha level of .05. These results would be attained by chance alone more frequently than permissible.

Although the null hypotheses cannot be rejected, and there is no legal-rational group to test, the results are in the expected direction and are worthy of notice.

Table 5: MEAN FORMALITY SCORES BY AUTHORITY TYPE CHOSEN

Mean formality was calculated from a possible score of 12.

Authority Type	Mean	Cases
Rational-pragmatic	5.67	12
Routinized charisma	5.19	54
Charismatic	4.46	13
Total		79

Grand Mean 5.14
F=2.32 Sig .105

4.4 Workloads

It was hypothesized (H3: p 55) that rational-pragmatic clergy would score highest on a scale of tasks assumed by ministers. As in the preceeding instance, not every relevant question was answered by every minister. The working sample here was reduced to 95 cases and the highest possible score was 16.

Table 6 displays the findings. Contrary to the expectations raised by Ingram (1980), the charismatic group, not the rational-pragmatic, reports being the most busy in the pastoral role. Once again, there is not sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis of equal means. Chance alone could produce these results.

Ingram (1980:45) highlights the success and power orientation of rational pragmatic clergy as observed in congregational polities. One example of this power that he cites has to do with initiation into church membership. Not only do

Table 6: MEAN WORKLOADS BY AUTHORITY TYPE CHOSEN

Mean workloads were calculated from a possible score of 16.

Authority Type	Mean	Cases
Rational-pragmatic	9.15	13
Routinized charisma	8.79	67
Charismatic	10.07	15
Total		95

Grand Mean 9.04
F=2.08 Sig .131

pastors usually instruct membership classes, they frequently also interview candidates prior to baptism. Sometimes this interview is the sole screening process for membership. Finally, the pastor performs the rite, and thus holds symbolic power over membership.

To test Ingram's assertion that the pastor is the gateway to church membership, I investigated that particular item further. While two-thirds of the pastors in this sample reported that a pastoral interview is a prerequisite for baptism, in only three cases was it the sole requirement. Furthermore, none of these three pastors favoured the rational-pragmatic view of authority. One chose charisma, one routinized charisma, and one did not commit him or her self.

4.5 Outside Involvement

I hypothesized (H4: p 57) that pastors who preferred the rational-pragmatic view of authority would be most involved in clergy associations, and that those who preferred the legal-rational authority would be most involved in the community (H5 p 57). As Table 7 indicates, the rational-pragmatic group is the most involved in the local ministerial assocations. Since the scores range only from 0 to 3, variability is restricted, and a difference of .3 is larger than it at first appears. Although the results are not statistically significant, they are in the expected direction.

A totally different picture emerges in regards to community involvement. There are no legal-rational authority holders in this study. If it is the rational quality of authority that influences the minister to become involved outside of the church, then rational-pragmatic clergy may be expected to be more involved than those who claim sacred authority. Although not significant, these findings are in the opposite direction to that hypothesized. The two charismatic groups share top score and the rational-pragmatic group's score falls below the grand mean.

One plausible reason might be that rational pragmatics "perform" for a very specific audience. The success-orientation, or the effectiveness they must demonstrate, is directed towards maintaining a pulpit. Specifically religious activity may be perceived as the most pragmatic approach. This may be particularly true in Mennonite circles where joining associations may not be highly valued.

Table 7: OUTSIDE INVOLVEMENT BY AUTHORITY TYPE CHOSEN

Local Ministerial Involvement

Authority Type	Mean	Cases
Rational-pragmatic	2.64	14
Routinized charisma	2.36	75
Charismatic	2.24	17
Total		106

Grand Mean 2.37
F=1.53 Sig .222

Community Involvement

Authority Type	Mean	Cases
Rational-pragmatic	2.43	14
Routinized charisma	2.56	71
Charismatic	2.56	16
Total		101

Grand Mean 2.54
F=.35 Sig .707

4.6 The Office-Person Dimension

In H6 (p 58) I suggested that pastors who hold to an office view of authority will be least likely to gladly marry a couple outside of their present church. The results from the crosstabulation are presented as Table 8.

Only 21% of the pastors perform ceremonies without question when they are not the couples' pastor. At the other extreme, 7% refuse. Most tread the

Table 8: THE OFFICE-PERSON DIMENSION AND THE MARRIAGE QUESTION

Question: How do you respond when asked to marry a couple you knew in another congregation?

	PERSON	OFFICE	TOTAL
Glad to do so	4 (16%)	14 (22%)	18 (21%)
Suggest they ask present pastor	19 (76%)	41 (65%)	60 (68%)
Prefer not to, but don't refuse	0 (0%)	4 (6%)	4 (5%)
Refuse	2 (8%)	4 (6%)	6 (7%)
Total	25 (28%)	63 (72%)	88 (100%)

Cramer's V-sqaured=.026

diplomatic route by encouraging the couple to ask their current pastors. These results, however, do not provide sufficient evidence to support the hypothesis of a strong office-person split.

Interestingly, nearly one-fifth of the respondents commented on the issue. One who did not circle any response wrote, "[I] clear it with the local pastor first." Six of the fourteen who "gladly do so" added that they make sure it is not a problem to the local minister and/or congregation. One pastor hoped for a reciprocal response when he was the overlooked local pastor:

> I am glad to do so, provided they consult with their minister, [and] partake in some pre-marital counseling. This is also my attitude to those who might want to ask someone else to marry them. It is their day as a couple to experience in as meaningful a way as possible."

Although the office-person dichotomy did not materialize, there does seem to be awareness of a certain degree of territoriality in existence in that pastors are aware of the problems they may cause by not recognizing who has priority in a particular setting.

4.7 The Sacred-Profane Dimension

Hypothesis #7 (p 59) stated the expectation that pastors with sacred authority (i.e. charisma and routinized charisma) would be more likely to marry only couples with some church affiliation. A real problem arose in interpreting the means arrived at here. I believe the problem arose largely as a result of the way many respondents interpreted the question. Forty-six per cent did not see church affiliation as **the issue,** either for themselves or for the researcher. They selected "other" and went on to say that pre-marital counseling was a prerequisite, that divorced parties presented problems, or that the church council made the decision. In order, therefore, to make the mean scores meaningfully interpretable on the church affiliation scale, 60 cases had to be dropped.

Scores ranged from 1, when both couples are required to be active in the church, to 6 when no affiliational requirements are in place. As Table 9 shows, the results obtained are in the expected direction, but the difference is negligible and not significant.

Table 9: THE SACRED-PROFANE DIMENSION OF CLERGY AUTHORITY

Authority Type	Mean	Cases
Profane	4.38	8
Sacred	4.27	49
Total		57

Grand Mean 4.28
F=.049 Sig .826

4.8 Other Related Factors

Six possible independent variables were tested for their relationship with the type of authority a minister might prefer.

4.8.1 Age

It was expected (H8: p 60) that it would be the older ministers who preferred the charismatic legitimation of authority. The respondents' ages ranged from 23 to 76 and were collapsed to four categories. As Table 10 shows the association between age and authority preference is a very weak one. Interestingly, the oldest group has representation solely in the routinized charisma group.

Table 10: THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN AUTHORITY PREFERENCE AND AGE

Authority Type	Respondents' Ages: under 35	35-49	50-64	65 + up	Totals
Rat-prag	1 (7%)	7 (17%)	8 (15%)	0 (0%)	14 (13%)
Rout char	12 (80%)	27 (66%)	28 68%)	9 (100%)	76 (72%)
Charisma	2 (13%)	7 (17%)	7 (17%)	0 (0%)	16 (15%)
Totals	15 (14%)	41 (39%)	41 (39%)	9 (9%)	106 (100%)

Cramer's V-squared=.024

4.8.2 Education in Years

Hypothesis 8 (p 61) predicted that increased education would be reflected in preference for a more rational-based authority. Education, which ranged from 8 to 22 years, was collapsed into four categories to test this hypothesis. Table 11 illustrates another weak association overall. However, the fact that 92% of those who chose rational authority have more than fifteen years of schooling as compared to 73% of those who chose charisma over rationality, does point in the expected direction.

Table 11: THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN AUTHORITY PREFERENCE AND EDUCATION

	Education in Years				
	under 12	13-15	16-18	19-22	Totals
Authority Type					
Rat-prag	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	4 (19%)	8 (19%)	13 (13%)
Rout char	7 (64%)	10 (77%)	21 62%)	34 (79%)	72 (71%)
Charisma	3 (27%)	3 (23%)	9 (27%)	1 (2%)	16 (16%)
Totals	11 (11%)	13 (13%)	34 (34%)	43 (43%)	101 (100%)

Cramer's V-squared=.062

4.8.3 Religious Training

It was expected that the more rational the perceived authority, the more likely the person would have undertaken religious training (H10 p 61). While the overall association is negligible, it is worth noting that all who legitimate their authority on rational-pragmatic grounds have invested time in religious training.

Perhaps the fact that Canadian Mennonites in general have availed themselves of the opportunity for religious education may have contributed to the weakness of the association. In denominations where religious education is geared more specifically towards ministry, a stronger association might exist.

Cramer's V is a symmetric measure and the strength of the association would not change if authority were seen as the causal variable.

Table 12: THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN AUTHORITY AND RELIGIOUS TRAINING

	Attended Religious School?		
Authority Type	No	Yes	Totals
Rational pragmatic	0 (0%)	14 (14%)	14 (13%)
Routinized Charisma	5 (71%)	69 (70%)	74 (72%)
Charismatic	2 (29%)	15 (15%)	17 (16%)
Total	9 (8%)	98 (92%)	105 (100%)

Cramer's V-squared=.016

4.8.4 Mennonite Education

According to H11 (p 62) routinized charisma and education at Mennonite schools were expected to have a strong association. Table 13 presents the findings on Mennonite education and authority, another weak association. Several patterns do emerge, however. It is the rational-pragmatic authority holders who have the best attendance record. The charismatics are as likely to have no Mennonite education as to have attended one school. And routinized charisma holders are

equally dispersed between no Mennonite schooling and having attended one or two schools.

Why did the routinized-charisma group not show a better attendance record? Several possibilities come to mind. First, the group is diverse in itself. It includes pastors with no Mennonite schooling and pastors who attended three Mennonite schools. Some of this variation may well be a function of age as well.

A second reason why Mennonite education cannot be shown to best promote routinized charisma is that it is only one socializing factor. Routinized charisma is the authority mode preferred by the majority and it is possible that ministers who are active conference supporters have adopted the dominant form of legitimation through their intense involvement and interaction with other ministers.

Why have those ministers who preferred rational-pragmatic authority attended Mennonite schools in greater proportion than any other authority group? First the nature of rational-pragmatic authority is that it has profane sources, that is, it comes as the result of work on the part of the authority holder. It has already been shown that all rational-pragmatic ministers took religious training. Second, given the ethnic and religious boundaries Mennonites have traditionally maintained, attendance at Mennonite schools may have been by default. Finally, in terms of pure pragmatism, attending a Mennonite school is a good strategy for being invited to fill a Mennonite pulpit.

The holders of charismatic authority fell far behind in terms of Mennonite education. Of the 15 who have some religious training (see Table 12) only 8 received any of their training at a Mennonite school. This raises a time-order

question. Did those who attended non-Mennonite schools become "indoctrinated" with a charismatic outlook? Or did those who favour belief in personal charisma shy away from the Mennonite schools where that sentiment might not be popular?

Table 13: THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN AUTHORITY AND MENNONITE SCHOOLING

	Number of Schools Attended				
	None	One	Two	Three	Totals
Authority Type					
Rat-prag	1 (3%)	4 (11%)	7 (23%)	2 (29%)	14 (13%)
Rout char	23 (70%)	25 (68%)	23 77%)	5 (71%)	76 (71%)
Charisma	9 (27%)	8 (22%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	17 (16%)
Totals	33 (31%)	37 (35%)	30 (28%)	7 (7%)	107 (100%)

Cramer's V-squared=.074

4.8.5 Theological Orientation

Hypothesis 12 (p 63) suggested a possible relationship between authority preferences and theological preferences. Twenty-seven persons declined putting a label on their religious beliefs. Several wrote comments such as:

> My theological position is not restricted to any of these categories. The only one I would not identify with would be fundamentalist.
>
> I have never been able to decide about myself.
>
> Liberal--social and peace issues, Biblical application; Conservative--view of scripture, christology, etc.
>
> Very much dependent on issue. Since I've been in the Mennonite church I've been catalogued both fundamentalist and raving liberal!

Table 14 illustrates the weak association between authority and theology. Although the table is set up with theology as the independent variable, Cramer's V is a symmetrical measure and would be unchanged if one were to assume theology to be dependent. Only 4% of the variation in authority can be explained by knowledge of the respondents' theological leanings.

Given the preponderance of support for routinized charisma, it is not surprising that the largest percentage of each theological group holds to a routinized charisma view of authority.

Table 14: THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN AUTHORITY AND THEOLOGICAL PREFERENCE

	Theological Preference				
	Liberal	Neo-Orth	Conserv	Fund	Total
Authority Type					
Rat-prag	1 (11%)	4 (25%)	5 (9%)	0 (0%)	10 (11%)
Rout char	7 (78%)	11 (69%)	43 75%)	5 (62%)	66 (73%)
Charisma	1 (11%)	1 (6%)	9 (16%)	3 (38%)	14 (16%)
Totals	9 (10%)	16 (18%)	57 (63%)	8 (9%)	90 (100%)

Cramer's V-squared=.043

Note: Neo-Orth = Neo-orthodox
Conserv = Conservative
Fund = Fundamentalist
Rat-prag = Rational-pragmatic
Rout char = Routinized charisma
Charisma = Charismatic

4.8.6 Clergy Fathers

The final hypothesis (H13 p 64) was set up to explore the possible impact that being a minister's son or daughter might have on one's preferential interpretation of authority.

Despite the strong possibility that childhood socialization in a minister's home might shape one's view of clergy authority, statistics do not bear that out. As

Table 15 shows, there is absolutely no predictive advantage gained by knowing whether a minister grew up with a clergyman father or not.[12]

Table 15: THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN CLERGY FATHERS AND AUTHORITY

	Father a Minister?		
	No	Yes	Totals
Rational pragmatic	11 (79%)	3 (21%)	14 (13%)
Routinized Charisma	60 (79%)	16 (21%)	76 (71%)
Charismatic	13 (76%)	4 (24%)	17 (16%)
Total	84 (79%)	23 (21%)	107 (100%)

Cramer's V-squared=.000

12 Ordination of the first woman in the CMC occurred less than a decade ago. While ideally the interest is in whether the present minister grew up in a minister's home, it will be ten years or more until one can realistically expect that the parent who was the minister will have been the mother.

4.9 Summary of Findings

The most outstanding finding had to be the response to the authority model itself. Hammond, Salinas and Sloane (1978) dropped routinized charisma from their study because it had not been recognized in the pre-test. Here it is the most popular choice and it was the legal-rational authority with which none could identify. Rational-pragmatic authority and genuine charisma were each claimed by a minority of ministers.

As expected charismatics scored lowest on formality. Contrary to expectation they also scored highest on mean workloads. Rational-pragmatics did demonstrate greatest interest in professional affairs, and charismatics lowest. That pattern, however, did not hold for community involvement. None of these findings attained statistical significance.

Using marriage ceremonies as a test case of the sacred-profane and office-person dimensions of the model, findings pointed in the expected directions; but once again significance was not attained.

Six independent variables were tested for their possible influence on authority preferences. While no strong associations were found, those pertaining to education did allow for differentiation between rational-pragmatism and charisma.

The following chapter discusses further the theoretical and practical implications of this study.

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION

5.1 Methodological Concerns

Marginal and unremarkable religious groups are often overlooked by researchers. The CMC was chosen for this study primarily because I explicitly expected its ministers to recognize routinized charisma. The group has not evoked a great deal of research attention. Furthermore, the issue of authority has been an on-going item for discussion within it since Sawatsky articulated it so clearly in 1983. A secondary focus was on the behavioural consequences of choosing a particular type of legitimation.

Replicating Hammond, Salinas and Sloane's (1978) ten-denomination study (with the addition of one routinized charisma to the study) within a single denomination restricted the possible range of findings. The location of routinized charisma was convincingly documented however.

There are two main concerns by which all survey research must be evaluated. They are the matters of validity and reliability.

5.1.1 Validity and Reliability

First, the question of validity: Did I measure what I think I measured? The four-cell authority model I tested, while having been used twice previously, was altered somewhat each time. Hammond, Salinas and Sloane (1978) used only three

of the four cells for their study. Falbo, New and Gaines (1987) retained the descriptions of charismatic and legal-rational authority, but altered the description of what had been called rational-pragmatic authority and returned to calling it traditional authority. I attempted to return to the theoretical underpinnings of Hammond, Salinas and Sloane and reinserted the fourth cell--routinized charisma.

My return to the full model and my replication of its first usage indicates my support for the theoretical validity of the model. I entered the project convinced that the measure was valid. Despite (or perhaps because of) the glaring lack of interest in legal-rational authority on the part of my respondents I stand by my belief in the theoretical framework for reasons I will return to later.

One reassuring indication that the model measured the dimensions of the theoretical continua came from several pastors who underlined key words in the descriptions in the process of making their choices. One pastor's deliberation is reflected by his comments:

> Part IV was hard to answer. While I put #3 as least like me, I do recognize God's call to ministry personally and through the congregation. As I read #3 it suggests authority without affirmation of the call through the congregation. That's not me.

A problem with the validity of the model has to do with the very term "authority." As Robertson (1980) points out, for many the word has assumed pathological dimensions harking back to T.W. Adorno's documentation of the authoritarian personality. Several pastors rejected the model on this kind of ground. This note from a pastor who did not make a selection, while not typical, exemplifies this revulsion towards authoritarianism:

> Authority is a quality I have never, repeat never, considered to be part of a pastor's makeup. Authoritativeness is what the "divine

> right of kings" was all about, but certainly not in our Mennonite churches. There is no quicker and surer way for a conscientious pastor to lose "authority" in a congregation than by practicing it.

It is not clear how many of those who did not answer this part of the questionnaire felt as he did, but an introductory paragraph might have improved both the response rate for the question and the validity of the measure. For example since this was a survey of ministers, several appropriate biblical references could have allayed their fears and increased validity. Two suitable references, commonly cited in the literature, are "And Jesus taught with authority, not like the scribes" (Matthew 7:29) and the incident where the Jews ask Jesus by what authority he is preaching and performing miracles (Matthew 21:23). In retrospect, I regret not introducing this usage of "authority" in either the cover letter or at the start of Part IV of the questionnaire.

The bulk of the survey instrument was made up of behavioural items. This was a very specific questionnaire directed towards a very specific population. No question seemed to be outside of the common experience of ministers, although many did leave blanks where their experience did not cover either the situation or the possible answers provided. On the face of it, how often testimonies are part of the worship service, for example, is a straightforward question measuring a quantifiable entity. But does it measure formality as both Hammond, Salinas and Sloane (1978) and I assumed? There are Mennonite churches, and likely others as well, where the "formality" of a testimonial period is perfunctorily offered. Three pastors separated what they do in their churches from "testimonies:" one crossed out "testimonies" and wrote in "faith stories or kingdom reports;" one said "not necessarily in the form of so-called testimonies" and another wrote that they have

a weekly "sharing time." The validity question comes into focus when using a word that carries a certain amount of emotional freight--either positive or negative--in respondents' circles.

Other validity problems that could be mentioned in this respect include: the recitation of creeds, use of liturgy, clerical dress, and typical sermon content or form. When used in a specific context, such as the Conference of Mennonites in Canada, do they have anything to contribute to a measure of formality? Mennonites are uneasy about creeds, they do not have a liturgy as such to follow, and their ministers do not wear stoles, albs or clerical collars. Because I wished to replicate Hammond, Salinas and Sloane (1978) I attempted to tap the same areas of concern. I substituted the use of worship aids from the hymnal for creedal recitation. I asked how they viewed the use of liturgies and I probed the issue of inappropriate dress.

In addition to the problems of measuring formality, I am uncertain about the validity of trying to measure formality altogether. Hammond, Salinas and Sloane (1978) equated formality with "high church" and informality with "low church." But is formality the crux of the difference between high and low church? Smith's (1952) division between sacramentalism and instrumentalism is much more satisfactory in my opinion. The four areas covered by formality (worship, titles, dress, sermon content) could have been as easily discussed as ranging along a continuum between sacramentalism and instrumentalism.

The second overall concern has to do with reliability: would these same results occur with repeated measurings? In regards to the authority model itself, I believe this study improved reliability over Hammond, Salinas and Sloane (1978) by

not being a telephone survey. The respondents had ample time to make their decisions based on a simultaneous consideration of all four options.

I believe, also, that requesting respondents to indicate most and least appropriate descriptions yielded more reliable returns than a Likert-type scale as used in the two previous studies (Hammond, Salinas and Sloane 1978; Falbo, New and Gaines 1987). The aim, in all three cases, was to assign each pastor to a particular single cell of the model. While Hammond, Salinas and Sloane (1978) used a more sophisticated scoring technique, they were not able to use one-third of their responses because they were not sufficiently polarized in their choices. Respondents are more likely to report the same most-least sentiments in a second measuring than they are to report the same critical difference on a scale of 1 to 10, particularly over the telephone. Only ten of my respondents did not assign themselves to a type: a loss of less than 10%.

The behavioural and attitudinal questions in this case were fairly straightforward. Appendix C discusses two areas where reliability may have been jeopardized by poorly-worded questions, and the steps I took to counteract the threat. It also explains the way in which occupations were coded.

5.1.2 The Limitations of a One-Denominational Study

Hammond, Salinas and Sloane (1978) found authority to be differently associated with different denominations and different theological positions, two common independent variables used in the study of religious professionals. Thus they felt that a third measure, authority, would delineate more closely between clergy of the same denomination and/or theology.

In the second stage of their analysis they examined the roles of theology, denomination and authority in explaining behaviour. Authority was shown to make an independent contribution to understanding behaviour, but not in equal proportions for different theological positions or denominational membership nor was the balance similar in the four areas of behaviour they studied. The total picture became very complicated.

Falbo, New and Gaines' (1987) comparison of power strategies between Roman Catholics and Southern Baptists claimed to lend support to the authority measure. Because the two religious traditions in question were so different, they might as easily have claimed denomination as the causal variable. For reasons of simplicity and economy, and because of an admitted problem with authority within the CMC, I limited my study to only one group. This greatly decreased the possibility of achieving statistically significant results.

The issue of formality is a case in point. Hammond, Salinas and Sloane could tabulate how many pastors wore a stole and alb in the pulpit, for instance, because their sample included Roman Catholics, Lutherans and Presbyterians (1978:247). Conversely, they could tabulate the presence of testimonies in the worship service precisely because their sample included the Assembly of God, and Baptists. The wearing of clerical dress counted as formality and congregational participation in the form of testimonies as informality. In the case of the CMC, where any mark of clergy identification was summarily rejected at its inception, all I could measure was the pastors' feelings about the place of liturgical dress. The testimony item was more relevant as testimonies are a part of the evangelical tradition with which Mennonites are familiar.

The CMC operates through a congregational polity. The hierarchy of the denomination does not dictate, for example, that the pastor shall wear a dark suit and tie for preaching. I have observed pastors preaching in short-sleeved shirts in the heat of summer. This would probably be perceived as informality and possibly as being radical, but it is within the range of acceptable behaviour. Each congregation decides for itself how it will worship. What would appear to be formal to a Mennonite young person would probably be the church where they "sing two hymns, have the announcements, sing a hymn, read the Bible, take the offering, have a sermon, etc. Sunday after Sunday after Sunday." The recitation of creeds, antiphonal readings between congregation and celebrant, and ministers dressed in robes, would be seen as **foreign,** not merely formal. The radically informal CMC church, I hazard to guess, is the one that uses chairs instead of pews, holds the worship service before Sunday School, and perhaps allows for discussion of the sermon by interested parties during that second hour. Particularly since CMC pastors did not identify with legal-rational authority, the expected range in formality (based on Hammond, Salinas and Sloane 1978) could not materialize.

Despite this limitation, one overall pattern did emerge. Throughout the elaboration of the findings it has been the "pure" or "ideal" charismatics who have stood out. Even when results are not statistically significant, it is noteworthy that one group constitutes an "oddball".

5.2 Response to the Model

There was one point at which the survey of one denomination was not a limitation. The CMC provided a case where routinized charisma was recognized and promoted, and this prompted a search for explanatory factors. On this point alone, the single denomination study was a strength.

Two things stand out immediately in the pastor's responses to the authority model (see Table 3). Nobody chose legal-rational authority and the majority (71%) chose routinized charisma. Reinforcing the strength of this result is the high degree of rejection for legal-rational authority expressed and the negligible dissatisfaction expressed with routinized charisma. What sense can we make of it?

Both the routinized charisma and the legal-rational authority descriptions refer to ordination as the signal event in their assuming authority. Both recognize the conferral of authority by others and its being connected to an office. The split, then, comes on the sacred-profane dimension of the model. While CMC ministers have a mean of 17 years' education and over half have attended more than one school of religion (see Tables 1 and 2), they overwhelmingly rejected authority based on learning. It is the judgement of one's suitability for ministry, based on a "sacred quality", and made by the community that qualifies one for the office.

Selection of routinized charisma by a sizeable group came as no surprise. The forcefulness of the outcome, in combination with a high proportion of rejection of personal charisma, makes one wonder how Hammond, Salinas and Sloane's (1978) pre-test group could not recognize it? By the same token, why did not even one

CMC minister identify with legal-rational authority? A second look at Hammond, Salinas and Sloane's study might help to clarify the situation.

One concern that may be raised regarding the Hammond, Salinas and Sloane (1978) study has to do with their sampling frame. Only pastors from denominations having twenty-five or more congregations in Arizona were included. Without knowing much about the religious climate of Arizona, it is probably safe to assume that smaller groups do exist. (There are only four General Conference Mennonite Churches in Arizona.) Insisting that a denomination be "strong" in Arizona may not be the best way to tap the full range of authority legitimations that can exist in religious collectivities. Routinized charisma may well be the authority type best represented in religious minorities--those with fewer than twenty-five parishes in Arizona.

Secondly, only 46 of the original 250 pastors interviewed by Hammond, Salinas and Sloane (1978) clearly favoured legal-rational authority. While every denomination except the Southern Baptists had at least one minister who preferred legal-rational authority, they were in the majority within their denomination only for the two Lutheran groups and for the Episcopalians. These latter groups have long histories as stable denominations, having had close relations with the state in their earlier stages. Their histories represent exactly what the Anabaptist movement rejected.

Regardless of the sectarian roots of the CMC, I expected some acceptance for legal-rational authority. Initially the Anabaptist church was a church without laity; that is, all were expected to take responsibility for the religious welfare of all others. Over time tasks came to be allocated to individuals. The rhetoric of

the priesthood of all believers has never been dropped, even though salaried clergy represent the norm.

The rhetoric of congregational polity, furthermore, embraces what seems to be a reversed hierarchy. The "top man" is ideally the servant of the churches, and is chosen for administrative rather than "religious" ability. There is no career path to becoming general secretary in the usual bureaucratic sense. It is simply one of the tasks that must be done. Authority, or legitimized power, is not vested in one strata of the hierarchy more than in any other--ideally.

Finally, given their egalitarian ideology, who is the minister if not the "religious specialist?" There are many gifts needed and used by the church, Mennonites would say, citing I Corinthians 12, and none is more important than any other. The minister is concerned with religious needs and is hired to do the "religious work" among a group of believers with other gifts and tasks. So there is reason to expect a Mennonite minister to see himself or herself as not more sacred than the plumber in the pew, only more religiously expert. From its beginnings in 1860, the General Conference Mennonite Church has recognized education's role in equipping candidates for ministry. All but a few of my sample have availed themselves of the opportunity to study, both generally and in their discipline. Why then, did nobody choose legal-rational authority?

An initial suggestion is that the term "religious specialist" deterred some. Although the cell in the model embraced office authority, the description of one with legal-rational authority is very much that of an isolated individual with a high view of his or her personal expertise. Although the singling out of one or two leading ministers from among the community for particular tasks could well be

done on profane grounds, the Anabaptist ideal of the priesthood of all believers might make this personal aggrandizement intolerable. "Religious" and "sacred" are not synonymous, but they were not differentiated in the description and there is a sense in which ministers are treated as "different" and may feel a need to resist this. If there is one point at which I question the validity of the **descriptions** (but not the underlying theory) by which authority was measured, it is here where not one person chose legal-rational authority.[13]

As I indicated earlier this result also strengthened my confidence in the model. That is, CMC ministers were able to differentiate clearly enough to vote strongly for office authority, while maintaining hold of a religious calling. Their choice of office-sacred authority while rejecting office-profane authority indicates that the model was sufficiently clear to the respondents.

Could legal-rational authority have been made palatable, not only recognizable to ministers of the CMC? I believe so. The present description of the legal-rational legitimation does not show office authority, although it does refer to ordination. A possible improvement might be the following:

> The first minister feels that authority is recognized by the church's ordination to the tasks and duties of ministry. This ordination must be preceded by careful training in theology and related subjects.

Recognition of the human conferral of authority implies that a construct of office is acknowledged as pre-dating the incumbent. The reference to "tasks and duties" removes any aura from the essentially profane authority we are dealing with, and makes it clear that the person is a functionary.

---

[13] While several in my pre-test chose legal-rational authority, two almost apologized for doing so. One hesitated, specifically, to call herself a "specialist".

Three authority types received support from my respondents. Genuine charismatic authority was preferred by 16% of the sample. Both Matheson (1987) and Barnes (1978) allow that in times of radical change, charisma may surface, often due to frustration with the traditional or legal-rational processes. While the changes in the CMC are not radical per se, for those who prefer their religion to be constant, abiding and immutable, the conference may seem to have undergone radical change. Given the diffuse nature of authority in a congregational polity it may be inevitable that some individuals feel called on to "turn things around." Given the sectarian roots of the group there may also be a lingering nostalgia for charisma. This nostalgia may explain why charisma makes so little difference in behaviour. The rhetoric is appropriate for those with a seige mentality within the larger confines of the CMC itself.

Rational-pragmatic authority at 13% was the least favoured of the three types represented. Harrison (1959) describes it as the consequence of the structural defects in congregational polities and speaks of it as "an acquired charisma." In developmental terms, rational-pragmatism is "higher" on the scale than routinized charisma and one is tempted to say the CMC is heading towards rational-pragmatism. Perhaps these 13% are the forerunners of the 71% majority on their way to becoming fully rationalized. Perhaps in twenty years there will be a few supporters of legal-rational authority, more of rational-pragmatic authority, and fewer supporters of both strains of charisma.

Alternatively, and this may better reflect the goal of the organization, routinized-charisma may come into greater esteem. It is an authority of office, but cognizant of a sacred dimension. It is the authority of a quasi-organization, as

the "hierarchy" of a congregational polity is a quasi-hierarchy. As an intermediate authority type between disruptive charisma and a strictly task-oriented authority, it is an uncomfortable authority to live with since it requires accountability on the part of each pastor and of each congregation that ordains a minister. This uncomfortable state may well be a healthy one, one where the identity of a people may best be expressed.

Sawatsky (1983) initiated this discussion in the CMC with his observations that faith and order have been neglected under excessive congregationalism and that authority has been reduced to being purely functional. Weber talked about the routinization of charisma, not about routinized charisma. Returning to the process motif, it is possible that the routinizing of charisma could be the long-term agenda of the CMC.

The leadership pattern Sawatsky advocated was the pattern of the traditional era, but it was definitely not legitimated on traditional grounds. Sawatsky was not calling for the return of bishops because "we've always done it that way." He called for a return of sacred authority to the office of bishop, minister and supporting church officers. He called for a corrective to laxity in the realms of faith and order that he saw as having crept in during the era of unconsidered authority.

Routinized charisma has not been measured elsewhere, to the best of my knowledge. Its overwhelming and systematic support from this small group of ministers indicates that it is clearly not an anachronism. While not commonplace it may well be the appropriate response for a religious collectivity that wishes to tread the fine line bordering on impersonalized bureaucracy, a group that has

picked and chosen from the fruits of secularization, and a group that values its sectarian tradition while moving more boldly into the twenty-first century than most of its Mennonite "cousins." The routinization of charisma is a process, a process that, consciously embraced as a process worth working at, provides a distinct type of authority. While Mennonites are no longer a people apart because of dress, language and an agrarian lifestyle, they may yet be a people apart as they strive to practice a unique legitimation of authority.

5.3 Broader Implications of this Study

Although denomination may be a powerful independent variable for studying Protestant groups on a comparative basis, I believe there are good grounds for a study of a single denomination and the views its ministers have of authority. It is important from the standpoint of both the social sciences and that of the organization itself.

First, the scope of the study could be greatly enlarged. This one was limited to only some of the roles played by the minister. Perhaps questions regarding how the minister counsels parishioners might have differentiated the sacred and profane elements. The present furor in the United Church of Canada over the ordination of professed homosexuals and lesbians has ministers supporting both sides of the argument. Would-be ordained homosexual and lesbian clergy may hold to a particular view of clerical authority. This difference may be highlighted particularly when grassroots' support for granting office authority to those whose sexual orientation is disparaged seems to be lacking. Capital punishment, abortion and nuclear disarmament are three other issues on which ministers are looked to

for guidance. This survey deliberately avoided these volatile issues, but not because of a lack of suitable material in the CMC.

Tapping these issues within a single denomination could be a fruitful enterprise. Which pastors dare to speak out on abortion? Which condemn homosexuality? How do different pastors "interpret" AIDS? Conferences, congregations and church members alike face these and similar dilemmas. Understanding the authority legitimation of both the ministers who are speaking out on these issues and those remaining silent, could help social scientists to understand the diversity of religious responses to modernity. Particular religious groups could also be helped in formulating an integrated response, one consistent with their philosophy of ministry.

Studies of this type have potential usefulness to the denomination itself. One group in this study was repeatedly set apart--the charismatics. Being less formal, more busy, and more involved in the community may be an interesting, but not worrisome, condition especially in a congregational polity. But perhaps the denomination places special value on particular elements of the scales constructed and reported on here. Let me offer two anecdotal examples.

Several years ago in Saskatchewan a group, calling itself "The Concerned Mennonites" formed to rid the Conference of Mennonites of Saskatchewan (CoMoS) of its secular humanist element--most of whom were instructors at the provincial Bible institute. They were able to precipitate a rash of resignations, letters to the editors of Mennonite publications, a significant loss of monetary support to CoMoS and perhaps one congregation's withdrawal from CoMoS. Although its members were all pastors of CoMoS congregations, 6 of the 9 charter

members had not attended a Mennonite school. These pastors quite likely held to a charismatic view of authority, the group that is repeatedly isolated in this study.

The second example also comes from Saskatchewan. At the CoMoS annual meeting in 1985, the executive outlined a procedure to be followed when a pastor was asked to marry a couple in another church. He or she was encouraged to write the current pastor a courtesy letter upon accepting the officiating role. It seems there had been problems. This survey, a national one, showed that most pastors today do defer to the local minister. Practices across the country correspond to the recommendation made by the CoMoS executive.

Finally to return to the possibility of prediction; a study like this one, if it were to address the felt needs and hurts of the conference, could help individual congregations and the conferences (both provincial and Canadian) in the hiring of personnel. If the charismatics continue to stand out from the crowd, candidates who have not attended a Mennonite institution might well be interviewed most carefully if the congregation itself accepts the salience of the issues covered by the research. If there really are no important differences, perhaps the conferences could close their schools and send their youth elsewhere for an education. As a small denomination the CMC and its member conferences might well be concerned that its distinctiveness be preserved. But first it must be shown where and when it makes a difference.

Chapter 6

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

This study was prompted to a large degree by fascination with the model presented by Hammond, Salinas and Sloane (1978). It is true that no model can completely portray reality. This one, however, because of its parsimony and its recognizable polar characteristics, captured my imagination. At the same time I was disappointed they had allow routinized charisma to slip out of the model with so little struggle to locate it in a religious collectivity.

A second impetus came from an underlying concern that modern Mennonites have been misunderstood as both a social and religious group. The fact that authority was a topic of concern in the CMC at the present time made my effort a timely one as well. By searching for an undocumented authority type in a little documented religious collectivity I was able to highlight the negotiation that is legitimated authority.

Willer (1967) in his discussion of Weber's "missing type" showed the consistency of Weber's analysis of authority and community. For example, when rationality dominates social action and legalism is the basis of an organization, domination will be legitimated via legal-rational authority. A struggling sect, on the other hand, may well be kept alive by emotion; affectual social action, affectual legitimation for its existence, and charismatic leadership belong together. During periods of persecution and stress, this affectual leadership is appropriate, perhaps essential, for the maintainence of the group.

After 200 years Mennonites in North America are no longer struggling for their existence, either physical or spiritual. Comfort and prosperity are theirs in their adopted countries. Some have dropped their "fortress mentality" and have become acculturated. Mennonites can be seen as being much like any other religious group.

But they are not just another denomination. Their history highlights a communal past, relative success in maintaining **Gemeinschaft** in a world of impersonal **Gesellschaft.** Their values, while not unique, do not represent mainstream culture. At the same time members of the CMC have cast off peculiar dress and hairstyles, the use of a peculiar vernacular, and other trappings of ethnicity.

The Amish and Hutterites have the affectual trappings of dress and language to legitimate their unusual behaviour. A simple, "We have always done it this way," from the lips of a man with a beard, broad brimmed hat, black pants held up with suspenders and a plaid long-sleeved shirt, particularly when spoken with a German accent is legitimation enough for driving a horse and buggy to church.

Modern acculturated Mennonites are, in a sense, invisible. In the past fifty years they have had to explain rationally what used to be shown symbolically. They, in fact, are having to explain to themselves and their children what was once taken for granted. Blending of values and rationality has not come easily to the CMC. Values reflected through life and work, are more easily maintained. It is the rational element, faith and order, that is a stumbling block for many.

Documenting routinized charisma and providing insight on a Mennonite group that has not been studied proved a serendipitous choice. By neglecting

uninteresting, marginal religious groups researchers such as Hammond, Salinas and Sloane (1978) closed the door on identifying routinized charisma. This study found them both in one place.

REFERENCES

Barnes, Douglas F.
1978 "Charisma and Religious Leadership: An Historical Analysis." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 17:1-18.

Bartholomew, John Niles
1981 "A Sociological View of Authority in Religious Organizations." Review of Religious Research 23:118-132.

Berg, Philip L.
1969 "Socialization into the Ministry: A Comparative Analysis," Sociological Analysis 30:59-71.

Bibby, Reginald W.
1979 "The State of Collective Religiosity in Canada: An Empirical Analysis." The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 16:105-116.

1983 "Religionless Christianity: A Profile of Religion in the Canadian '80s." Social Indicators Research 13:1-16.

1987 Fragmented Gods: The Poverty and Potential of Religion in Canada. Toronto: Irwin Publishing Co.

Blizzard, Samuel W.
1955 "The Role of the Rural Parish Minister, the Protestant Seminaries , and the Sciences of Social Behaviour." Religious Education 50:383-392.

Bocock, Robert J.
1970 "The Role of the Anglican Clergyman." Social Compass 17:533-544.

Brewer, Earl D. C.
1952 "Sect and Church in Methodism." Social Forces 30:400-408.

Carroll, Jackson W.
1981 "Some Issues in Clergy Authority." Review of Religious Research 23:99-117.

Chamberlayne, John H.
1964 "From Sect to Church in British Methodism." The British Journal of Sociology 15:139-19.

Coleman, John A., S.J.
1968 "Church-Sect Typology and Organizational Precariousness." Sociological Analysis 29:55-66.

Conference of Mennonites in Canada
1987 Yearbook 1987. Winnipeg: Conference of Mennonites in Canada.

Conley, Carolyn
1982 "'Make Full Proof of Thy Ministry:' LaMarr Mooneyham, the Tri-City Baptist Temple, and the Moral Majority." The South Atlantic Quarterly 81:131-146.

Dillman, Don A.
1978 Mail and Telephone Surveys. Toronto: John Wiley and Sons.

Dyck, Cornelius J.
1981 An Introduction to Mennonite History. Kitchener: Herald Press.

Enns, F. F.
1979 Elder Enns. Steinbach: Derksen Printers.

Enns, Herman
1972 "Forms of Ministry." Henry Poettcker and Rudy Regehr, editors, Call to Faithfulness. Winnipeg: Canadian Mennonite Bible College: 93-102.

Ens, Adolf
1980 "The Public School Crisis Among Saskatchewan Mennonites 1916-1925." Harry Loewen, editor, Mennonite Images. Winnipeg: Hyperion Press: 73-88.

Epp, Frank H.
1962 Mennonite Exodus. Altona: D.W. Friesen and Sons Ltd.

1974 Mennonites in Canada: Volume I. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada.

Epp, Menno H.
1984 The Pastor's Exit: The Dynamics of Involuntary Termination. Winnipeg: Canadian Mennonite Bible College.

Falbo, Toni, B. Lynn New and Margie Gaines
1987 "Perceptions of Authority and the Power Strategies Used by Clergymen." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 26:499-507.

Ference, Thomas P., Fred H. Goldner and R. Richard Ritti
1971 "Priests and Church: The Professionalization of an Organization." American Behavioral Scientist 14:507-524.

Greenfeld, Liah
1985 "Reflections on Two Charismas." British Journal of Sociology 36:117-132.

Hammond, Philip E., Luis Salinas, and Douglas Sloane
1978 "Types of Clergy Authority: Their Measurement, Location and Effects." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 17:241-253.

Harder, Helmut
1985 Accountability in the Church: A Study Guide for Congregations. Winnipeg: Committee on Ministerial Leadership.

Harder, Leland
1971 Fact Book of Congregational Membership. Newton: The General Conference Mennonite Church.

Harrison, Paul M.
1959 Authority and Power in the Free Church Tradition. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hertel, Bradley R.
1977 "Church, Sect and Congregation in Hinduism: An Examination of Social Structure and Religious Authority." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 16:15-26.

Houghland, James G. and James R. Wood
1979 "Determinants of Organizational Control in Local Churches." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 18:132-145.

Ingram, Larry C.
1980 "Notes on Pastoral Power in the Congregational Tradition." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 19:40-48.

1981 "Leadership, Democracy, and Religion: Role Ambiguity Among Pastors in Southern Baptist Churches." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 20:119-129.

Isichei, Elizabeth Allo
1964 "From Sect to Denomination in English Quakerism With Special Reference to the Nineteenth Century." The British Journal of Sociology 15:207-222.

Janosik, Robert J.
1974 "Religion and Political Involvement: A Study of Black African Sects." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 13:161-175.

Jeffries, Vincent and Clarence E.Tygart
1974 "The Influence of Theology, Denomination, and Values upon the Positions of Clergy on Social Issues." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion. 13:309-324.

Juhnke, James C.
1984 "Historical Perspectives on Authority in the General Conference Mennonite Church." unpublished paper, presented at "Dialogue on Faith", October 1984.

Kauffman, J. Howard and Leland Harder
1975 Anabaptists: Four Centuries Later. Scottdale: Herald Press.

Kniss, Fred
1988 "Toward a Theory of Ideological Change: The Case of the Radical Reformation." Sociological Analysis 49:29-38.

Knudsen, Dean D., John R. Earle, and Donald W. Schriver, Jr.
1978 "The Conception of Sectarian Religion: An Effort at Clarification." Review of Religious Research 20:44-60.

Martin, David
1962 "The Denomination." The British Journal of Sociology 13:1-14.

1978 A General Theory of Secularization Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Matheson, Craig
1987 "Weber and the Classification of Forms of Legitimacy." The British Journal of Sociology 38:199-215.

Niebuhr, H. Richard
1929 The Social Sources of Denominationalism. Cleveland: World Publishing.

O'Dea, Thomas F.
1954 "Mormonism and the Avoidance of Sectarian Stagnation: A Study of Church, Sect and Incipient Nationality." The American Journal of Sociology 60:285-293.

Palmer, Susan J.
1988 "Charisma and Abdication: A Study of the Leadership of Bhagwan Shree Rajneesh." Sociological Analysis 49:119-135.

Pannabecker, Samuel Floyd
1975 Open Doors: The History of the General Conference Mennonite Church. Newton: Faith and Life Press.

Petkau, Irene Friesen (ed)
1978 Just When We Were: The Story of the Conference of Mennonites in Canada. Winnipeg: The History Archives Committee of the Conference of Mennonites in Canada.

Pineo, Peter C.
1985 Revisions of the Pineo-Porter-McRoberts Socioeconomic Classification of Occupations for the 1981 Census. Hamilton: McMaster University.

Redekop, Calvin Wall
1974 "A New Look at Sect Development." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 13:345-352.

Reimer, Margaret Loewen
1983 One Quilt, Many Pieces. Waterloo: Mennonite Publishing House.

Robertson, Roland
1980 "Aspects of Identity and Authority in Sociological Theory." Roland Robertson and Burkhart Holzner (eds), Identity and Authority: Exploration in the Theory of Society. Oxford: Basil Blackwell: 218-265.

Sawatsky, Rodney
1978 "Domesticated Sectarianism: Mennonites in the United States and Canada in Comparative Perspective." Canadian Journal of Sociology 3:233-244.

1983 "Autonomy and Accountability: Church Polity Within the Conference of Mennonites in Canada." Mennonite Reporter 13:19:B1-B4.

1987 Authority and Identity. North Newton: Bethel College.

Schreuder, Osmund
1970 "A Review of Ministry Studies." Social Compass 17:579-588

Sennett, Richard
1980 Authority. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Smith, Luke M.
1952 "The Clergy, Authority Structure, Ideology, Migration." American Sociological Review 18:242-248.

Steeman, Theodore M.
1975 "Church, Sect, Mysticism, Denomination: Periodological Aspects of Troeltsch's Type." Sociological Analysis 36:181-204.

Swatos, William H.
1975 "Monopolism, Pluralism, Acceptance and Rejection: An Integrated Model for Church-Sect Theory." Review of Religious Research 16:174-185.

Szafran, Robert F.
1976 "The Distribution of Influence in Religious Organizations." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 15:339-349.

Takayama, K. Peter
1975 "Formal Polity and Change of Structure: Denominational Assemblies." Sociological Analysis 36:17-28.

Urry, James
1983 "'The Snares of Reason'--Changing Mennonite Attitudes to 'Knowledge' in Nineteenth Century Russia." Comparative Studies in Society and History. 25:306-322.

Vogt, Roy
1980 "The Impact of Economic and Social Class on Mennonite Theology." Harry Loewen, editor, Mennonite Images. Winnipeg: Hyperion Press:137-148.

Wallis, Roy
1975 "Scientology: Therapeutic Cult to Religious Sect. Sociology 9:89-100.

Warburton, T. Rennie
1966 A Comparative Study of Minority Religious Groups With Special Reference to Holiness and Related Movements in Britain in the Last Fifty Years. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of London.

1967 "Holiness Religion: An Anomaly of Sectarian Typologies." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion. 8:130-139.

Weber, Max
1947 The Theory of Social and Economic Organizations (translated by A.M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons). New York: The Free Press.

1968 Economy and Society (edited by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich) New York: Bedminister Press.

Wiebe, Donald
1980 "Philosophical Reflections on Twentieth-Century Mennonite Thought." Harry Loewen, editor, Mennonite Images. Winnipeg: Hyperion Press:149-164.

Willer, David E.
1967 "Max Weber's Missing Authority Type." Sociological Inquiry 37:231-239.

Wilson, Bryan R.
1959 "The Pentecostalist Minister: Role Conflict and Status Contradictions." The American Journal of Sociology. 64:494-504.

1967 Patterns of Sectarianism. London: Heinemann.

1982 Religion in Sociological Perspective. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wood, James R.
1970 "Authority and Controversial Policy: The Churches and Civil Rights." American Sociological Review 35:1057-1069.

Worsley, Peter
1968 The Trumpet Shall Sound, second edition, New York: Schocken Books.

Yinger, J. Milton
1961 Religion in the Struggle for Power. New York: Russell and Russell.

APPENDIX A

RESOLUTION ON RECRUITING FOR MINISTRY AND SERVICE

Presented and Accepted, July 7, 1987;
Clearbrook, British Columbia

Given that we are facing a growing shortage of pastoral leaders in our churches and that fewer of our members are volunteering for service assignments in our service agencies:

we call upon our parents to encourage their children to seriously consider service and ministry in and for the church, including especially pastoral ministry;

we call upon our congregations to initiate creative ways to discern the gifts in Christian ministry and service of all members both the younger and the older and to encourage the full utilization of these gifts;

and, we call upon our Conference(s) to provide educational experience in all the provinces, especially for mid-career women and men with limited mobility, to test and to develop their ministerial gifts.

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

Pastoral Leadership Survey

As you are already aware, ministers have been the subject of debate at several recent annual sessions of the Conference of Mennonites in Canada.

This questionnaire represents an opportunity for you to express your thoughts, feelings and experiences related to the ministry. Please feel free to add comments in the margins or on a separate sheet of paper. All responses will be kept confidential and anonymous.

You may have noticed a number on the flap of the return envelope. Upon arrival the envelope will be separated from the response, as will any comments you make on an unattached sheet of paper. The number on the returned envelope will simply tell me to take your name off the mailing list. It <u>will</u> <u>not</u> identify your response.

Unless otherwise indicated, please circle the number beside the response that <u>most</u> <u>closely</u> reflects your feelings.

Thank you in advance for your assistance.

PART I: SOME BACKGROUND ON YOUR MINISTERIAL CAREER

To begin, here are some questions about your background--the influences and preparation that preceded your entering the ministry. Please circle the number corresponding to the answer that best reflects your feelings, or write in the space provided.

1. In what year did you enter the ministry?_____

2. Are you an ordained, commissioned or licensed minister?

   1 ORDAINED

   2 COMMISSIONED

   3 LICENSED

   4 NONE OF THE ABOVE

3. Looking back, were there individuals who encouraged you personally to enter ministry?

   1 YES

   2 NO

4. If yes, who stands out in your memory? (Please circle as many as are appropriate.)

   1 PARENTS

   2 BROTHERS AND/OR SISTERS

   3 OTHER RELATIVE(S)

   4 SUNDAY SCHOOL OR YOUTH WORKER

   5 LOCAL PASTOR

   6 LEADER IN THE DENOMINATION

   7 A MISSIONARY

   8 A TRAVELLING EVANGELIST

   9 OTHER (please specify) _____

5. Who is the closest relative to you who was, or is, officially in ministry before you?

   1 FATHER OR MOTHER

   2 BROTHER OR SISTER

   3 UNCLE OR AUNT

   4 GRANDPARENT

   5 COUSIN

   6 NO CLOSE RELATIVE WAS A MINISTER BEFORE ME

6. What was your father's occupation at the time you left home? _____

7. Were there individuals whose lives served as examples of ministry?

   1 YES

   2 NO

8. If yes, which one of the following was most significant to you?

   1 PARENT

   2 BROTHER OR SISTER

   3 OTHER RELATIVE

   4 SUNDAY SCHOOL OR YOUTH WORKER

   5 LOCAL PASTOR

   6 LEADER IN THE DENOMINATION

   7 MISSIONARY

   8 TRAVELLING EVANGELIST

   9 OTHER (please specify) _____

9. How many years of formal schooling have you completed?_____

10. Did you attend a Bible institute, college or seminary?

    1 YES

    2 NO

11. If yes, which one(s)? Please indicate your graduation year where appplicable.

    _____ _____

    _____ _____

    _____ _____

    _____ _____

12. When you entered biblical studies were you entering specifically to prepare for ministry?

    1 YES

    2 NO

13. What was your occupation at the time you entered, or began training for, ministry? _____

PART II: YOUR CONGREGATION AND YOU

Not all congregations are alike. This section asks about the role you play in your present congregation. Again, please circle the number corresponding to the answer which most closely reflects your feelings; or write in your response.

1. As recorded in the Conference of Mennonites in Canada Yearbook, what is your title?

    1 MINISTER, LEADING MINISTER, OR SIMILAR TITLE

    2 CO-PASTOR

    3 OTHER (please specify) _____

2. Are there other ministers in your congregation who are also listed in the Yearbook?

   1 YES

   2 NO

3. Are you hired for a set term?

   1 YES (please specify number of years) _____

   2 NO

4. Are you the only person on your congregation's payroll?

   1 YES

   2 NO

5. If married, does your spouse presently hold a paying job?

   1 YES

   2 NO

   3 I AM NOT MARRIED

6. How much of your household income does the congregation provide?

   1 ALL OF IT

   2 MORE THAN HALF

   3 ABOUT HALF

   4 LESS THAN HALF

   5 NONE

7. According to the constitution of your present congregation, are you automatically a member of every church committee?

   1 YES

   2 NO

8. How often do you find yourself having to call the meetings of committees?

1 ALWAYS

2 FREQUENTLY

3 INFREQUENTLY

4 NEVER

9. How frequently do you drop in, unannounced, on committee meetings?

1 FREQUENTLY

2 INFREQUENTLY

3 NEVER

10. Is your congregation usually represented at the provincial conference?

1 YES

2 NO

11. If yes, are you usually a delegate?

1 YES, THE SOLE DELEGATE

2 YES, ONE OF THE DELEGATES

3 NO, I AM NOT USUALLY A DELEGATE

12. Are you usually delegated to represent the congregation at the CMC sessions?

1 YES, AND MOST OFTEN AS SOLE DELEGATE

2 YES, AS ONE DELEGATE AMONG SEVERAL

3 I AM SELDOM APPOINTED AS DELEGATE FROM OUR CHURCH

4 I OFTEN ATTEND WITHOUT BEING A DELEGATE

5 I SELDOM ATTEND CMC SESSIONS

13. Do you presently teach a Sunday School class? (If yes, please indicate which age group.)

1 YES _____

2 NO

14. If catechism, or other doctrinal instruction is offered, do you generally instruct the candidates yourself?

1 YES

2 YES, BUT OTHER MEMBERS ASSIST ON OCCASION

3 NO

15. In order to receive baptism in your present congregation which of the following must a candidate do. Please circle all correct answers.

1 GIVE A PUBLIC TESTIMONY AT THE BAPTISM SERVICE

2 GIVE A PUBLIC TESTIMONY AT A SPECIAL SERVICE

3 MEET WITH AN ADVISORY COUNCIL OR GROUP

4 HAVE A PRIVATE INTERVIEW WITH THE PASTOR

5 PARTICIPATE IN CATECHISM INSTRUCTION

16. One service offered by the church is weddings. As a general rule, where do you draw the line when asked to officiate at a marriage ceremony?

1 BOTH BRIDE AND GROOM MUST BE ACTIVE IN THE CHURCH

2 EITHER BRIDE OR GROOM MUST BE ACTIVE IN THE CHURCH

3 PARENTS OF EITHER MUST BE ACTIVE IN THE CHURCH

4 SOME CONNECTION TO THE CONGREGATION MUST BE EVIDENT

5 ANYONE WHO RENTS THE FACILITIES

6 ANYONE WHO ASKS

7 OTHER (please explain) _____

17. How do you respond when asked to marry a couple you knew in another congregation?

1 I AM GLAD TO DO SO

2 I SUGGEST THEY ASK THEIR PRESENT MINISTER

3 I'D PREFER TO PARTICIPATE IN SOME OTHER ROLE, BUT DON'T SAY SO

4 I REFUSE; THEIR PRESENT MINISTER SHOULD DO IT

18. Do you attempt to keep in touch with those you marry?

1 YES, I TAKE THE INITIATIVE

2 I MAKE SURE THEY KNOW I'M AVAILABLE

3 NOT UNLESS THEY ATTEND MY CHURCH

4 NO

19. Do you frequently lead the worship service from start to finish?

1 YES

2 NO

20. Often the format of the Sunday worship service varies little from week to week. When you began to serve this particular congregation, did you "adjust" the order of worship?

1 YES, I CONTINUED TO USE THE FORMAT I WAS ACCUSTOMED TO

2 YES, I MADE SOME CHANGES AND LEFT SOME THINGS UNCHANGED

3 NO, THEY WERE DOING THINGS THE WAY I WAS ACCUSTOMED TO

4 NO, I CONTINUED TO USE THE FORMAT THEY WERE ACCUSTOMED TO

5 I DON'T KNOW WHAT FORMAT WAS USED IN THE PAST

21. At the back of many hymnals there are a number of responsive readings, affirmations of faith, and communal prayers. How frequently do you use any of these resources?

1 WEEKLY

2 2 OR 3 SUNDAYS PER MONTH ON AVERAGE

3 ONCE A MONTH ON AVERAGE

4 LESS THAN ONCE A MONTH ON AVERAGE

5 NOT AT ALL

22. Has your congregation used worship resources written specifically for an occasion by you or a member of the congregation?

1 YES

2 NO

23. Are informal testimonies a part of your Sunday morning worship service?

1 YES, EVERY SUNDAY

2 YES, ON OCCASION

3 YES, IF SOMEONE REQUESTS THE OPPORTUNITY BEFOREHAND

4 NO

24. Some churches steadfastly adhere to a church calendar, complete with assigned readings for each Sunday of the year. Which phrase below most closely summarizes your feelings about this.

1 IT IS A GOOD IDEA IN THAT IT PROVIDES "EVEN COVERAGE" OF THE SCRIPTURES

2 IT IS A GOOD IDEA; IT KEEPS US FROM "PET TOPICS"

3 PRESCRIBED READINGS ARE A HINDRANCE TO THE SPIRIT

4 I PERSONALLY WOULD NEVER FOLLOW SUCH A SCHEDULE

25. Which of the following, listed in the General Conference pocket diary, do you usually observe with a worship service on an annual basis?

a NEW YEAR'S DAY

b WORLD DAY OF PRAYER

c WORLD MISSIONS SUNDAY

d ASCENSION DAY (ON THURSDAY)

e FESTIVAL OF THE CHRISTIAN HOME

f PENTECOST

g LABOUR DAY

h WORLD-WIDE COMMUNION SUNDAY

i THANKSGIVING

j STEWARDSHIP SUNDAY

k REMEMBRANCE DAY (IF ON A SUNDAY)

l "TOTEN SONNTAG"

m ADVENT

n BOXING DAY

26. What is your practice immediately following the benediction?

1 I GREET ALL WORHSIPPERS AS THEY FILE OUT

2 I GREET AS MANY AS USE THE MAIN EXIT

3 I AM ACCESSIBLE TO AS MANY AS WISH TO BE GREETED..

4 I RETIRE TO AN OFFICE WHERE THOSE WHO WISH TO CAN FIND ME

5 OTHER (please explain) _____

27. By what title would you prefer to be called if your name were Joe Braun?

1 REV. BRAUN

2 PASTOR BRAUN

3 PASTOR JOE

4 MR. BRAUN

5 JOE

28. Some pastors wear a robe or a uniform. How do you feel about this? (Please circle the response that comes closest to expressing your sentiments.)

1 IT IS A GOOD IDEA; THE ROBES HAVE SYMBOLIC SIGNIFICANCE

2 IT IS A GOOD IDEA; THE ROBES REMOVE THE DISTRACTIONS OF DRESS SYTLES.

3 THE ROBES CALL ATTENTION TO THE CLERGY AS A ROLE AND NOT AS A PERSON

4 THE ROBES DISTANCE THE WEARER FROM HIS OR HER EVERYDAY IDENTITY

5 UNIFORMS HAVE NO PLACE IN THE MENNONITE CHURCH

29. What mode of dress would be inappropriate for a minister to wear while carrying out church business? (Please circle all that apply.)

1 NO SUIT JACKET FOR A MAN

2 NO TIE FOR A MAN

3 BRIGHT COLOURS FOR EITHER A MAN OR A WOMAN

4 PRINTED OR PATTERNED MATERIALS FOR EITHER

5 COLOURFUL OR NOISY JEWELRY

30. Reflecting on your most recent sermon, would you say it was mostly inspirational or mostly instructional?

1 INSPIRATIONAL

2 INSTRUCTIONAL

31. Was it a typical sermon? (If not, please comment.)

1 YES

2 NO _____

PART III: YOUR PERSONAL BELIEFS

This short section includes questions about your beliefs and some "extra-curricular" matters pertaining to the ministry.

1. On matters of theology which of the following best describes your position?

1 LIBERAL

2 NEO-ORTHODOX

3 CONSERVATIVE

4 FUNDAMENTALIST

2. When you compare yourself with other ministers in the Conference of Mennonites in Canada, would you say you are more or less conservative than the majority?

1 MORE CONSERVATIVE

2 LESS CONSERVATIVE

3 ABOUT THE SAME AS THE MAJORITY

3. How involved are you in the local ministerial association or council of churches?

1 VERY INVOLVED

2 SOMEWHAT INVOLVED

3 NOT AT ALL INVOLVED

4. If you were to receive some welcome news in the next ten minutes, whom would you invite to celebrate with you this coming weekend? (Circle as many as apply.)

   1 ANOTHER MENNONITE MINISTER

   2 MEMBERS OF THE CONGREGATION

   3 MEMBERS OF A PAST CONGREGATION

   4 FRIENDS FROM 'WAY BACK

   5 FAMILY MEMBERS ONLY

   6 OTHER (please explain) _____

5. Based on your experience, should a pastor become close friends with members of the congregation?

   1 I SEE NO PROBLEMS WITH IT

   2 I CAN SEE PROBLEMS, BUT IT IS A RISK YOU HAVE TO TAKE

   3 I THINK IT IS BETTER TO REFRAIN FROM HAVING CLOSE FRIENDS FROM WITHIN THE CONGREGATION

6. Upon resignation should a pastor leave the community?

   1 YES, IN NEARLY ALL CIRCUMSTANCES

   2 IT IS PREFERABLE

   3 THEY SHOULD NOT FEEL COMPELLED TO LEAVE

   4 THEY SHOULD STAY UNLESS THEY ARE CALLED ELSEWHERE

7. Are you involved in community service groups that are not sponsored by any religious group?

1 I AM INVOLVED; BUT AS A PRIVATE CITIZEN, NOT AS A MINISTER

2 AS A MINISTER, I FEEL MY INVOLVEMENT IN WORTHY CAUSES IS IMPORTANT

3 I HAVE ENOUGH TO DO WITHOUTH SUCH INVOLVEMENT

4 I PREFER NOT TO GET INVOLVED IN THE SECULAR COMMUNITY

5 MY WITNESS AS A MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL WOULD BE HURT IF I JOINED ONE OF THESE GROUPS

PART IV: SOME CASES TO CONSIDER

I will now describe four hypothetical clergymembers. Each exemplifies a different understanding of clergy authority. Please compare yourself to them and indicate which is most and least like you.

1. The first clergymember feels that authority comes as a result of training, which is recognized by the church in ordination. In a way, this person regards him or her self as a religious "specialist" as a result of thorough training in theology and other subjects.

2. The second clergyperson feels that authority must be demonstrated regularly. The right to preach, to lead worship, and so forth, disappears if she or he fails to be effective. Therefore authority is dependent on effectiveness.

3. The third clergymember regards authority as coming directly from God. A Divine call was received and remains in force. Authority is a direct gift of grace, and does not depend on one's holding an office or title.

4. The fourth clergyperson feels that authority is conferred in recognition of one's God-given gifts and abilities. Ordination is the process whereby one enters the office in which authority resides.

Which minister (1, 2, 3, or 4) is most like you? _____

Which minister (1, 2, 3, or 4) is least like you? _____

PART V: SOME FINAL DETAILS

Finally, I'd like to know a little more about you. Please circle, or write in, appropriate answers.

1. In what year were you born? _____

2. Were you born in the province in which you now live?

   1 YES

   2 NO

3. Is the congregation you are presently serving within a fifty mile radius of where you grew up?

   1 YES

   2 NO

4. Are you a male or a female?

   1 MALE

   2 FEMALE

5. What is the membership of your present congregation? _____

6. How many congregations previous to this one, and not including summer assignments, have you served? _____

7. When you look towards the future, what would you like to be doing ten years from now?

Thank you, once again, for your assistance. If you wish to comment on any particular question or a related matter, please feel free to do so here or on a separate sheet of paper.

APPENDIX C

CODING PROBLEMS

Most of the coding used was straightforward and is explained in the chapter on hypotheses and measurement. Three questions, however, called for decision-making as the results were being coded. The problems, and the decisions made, are discussed below.

C.1 How many years education?

It was anticipated that not all pastors would have completed high school, that many would have undertaken unaccredited studies, that some would have majored in disciplines not related to ministry before changing careers, and that some would hold advanced degrees. To simplify matters the question was asked, "How many years of formal schooling have you completed?" (I.9) This was followed by two questions on religious education.

Most respondents gave a numerical response, but some were misleading. Pastors who claimed six years and then reported graduating from Canadian Mennonite Bible College and Associated Mennonite Biblical Seminaries in the 1970s for example, had to have at least Grade 12 before entering CMBC. Their "six" years were obviously post-high years.

Another problem arose in the cases of the handful of "Ph.D" and "D.Min" responses. Depending on how many years one spent in high school, non-accredited Bible training, and doing graduate work, the number of years could easily reach 25 or more.

Initially these problem cases were left as "missing." That, however, meant losing the cases for later crosstabulations. Therefore, the first problem was solved by making individual intelligent guesses based on the age of respondent and schools attended. The doctoral degree holders were assigned 20 years.

The mean score for the sample was calculated both before and after this modification was made. Less than .05 years was added to the mean; but many fewer cases were lost to further analysis.

C.2 Dress

The question on inappropriate dress (II.29) was badly worded and unfortunately not drawn to my attention in the pre-test. The directions asked that all inappropriate mode of dress "while carrying out church business" be marked. Thus, no markings should have indicated that dress was not an issue. However, "what is 'church business'?" was the question put to me by several who then did not answer the question.

The majority circled more than one response and these were re-coded according to the combinations: e.g. "all inappropriate," "suit only nonessential," "jewelry only problem." "Qualified response" and "no response" became additional categories.

C.3 Occupations

Two open-ended questions regarding occupations were asked (I.6 and I.13). Following Pineo's recommendations for small samples, the revised Pineo-Porter-McRoberts Socioeconomic Classification Scale was collapsed from sixteen to eight categories. Because the sample was predominantly male, the clerical, sales and service group was placed above supervisors as Pineo suggests is appropriate.

Farmers are always a difficult group to classify. Given the traditional agricultural base of Mennonites in Canada, and the expectation that a higher proportion than in the general farming population are economically stable, I chose to rank farmers between skilled and semi-skilled workers. This option is also one given by Pineo (1985:9).

Retired, unemployed or deceased fathers were coded under "other" for father's occupation. Student, housewife, or no occupation became "other" for the ministers' prior occupations.

VITA

Surname: Wilson Given names: Judith Pamela

Place of Birth: Waldheim, SK Date of Birth: April 11,1953

Educational Institutions Attended, with Dates of Entering and Leaving:

Canadian Mennonite Bible College, Winnipeg, MB	1971 to 1974
University of Lethbridge, AB	1983 to 1984
University of Victoria, B.C.	1986 to 1988

Degrees, Diplomas, Etc., Awarded with Dates and Names of Institutions:

B.Th. 1974 Canadian Mennonite Bible College
B.A. 1984 University of Lethbridge

Honours and Awards:

named to Dean's List 1983/84
UVic Graduate Scholarship 1986/87 and 87/88

Partial Copyright License

I hereby grant the right to lend my thesis or dissertation (the title of which is shown below) to users of the University of Victoria Library, and to make single copies only for such users or in response to a similar request from the Library of any other University, or similar institution, on its behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or a member of the University designated by me. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis: THE LEGITIMATION OF CLERICAL AUTHORITY: THE CASE OF THE CONFERENCE OF MENNONITES IN CANADA

Author: [redacted]

JUDITH PAMELA WILSON

September 9, 1988