The Effect of Ego Strength on Extramarital Involvement

Among Protestant Clergy

D. Mitchell Whitman

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

In

Clinical Psychology

Seattle Pacific University
Department of Graduate Psychology

April 2004

Approved by: 

Date: ________________

John Thoburn, Ph.D.
Dissertation Chair

Jay Thoburn, Ph.D.
Chair, Department of Graduate Psychology

Jay Uomoto, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Micheál Roe, Ph.D.
Dean, School of Psychology, Family & Community

Marcia Webb, Ph.D.
Committee Member
Dedication

I wish to dedicate this work to my wife Jill, and daughters Emilie and Katrina. Jill encouraged me to start this doctoral program, and has loved me, sacrificed with me, and supported me in a myriad of ways through eight years of study and completion of my dissertation. I couldn’t have done it without her. My young daughters have only known a father who has been going to school and working on a dissertation. I trust we will all enjoy a less distracted and more available parent from now on.

I also dedicate this project to my dear friend and colleague, Dr. Gail Nank. While her excitement for this topic of great professional interest inspired me with new ideas, this was only one aspect of her inspiration: it was through watching her battle with cancer with faith, purpose, and ultimately earning her doctorate, that challenged me to persevere to completion. I shall endeavor to apply her “joy test” to life through the years to come.
Acknowledgements

I wish to express my appreciation to those who are the contributors to my life, clinical work and ultimate success at completing this project and program. This has not been a solo endeavor.

Dr. John Thoburn, my committee chair, offered me a new project when I had almost given up hope of finding a manageable dissertation topic, and encouraged me to “hang in there” when I felt like giving up. I have admired his commitment to integrate faith with his teaching and in his feedback to me. My committee members, Dr. Jay Uomoto and Dr. Marcia Webb, brought humor, warmth, and different and helpful perspectives to this research project. What I thought was a simple task of putting my survey online was actually a complicated one, and my computer consultant, Dwayne Harder did a fantastic job for me. I shall always be thankful for my clinical mentor in this graduate program, Dr. Roy Barsness, who greatly enriched my growth as a person, a Christian, and a psychologist.

My friend and colleague, Dr. Carson Pue, helped take an idea and bring it into reality by offering me his endorsement and the assistance of Arrow Leadership Ministries staff, and the Arrow students and alumni who were the sample from which this research was conducted. His listening ear, bright mind, fun, and faith-inspiring words are the best of sweet fellowship and collegiality.

Reverend Gib Martin has been my pastor, mentor, friend, confident and colleague for almost 30 years. I hear his voice always as I write and counsel; he has taught me to be faithful to my theology and my Lord, and kept me from becoming jaded.
My mother, Celia Whitman, who seldom failed to ask “how I was coming along with school” and “when I was going to finish”, financially supported us through some lean times, and raised me with the belief that I could accomplish whatever I set out to do.

Thank you to my friends and colleagues who have encouraged me to keep perspective, and put up with my educationally-induced distractions. Among these, my dear friend Dr. Aaron Hait has offered many helpful comments on several drafts, drunk a few drafts with me, and dragged me (willingly) out water skiing when I needed it.

Last, but far from least, how can I say thank you to my in-laws, Wilbert and Jeanette Stroming. They have filled in the many gaps in my absences by helping with our children, assisting in our multiple building projects, caring for all of us in many small ways, and believing in me and the value of earning this degree.
# Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approval Page</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgments</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table of Contents</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of Tables</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of Figures</td>
<td>vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of Appendixes</td>
<td>viii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>ix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Chapter I: Introduction and Review of the Literature

1.1. Introduction                                                      | 1    |
1.2. Types of Extramarital Involvement                                  | 6    |
1.3. Prevalence of Extramarital Involvement                             | 10   |
    In the General Population                                           |      |
1.4. Professional Sexual Misconduct                                    | 12   |
1.5. Effects of Professional Sexual Misconduct                         | 15   |
1.6. Clergy Extramarital Involvement                                    | 16   |
1.7. Predisposing Variables in Extramarital Involvement                 | 20   |
1.8. Predisposing Variables in Clergy                                  | 29   |
    Extramarital Involvement                                            |      |
1.9. Personality Theory                                                | 33   |
1.10. Ego Strength as a Personality Construct                           | 38   |
1.11. Personality, Ego Strength, and Extramarital Involvement           | 40   |
1.12. Statement of Purpose………………………………………………… 41
1.13. Hypotheses……………………………………………………………. 42

2. Chapter II: Methodology
  2.1. Participants………………………………………………………….. 43
  2.2. Demographics of Study Participants……………………………. 44
  2.3. Protection of Participants………………………………………. 47
  2.4. Data collection and Procedures……………………………….. 48
  2.5. Measures………………………………………………………. 50
  2.6. Statistical Analysis……………………………………………. 52

3. Chapter III: Results
  3.1. Descriptive Statistics……………………………………………… 53
  3.2. Analysis of Hypotheses………………………………………….. 61
  3.3. Follow-up Analysis…………………………………………….. 67

4. Chapter IV Discussion
  4.1. Hypotheses………………………………………………………… 68
  4.2. Physical EMI…………………………………………………… 70
  4.3. Emotional EMI………………………………………………… 73
  4.4. Clergy EMI……………………………………………………… 76
  4.5. Conclusion……………………………………………………… 78
  4.6. Implications for Research and Practice………………………. 81
  4.7. Future research………………………………………………… 82
  4.8. Limitations of Study…………………………………………… 84

5. References……………………………………………………………… 86
6. Appendixes.................................................................................. 103
List of Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 1</td>
<td>Demographic Information A</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2</td>
<td>Demographic Information B</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3</td>
<td>Extramarital Involvement (EMI)-Physical</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4</td>
<td>Extramarital Involvement (EMI)-Emotional</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5</td>
<td>Clergy Extramarital Involvement (CEMI)-Physical Contact</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6</td>
<td>Clergy Extramarital Involvement (CEMI)-Emotional Contact</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 7</td>
<td>Multiple Regression: Dependent Variable: Ego Strength</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 8</td>
<td>Bivariate Correlation: Dependent Variable Ego Strength</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 9</td>
<td>Multiple Regression: Dependent Variable: Slight Emotional Intensity</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 10</td>
<td>Multiple Regression: Dependent Variable: Moderate Emotional Intensity</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 11</td>
<td>Multiple Regression: Dependent Variable: Strong Emotional Intensity</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 12</td>
<td>Multiple Regression: Dependent Variable: Ego Strength</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Figures

Figure 1: Physical behavior by gender……………………………………55
Figure 2: Emotional EMI by gender……………………………………57
Figure 3: Physical CEMI rates separated by gender…………………59
Figure 4: Emotional CEMI rates separated by gender………………61
Figure 5: 16PF – 5th Edition Factor C Sten Scores…………………62
Figure 6: Reported inhibitors to clergy involvement in EMI’s………67
List of Appendixes

Appendix A

Letter I: Pre-Notice ......................................................... 103
Letter II: Cover Letter ....................................................... 104
Letter III: Follow-up Letter ............................................... 105
Letter IV: Final Letter ...................................................... 106

Appendix B

16PF – 5th Edition .......................................................... 107

Appendix C

Clergy EMI Online Survey ............................................... 108
Abstract

The purposes of the study were to refine and augment existing evidence concerning the rate of physical and emotional extramarital involvement (EMI) among Protestant clergy and to determine if EMI by clergy is correlated significantly with ego strength. Based on a review of the literature, it was hypothesized that there is: a) a negative relationship between Ego Strength and physical EMI; b) a negative relationship between Ego Strength and emotional EMI; and c) a negative relationship between Ego Strength and clergy extramarital involvement (CEMI). Participants were 178 male and female clergy leaders from multiple denominations who were students or alumni of a clergy leadership training program. Participants completed a demographics questionnaire, a sexual and emotional behavior questionnaire, and the 16PF-5th Edition Questionnaire.

Results indicated that there was a small but significant inverse correlation between Ego Strength and EMI that involved some form of sexual touching. No correlation was found to exist between Ego strength and CEMI. Interestingly, the rate of physical EMI and CEMI reported by clergy leaders in this sample was lower than rates found in other studies of this population. The rate of emotional EMI was almost three times higher than physical EMI. Further, the rate of CEMI was lower among clergy participating in this study than rates for other professionals described in the professional sexual misconduct literature. Finally, the rates of extramarital involvement in the personal or professional life of clergy leaders sampled here were similar across genders, which is inconsistent with prior research. Implications for prevention of EMI among
clergy are discussed. Limitations of the study are reviewed and recommendations for future research offered.
CHAPTER I
Introduction and Literature Review

Introduction

Previous research has established that extramarital involvement (EMI) by clergy is a serious issue, which, when it occurs, has powerful consequences for individuals, their families, and the churches they serve (Berry, 1992; Fortune, 1989; Hopkins & Laaser, 1995; MacDonald, 1988). It is the purpose of this study to further the research by exploring the relationship that personality factors have on extramarital involvement by Protestant clergy. This study will impact and expand dialogue by including emotional as well as a better understanding of the physical aspects of EMI. The following questions will be considered: Does personality have an impact on the occurrence of EMI in clergy? Does personality affect the type of EMI a clergy person might engage in, whether physical only, emotional only, or a combination of both? Finally, does personality impact the occurrence of EMI within the clergy person’s professional setting more than outside the professional context?

The following literature review will summarize extramarital involvement among the general population, the helping professions, and the particular helping profession of Protestant clergy. Secondly, the range of explanatory issues contributing to EMI will be reviewed. Finally, an overview of the development of personality theory, the role and measurement of ego strength in personality and its potential impact on clergy EMI will be considered.

This study is limited to male and female Protestants, because Catholic priests constitute a group of clergy with unique sexual dynamics and behavior resulting from mandatory celibacy and institutional power structures (Kennedy, 2001; Sipe, 1995).
“Protestant” describes those represented in that “sector of historic Christianity which in seeking to reform the church according to the word of God withdrew from papal [Roman Catholic] obedience in the sixteenth century. Hence, it denotes the system of faith and practice derived from the principles of the Reformation” (Harrison, Bromiley, & Henry, 1960, p. 426). Orthodox clergy constitute a minority of Christian churches in North America, and none were a part of this sample. The term “clergy” will normally be used in this paper, and refers to those who engage in professional ministry in the roles of pastors, youth leaders, teachers, or employees of Christian para-church organizations.

The following terms have been used in the literature to describe a range of problematic interpersonal sexual behaviors: infidelity, extramarital sex, extradyadic sexual relations, affairs, intimate sexual contact, adultery, fornication, sex in the forbidden zone, professional sexual misconduct, and sexual abuse in the ministerial relationship. In addition, variations in research, social norms, theological proscriptions, professional ethics codes, and legal status further complicate definitive terms. Therefore, as this study seeks to build upon existing literature and break new ground in the investigation of prevalence and type of EMI engaged in by Protestant clergy, initial clarification of applicable terms used in this paper will help ground a thoughtful discussion of the topic.

Broadly understood, extramarital involvement is any kind of sexualized behavior, physical or emotional, with another person outside the context of marriage. The exact nature of “involvement” is best understood using more specific terms which describe objective behavior combined with its marital context.

Physical extramarital involvement is any sexual contact with a person other than a spouse, or overtly physically suggestive sexual behavior between two persons who are
separated by distance, but joined by technology. Thus, as in the case of explicit phone or internet sex, there is the physically separate yet immediate sexual presence of another person.

*Emotional extramarital involvement* refers to a deep emotional attachment and romantic feelings privately held or expressed toward a person other than a spouse.

*Clergy extramarital involvement* is sexualized physical involvement or romantic emotional connection between a minister and a person with whom s/he has a professional relationship. Such behavior constitutes a breach of professional relational trust and a violation of professional ethics or the law, irrespective of whether or not it is a betrayal of a marital relationship.

In his study on EMI among clergy, Thoburn (1991) takes the position that *adultery* includes both emotional/spiritual investment and physical intimacy. Support for this position comes from Joy’s (1986) definition of adultery as “the weakening of any healthy bond by the intrusion of an alien bond into the previously exclusive relationship” (pp.46-47). In addition, psychophysical experience with a non-marital partner undermines the commitment to and integrity of the psychophysical fellowship of a marriage, regardless of the presence or absence of sexual intercourse (Thielicke, 1964, p. 259). Therefore, from a Christian theological perspective, the definition of adultery includes spiritual, emotional, and physical components.

From a theological perspective, acts of adultery are not only a violation of covenantal commitment, but are a fundamental violation of God’s Law summarized in the seventh Commandment, “You shall not commit adultery” (Exodus 20:14, NIV). It is notable that Jesus applied the term “adultery” to attitudes as well as physical acts: “But I tell you that anyone who looks at a woman lustfully has already committed adultery with
her in this heart” (Matthew 5:28, NIV). It is viewed as “religious disloyalty” as a type of betrayal of God (Gaddy, 1996); has many severe consequences, including grounds for not entering the Kingdom of God (I Corinthians 6:9-10); hurts one’s own body (I Corinthians 6:18-20); destroys the union of “one flesh” in the marriage and pollutes the purity of the marital bed (Hebrews 13:4); and negatively affects the whole community (I Corinthians 5:6-11). Grenz (1990) describes the integration of sexual behavior and who one is as a person, together with the universality of morality based on the existence of God:

Because of our view of the human person as a unified being, we simply cannot follow those voices which assert that the body can be indulged without affecting the essential person. Because we are created as embodied persons, we cannot relegate the sexual dimension of our existence to the realm of the non-significant, as having no bearing on our relation to God. (p. 17)

Prevalence or incidence rates (e.g. Blackmon, 1984; Muck, 1988; Thoburn, 1991) of clergy extramarital involvement tell only part of a story, since the impact of such behavior has broad and significant ramifications. Pastors and other Christian leaders are usually a highly trained professional group in their own right, and make a living at this career, whatever the specifics of their job description. In contrast to other professionals, however, they also normally identify with a faith community and view their career as a “calling.” The calling includes a sense of mission in work, a divine purpose, and living out a faith. Martin and Richards (1981) write that, theologically, a Christian leader is working out a Biblical calling in the role of prophet, priest, and king. This understanding by both the leader and the congregation reasonably allows for the status, power, and authority unique to their career. It also implies a greater responsibility for integrity in both personal and professional life and practice. Thus sexual behavior with a congregant
or counselee is not only a violation of professional ethics, but also a betrayal of Kingdom ethic. Birchard (2000) writes, for example, “clergy sexual misconduct creates a breach of trust that offends against spirituality and thus against ultimate solace, purpose and meaning” (p. 127).

Victims of sexual misconduct share experiences similar to those of victims of infidelity or sexual misconduct in other professions, as discussed above. In addition however, there is often the precipitation of a crisis of faith—a kind of theological dissonance. It may take the form of the question, “Why didn’t God protect me?” or “Where was God?” It may present as blaming God, or feeling unable to communicate with God. The view of clergy consequently suffers a credibility gap. The cognitive and emotional dissonance associated with the apparently known person and all that he or she stood for, now with the revelation of a secret world, leaves the observer wondering who to trust, and how to make sense of these disparate views. In addition, the more vulnerable party usually experiences the dynamics of sexual behavior in professional relationships, even with an apparently consenting adult, as abusive. The sexual abuse is dynamically similar to incest (Fortune, Wood, Stellas, Lindsay, & Voelkel, 1992; Pope, 1989).

For the particular minister, disclosure of infidelity or sexual misconduct often results in public humiliation, disciplinary actions often precipitating loss of employment, loss of community, loss of future options for ministry, disruptions of relationships among family and friends, and the possibility of criminal or civil prosecution. In his national survey of pastors, Muck (1988) notes that among those who had engaged in some sort of sexually inappropriate behavior, 6% percent indicated it had resulted in divorce, 16% had other marriage difficulties, and 6% said they had lost their job. Interestingly, 31% stated that there were no consequences. Perhaps this is because only 4% indicated that their
churches had learned about the behavior. Steinke (1989) noted that only 2 of the 65
clergy marriages in his caseload survived the affair, even with denominational and
personal views of the importance of marriage. Guilt, shame, depression, loss of personal
vision, loss of identity, loneliness, and alienation from God are common internal
consequences (Thoburn, 1991).

The Church as community is also impacted. The picture of the community of faith
as a family is one found both in the Bible and in the literature on church and
organizational dynamics (e.g., Fortune, 1987; Friedman, 1993; Hopkins & Laaser, 1995;
White, 1986). “What the ‘family feeling’ means for congregations experiencing sexual
misconduct is that the normal nurturing and protecting role of authority figures has been
abdicating” (Knudsen, 1995, p. 91). Sometimes a church will split as sides for or against
the offending pastor are taken. In a well-publicized case of alleged sexual misconduct by
the pastor of a 6,500-member congregation in the Pacific Northwest, his denial of
wrongdoing included a challenge to “those who brought the ‘horrible, perverted’ charges
against him to repent” (Moore, 1998, p. 28). The congregation has to make some sense of
what has happened, resulting in a usually long and painful process of recovery. Clearly,
the impact of EMI affects not only the personal but also the corporate spiritual and
emotional well being of the organization.

*Types of Extramarital Involvement*

Physical extramarital involvement is any sexual contact with a person other than a
spouse. Such contact should be understood as a continuum of behaviors from holding
hands, kissing, long embraces, petting, and sexual intercourse. Autoerotic behaviors such
as masturbation, or explicit sexual talk with a person on the phone, Internet, or other sex
trade establishment are included. On a continuum, these behaviors may be periodic
pleasurable experiences, actively sought-after habitual activities, or a strong attachment to a mood altering experience characterized as compulsive and addictive (Carnes, 1983; May, 1988). Sexual addiction may be the theoretical construct for a certain type of infidelity (Brown 1991; Pittman 1989), is treated from an addictions model (e.g. Carnes, 1991; Martin, 1989), and, theologically, is viewed as adultery and sin (e.g. Gaddy, 1996; Willingham, 1999).

Emotional extramarital involvement occurs where a relationship with a person other than one’s spouse is characterized by emotional intimacy, sexual chemistry, and some degree of secrecy from the spouse (Glass & Wright, 1988; Glass, 2003). The presence of all three elements is important in this definition. The emotional intimacy of a relationship that is shifting from friendship to “affair” reflects a deepening level of sharing personal information that develops a strong bond in a couple. Sexual chemistry refers to feelings of warmth, excitement, romanticism, and sexual tension that may even be fueled by the absence of actual sexual contact. Secrecy is the “container” that allows a private world to develop. In a British survey of 579 people, Lawson (1988) found that over 40% reported a relationship that they considered adulterous even though they had not had sexual intercourse. She called these “adulteries of the heart” (p. 37).

Therefore, EMI is recognized in this study as a continuum of behavior that includes different levels of both emotional and sexual involvement. Thompson (1984) recognized the broader range of extramarital behavior and thus investigated the emotional and sexual components of extramarital relationships. In his sample of 378 married and cohabitating persons, almost 44% (162) of his subjects indicated having had some form of EMI. He found that almost as many people (within 3% of those who identified as having extrasexual relationships) experienced extradyadic relationships that were strongly
emotional (in love) but not sexual, and just as many people (within 2%) identify such relationships as highly emotional (in love). Although EMI incidence rates throughout the literature are higher for males, Thompson (1984) reported that male and female incidence rates, 45.8% versus 42.2% respectively, are very close when overall incidence rates for emotional, sexual, plus emotional and sexual are combined, as in this study.

Understanding EMI can be difficult and confusing given differences in focus by various researchers. Challenges to understanding include problems in operationalizing variables and with methodology. For example, the greater number of EMI surveys are based upon extramarital sex defined as sexual intercourse only. This neglects other physical behaviors as well as emotional extramarital involvement. Further, many studies are based on non-random samples and thus reflect an important selection bias (e.g., Hite, 1987; Hunt, 1974; Janus & Janus, 1993).

A review of studies on infidelity in general, based on convenience and probability samples, identify a range of behavioral factors that have some relationship to infidelity (e.g. Atkins, Jacobson, and Baucom, 2001; Glass, 2003; Greeley, 1991; Spanier & Margolis, 1983; Treas & Giesen, 2000; Wiederman, 1997). The clinical application literature, on the other hand, tends to accentuate different types or patterns of infidelity (e.g. Brown, 2001; Carder, 1992; Pittman, 1989). The professional sexual misconduct literature generally focuses on interpersonal dynamics, such as power differentials inherent in the professional relationship, and intrapsychic factors relating primarily to the transgressing professional (e.g. Grenz & Bell, 1995; Peterson; 1992; Rutter, 1989). Finally, EMI reflects a progression of thoughts, feelings, behaviors and contexts over time. Measurable variables thus reflect differences associated with stages of EMI (Allen, Atkins, Baucom, Glass, Gordon & Snyder, 2003). When EMI occurs among the clergy,
additional factors must be considered in the literature because of the unique role, context, and spiritual dynamics inherent to that population.

In the mainstream press, psychiatrist Frank Pittman (1989) uses the term “infidelity” and identifies four primary types. Accidental infidelity, where the infidel might proclaim, “It just happened,” usually is not about “falling in love,” nor does the affair continue. Philandering, however, demonstrates a need for constant change of partner. Such people, usually men, “are in love with their masculinity” (Pittman & Wagers, p. 302). In another variant, romantic affairs entail a romantic escape from reality. Finally, Pittman identifies marital arrangements, which usually begin with agreement to multiple partners without emotional attachment, but result ultimately in a betrayal of the agreement.

Carder (1992) identifies three types of affairs. Class I affairs are those where there is a single sexual encounter and no emotional involvement. Class II affairs develop gradually, have an intense emotional involvement, and sex usually occurs later in the relationship. Class III affairs are of the sexual addiction type, where there is no emotional involvement and repeated sexual encounters. Because the negative outcomes of Class II affairs are usually more significant, and because he believes that the greater number of affairs are in this category, the majority of the book is devoted to this type. He details four marital variations on the class II theme, which are essentially a replication of Brown’s (2001) typology. In detailing the components of an emotional affair (Class II without sex), he points out that a relationship usually starts out “innocently,” but at some point there is a conscious cultivation of the feelings and attraction that develop into the affair.
Patrick Carnes (1983) was the first to apply addiction terminology, dynamics, and recovery process to sex. In his view, affairs are the product of compulsive sexuality. He writes,

Sex addicts have lost control over their ability to say no; they have lost control over their ability to choose. Their sexual behavior is part of a cycle of thinking, feeling, and acting which they cannot control. Contrary to enjoying sex as a self-affirming source of physical pleasure, the sex addict has learned to rely on sex for comfort from pain, nurturing, or relief from stress, etc…. Contrary to love, the obsessional illness transforms sex into the primary relationship or need, for which all else may be sacrificed, including family, friends, values, health, safety, and work. (Carnes, 1989, p. 5)

Laaser (1992) and other authors who write specifically to a Christian audience often replicate this theme and foundation for affairs.

*Prevalence of Extramarital Involvement in the General Population*

The Kinsey research claims that approximately one half of married men and a quarter of all married women have engaged in extramarital sex (Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1948; Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, & Gerhard, 1953). Other convenience samples generated in the 1970s and 1980s describe similar findings. Hite (1987) reported that 70% of women and 72% of men committed adultery. In a study for *Playboy*, Hunt (1974) reported that 42% and 25% of white middle class men and women respectively had sexual EMI. In early reviews of the literature, Thompson (1983) concluded that prevalence of sexual EMI was 50% for men, “and the figure for married women is rapidly approaching the same level” (p. 18). Scarf’s (1987) review concludes that about 55% of married men and 45% of married women have sexual EMI. More recently the
Janus Report on Sexual Behavior in America (Janus & Janus, 1993), a selective representative national sample, found that 35% of men and 26% of women have engaged in sexual EMI.

It should be noted that the results of these studies, represent a fundamental methodological problem, in that none are based on national probability samples. More recent national sexual surveys have been conducted with more conservative findings. In his study, Greeley (1994) found that 90% of respondents had only one sexual partner for the duration of their present marriage. He found that 96% of respondents had been sexually faithful to their spouses in the past year. In a national sample of 884 men and 1,288 women who were interviewed face-to-face, Wiederman (1997) reported that lifetime sexual infidelity rates were 22.7% for men and 11.6% for women. The incidence of extramarital sex over the last year was 4.1% for men and 1.7% for women. In a well-publicized large national survey, Michael, Gagnon, Laumann, and Kolata (1994) reported that 24.5% men and 15% women ever experience extramarital sex. Further, they found that 80% of women and 65-85% of men of every age report no partners other than their spouse while being married. Over the prior 12 months, 94% of the married sample reported that they had had sex with only one partner. Finally, Atkins, Jacobson, and Baucom (2001), drawing from General Social Survey (GSS) data collected between 1991-1996, in a sample of 4,118 married people, reported that 86.7% of the subjects never had sex with another person while married (13.3% reported sexual EMI). In summary, the results of these more recent national probability surveys indicate that between 15-25% of ever-married Americans report having had extramarital sex. Incidence rates over any year are between 1.5-4.0%. These figures are higher than those
among clergy who have engaged in sexual intercourse as the specified type of EMI, a topic that will be addressed in the subsequent section.

**Professional Sexual Misconduct**

Extramarital sexual behavior falls into a different category when it involves a professional functioning in his or her official role. Various terms have been used to describe this behavior: “sexual exploitation” (Schoener, 1989), “sexual boundary violation” (Gabbard, 1996), “clergy sexual misconduct” (Hopkins & Laaser, 1995), “sexual abuse in the ministerial relationship” (Fortune, Wood, Stellas, Lindsay, & Voelkel, 1992), and “sex in the forbidden zone” (Rutter, 1989). This study defines professional sexual misconduct (PSM) as any sexual activity, with or without contact, between two people who have a professional relationship based on trust (Rutter, 1989). Trust relationships in which the professional has a fiduciary role toward another person are inherent in the interpersonal dynamic between pastor/congregant, doctor/patient, therapist/client, teacher/student, and mentor/protégé (Fortune et al., 1992). The abuse of trust by the sexualizing of these relationships constitutes unethical behavior according to most professional association codes. It is usually considered immoral behavior in religious contexts, and in an increasing number of jurisdictions, may constitute a criminal offense (Kagle & Giebelhausen, 1994). The concept of trust is closely associated with the concepts of power and control. It is generally assumed that the professional, by degree, training, status, and often because of class, gender and age, has greater power or authority relative to the person engaging him for the professional service. As a review of the literature will demonstrate, the most common example of PSM is a male professional offending against a female client. Rutter (1989) defines the relationship in this way:
Clergy Extramarital Involvement

The forbidden zone is a condition of relationship in which sexual behavior is prohibited because a man holds in trust the intimate, wounded, vulnerable, or undeveloped parts of a woman. The trust derives from the professional role of the man as doctor, therapist, lawyer, clergy, teacher, or mentor, and it creates an expectation that whatever parts of herself the woman entrusts to him (her property, body, mind, or spirit) must be used solely to advance her interests and will not be used to his advantage, sexual or otherwise. (p. 25)

Although the majority of PSM literature has been written over the last two decades, the issue of sexual contact with clients is not new in the history of the helping professions. Sexual involvement with patients has historically been frowned upon, and more recently even made a felony act in many jurisdictions. Freud (1958) made the case that an analyst should not take advantage of the patient’s transferential “longing for love” and must abstain from sexual involvement with the patient. The first major professional uproar over the issue was prompted by J. L. McCartney’s (1966) written report that he had engaged 30% of his female clients in some sort of “overt transference” sexual contact. Shepard (1971) fueled the debate by his widely cited writings on patient-therapist sexual relationships. Schoener (1989) summarizes Shepard’s opinion: “as many people are aided by intimate involvements with their therapists as are hurt” (p. 17).

One early study on the prevalence of this issue was conducted by Kardener, Fuller and Mensh (1973), who studied a random sample of 1,000 physicians of various specialties in Los Angeles, and found that between 5% and 13% of respondents reported that they had engaged in erotic contact or sexual intercourse with patients. Among psychiatrists as a subset of physicians, 10% admitted to erotic contact and 5% to sexual intercourse with patients.
Gartrell, Herman, Olartes, Feldstein and Localio (1986) conducted a national survey on psychiatrist-patient sexual contact, and found that of 1,423 psychiatrists, 7.1% of the male respondents and 3.1% of the female respondents acknowledged sexual contact with patients; 88% of these contacts were between male psychiatrists and female patients. Twenty-eight of the 75 male psychiatrists (37%) who admitted to sexual contact with their patients indicated involvement with more than one client.

Holroyd and Brodsky (1977) replicated the Kardener et al. (1973) study with a national survey of licensed psychologists. They obtained a 70% return rate (N=666), and found that 5.5% of males and .6% of females had engaged in sexual intercourse with clients during the course of therapy. They also found that an additional 2.6% of males and .3% of females had engaged in intercourse with their clients within three months of terminating treatment. The combination of these two time frames results in 8.1% of males and 0.9% of females who had sexual intercourse with clients. Eighty percent of the psychologists had contact with more than one patient (median=2, mean=2.6).

Bouhoutsos, Holroyd, Lerman, Forer and Greenberg (1983), surveying all 4,385 licensed psychologists in California, obtained a 16% return rate (704 respondents) and found that 4.8% of males and .8% of females were sexually involved with their patients. Pope, Keith-Siegel, and Tabachnick (1986), after obtaining a 59% return rate on a nationwide survey of 1,000 psychologists (APA Division 42, Private Practice), found that 7% (i.e. 9.4% men, 2.5% women) of the responding psychologists had been involved sexually with their patients. Further, 95% of the male psychologists and 76% of the female psychologists acknowledged sexual attraction to their clients on occasion.

Glaser and Thorpe (1986) conducted a survey of female members of APA, Division 12 (Clinical Psychology). They obtained a 44% return rate resulting in a sample of 464
respondents. They found that 17% had sexual contact with their psychology educators or supervisors during their training program. Another 31% experienced sexual advances from their instructors. Most of those who had sexual contact viewed the experience as exploitative and harmful.

Effects of Professional Sexual Misconduct

The potential for serious harmful effects following PSM have been shown in much of the literature. Of Gartrell et al.'s (1986) 1,423 responding psychiatrists, 65% said they had treated patients who had been sexually involved with a former therapist. They report that these relationships were harmful to their patient in 87% of the cases. California psychologists in the Bouhoutsos et al. (1983) survey, responding to questions about reported sexual contact between clients and former therapists, indicated that about 90% of the victimized clients were harmed by it in some way. Eleven percent of those patients were hospitalized as a result of the sexual involvement and 1% committed suicide.

Clients may experience consequences similar to those of survivors of incest or childhood sexual abuse (Fortune et al., 1992; Sonne & Pope, 1991). Pope (1989) holds that these effects constitute what he calls “therapist-patient sex syndrome.” Symptoms include: ambivalence toward the exploitation and subsequent therapists; guilt over betraying the therapist and from a sense of responsibility for the sexual involvement; emptiness and isolation; sexual confusion; impaired ability to trust, identity and role reversal with the patient becoming the therapist, taking care of the actual therapist’s needs; emotional lability or dyscontrol; suppressed rage; increased suicidal risk, and cognitive dysfunction such as difficulty concentrating, flashbacks, intrusive thoughts, and nightmares (Sloan, Edmond, Rubin, & Doughty, 1998).
The helping professional is also likely to suffer serious consequences. They may be subject to prosecution, malpractice suits, suspension, or revocation of their licenses. There is a range of negative emotional, interpersonal, and community consequences (Peterson, 1992; Rutter, 1989), many of which are similar to other types of EMI as noted above.

Clergy Extramarital Involvement

There are implicit questions about why EMI occurs among the clergy, most of whom are generally believed to eschew such behavior as contrary to social and theological norms. Clergy are generally held to a higher standard of sexual behavior than are other professionals. They are expected to be role models, may have a sacramental role as a representative of God, and represent a moral tradition that is explicit in ecclesiastical standards as well as tradition. Further, because of the nature of leadership in a congregation or organization, the impact of infidelity is felt on many levels. The leader’s family, congregation, denomination, or organization, and even the media are challenged by his or her failure to live up to his/her role and calling.

The literature on clergy and extramarital involvement suggests two different EMI domains. The first relates to sexual and emotional behavior outside of marriage, which is considered immoral behavior. The second involves sexual or emotional boundary violations in the professional relationship with church staff, counselees, or congregants, i.e. clergy EMI. Individuals, congregations, and church judicatory bodies may not make such a distinction, viewing any form of EMI as inconsistent with the role of and moral expectations for a Christian leader. Indeed the potential crisis and consequences precipitated by the discovery of infidelity occur irrespective of whether or not the infidelity occurred with an acquaintance in a distant place or with a church staff member.
It is difficult to meaningfully study EMI if the two categories are blurred, since the general professional sexual misconduct literature deals exclusively with the professional relationship and is not at all concerned with immorality or “personal” behavior that the professional may engage in outside of the profession.

In one of the first major studies of clergy sexual behavior and attitudes, Blackmon (1984) surveyed male and female pastors from four denominations: Presbyterian, Methodist, Episcopalian, and Assemblies of God. Seven areas of ministry were considered, of which sexuality was one. He found that out of a sample of 300 (representing a return rate of 25%), 37.2% felt they had engaged in “sexual behavior inappropriate for a minister.” It was unclear what behaviors were considered “inappropriate” by these pastors, and this figure may be more indicative of pastors' self-criticalness rather than inappropriate behavior. When pastors were asked whether they had ever had physical contact, excluding intercourse, with a church member, 38.6% affirmed they had. This question too was ambiguous enough that pastors may have affirmed contact that was not inappropriate. When asked about sexual intercourse with anyone other than a spouse, 32.0% answered in the affirmative, although the question was rather ambiguous with regard to time frame, since a pastor may have included a premarital experience. When asked if they had ever had sexual intercourse with members of their congregations, 12.6% of respondents answered in the affirmative. Sixteen of the 300 respondents did not answer that question, and Blackmon believed that the actual rate might have been higher.

With regard to other types of behavior, 9.4% of the respondents reported homosexual attraction. Further, Blackmon found that 12.9% of pastors consumed pornographic literature or movies frequently or often.
Somers (1986) replicated Blackmon's study with a sample of 118 pastors affiliated with the Free Methodist Church. Fourteen and six tenths percent indicated that they had physical contact, excluding intercourse, with a church member. Sixteen and two tenths percent indicated that they had intercourse with someone other than a spouse, while 5.9% indicated having had intercourse with a member of their congregation. Somers found that 3.5% indicated homosexual attraction, while less than 3% read or viewed pornographic literature or movies. Somers’ findings were lower than those in Blackmon’s study, which he attributed to the conservative doctrine and life representative of the Free Methodist denomination.

Another clergy survey was conducted by Goble (1986), who contacted all 3,198 Southern Baptist Ministers (N = 3,198) of North Carolina with a questionnaire on extra-marital sexual relationships, of which 263 (8%) responded with a useful survey. Respondents reported extra-marital activity with a woman other than their wife 9% of the time. Almost 68% of these relationships were with a counselee. Those who reported an extra-marital relationship indicated they experienced low marital satisfaction 73% of the time.

Muck (1988) conducted a survey of pastors for Leadership magazine, with nearly 300 respondents, a 30% response rate. When asked, “Since you’ve been in local church ministry, have you ever done anything with someone (not your spouse) that you feel was sexually inappropriate?” 23% responded positively. The term “inappropriate” was not specifically defined. Eighteen percent of the pastors indicated that they had engaged in other forms of sexual contact (i.e. passionate kissing, fondling, mutual masturbation) with someone other than a spouse since being in local ministry. He found that 12% had sexual intercourse with someone other than a spouse since being in local church ministry.
Pastors were asked with whom they had sexual contact or had sexual intercourse: 39% with a church member, 17% with a counselee, 13% with a ministerial or staff member, and 31% with someone outside the church. Further, 20% admitted to some type of pornography use at least once a month.

Berry (1991) sent questionnaires to 213 Virginia Episcopalian priests. A response rate of 47% (N = 100) of the surveys represented 83 male and 16 female priests. The mean age was 48 with a range of 30 to 91 years. Of the 71 priests (71%) who reported feeling at least some sexual attraction toward their parishioners, the following behavior was reported: 63% - shake hands; 56% - casual touch; 65% - affirming hug; 25% - sexual hug; 25% - kiss; 14% - genital caress; and 9% - oral sex.

Thoburn (1991) conducted a random survey of 500 ministers from 21 denominations to determine predictive factors regarding extramarital sexual activity among male protestant clergy. Of the 186 respondents (a 38% response rate), 15.6% indicated sexual EMI. A total of 9.6% admitted to intimate sexual contact and 5.9% to sexual intercourse. Of the total sample, intimate sexual contact was with a church member (6.5%), a counselee (5.4%), or a member of the church staff (3.7%). Of these pastors, 5.9% admitted to sexual intercourse; 15.3% indicated it was with a church member, and 1.6% a counselee. Thoburn found that 83 pastors out of the 186 surveyed, or 45%, reported some use of pornography. A total of 12% indicated homosexual attraction, and 2.1% noted a homosexual preference.

In a recent survey of Church of England clergy, Birchard (2000) asked 100 respondents (representing a 42% return rate) the question, ‘Since ordination, have you done anything with someone [other than your spouse] that you feel was sexually inappropriate?’ Seventeen out of 42, or 40% of his sample answered ‘yes.’
In summary, multiple studies (Berry, 1991; Birchard, 2000; Blackmon, 1984; Goble, 1986; Muck 1988; Somers, 1986; Thoburn, 1991) report samples of clergy who have admitted to engaging in some type of extramarital sexual behavior (physical EMI) at a rate ranging from 5.9%-40%, have engaged in behavior constituting professional sexual misconduct at a rate ranging from 6%-69% of the sexual contacts, and between 3%-45% have admitted to using pornography. Although some behavior takes place in private and some known only to an affair partner, disclosure to family and public is often followed by significant consequences. Thus it is important to understand why this condition occurs. There are many variables that have been demonstrated to have some relationship to EMI. It is problematic to assert a causative relationship between any one factor alone and infidelity since there are complex sets of interconnecting factors that provide some contribution to the ultimate occurrence of EMI.

*Predisposing Variables in Extramarital Involvement*

In an attempt to understand and facilitate further study and application of the EMI literature, Allen et al. (2003) have proposed an integrative framework that organizes variables by delineating classes of variables that are attached to the stages of EMI over time. Most of the empirical literature focuses on “predisposing factors” that exist prior to the initiation of a particular extramarital relationship. These risk factors, or predictors as they are sometimes called, may be grouped into domains that reflect individual factors related to the infidel, the spouse, the marriage, or the micro or macro environment external to the marriage—for example, workplace, culture, and peer group. There is a relatively limited portion of literature which examines personality variables (Allen et al., 2003). The following review focuses on the more important intrapersonal variables, in addition to marital and opportunity factors that pave the way for an EMI.
Gender and age variables. Gender is the most consistent predictor of differences in infidelity rates (Greeley, 1994). Recent large studies have found that more men than women engage in infidelity (Greeley, 1991; Michael, Gagnon, Laumann, & Kolata, 1994; Wiederman, 1997). Using the 1992 National Health and Social Life Survey (NHSLS) data (reported in Laumann, Gagnon, Michael & Michaels, 1994, pp. 42-73), Treas and Giesen (2000) concluded that being male increased the likelihood of having engaged in extramarital sex by 79%.

There appears to be, however, a combined impact of age and gender, as observed by Wiederman (1997) and Atkins et al. (2001). Their research indicates for example, that men and women 40-45 years of age and younger do not actually differ in regard to reported incidence of extramarital sex. On the other hand, 55-65 year old men and 40-45 year old women at the time of taking a survey, were the most likely to have ever had extramarital sex (Atkins et al., 2001). Thus to best appreciate similarities and differences, consideration should be given to which gender is identified for a particular period in the life span.

Men report more “sex only” relationships (Thompson, 1984), and women are more likely to engage in “emotional-only” infidelity (Glass 2003; Glass & Wright, 1985). Thompson (1994) points out that research on infidelity that focuses exclusively on sexual behavior misses the narrowed differences between men and women when emotional infidelity is considered in incidence rates (as noted above).

Based upon data gathered in the 1991 General Social Survey (GSS), Greeley (1994) concluded that six significant standardized predictors accounted for 28% of the variance in infidelity in men. Ranked in order of importance, these were: “belief that adultery was not wrong, dissatisfaction with family life, perception of poor health, recent
psychological counseling, admission of drunkenness, and smoking” (Greeley, 1994, p. 12). Among women however, the four factors of “moral conviction, loss of a job, conflict with spouse, and trouble with a child” explained 15% of the variance accounting for infidelity. In summary, men’s risk of infidelity is related to emotional stresses and personality problems, whereas women are generally at greater risk because of relationship problems.

Marital variables. Marital dissatisfaction is often reported as the primary predictor of EMI. A variety of contributing factors that are sometimes encompassed in the term “marital satisfaction” have been studied: marriage difficulties such as conflict, lack of intimacy, boredom; sexual dissatisfaction; need for autonomy; problems with power; age at the beginning of marriage; cohabitation prior to marriage; and marriage duration. Confounding variables such as gender and type of EMI (Glass & Wright, 1985), and religious behavior together with marital satisfaction (Atkins et al., 2001), are also factors. In an early review of ten studies on infidelity, Thompson (1983) held that deficiencies in the marital relationship are fundamental to precipitating and sustaining the infidelity. He estimated that low marital satisfaction and low sexual frequency reliably account for 25% of the variance in infidelity. Gottman (1999) views affairs as fundamentally the result of marital dynamics. He describes a process of a couple’s relationship slide toward divorce, where profound feelings of loneliness and emptiness set the final stages of deterioration, making people more vulnerable to infidelity. Brown (2001) also holds that EMI is fundamentally a symptom or result of marital problems.

A review of the few surveys on clergy reveals that marital difficulties are among the predisposing variables that increase the risk of infidelity. In Muck’s (1988) survey of pastors, 41% of those who had an EMI reported marital dissatisfaction. Steinke’s (1989)
clinical sample indicated that marital difficulty was one of seven factors in those who engaged in extramarital sex. Thoburn and Balswick’s (1994) research found that the greater the emotional distance a pastor feels from his wife, the greater the likelihood of infidelity. They identified a strong relationship between two primary factors for the pastor: an experience of low intimacy with his wife—either one or both partners being the contributors to this condition, and a minister’s dissatisfaction with his marital sex life. These issues appear to be reciprocal and mutually reinforcing.

Caution should be used in any claim that marital distress is the primary cause of EMI. Marital unhappiness is a factor for EMI in many marriages, but not in all. Glass and Wright (1985) found that among those who had engaged in EMS, 56% of the men and 34% of the women rated their marriage as very happy or happy. Only for women was high marital satisfaction associated with less frequent desire for extramarital involvement (Glass & Wright, 1988). In their study of separated and divorced adults, Spanier and Margolis (1983) found that extramarital sex was generally seen by the respondents to be a result, rather than a cause, of marital discord. However, they found that quality of marital sex was unrelated to the incidence of extramarital sex.

Stanley (1998) emphasizes the centrality of the need to continually make choices associated with commitment to the longevity and deepening of the marriage relationship. Thus, for example, a person who is dedicated to his or her marriage will avoid thinking about attractive alternatives to their mates, which would otherwise pose a threat to fidelity. This perspective is consistent with the findings of Johnson and Rusbult (1989), who determined that committed persons internally devalue the attractiveness of the alternatives to protect their commitment to their spouse. The investment model
1980, 1983) emphasizes satisfaction, alternative quality, and investment—the contributing variables impacting the level of relationship commitment.

Buunk and Bakker (1995) found evidence of the role of “habit” in the willingness to engage in further EMI. It thus may be that the practice of extradyadic sex is a behavior that the unfaithful person is “used to,” even when normative and attitudinal aspects are factored out.

**Contextual variables: Opportunity.** In addition to intrapersonal issues or characteristics of marriage, there are a variety of other variables that have demonstrated some contributory or inhibiting relationship to EMI. Studies which focus on opportunities for extramarital sex consider variables such as type and place of employment, amount of travel, and presence of an attractive potential partner (Atkins et al., 2001; Saunders & Edwards, 1984; Schmitt & Buss, 2001). Glass (2003) contends that opportunity is a primary factor in the incidence of EMI. The focus here is on the impact of the work environment leading to greater opportunities for the development of EMI, and to ease of access to the Internet. In general, those who are interested in experiencing EMI are more likely to actually follow through with an EMI. Such men look for opportunities for extramarital sex and often report regret for the lack of opportunity (Johnson, 1970). These women, on the other hand, tend to discount opportunities, especially if they are happily married (Glass & Wright, 1988).

Actually, among those who have engaged in EMI, the greater number did not plan to fall into an extramarital relationship. Glass (2003) reports that among couples dealing with infidelity in her clinical practice (about 350 couples), 82% started out as social acquaintances, neighbors, or workplace colleagues. People who have friendships around common social involvements may become close because of shared interests, time
involvement, exciting projects, and common goals. In the same sample, Glass (2003) notes that 62% of husbands and 46% of wives were unfaithful with someone they met at work, whereas the extramarital partner was a friend or neighbor of 29% of unfaithful wives and 16% of unfaithful husbands. Thus, opportunities for emotional intimacy due to circumstantial or environmental factors seem to play a frequent or significant role in the development of EMI.

**Contextual variables: Internet.** Misuse of the Internet has increased the possibility of infidelity. Possibilities include mutual erotic dialogue (“cybersex”) that includes the exchange of text-based sexual fantasies, or a romantic relationship that is initiated and/or maintained electronically—a “cyberaffair” (Griffiths, 2000). Online relationships can quickly become intimate, trusting, and compelling. Joinson (1988) documents the disinhibitory affect of Internet communication that is often quickly and easily established.

The factors that contribute to the development of online relationships are summarized by Griffiths (2000) as easy accessibility and convenience, affordability, anonymity, escape, social acceptability of expanding a social network, and the reduction of time to build face-to-face relationships because of long working hours. Glass (2003) considers Internet infidelity to be the premier emotional infidelity since it combines (a) emotional intimacy because of the ability to open up emotionally very quickly, free of other distractions and everyday problems; (b) secrecy, because it is so easy to communicate covertly; and (c) sexual chemistry, since physical contact is limited and romantic comments, sexual fantasies or “whatever your heart desires” are easily exchanged. Cyberaffairs are likely to negatively impact the health of ongoing, committed face-to-face relationships, resulting in marital conflict, separation, or even divorce (Young, 1998).
Religious variables. The literature shows that religious affiliation generally does not correlate with EMI (Greeley, 1994), i.e. differences in denominations (Protestant groups, Catholics, etc.) appear relatively small (Kraaykamp, 2002). In a national probability sample of 1,235 women, aged 20 to 37 years old, Forste and Tanfer (1996) found that in general religious homogamy had little or no consistent effect on sexual exclusivity. However, they did find that a woman who belonged to a religious group other than a mainstream Protestant or Catholic group, or who belonged to no religious group at all, was twice as likely to have an extradyadic heterosexual relationship compared to a woman with a mainstream religious affiliation. Those who claim no religious affiliation whatsoever report higher rates of EMI (Greeley, 1994).

Religious involvement, usually measured by church attendance or self-reported religiosity, has a positive relationship to religious morals in general (Thornton & Camburn, 1989), and attitudes toward extramarital sex in particular (Kraaykamp, 2002; Scheepers, Te Grotenhuis, & Van Der Slik, 2002). Greeley (1994) claims that the strongest predictor of infidelity is the moral principle condemning infidelity. Religious involvement shows a negative relationship with an actual history of engaging in extramarital sexual relations (Atkins et al., 2001; Amato & Rogers, 1997; Janus & Janus, 1993). Treas and Giesen (2000) found church attendees less likely to have had extramarital sex in the prior year. They concluded that religiosity constrained sexual behavior through moral convictions as well as supportive social networks. Amato and Rogers (1997) came to a similar conclusion, noting that religious socialization reinforced internalized behavioral norms because the church community monitored and supported them. A person’s worldview does appear to have an impact on beliefs or behavior,
according to a national survey of American adults conducted by the Barna Research Group (2003). Comparing 2,033 respondents who have a biblical worldview with those who do not, the latter were 11 times less likely to describe adultery as morally acceptable (4% versus 44%). Further, less than one out of every 100 individuals who have such a worldview had sexual relations with someone other than their spouse during the prior month, compared to one out of every eight adults who lack a biblical worldview.

In a sample of divorced or separated men and women, Spanier and Margolis (1983) found no relationship between religion and EMI. The less religious the respondent was however, the earlier in the marriage he or she began an extramarital relationship.

Atkins et al. (2001) found that those who did not attend church were 2.5 times more likely to have had extramarital sex than those who attended church more than once a week. They also found a very interesting and strong relationship between marital satisfaction and religiosity. Respondents in “pretty happy” or “not too happy” marriages showed little effect of religion on their rates of extramarital sex, whereas those who were “very happy” showed a strong effect on their religiosity and consequent reduction of incidence of infidelity. The authors hypothesize, “It may be that in happy marriages, religious values can bolster one’s commitment to the primary relationship. However, when the primary relationship is less than ideal, the dissatisfaction with the relationship may ‘override’ religious values” (p. 147).

**Personality Variables.** Schmitt and Buss (2001) studied “mate poaching”, which is the act of attracting someone who is already in an established romantic relationship. They consider extramarital involvement, which may be “short-term incursions” or “long-term relationship takeovers,” as one form of mate poaching. Participants were given measures
of sexuality attributes and personality traits, the latter using the Big Five personality dimensions (Goldberg, 1992). They found that poachers tended to describe themselves as relatively mean, unreliable, adulterous, and erotophilic. The most successful poachers were those who were both sexy and adulterous. Further, persons higher on Extraversion and Openness to Experience reported that they had more often been approached by others while in a romantic relationship; while those who had been successfully poached were lower on Agreeableness and Conscientiousness, and higher on Neuroticism.

These results are similar to those found earlier by Buss (1991). He found that newlywed wives whose husbands were lower on Agreeableness and Conscientiousness, and higher on Neuroticism, were more likely to complain that their husbands had been unfaithful over the prior year. Furthermore, newlywed husbands whose wives were lower on Agreeableness were more likely to complain that their wives had been unfaithful over the prior year. In his sample of successful men, Whitehurst (1969) found that men scoring high in alienation had the highest prevalence of extramarital sex. Alienation was defined as a sense of powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, and social isolation. The men with the highest rate of poaching experienced the greatest sense of powerlessness. In another study, which included both men and women, Edwards and Booth (1976) failed to establish a relationship between alienation and a history of extramarital sex.

Allen and Baucom (in press) examined the relationship between patterns of EMI and adult attachment. Attachment theory originated with the study of infant-mother relationships (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978; Bowlby, 1969, 1973, 1980). Attachment relationships continue to be important through the life cycle (Ainsworth, 1982; Bowlby, 1980) and have been applied to adult romantic relationships (Hazan &
Shaver, 1987; Simpson & Rholes, 1998), where it is conceptualized as avoidance of closeness and interdependency, or anxiety about abandonment (Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998). Adult romantic attachment was demonstrated to be a significant way to explore intimacy-regulating functions of infidelity in one sample of undergraduates reporting romantic relationships with someone other than their partner, and in another sample of community adults who were or had been married.

Two primary findings were generated by this study. First, the presence of anxiety predicted feelings of neglect in the primary relationship. The need for ego boosting and intimacy were given as reasons for infidelity. In married men, anxiety also predicted emotionally-intense infidelity and comfort with illicit intimacy because of perceived limitations of the extradyadic relationship. Second, infidelity among those with a dismissive adult attachment style was found to be a way to minimize uncomfortable levels of intimacy in the primary relationship, thereby creating a motivation and justification for autonomy.

Predisposing Variables in Clergy Extramarital Involvement

The Protestant clergy extramarital involvement literature offers further insight into the predisposing factors identified in this population. Blackmon's (1984) research suggested three possible predictive factors. First, a pastor's theological orientation was important. He found that conservative pastors reported the least physical contact with parishioners (21.4%), whereas 44.2% of theologically middle of the road and 50.7% of theologically liberal pastors reported sexual contact.

Second, Blackmon examined the impact of training in transference and counter transference dynamics in counseling. Of those pastors involved in illicit relationships, 30.8% reported training in transference and counter-transference issues, while 69.2% of
those involved in extra-marital sexual behavior had no such training. Blackmon concluded that training for pastors in this area would have a significant impact on reducing problematic behavior. This finding is consistent with that of Birchard (2000). His survey data from 42 pastors showed that 91% believed that the absence of ‘awareness training’ was the foremost causal factor in sexual misconduct. The cumulative data from Birchard’s interviews, focus groups, and questionnaire respondents led him to conclude that the combined effect of three factors were “causal” in clergy sexual misconduct: boundary ambiguity that comes with the role; absence of awareness training that comes with the institution; and problems and needs that come with the clergyman (2000).

Third, Blackmon hypothesized, and his data showed no support for, a situation in which a person in desperate need of help and assurance is sexually arousing for a pastor. Thoburn’s (1991) research findings were similar: nearly 72% of his respondents thought that that kind of situation would never be arousing. However, a secondary finding was that a pastor who is aroused by a person in need is at an increased risk of an EMI.

The survey conducted by Muck (1988) found two primary factors resulting in sexually inappropriate behavior. Seventy eight percent of those acknowledging sexual contact said it was because of physical and emotional attraction to the EMI partner. Marital dissatisfaction was a distant second reason given by 41% of the pastors.

Steinke (1989) published his study of a review of 350 of his own clinical cases, 65 (19%) of whom had acted out before or during the time that he had seen them. He listed seven characteristics consistent with CEMI. First, the pastors underestimated the power of attachment needs, and overestimated their power to disentangle themselves from relationships. Second, in most cases the sexual affair was preceded by an emotional affair of three to six months duration. Third, the targets of the affairs were people with whom
the pastor was in close contact. Fourth, the majority of the pastors were between the ages 35-50. Fifth, almost three fourths of the pastors had troubled marriages. Sixth, in an attempt to cope with marital dissatisfaction, pastors created an environment for unconscious displacement by acting out. Seventh, many clergymen had unresolved childhood issues which affected their sense of self-worth. It was Steinke’s observation that there was a strong narcissistic personality characteristic in many of the clergy involved in affairs.

Oswald and Kroeger (1988) of the Alban Institute tested 1,319 ordained clergy from multiple denominations using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI; Myers & McCaulley, 1985). The MBTI as a temperament inventory has been widely used in organization consultation. Among their many findings in this study, the relationship of temperament and “sexual impropriety” was considered. They contend that NF’s (Intuitive-Feeling) are the most “seductive” of the four temperaments. Further, they believe that ENFP’s are the most seducible and most seductive. “NF’s translate all relationships into either interpersonal or intrapersonal possibilities. The P (Perceiving) function adds openness to the possibility of the moment and Extraversion (E) gives an ability to act on what’s going on inside” (p. 132). They found that the majority (44%) temperament of clergy was NF, and the ENFP temperament made up 11.6% of clergy types—the third most common type after ENFJ and ESFJ.

In his study of predictive factors of extramarital activity in clergy, Thoburn (1991) identified factors that showed a relationship between how ministers viewed themselves and the risk of infidelity, and the quality of the marital relationship and infidelity. Those with low self-esteem, or feelings of unworthiness, and fears of rejection, mistrust of others, and a pervasive sense of shame, appeared to look to sexual involvement with low
emotional connections, such as pornography, or sex with prostitutes and strangers, as a means to compensate for these feelings. Thoburn and Balswick (1994) point to three basic factors with regard to poor marital adjustment and the risk of infidelity: 1) a pastor's wife being responsible for a lack of intimacy; 2) a pastor being responsible for a lack of intimacy; 3) a pastor experiencing dissatisfaction with his marital sex life. These issues are reciprocal and mutually reinforcing. Nearly two out of three affairs were likely to be characterized as both emotional and physical. Thirty-eight and eight tenths percent reported little emotional investment, while 61% indicated an emotional component to the sexual relationship.

In summary, the somewhat limited research on clergy EMI shows that between 9% and 40% of clergy admit to engaging in some form of inappropriate extramarital sexual contact. These figures represent a range of physical behaviors, but do not include emotional behavior. The role of emotion in extramarital relationships by clergy has been studied on limited basis (Thoburn, 1991; Thoburn & Whitman, in press). When emotion is factored into the data on total EMI, statistics increase by 15 to 20% (Glass 2003), illustrating that this represents a significant problem requiring further study.

The literature also supports a relationship between intrapersonal factors and EMI (e.g. Allen & Baucom, in press, Atkins, 2001; Glass & Wright, 1985; Greeley, 1994; Pittman, 1989; Schmitt & Buss, 2001; Treas & Giesen, 2000; Wiederman, 1997). The intrapersonal factors among the various research studies are loosely associated and suggest a need for an organizing, overarching structure. Thoburn’s (1991) study was an initial attempt to create such a structure. He considered a range of personality factors associated with clergy EMI, and explored ego development as an umbrella concept for these factors. He administered the SCT (Loevinger & Wessler, 1970), an assessment of
level of ego development, noting, “It would seem logical that testing a pastor's level of ego development would provide secondary information with regard to other developmental and dynamic aspects of the person, thus providing a platform for further investigation in those areas applicable to extramarital sexual activity” (Thoburn, 1991, p. 15). His findings were inconclusive, explaining that the SCT as a projective test, might best be used in qualitative research, and that most of the respondents were clustered around the middle levels of Loevinger’s stages. The latter is not surprising; Loevinger (1997) points out that the “richest” and most populated of all stages are at the middle levels (the Conformist, the Self-Aware, and the Conscientious Stages). A further limitation of the ego development methodology is in confounding factors such as socioeconomic status, intelligence, and verbal ability, which pose a problem with discriminative validity (Loevinger, 1997). Further research on EMI among clergy using the SCT would thus not likely be fruitful.

The concept of ego strength, however, also offers a construct for understanding intrapersonal factors such as shame, narcissism, neediness, mistrust, obsessiveness, etc. Personality, as one intrapersonal factor, appears to be the least represented in studies of predisposing variables (Allen et al., in preparation). While clinical work with clergy has led to the belief that personality attributes (Steinke, 1989) or certain personality types (Brock & Lukens, 1989; Oswald and Kroeger, 1988) are contributors to clergy EMI, such observations are more anecdotal than empirical. The following overview of personality theory and an examination of the ego strength construct lend theoretical support to the goals of the current study.

*Personality Theory*
Theorists have attempted to study and conceptualize “personality” from a variety of perspectives and levels of abstraction (Hampson, John, & Goldberg, 1986). Two fundamental principles are helpful in understanding personality: (a) differences should be enduring and consistent within the individual, and (b) classification theories should tell us something meaningful about how people will behave over time. An overview of personality includes the identification of three general approaches.

First, there is the psychoanalytic and psychodynamic orientation that shares the basic view that important aspects of personality are rooted in the unconscious and are therefore hidden. In addition to Sigmund Freud, whose theories regarding human nature and behavior have influenced all modern behavioral sciences, other primary theorists in this school include Carl Jung, Alfred Adler, Erich Fromm, and Erik Erickson.

Second, there is the humanistic or constructivist approach that shares the common belief that knowledge about personality is found in experiences and conscious choices. Theorists such as Abraham Maslow, Carl Rogers and George Kelly represent one stream of thought among this group, while another stream of theorists, perhaps best identified as cognitive developmentalists, are represented by Jean Piaget, Kohlberg, and Loevinger.

Developmental theories are based on tracing the development of character constructs over time. Drawing from the influence of both Erickson and Freud, Kohlberg (1969) postulated stages in the development of moral judgment and, in turn, significantly impacted stage theorists. Loevinger (1966) applied developmental theory to the ego. For her, ego development is "that which is common to the developmental sequence and a certain characterology that applies almost independently of age level" (p. 195). She goes beyond age changes to build upon common aspects of types and stages to describe a set of characteristics in each of seven stages. At any given time a person functions at a
particular stage with its particular characteristics. There is not a straight progression to each stage, and every stage has its own strengths and weaknesses (Loevinger, 1997).

Third, there are the behavioristic trait theorists such as Allport, Cattell, Eysenck, and McCrae and Costa. The view here is that careful observation of behavior and environment and their interactions are subject to experimental methods and yield quantifiable data about personality. Factor, or trait, theories postulate that there are characteristic and enduring patterns of behavior, and, that like behavior, feelings can be assessed as well.

Gordon Allport (1937) laid the foundation for trait theory. He challenged the behaviorists on the one hand, and the psychoanalysts on the other. He held that unique traits characterize the central theme of a person’s life. Some clarification of terminology should be noted here. “Trait” and “temperament” are different constructs. Temperament refers to a genetic or biological predisposition that tends to predict how one might respond to particular events or situations. Traits, however, are the fundamental and enduring qualities that exist within all individuals and underlie thoughts, feelings, and behavior over time and across situations.

Allport (Allport & Odbert, 1936) used a lexical approach as the starting point for his taxonomy. This approach assumes that socially relevant personality characteristics are embedded in language. Allport and Odbert (1936) found nearly 18,000 personality relevant words available at that time. Using the data reduction technique of factor analysis, those that followed him (e.g. Cattell, Eysenck, Norman, and Costa & McCrae) substantially reduced this number to certain personality traits. The first two early scholars to look at personality and individual differences were Hans Eysenck and Raymond Cattell.
Using factor analysis, Hans Eysenck (1967) determined that there are three broad independent personality types or “superfactors.” His theoretical writings reflect his belief that personality differences grow out of genetic inheritance. Thus, according to Eysenck, the *extroversion* dimension is linked to the brain’s ability to control arousal through the ascending reticular activating system, the *neuroticism* dimension involves the function of the sympathetic nervous system, and the *psychoticism* dimension is related to the androgen hormone system. Eysenck’s factors have been used in many studies of personality.

Cattell (1950; 1965) applied cluster and factorial analysis to originally produce 35 personality variables. His approach entailed the discovery of the naturally occurring structure of personality, leading to the measurement of what was discovered (Krug, 1989). Cattell’s efforts were directed to determine personality traits that would help predict behavior. He defined personality as “that which permits a prediction of what a person will do in a given situation” (1950, p. 2). He ultimately identified sixteen traits (or factors) that he believed are basic dimensions of personality. He developed the Sixteen Personality Factor (16PF) questionnaire to assess individual differences along these sixteen factor continuums, with the addition of five higher order, or “global factor” clusters.

The most recent taxonomy, proposing that there are five temperament dimensions, was first introduced in an Air Force technical report re-evaluating Cattell’s work, by E.C. Tupes and R.E. Christal (1961). It was later refined by Warren Norman (1963), and most thoroughly developed by McCrae and Costa (1990) and known as the “Big Five.” Using many of the ideas of Allport, Eysenck, and Cattell, their (1984) model identifies the five factors of *extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to*
experience. The NEO Personality Inventory, Revised (NEO PI-R, Costa & McCrae, 1992) is designed to measure these five major dimensions of normal personality. Each dimension is composed of six “facet” scales that draw on more specific personality attributes, not unlike the structure of the 16PF.

Personality psychology literature is encyclopedic with regard to analyses and critiques of multiple theories. An attempt to determine which taxonomy is “best” is a difficult proposition. Personality theories, physiological functioning, neurological systems, statistical techniques, construct validity, and instrument design and application, are all part of the complexity of such a determination—and one which ultimately has not appeared to be decided upon by the research community.

It appears that Eysenck’s Three-Factors model consists of too few factors to be a good explanatory model, while Cattell’s Sixteen Factor model probably contains too many factors (John, 1990; Webley, 2003). Costa and McCrae (1986) argue for the utility and robust nature of the Five Factor model. Digman and Takemoto-Chock (1981) reanalyzed data from six studies using a variety of different rating techniques, and concluded that all were consistent with the five-factor structure: "Regardless of whether teachers rate children, officer candidates rate one another, college students rate one another, or clinical staff members rate graduate trainees, the results are pretty much the same" (p. 164-65). On the other hand, with reference to the current study, the Big Five are very broad dimensions; thus the disadvantage is their low fidelity in predicting specific behaviors (John, 1990).

In any hierarchical representation, one always loses information as one moves up the hierarchical levels. For example, categorizing something as a “guppy” is more informative than categorizing it as a “fish,” which in turn is more information than
categorizing it as an “animal.” Or, in psychometric terms, one necessarily loses
item information as one aggregates items into scales, and one loses scale
information as one aggregates scales into factors. (John, 1990, p. 93)

_Ego Strength as a Personality Construct_

This study advances the research as it focuses on and explores ego strength as a
personality construct and its impact on clergy EMI. The personality trait of ego strength
is examined through Cattell’s Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire, Fifth Edition
(16PF). The 16PF measures an individual’s temperament, which includes a person’s
normal style of thinking, perceiving, and behaving in a wide range of situations and over
an extended period of time (Cattell, 1989). Each of the 16 temperament traits, also called
“factors”, is derived from the multifaceted interaction of biologically inherited
disposition and the individual’s development within her/his particular environment. A
person’s set of personality traits fundamentally impacts overall functioning in the world.

The psychoanalytic term “ego” is now generally understood to pertain to the
executive function of the personality. The ability to ground oneself in reality and
integrate various aspects of the self are inherent parts of the function. The ego can
distinguish between things in the mind and the things outside of it. Ego strength generally
refers to the parts of the “self”—what a person understand as the “I” in normal life
interaction and being—which is not unreasonably subject to external forces, demands,
pressures, distractions, or difficult feelings.

Freud’s theory of ego is understood to be “a set of cognitive and perceptual
functions that serve adaptive purposes” (Cattell, 1989, p. 37). A person’s ability to adapt
to his environment is a process that occurs in two ways: alloplastically (changing the
environment to meet one’s needs), and autoplastically (changing oneself in order to better adapt to the environment).

In the alloplastic role, the ego essentially works to overcome problems or obstacles to bring about a more satisfactory life. Cattell’s ego theory postulates that, “since human personality fundamentally stems from the pressure of innate drives seeking satisfaction, the ego is a problem-solving structure that mediates between needs and the environment” (Cattell, 1989, p. 40). Cattell’s (1989) later research hypothesized that the ego solves problems according to four distinct sequential stages:

1) Recognition that a need exists;
2) Generation of options for satisfying needs;
3) Selection of the best option for satisfying need, while assuring safety and overall well being;
4) Implementation of the selected option.

A person with low ego strength will likely demonstrate a deficit in at least one of these problem-solving sequences.

The second function of the ego, the autoplastic role, allows a person to cope with frustrations and delays in gratification by altering their own psychological responses. This may be accomplished by (a) using defense mechanisms (cf. Anna Freud, 1946); (b) choosing palliatives, i.e. intentionally making oneself feel better without actually solving the problem; and (c) intentionally accepting the difficulties of life (Cattell, 1989).

The healthy individual demonstrates the flexibility necessary to determine the best choice between alloplastic and autoplastic responses in the face of life’s inevitable difficulties. This is not necessarily a function of intelligence. An EMI represents a failure within the marital relationship or a problem with healthy functioning. The pursuit of an
extramarital partner often meets a perceived need(s), but the likelihood of actually solving relationship problems and increasing overall well-being is questionable. It is really a failure in sequence stage number three above.

Individuals who score high on ego strength (16PF, Factor C) are emotionally stable, able to manage stress in a positive, proactive way, and problem-solve well under stress. They adjust to the facts and tend to handle their emotional needs in a mature, proactive fashion. Above average scores on ego strength indicate self-representations of ego strength, and not necessarily actual ego strength, since some may view themselves as better adjusted than they really are (Karson, Karson, & O’Dell, 1997).

People who are low on ego strength find it difficult to cope with challenges that come from without as well as from within. They tend to experience low self-esteem, feel dissatisfied, and function in a very inefficient fashion. Anxiety is a typical outcome of this low level of functioning (Karson, Karson, & O’Dell, 1997). They struggle more with stress, and find it difficult to adequately resolve problems and adapt to their environment, feeling rather a certain lack of control over life. A person who scores low is more easily annoyed by things and people, dissatisfied with the world, family, restrictions of life, and their own health. Low scores are associated with a greater susceptibility to psychological problems such as phobias, psychosomatic disturbances, sleep disturbances, and obsessional behavior (Cattell, Eber, & Tatsuoka, 1970).

**Personality, Ego Strength, and Extramarital Involvement**

In conclusion, it seems that the personality factor of ego strength is well suited to this study of EMI in clergy for the following reasons:

1. Low ego strength (C-) people tend to be dissatisfied in relationships. Given that marital satisfaction, as noted earlier, is an established predictor of marital
infidelity, this relationship suggests predictive validity.

2. People who are not coping well, and choose to comfort themselves, may use sex for this self-soothing function. The sexual addiction and marital infidelity literature, as discussed previously, suggest the possibility of this palliative relationship.

3. The greater number of EMI cases started out as Class II (Carder, 1992) relationships with a strong friendship and emotional component. In the face of a developing extramarital relationship, the realization of getting “hooked-in”, with its attendant cognitive dissonance between acknowledged standards and actual behavior, calls for a mature problem-solving response—with which a person of low ego strength will theoretically have difficulty.

4. The 16PF is widely used throughout the world as a measure of normal personality functioning, and is used in a variety of clinical, vocational, and academic settings. Thus it has utility for further research in the area of sexuality and EMI.

Statement of Purpose

There are three primary purposes of this study. First, to identify the rate of two different types of EMI, physical and emotional. Second, to identify the rate and type of clergy EMI that occurs within the professional relationship. Third, to examine the interaction between ego strength, and type and level of extramarital involvement among clergy.
Hypotheses

Hypothesis I. An inverse relationship exists between the personality factor Ego Strength and **physical extramarital involvement**. Clergy who score low on Ego Strength, who are or have been married, will report more extramarital physical involvement such as kissing, hugging, caressing, intimate sexual contact without intercourse, and sexual intercourse, than those with higher Ego Strength scores.

Hypothesis II. An inverse relationship exists between the personality factor Ego Strength and **emotional extramarital involvement**. Clergy who score low on Ego Strength, who are or have been married, will report having had more extramarital emotional involvement at the slight, moderate, and strong levels of intensity than those scoring higher on this scale.

Hypothesis III: An inverse relationship exists between the personality factor Ego Strength and **clergy extramarital involvement**. Clergy who score low on Ego Strength will report more clergy extramarital involvement than those with higher Ego Strength scores.

i) A clergy leader’s level of Ego Strength predicts extramarital sexual behavior or contact including sexual intercourse while performing the functional role of clergy.

ii) A clergy leader’s level of Ego Strength predicts emotional EMI at the slight, moderate, and strong levels of intensity, while performing the functional role of clergy.
CHAPTER II

Methodology

Participants

Three hundred and fifty Christian leaders who graduated from or are currently students associated with Arrow Leadership Ministries (ALM) were contacted about voluntary participation in this study. The Arrow Leadership Program (ALP) is a two year program that trains young male and female clergy leaders (age range 20-40 years) in the development of leadership skills concurrent with their church or organizational responsibilities. The recruited convenience sample included 373 identified ALP alumni from the 1997-2003 cohorts, as well as current 2004 participants from both the United States and Canada. There were 23 individuals who did not have valid contact data or were not successfully contacted by either e-mail or regular mail. A total of 179 ALP students and alumni elected to participate in the study, a survey response rate of 51%. One participant was eliminated from the total responses because he was a Catholic priest. Given the distinct differences in theology and lifestyle between Catholic and Protestant clergy, the decision was made prior to the beginning of the project to use only Protestant subjects. There were 27 participants who had no available 16PF data. These individuals were excluded from the hypotheses analysis.

An apriori power analysis using a one-tailed test showed that a total sample size of 176 was needed for a moderate effect size of .5 (Delta 3.32), at an alpha level of .05, \( t(174) = 1.65 \), at the .95 power level. Calculations were done using GPOWER (Faul & Erdfelder, 1992).
Demographics of Study Participants

Tables 1 and 2 exhibit the demographic data of the entire participant sample of 178 Christian leaders. The current ages of participants range from 26-50 years old with a mean of 38 years old. There were 144 (81%) males and 34 (19%) females. Of this sample 161 (90%) were married and 17 (10%) were single. The ethnicity of the sample was composed of 165 (92%) Caucasians, 4 (2%) African-American, 6 (3%) Asian/Pacific Islander, and 4 (2%) Other. Half (50%) of the sample had been in Christian ministry between 6-15 years, and 43% for more than 15 years. Most held pastoral positions (67%), or were para-church or denominational leaders (24%). Tables 1 and 2 present demographic data for the sample.
Table 1

Demographic Information A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>26-50</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years With Present Spouse</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>1-28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Post Secondary Education</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALP Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Official Role or Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Pastor</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Pastor</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth or Student Pastor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church or Organization Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para-church Leader</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denominational Leader</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Christian Ministry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 years</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denomination</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para-church Organization</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent/Non-Denominational</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican/Episcopal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Gospel Churches</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Reformed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian &amp; Missionary Alliance</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of God</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregational</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Covenant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical Missionary Church</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Methodist</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Missionary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mennonite Brethren</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecostal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth Brethren</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanese Alliance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Methodist</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Protection of Participants

Participant involvement in the study was voluntary. There were no physically invasive procedures used. All contact with potential participants was conducted by private e-mail and general information on the ALM website. Prior to participating in the study, participants were asked to read a brief description of the study and to indicate their consent for participation by typing in their name at the end of the document. Access to the survey was not allowed without a name being entered. Participants were provided information on how to contact the researchers.

According to the APA Ethics Code (Canter, Bennett, Jones & Nagy, 1994, pp.126-127), psychologists conducting research with individuals must be careful to protect prospective participants from the possible negative consequences of participating in the study, withdrawing, or declining to participate. Federal guidelines by the Office for Protection from Research Risks (OPRR) indicate that there should be minimal risk of harm to participants. Minimal risk is defined in reference to instances in which “the probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the research are not greater in and of themselves than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests” (OPRR, 1996, p. 6). Empirically, participation in sexuality research has not been demonstrated to pose harm (Wiederman, 2002). However, it was understood that this study might create emotional disturbance in some participants because of the personal nature of questions regarding sexual and intimate behavior. Thus, some researchers’ informed consent statements include a warning about the experience of such emotions as well as information regarding where counseling services may be accessed. Following this
protocol, a warning statement and offer for counseling referral was included in the informed consent document for this research study.

For the protection and confidentiality of the participants, a former staff member at ALM entered the data and coded the names of the participants. The e-mail addresses of students identified for this sample were compiled together with the code number included in order to gain access to the online questionnaire. Secured access to code key to student names was limited to this author.

Data Collection and Procedures

All 178 participants have been or continue to be enrolled in the Arrow Leadership Program in North America (United States and Canada) from 1997 to 2004. Upon entering the ALP, all participants are given a comprehensive assessment, including the Cattell 16PF. For the purpose of this study, the collection of data was done in two parts. The first set of data compiled was the 16PF data, which had been archived at the headquarters of ALM. Each individual assessment was coded and entered into a data bank by a contracted former employee of ALM. Potential participants were advised in the letter of introduction to the online questionnaire that this archival data was to be used in the current study. They were further advised that archived data would be merged with new data by assigning a coded number to each subject. Subject anonymity was maintained by matching only coded data.

The second part represented a set of data that was collected over a five week period. Alumni and students were contacted in several ways. First, a short general notice of a study to be conducted over the following several weeks was posted on the ALM website. The link contained a letter from the President of ALM, introducing the study and offering the e-mail address to the primary researcher for further information. The ALM
website is often accessed by ALP students and alumni. Secondly, each potential participant was sent an e-mail with the ALM president’s introductory letter, informing him or her of subsequent contact about participation in the study. Thirdly, approximately four days later, participants were sent an invitation via e-mail to participate in the included online survey, together with the introductory letter. This invitation included a link to the survey site, which automatically allowed access through an embedded individual URL personalized participant code. Fourthly, letters were sent out in regular post concurrently with the e-mail version, containing the same invitation packet. This invitation included a link to the survey site, but was slightly different in that the personalized participant code was identified. The code was to be entered when requested by the online survey administrator. Fifthly, two follow-up invitation requests were sent by e-mail only in the fourth and fifth weeks. The hope was that an ALP student would therefore be contacted about participation either by e-mail or surface mail or both.

Subject participation in the study was noted to be voluntary, and a prizewinner (of a Palm personal information organizer) would be randomly selected from among those who were participants in the study. Following the participants’ reading of a confidentiality statement, which included an introduction to the survey and assurance of confidentiality, informed consent through an online signature was obtained prior to being granted access to the research questionnaire itself. Each response was simultaneously recorded in a Microsoft Excel database. Confidentiality of the data was ensured by encryption of online data, and a state-of-the-art firewall was used at the computer server access site. The questionnaire data along with the participant’s code number was subsequently matched with the archival 16 PF data.
Measures

*Clergy EMI Questionnaire.* This questionnaire was designed for the current study in order to assess participants’ self reported sexual and emotional behaviors and attitudes while married and in the Christian ministry. The online-administered questionnaire included three sections. Section A consisted of 15 items which solicited demographic information such as the participant’s age, gender, marital status and number of years married, gender, education level, and professional affiliations. It also included two questions related to attachment style to be used in future research. Section B for married (or separated) participants included 29 items about sexual behavior and feelings designed to assess marital sexuality, physical or emotional EMI, sexual or emotional professional misconduct, and solitary sexual behaviors. Section B for single people consisted of 18 items designed to assess solitary sexual behaviors and sexual or emotional professional misconduct. Items for Section B were primarily adapted from Glass’ patient intake materials (personal communication, 2/2003) and the dissertation research of Thoburn (1991). Section C consisted of 11 questions, and asked married and single participants about same-sex attraction, and same-sex romantic or sexual behaviors. These items were adapted from Spitzer’s (2003) study of sexual orientation change. The final Section D included two open-ended questions which allowed the participant to offer anecdotal information.

*Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire, Fifth Edition.* The 16PF-5th Edition (Cattell, 1993) was used in the present study to measure the personality trait of “Ego Strength.” The 16PF-5th Edition contains 185 items that comprise the 16 primary factor scales, five global factor scales, as well as three validity scales.
There is a substantial amount of normative data and validation on the 16PF. Internal consistency for the 16PF, as calculated with Cronbach’s coefficient alpha, has a mean of .76, with a range from .68 to .87 depending on the factor (16PF-5th Edition Norm Supplement, 2002). The 16 primary factors demonstrate reliability coefficients from .69 to .87 (McLellan, 1995). Conn and Rieke (1994) sought to establish the convergent and discriminant validity of the Fifth Edition global factor scales by comparing the 16PF with four other commonly used personality inventories: the California Psychological Inventory (CPI; Gough, 1987), the Personality Research Form (PRF; Jackson, 1984), the NEO Personality Inventory-Revised (NEO PI-R; Costa & McCrae, 1992), and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI; Myers & McCaulley, 1985). Results from correlational, regression, and factor analysis provide substantial evidence of construct validity for the global factors. Further evidence of the validity of the 16PF scales is supported by strong correlations between the 16PF primary factor scales and the other measures.

There are 10 items that comprise the primary factor “C”, ego strength, or emotional stability, test construct. Some representative samples of questions are: “When something upsets me, I usually get over it quite soon.” “I feel that my emotional needs are …” Factor C has adequate internal consistency of .79. This factor is mainly concerned about a respondent’s feelings of coping ability in day-to-day life. High scorers tend to deal with life quite well and manage their emotions and daily events in a balanced way. Low scorers tend to react to life and exhibit a lack of ability or control of life.

The highest primary factor correlation (.64) is with Apprehension (O+), an indication that “when ego strength is low, the ego has failed in its important role of maintaining a positive self-concept” (Cattell, 1989). Emotional reactivity, a descriptor of a low score on the Factor C measure, is strongly correlated to the Anxiety global factor.
A C-score and its relationship to Anxiety is supported by a strong correlation with the NEO Neuroticism factor of Anxiety (N1), Angry Hostility (N2), Depression (N3), Self-Consciousness (N4), and Vulnerability (N6). Anxiety (Factor N1) and Ego Strength (Factor C) are at $r = -.57$, and Apprehension (Factor O) $r = .61$. Ego strength is positively correlated with the MBTI Extraversion ($r = .36$) and negatively with MBTI Introversion ($r = -.23$) (Russell & Karol, 1994, pp. 85, 87).

**Statistical Analysis**

The data sets for all four hypotheses were analyzed in two steps. First, a correlation matrix was run to determine which dependent variables (e.g. sexual behaviors) were significantly associated with the independent variable of ego strength. Second, linear regressions and ANOVA were used to analyze significant correlations determined from Step One. This allowed for a comparative analysis of various types of sexual behavior relative to the level of ego strength. The level of significance was set at .01 level of probability for step one, then at .05 level of probability for step two. Other descriptive statistics were used when possible correlations were not involved.

SPSS, version 12 for Windows, was used to analyze the archival and questionnaire data. SPSS is a comprehensive statistical analysis and data management program for the personal computer running under a Windows environment.
CHAPTER III

Results

Descriptive Statistics

The extramarital physical and emotional behavior of 178 clergy leader participants was examined in this study. The time frame for this self-reported set of behaviors was specifically stated to be “since being in Christian ministry.” The rationale for this time duration was to minimize confusion with pre-marital behaviors, identify the period of time when personal, social and religious constraints on such behavior are most unequivocal, and to increase the validity of retrospective memory by somewhat limiting the period under question. For a greater number of participants, time in ministry actually exceeded the time with their spouse. The married participants had been with their current spouse for an average of 12 years, and the average number of years in ministry was between 11 and 15 years, although the greatest percentage (42%) had been in ministry for more than 15 years. The data include type of behavior, with whom, and how often.

Physical EMI

For the analysis of physical and emotional EMI outside of the professional role, a total of 161 clergy leaders, 141 married male (87.6%) and 20 married female (12.4%), were included. The total amount of any form of physical EMI was 10.1% (n=16) for this sample, as shown in Table 3. If physical EMI was limited to sexual contact of any kind, without intercourse, the rate was only slightly less at 9.4% (n=15). A conservative definition of EMI that held that a behavior has to occur on at least two occasions would show the total rate of physical EMI to be 7.6% (n=12) of this sample.
Table 3

Extramarital Involvement (EMI)-Physical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type and Frequency of Behavior</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined Male &amp; Female</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kissing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One time</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more times</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugging &amp; Caressing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One time</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more times</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One time</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more times</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Intercourse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One time</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more times</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Physical EMI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One time</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more times</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sexual behavior separated by gender (see Figure 1) is demonstrated to be 10.1% (n=14) for males and 10% (n=2) for females. A post hoc analysis was conducted using an independent-samples t-test to determine whether males and females scored differently. The findings on sexual behavior were determined to be not significant.
Figure 1. Physical behavior by gender.

Emotional EMI

The total amount of emotional EMI was 36.2% (n=58) of respondents who admitted to one or more incidents of emotional EMI at any level of intensity. Data for all variables and by gender are shown in Table 4. A conservative definition of EMI that held that emotional involvement has to occur on at least two occasions would show the rate to be 26.8% (n=43) of this sample.
Table 4

Extramarital Involvement (EMI) - Emotional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Emotional Intensity</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Combine Male &amp; Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight Emotional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One time</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more times</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Emotional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One time</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more times</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Emotional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One time</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more times</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Emotional EMI, All levels of Intensity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One time</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more times</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Emotional EMI Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more persons</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total amount of emotional behavior separated by gender, illustrated by intensity of involvement in Figure 2, shows a difference by percentage of 38.6 % (n= 54) for male clergy and 20% (n=4) for female clergy. A post hoc analysis was conducted using an independent-samples t-test to determine whether males and females scored differently. The findings on emotional behavior were determined to be not significant.

One or more emotional relationships on the Internet were determined to be at a rate of 5.6% (n=9) of this sample. These nine clergy leaders were men.
Figure 2. Emotional EMI by gender.

Clergy Extramarital Involvement (CEMI)

By definition of CEMI--EMI’s that occur while performing in the professional role—emphasize the object of attraction and context of occurrence rather than marital status. Thus the total sample of 178 married participants (n=141 (79.2%) clergy men, n=20 (11.2%) clergy women) and single participants (n=3 (1.7%) clergy men, n=14 (7.9%) clergy women) were included in this evaluation. The findings are presented in Tables 5 and 6.

Physical Clergy Extramarital Involvement

The total amount of any form of physical CEMI was 4.0% (n=7) for this sample, as shown in Table 5. A conservative definition of EMI that held that a behavior has to occur on at least two occasions would show the rate to be 3.4% (n=6) of this sample.
Table 5

Clergy Extramarital Involvement (CEMI)-Physical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type and Frequency of Behavior</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Combined Male &amp; Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kissing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One time</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more times</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugging &amp; Caressing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One time</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more times</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One time</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more times</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Intercourse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more times</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Physical CPM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One time</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more times</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sexual behavior separated by gender (see Figure 3) is demonstrated to be similar at 3.5% (n=5) for males and 5.9% (n=2) for females. A post hoc analysis was conducted using an independent-samples t-test to determine whether males and females scored differently. The findings on sexual behavior were determined to be not significant.
Figure 3. Physical CEMI rates separated by gender.

Emotional Clergy Extramarital Involvement

The total amount of any form of emotional CEMI was 24.0% (n=43) for this sample, as shown in Table 6. A conservative definition of EMI that held that a behavior has to occur on at least two occasions would show the rate to be 17.5% (n=31) of this sample.
Table 6

Clergy Extramarital Involvement (CEMI)-Emotional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Emotional Intensity</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Combined Male &amp; Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td>% N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight Emotional Never</td>
<td>77.1 111</td>
<td>82.4 28</td>
<td>78.1 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One time</td>
<td>11.1 16</td>
<td>2.9 1</td>
<td>9.6 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more times</td>
<td>11.8 17</td>
<td>14.7 5</td>
<td>11.8 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Emotional Never</td>
<td>90.3 130</td>
<td>85.3 29</td>
<td>89.4 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One time</td>
<td>5.6 8</td>
<td>5.9 2</td>
<td>5.6 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more times</td>
<td>4.1 6</td>
<td>8.8 3</td>
<td>5.0 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Emotional Never</td>
<td>92.4 133</td>
<td>88.2 30</td>
<td>91.5 163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One time</td>
<td>4.9 7</td>
<td>5.9 2</td>
<td>5.1 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more times</td>
<td>2.7 4</td>
<td>5.9 2</td>
<td>3.4 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Emotional Never</td>
<td>74.3 107</td>
<td>82.4 28</td>
<td>75.8 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One time</td>
<td>7.6 11</td>
<td>2.9 1</td>
<td>6.7 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more times</td>
<td>18.1 26</td>
<td>14.7 5</td>
<td>17.5 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emotional behavior separated by gender (see Figure 4) shows some difference in percentages: 26% (n=37) for male clergy and 18% (n=6) for female clergy. However, a post hoc analysis was conducted using an independent-samples t-test to determine whether males and females scored differently, and the findings on emotional behavior were determined to be not significant.
Analysis of Hypotheses

In general, the results of the study provide only partial support for the hypotheses that ego strength in clergy who are or have been married is negatively correlated with their tendency to engage in physical extramarital behavior, extramarital emotional involvement of a romantic nature, and clergy extramarital involvement.

A review of the mean Sten scores for the 16PF – 5th Edition factor of Ego Strength provides some indication as to why the three hypotheses received only partial support. Of the 137 available 16PF scores, participants in this study obtained a mean Sten score of 6.3 (see Figure 5). The distribution of Sten scores was skewed negatively (skewness = -.11, SE = .21), showing that few participants (n = 6) scored in what is normally understood to constitute the range for “low” ego strength.

Figure 4. Emotional CEMI rates separated by gender.
The fact that only 3.4% of participants can be classified as having low ego strength, while 37% scored in the high range for ego strength, severely limits the ability to test the three hypotheses of this study. Nevertheless, a detailed analysis of each of the three hypotheses is included below.

**Hypothesis I**

The hypothesis that clergy who are or have been married are more likely to engage in extramarital sexual behavior of some type, the lower their level of ego strength, received support for sexual intercourse (Beta (β) = - .24, t = -2.6, p < .01). The result is in the expected direction: lower ego strength is related to a higher frequency of intercourse. Although this is a significant relationship, there were only two participants who admitted to sexual intercourse. For all other forms of sexual behavior, ego strength was found to have a nonsignificant impact (Beta (β) = .07, t = .74; ns). The regression analysis model used to evaluate this relationship was determined to be valid based on a regression coefficient of \( r = .22, (r^2 = .05, F (-2, 134) = 3.42, p = < .05) \). The results are shown in Table 7.
The results were examined for multi-collinearity, with the finding that kissing, hugging, and caressing sexual behaviors show high collinearity with sexual contact with and without sexual intercourse, with tolerances below .10. They were therefore dropped from analysis.

Table 7

Multiple Regression: Dependent Variable: Ego Strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>SEE</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Contact, Sexual Intercourse</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Contact</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Intercourse</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis II

The hypothesis that clergy who are or have been married are more likely to engage in extramarital emotional involvement the lower their level of Ego Strength did not receive support. The regression analysis model used to evaluate this relationship determined emotional EMI at slight intensity was r = -.07, moderate intensity r = -.13, and strong intensity r = -.03. Table 8 shows the results.

Table 8

Bivariate Correlation: Dependent Variable Ego Strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slight Emotional Intensity</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Emotional Intensity</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Emotional Intensity</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of the relationship between emotional EMI and sexual behavior was conducted. In Hypothesis II, the levels of multi-collinearity were acceptable. For slight intensity of emotional involvement, the entire model was significant \( R^2 = .17, F (4, 153) \)
An examination of betas showed a significant effect for sexual contact (Beta (β) = -.37, t = -2.63, p < .01), and for kissing (Beta (β) = .72, t = 3.71, p < .001). The negative Beta (β) weight indicates that slight intensity of emotional involvement is negatively correlated with sexual contact, whereas it is positively correlated with kissing.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>SEE</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kissing, Hugging, Sexual Contact, Sexual Intercourse</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kissing</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugging &amp; Caressing</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Contact</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-2.63</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Intercourse</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For moderate intensity of emotional involvement, all four physical behaviors together were significant, but were not significant when separated $R^2 = .09$, $F = 3.78$, $p < .01$.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>SEE</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kissing, Hugging, Sexual Contact, Sexual Intercourse</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kissing</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugging &amp; Caressing</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Contact</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Intercourse</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.80</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For strong intensity of emotional involvement, the model was statistically significant $R^2 = .34$, $F (4, 154) = 20.12$, $p < .001$. An examination of betas showed significant effects for
sexual contact (Beta (β) = .52, t = 4.11, p < .001). For sexual intercourse, while significant, the relationship was weaker (Beta (β) = -.20, t = -2.53, p < .05). The negative Beta (β) weight indicates that strong intensity of emotional involvement is negatively correlated with sexual intercourse. These results are noted in Tables 9, 10 and 11. Further examination showed that sexual contact accounted for 7% of the unique variance in strong emotional EMI, intercourse accounted for only 3% of the variance in strong emotional EMI.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>SEE</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kissing, Hugging, Sexual Contact, Sexual Intercourse</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>20.12</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kissing</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugging &amp; Caressing</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Contact</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Intercourse</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>-2.53</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this evaluation of EMI, two general questions about type of EMI (physical and emotional) and frequency of any type of EMI were posed to the participants. These were used as a reference check and point of comparison for other data in the respective constructs. There were 78.9% (n = 127) of clergy leaders who indicated that they had never had any type of EMI (see Table 12). Of the remaining 21.1%, 2.5% were exclusively sexual, and the rest (18.6%) indicated some amount of emotional connection with the EMI partner. An examination of responses showed that there was no difference in ego strength when asked about type of EMI, F (4,132) = 2.12, ns, or frequency of EMI, F (4,132) = 1.53, ns.
Hypothesis III

The hypothesis that clergy are more likely to engage in extramarital physical or emotional involvement while performing the functional role of clergy, the lower their level of Ego Strength, did not receive support. As shown in Table 13, there was no relationship between ego strength and any form of physical behavior: kissing $r = .13$, hugging $r = .06$, sexual contact $r = .13$, sexual intercourse, no cases; or emotional intensity of involvement EMI, $r = .07$. An examination of betas for emotional EMI showed that slight intensity ($\beta = .08$, $t = .77; \text{ns}$), moderate intensity ($\beta = -.09$, $t = -.69; \text{ns}$), and strong intensity ($\beta = .03$, $t = .30; \text{ns}$) demonstrated an insignificant relationship.

Table 12
Multiple Regression: Dependent Variable: Ego Strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
<th>$F$ Change</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kissing</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugging/Caressing</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Contact</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Intercourse</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Emotional: Slight, Moderate, &amp; Strong Intensity</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Follow-up Analysis

Participants were asked about inhibitors to potential involvement in EMI. The inhibitors noted to be “very important” by approximately 95% of the clergy participants were: religious beliefs, moral values, commitment to marriage, devotion to spouse, and marital satisfaction. In the “other” category, most said that effect on children was an important inhibitor (10 of 11 who answered in this category).

Figure 6. Reported inhibitors to clergy involvement in EMI’s.
Hypotheses

Hypothesis I stated that ego strength is negatively correlated with physical extramarital involvement. Specifically, clergy with lower ego strength would report having engaged more frequently in kissing, hugging, or intimate sexual contact than those with higher ego strength. This hypothesis was partially supported; ego strength was found to be negatively correlated with sexual intercourse but not with any other forms of sexual behavior. It should be noted, however, that although ego strength and sexual intercourse were inversely related, only two of the 161 married clergy who participated in this study reported having engaged in extramarital sexual intercourse. In retrospect, this low level of reported extramarital sex is not surprising given that only 6 participants (3.4%) scored in the low range for ego strength. There was insufficient variability in ego strength scores to provide a robust test of the hypothesized correlation between ego strength and sexual infidelity. In a larger sample, a more compelling relationship between ego strength and extramarital intimacy might have been found, underscoring the hypothesis that people with low ego strength are at greater risk of extramarital sexual intercourse, though not necessarily lower levels of other sexual behavior.

Hypothesis II stated that ego strength is negatively correlated with emotional extramarital involvement. Specifically, clergy leaders with lower ego strength would be more likely to report having experienced romantic, nonsexualized involvement than those with higher ego strength. This hypothesis was not supported at any level of intensity of emotional involvement.
A follow-up analysis of the relationship between emotional EMI and physical EMI was conducted to determine if clergy who engaged in extramarital, emotionally charged relationships were also more likely to engage in some form of extramarital sexual touching (including intercourse). The data showed that participants who had at least one emotional involvement of slight intensity were unlikely to report having engaged in extramarital intercourse but were likely to have acknowledged extramarital kissing. Those clergy who admitted to a moderate intensity of extramarital emotional involvement also reported having engaged in at least one form of extramarital sexual touching. Finally, clergy who admitted to a high intensity of emotional involvement also admitted to engaging in a variety of extramarital sexual behavior, including sexual intercourse.

What these findings suggest is that kissing is the most likely form of sexual touching at the lowest levels of emotional intensity. One can speculate that at lower levels of extramarital emotional involvement kissing is acceptable where other, presumably more intimate, forms of touching are not. In fact, at low levels of emotional EMI, petting and sexual intercourse seldom, if ever, occur. Not surprisingly, as the level of emotional involvement increases so does the possibility of increasingly intimate forms of sexual touching. In fact, only at the highest levels of extramarital emotional involvement were clergy likely to engage in sexual intercourse. Even then, sexual intercourse was uncommon relative to other forms of sexual touching. One possible explanation for this is that moderating variables constrain clergy from “going all the way.” The clergy evaluated in this study reported that the most important inhibitors to extramarital involvement were religious beliefs, moral values, commitment to marriage, devotion to spouse, and marital satisfaction.
Hypothesis III stated that there is a negative correlation between ego strength and extramarital involvement among clergy. Specifically, clergy with lower ego strength would report more physical or emotional CEMI than those with higher ego strength in their roles as clergy. No support for this hypothesis was found. However, this might be due to the fact that the sample size wasn’t large enough to generate sufficient rates of reported CEMI upon which to base a robust test of the hypothesis. As noted earlier, the rate of CEMI in this sample was only 4% for sexual involvement, and 24% for emotional involvement.

Another possible explanation is that the professional office held by clergy leaders protects them from EMI. In other words, the fiduciary responsibility for upholding the office of pastor or Christian ministry leader as a representative of God for a person during the practice of ministry may overrule whatever the effects of reduced ego strength. Further, Thoburn’s (1991) study which hypothesized that ego development may be a precursor to EMI, similarly found no relationship since there were few in the sample who had low levels of ego development—just as there were few (6 participating clergy) who had low ego strength in this study.

*Physical EMI*

The finding of this study show that 89.9% (143) of participants had never engaged in any type of physical EMI since being in Christian ministry, which is well below all other previous studies. While this conservative calculation of 10% who admitted to sexual behavior one or more times is helpful toward comparison with other studies, perhaps a more meaningful figure is derived from an analysis that considers two or more incidents of any behavior. Without minimizing the possible consequences of crossing a line once, it can be argued that a problem or pattern does not exist until a behavior is
engaged in at least twice. Thus an analysis of the data in this study shows that 7.6% (n=12) admitted to two or more incidents of some type of sexual behavior with someone other than their spouse. The rate of sexual intercourse is then 0.6% (2 or more times).

The findings of this study differ importantly from previous major EMI clergy sample studies (Berry, 1991; Birchard, 2000; Blackmon, 1984; Goble, 1986; Muck 1988; Somers, 1986; Thoburn, 1991). These studies report extramarital sexual behavior at a rate ranging from 5.9%-40%, depending on type of behavior, with whom, and over what period. Blackmon (1984) found the rate of sexual intercourse with members of their congregations to be 12.7%. In another often-cited study (Muck, 1988) the figure was 12% of pastors who had reported sexual intercourse with someone other than a spouse while in local ministry. As the closest point of comparison, Thoburn’s (1991) study reported an overall rate of 15.6% who indicated a sexual EMI. Specifically, a total of 9.6% admitted to intimate sexual contact and 5.9% to sexual intercourse. There are three likely reasons for lower findings in this study compared to prior studies. The first is the uniqueness of this sample. Although the Arrow Leadership Program cohort shares most of the same challenges and hazards of ministry that most clergy share, they nonetheless are a select group of Christian leaders. Most, but not all, are pastors (65%), and all are identified by approximately 600 recommenders who nominate a given person to be considered for the 2-year training program that is designed to sharpen the character and skills of the “best and brightest” of young (less than 40 years old) Christians who are currently in significant positions of leadership. Their circle of influence is similar to other leaders, but the impact of moral or ethical failure may be more profound. Furthermore, there is an emphasis on the quality of peer relationships. “Peer clusters” allow for the development of very close and honest personal and professional relationships during the
active two-year process, and students are encouraged to keep in contact with their peers well after graduating from the program. This offers the possibility of a life-long closeness, encouragement, and accountability that are likely to positively impact attitudes and behavior.

The second reason is the specificity around behavior and period of time in question. Generally speaking, the reported EMI rates across studies have decreased relative to the dates of studies. This is likely because questions have changed from those such as: “Have you ever done anything sexually inappropriate?” to a set of questions in the current study such as: “If you have been sexually involved with someone other than your spouse since being in Christian ministry, how many times did the sexual behavior of kissing occur with a church member?”

Third, the literature suggests that there is a relationship between marital satisfaction, religious behavior, and EMI. In a stratified sample of the general population, Atkins et al. (2001) found that those who were “very happy” in their marriages also reported regular church attendance and infrequent involvement in infidelities. The authors hypothesize that religious values increase commitment to the marriage relationship. In this clergy leader sample, 80% of participants indicated that all things taken together, their marriages were “happier than average” or “very happy.” Furthermore, approximately 95% of participants stated that religious beliefs, moral values, commitment to marriage, and devotion to their spouse were all very important factors in inhibiting extramarital involvements. These factors all suggest a lower rate of EMI in this sample. The fact that the rates for EMI are lower among this sample of Christian clergy than other more general subject pools of clergy would argue for an examination of the ALP training, mentoring and accountability practices. This finding
might point the way to important preventive strategies in dealing with sexual hazards of ministry.

There was no statistically significant difference between men and women; separated by gender, 10% of men and 10% of women engaged in some form of physical EMI. The two cases of sexual intercourse were men. There were some behaviors (hugging and caressing) that showed at least a trend toward higher representation among female clergy leaders, but the sample size is too small to make a definitive claim for such a difference. This may well reflect general social changes which show increased numbers of married women having affairs, more solicitation of sexual involvements by women, and more women in the workforce. Cross-gender workplace friendships are the most common context for the slippery slope toward an EMI (Glass, 2003). This opportunistic trend noted in the literature is supported by this study, since those participants noting greater numbers of opportunities to have sexual contact with someone other than a spouse are at greater risk to engage in an emotional or physical EMI in contrast to earlier studies. In any case, the most compelling conclusion to be offered in this analysis of gender and EMI is that the rates of female clergy leaders’ involvement are not significantly lower than those of their male peers.

Emotional EMI

The current study constitutes a substantively new contribution to the literature on this topic by clearly defining what constitutes emotional EMI, how intensely it was experienced, and how often it occurred, and also shows a rate significantly higher than physical EMI.

Emotional EMI is referred to here as an emotional attachment and romantic feelings privately held or expressed toward a person other than a spouse. It was
specifically defined for participants as emotional involvement characterized by a combination of sharing emotional intimacy, sexual energy, and keeping one’s feelings secret from one’s spouse and others. Participants were asked to respond to three levels of intensity of involvement, slight, moderate, and strong, and identify what type of person it was with (church staff person, church member, counselee, friend, stranger or acquaintance, prostitute or other), and how many times they had engaged in the behavior. There was no definition of what constituted “intensity of involvement.”

Findings in this clergy leadership sample showed that 63.8% had never engaged in any level of emotional EMI. Of the remaining 36.2% who engaged in some kind of emotional behavior one or more times, 33.7% reported this to be of slight intensity, 18.0% reported this to be of moderate intensity, 10.6% reported this to be of strong intensity. As noted above, perhaps a more meaningful figure is derived from an analysis that considers two or more incidents of any behavior because of the indication of a greater problem. If this were the case, 26.8% (n=43) of the participants admitted to emotional involvement at some level of intensity, two or more times.

A review of the literature on extramarital involvement in general and clergy populations in particular, reveals the greatest emphasis on physical behavior in EMI. Affair prevention and sexual recovery publications that target Christian readers have discussed the development and consequences of emotional involvements, but offer little information about the prevalence of EMI, or substantiated the nature of the relationship between emotional attachment, sexuality, and EMI. A few clergy studies on EMI have investigated this emotional component of the issue. Steinke (1989) emphasized several emotional components that contributed to EMI among clergy, and argued that a personal emotional imbalance leads to interpersonal emotional over-involvement in others’ lives,
leading to physical attraction and ultimately to the possibility of sexualization. Thoburn (1991) was the first to study the emotional quality of affairs and who they were with in a clergy sample, and found that almost two thirds (61%) of his male Protestant clergy participants indicated some emotional investment when involved in an extramarital sexual relationship. A specific definition of “emotional investment” was not offered, and the context for the participants' response was in relation to the duration of the affair, i.e. brief versus long-term. This was an important contribution to the literature by demonstrating the prevalence of the emotional component in sexual affairs.

In the current study, a general question about the emotional versus sexual component was included. Thirty of the 34 participants (88%) who admitted to an EMI indicated at least some amount of emotional involvement with the EMI partner, and 55% indicated that the EMI was “mostly” emotional. These percentages are higher than Thoburn’s (1991) findings, which likely reflects differences in the constructs being measured, i.e. the presence of emotional investment but not an emotional EMI per se, but affirms the significant presence of an emotional component to EMI’s in general. A finding that 36% of a select group of highly committed Protestant clergy leaders admits some level of intensity of emotional EMI is cause for concern and really has no other comparable study to compare and contrast with. It also reflects a 26% greater amount of emotional than physical EMI, which is somewhat higher than Glass’s (2003) comparable estimate of 15-20% if emotional EMI was added to physical EMI in the prevalence rates of the general population.

There was almost double the percentage of men (36%) relative to women (20%) who admitted to a slight emotional level of intensity. The other categories of moderate intensity (18% and 15% respectively) and of strong intensity (11% and 10% respectively)
were not different between genders. An analysis of these figures shows that these differences are not statistically significant, which is likely due to the small number of women (N=20) relative to men (N=140) in the married sample. The greater number of men at the lower level of intensity may be due to the gender-specific generalization that men are more quickly visually attracted to a sexually interesting partner. Women on the other hand are more generally oriented to the quality of relationship and slower to warm up to a sexually attractive person (Schnarch, 1991). In general however, this parallels the assertion in many previous studies on physical EMI that the number of women is fast approaching the number of men who get involved with someone.

A particular form of emotional EMI, the “internet affair,” is involvement characterized by a combination of sharing emotional intimacy, sexual energy, and keeping one’s feelings secret from one’s spouse and others, but the relationship is sustained through continued contact by Internet rather than face to face. Six percent (n=9) of the male participants indicated that they had experienced this form of EMI with one or more persons. No women reported Internet EMI. Further analysis of the questions about Internet EMI showed that four participants had been involved with only one partner, three had cyber relationships it with 2-5 partners, one with 5-9 partners, and one respondent with 10 or more partners. Of the total of nine clergy leader participants, eight of them indicated that the online communication occurred 1-11 times per year, and one person indicated it was 1-4 times a week. This is noteworthy, since the Internet provides an easy and unique opportunity for emotional infidelity to occur.

Clergy Extramarital Involvement

The findings on clergy extramarital involvement (CEMI), or sexualized physical involvement or romantic emotional connection between a minister and a person with
whom he or she has a professional relationship, show a rate of commission lower than that of other studies using clergy samples, and generally lower than other professional groups.

The present study showed that 96% (169) of the participants had never engaged in any form of physical CEMI since being in Christian ministry. Of the 4% who acknowledged some kind of behavior one or more times, 3% reported this to be kissing, 3% reported this to be hugging or caressing, 2% reported this to be sexual contact, and sexual intercourse never occurred. Once again, there was little statistical difference in behavior between men and women.

CEMI prevalence rates in prior studies of clergy (Berry, 1991; Birchard, 2000; Blackmon, 1984; Goble, 1986; Muck 1988; Somers, 1986; Thoburn, 1991) revealed a range from 6-69% of physical EMI fits the general definition of professional sexual misconduct. In contrast to other similar professional groups, 7.1% for male and 3.1% female psychiatrists in Gartrell et al.’s (1986) study admitted to sexual contact with a patient, and 37% of these had sex with more than 1 patient. Among psychologists, Holroyd and Brodsky (1977) found that 8.1% males and 0.9% females admitted to sexual intercourse with patients. In Boulhoutsos et al. (1983), 4.8% males, 0.8% females admitted to sexual involvement. Finally, Pope et al. (1986) noted that 9.4% male and 2.5% female psychologists admitted to sexual misconduct. The percentage of women admitting to sexual misconduct in the psychologist studies was notably lower than that of the present clergy leader sample.

The findings were somewhat different for emotional CEMI. There were 87% (N=13) of participants who had never engaged in any level of intensity of emotional CEMI since being in Christian ministry. Of the remaining 13% who admitted to one or more
involvements, 22 percent noted slight emotional intensity of involvement, 11% reported a moderate emotional intensity of involvement, and 8% admitted to strong emotional intensity of involvement.

That emotional EMI rates are higher than physical EMI rates may be explained in part by the difference in perception between the two types of behavior. Within a conservative Christian environment, sexual behavior with an extramarital partner is clearly immoral, and completely inconsistent with moral and ethical pastoral care. In contrast to this, emotional boundaries or the internal map of which thoughts and feelings are “over the line” may be unclear, changeable under various circumstances, and easily subject to justification and rationalization. Arousal or an “emotional buzz” from the experience may be experienced positively without being judged as wrong. Such emotional arousal is seductive and may appear to meet nonconscious emotional needs without being considered “sexual” in the same way that overt sexual contact is identified. The differences in findings may also be explained as a consequence of the observable generalization that men in particular think of “sex” as a genital behavior, and not so much as a romantic, emotional attachment. This is reinforced in the general professional or specifically clergy sexual misconduct literature when physical behavior is proscribed and the emotional components are largely framed within a power differential ethical analysis (e.g. Fortune, 1989; Fortune, et al., 1992).

**Conclusion**

Although the rate of physical EMI in this sample of clergy leaders is lower than in other studies, 10% of clergy leaders that have done something physically inappropriate with someone other than their spouse is noteworthy. Several things should be taken into account when considering this figure. On the one hand, this is a highly conservative
number and represents physical behavior on a continuum from romantic hugging, to kissing, to sexual intercourse, on at least one occasion. One might be tempted to say that a more liberal understanding is fairer: the sexual contact should be more sexually explicit, say breast or genital contact. Few would reasonably argue that holding hands for 4.5 seconds is synonymous with sexual intercourse. However, one incident anywhere on the physical continuum may have significant consequences, simply because the behavior in question is considered to be over a line established by personal values, the spouse, church, or organization. Furthermore, the physical act may also be the proverbial “tip of the iceberg”, since it may be the result of a set of thoughts and feelings that in themselves are a greater threat to the marriage or professional role.

Arguably of greater concern then, is the finding that 36% had engaged in some form of emotional EMI at least once. Here again we might approach this from two perspectives. One might argue that “slight” intensity of involvement is just in passing, and the person of interest may not even have known about it and “nobody was hurt.” The significance of this is however noteworthy. First, “slight” is a starting place—it could lead to a deeper level of involvement on the “slippery slope” toward a fully-developed EMI. Hence it is an important warning sign. Secondly, there is an established relationship between the emotional and the physical—there is a greater risk that the emotional will turn to physical, than if there was no emotional relationship to start with. Thirdly, there are a relatively greater number of participants who report emotional involvement compared with physical involvement. A higher incidence of an entry behavior increases the risk of an escalated behavior.

In contrast to other professions, this sample of clergy leaders has a very low professional sexual misconduct rate when referencing physical behaviors, and an
emotional rate that is hard to compare with the very few comparable studies. Because integration and consistency of private and public ministry life is generally assumed for clergy, this discussion of EMI should be considered to have applicability to the professional contextual variation that we call CEMI. It would appear that this clergy leader sample demonstrates a very strong commitment to sexual fidelity and ethics when compared to other clergy professionals or to other professionals in general.

The lesson here is that absence of physical behavior does not constitute sufficient safety. Christian leaders need to pay attention to their emotional investments, being cautious not to minimize emotional attachments or their precursors. There is evidence here that clergy leaders’ sexuality and professional sexual ethics have roots in meaningful connectedness. Significant peer relationships that support fulfillment of the professional faith calling and fidelity to the marital relationship are the powerful moderating variables. These will affect the internal emotional world as a preventative to immoral or unethical behavior.

The importance of the relationship between emotional and physical behaviors in the development or maintenance of an EMI is supported by principles from both psychology and theology. Most importantly, in working toward a more holistic assessment of the precursors to EMI, the elements of the emotional EMI construct, most clearly identified by Glass (2003) and adapted for this study, can be used in churches and other religious contexts to understand the emotional attachments that otherwise may not be given attention. The Ten Commandments (Exodus 20) actually incorporate the internal and external EMI components in the admonition not to covet a neighbors wife (i.e. psychological), nor commit adultery (i.e. behavioral) respectively. Jesus continually pointed out that outside behaviors are hypocritical if the internal thoughts are
inconsistent. He challenged his hearers to understand that adultery is not just an act of extramarital sex, but a strong illegitimate desire for the person (Matthew 5). Other New Testament writers, such as James, similarly point to the heart as the place where sin is conceived, not just in sinful behavior itself (James 1). These are among the useful principles that need to be considered beyond heart-felt admonitions not to “fall,” or the comprehensive curricula that elaborate on the ethical principles supporting the right of parishioners not to be sexually abused in professional relationships (e.g. Fortune et al., 1992).

With respect to other findings in this study, there is some support for extra caution on the part of a Christian leader with lower ego strength. Although ego strength cannot be seen as a “predictor” or “cause” of EMI, a statistical relationship was found, which may be determined to have a stronger, or perhaps weaker, relationship in a future sample with greater variability in subjects’ ego strength and sexual behavior. In any case, wisdom suggests vigilance in the recognition that each person experiences times of increased emotional or situational vulnerability.

Women are not exempt from the potential of an EMI or CEMI as the results of this study show. The literature suggests that emotional EMI may be higher in females than males. This study demonstrates a similarity between genders in emotional and physical behaviors however, which is inconsistent with previous studies, and is a surprise finding.

Implications for Research and Practice

Christian leadership training on prevention of EMI’s and sexual misconduct in the ministerial relationships should thus incorporate the findings of this study. First, the target audience should include both men and women; risk of sexual or emotional
impropriety can no longer be assumed as gender-specific. Secondly, it should offer a clear understanding of the multifaceted aspects of emotional involvements. A useable definition or construct should be offered, and within this Christian constituency, Biblical principles explored. The emphasis on the more obvious physical behaviors should be revised to an emphasis on the emotional elements that increase vulnerability for emotional need-fulfillment through attachments to alternative partners. Traditional training in the dynamics of transference and countertransference would be helpful in this area. Thirdly, opportunity afforded by collegial relationships, shifts in the makeup of work places where church leadership is more inclusive than ever of women, openness to cross-gender friendships, and a variety of pastoral care or counseling activities, increases the risk of an EMI or CEMI. With these increased possibilities of developing emotional attachments that could lead to physical attachments, there is evidence for the need to establish and maintain clear internal and external boundaries.

Future Research

A significant conclusion to be made from the rates of EMI found in this study is reflected in the uniqueness of the Arrow Leadership Program (ALP) cohort, which is the sample surveyed here. It has been argued above that the elements of this uniqueness do in fact have a combined impact on lowering the average magnitude of EMI. In future research, this thesis could be tested by replicating this study on a larger and more representative sample of clergy and comparing the results.

The ALP includes a training module on sexuality in Christian leadership, but the current study cannot be construed to be a program evaluation that might demonstrate a direct preventative correspondence between the training and lower than expected rates of
physical EMI. Still, the ALP leadership has prioritized this module among many competing topics, recognizing that sexual misconduct of any kind is problematic for both the personal and public life of a Christian leader. Therefore, a more definitive finding on the prevention efficacy of the module, as well as other ALP programmatic elements, would be of interest and worthy of future research.

The emotional EMI construct is relatively recent in the professional literature, although recognition of extramarital emotional relationships is not. Further refinement of this construct may aid clarification and measurement in future research. Specifically, “slight,” “moderate,” and “strong” levels of emotional intensity were not explicitly defined, and thus this construct may have had some weakness in reliability.

A larger sample of female clergy leaders would be a contribution toward a greater understanding of this population. It is evident that there is an increase in the numbers of women in the professional religious workforce, and it is likely that there are variables which may impact higher or lower levels of EMI and CEMI among these women than could be discovered in the present study.

The explosion of Internet access for legitimate professional uses, as well as for illegitimate personal misuses is increasingly understood to be a cultural issue. Fifty seven percent of married clergy leaders in this sample had accessed online pornography one or more times in a year since being in Christian ministry. What impact that may have had for those 6% who were involved in internet EMI remains a subject for further exploration. For example, one wonders how much of an Internet relationship is emotional vs. sexual? Is there a relationship between online pornography use and Internet EMI’s? In other words, EMI’s established or maintained on the Internet may reflect the variables of opportunity, anonymity, secretiveness, convenience, and cost-effectiveness rather than
explicit sexual interest. Finally, in a broader sample there may be more gender variability found among those who engaged in an Internet EMI.

Limitations of Study

There are some technical and theoretical limitations to this study. Not all participants had 16PF test profiles on file in the archives. Had these 27 sets of test data been available, they would have at least slightly broadened the range for analysis of hypotheses for this sample. Although a relationship between sexual behavior and Ego Strength was indeed found, there was too much restriction of range. Nonetheless, a greater number of participants may not have helped with the skewed nature of the Ego Strength (Scale C) finding with this sample, since ALP initial screening decisions are likely to be biased toward high-functioning, mature, demonstrably stable student intakes.

In addition, ALP leaders who chose to participate may not have been representative of the group as a whole. It is not clear why 49% of the potential participants chose not to participate. A plausible primary explanation is that this group did not have time to make the extra effort to take the survey. According to the ALM president, the Arrow cohort is extremely busy set of Christian leaders; it is hard to get their attention when there are multiple agendas competing for attention on a daily basis. The stated 25 minutes of time needed to complete the survey may have reduced the number of otherwise willing respondents. ALM’s own periodic specific feedback requests result in a response rate of about 30%. It is also possible that the content of this survey was personal or sensitive enough that some elected not to participate.

There were some questionnaire item limitations that became evident upon analysis. For example, a number of participants seemed to have difficulty understanding how to
answer questions in the “other” category when offered a list of people with whom it may have been possible to have some specified type of EMI. Future research should use a Likert-type scale that includes “none”, 1 or 2 times, 3-5 times, 6-9 times, and 10 or more times. This would provide a more useful distinction between those who have engaged in an EMI on an infrequent basis in contrast to those who have developed a habit or pattern, which arguably may be represented at the 3 or more times cut-off point.

Another limitation stems from the survey method utilized. There is a possible bias against those who were not computer literate or who did not have Internet access, or who may be uncomfortable with the electronic medium.

Inherent in any investigation of this type are the limitations to generalizability. As noted above, this appears to be a select group of Christian leaders. Other studies would suggest higher rates of EMI. Some might conclude from this study that there is a trend toward decreased rates, which may or may not be true. Reference to the results of this study should accommodate this limitation by noting that these figures and conclusions may represent the best of possible behavioral worlds.
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Appendices

Appendix A

Letter I: Pre-Notice

ARROW LEADERSHIP MINISTRIES

January 10, 2004

Dear Arrow Leader:

Mitch Whitman has been a part of our Arrow Leadership assessment and trainer team for the past six years and is a valuable contributor to the Arrow Leadership Program. When he approached me about the research he was undertaking – I was more than willing to have Arrow participate in the gathering of new data that will be invaluable to the development of future leaders and ministering to those already in leadership roles.

It is the responsibility of Christian leaders to respect and maintain the appropriate emotional and relational boundaries of those they serve or with whom they work. We know that boundary violations happen, and there is a great need for additional research in this area. Mitch has agreed to undertake such a project under faculty supervision of the Department of Graduate Psychology at Seattle Pacific University.

You and your ministry leadership role represent a key part of the audience. Your feedback is important to help produce information that will serve your needs and the needs of other leaders in the future. I want to encourage you to offer your feedback on this important topic and assist Mitch in gathering data for future publication. He has taken the necessary steps to protect the confidentiality of all respondents and our office will have absolutely no access to individual responses – only the aggregate findings.

Please take a few minutes to fill out the online survey when you receive it. Your responses will be kept confidential. Mitch is offering to send a summary of the findings to all who participate and you will find this helpful for teaching and training leaders yourself.

Arrow would greatly appreciate your participation. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions about our encouragement of this research at 604-576-5613 or carsonp@arrowleadership.org.

Thank you for your time and help.

Sincerely,

Dr. Carson Pue
President
January 16, 2004

Dear [Name],

You are invited to participate in a research study of Christian clergy. The purpose of this study is to explore factors that contribute to the hazards of ministry. This doctoral dissertation research is being conducted through the Department of Graduate Psychology at Seattle Pacific University (SPU), and is approved by the SPU Institutional Review Board. Your participation is voluntary, and your responses to the survey are completely confidential.

We hope you will take a few minutes to participate at this time by logging on to our secure website at: www.dphsolutions.com/spu. When prompted, please enter your secure ALP code to start the survey: __________.

As an added incentive to complete this survey, your name will be placed in a drawing to win a Palm or Sony Clie Personal Data Assistant (PDA) once your survey has been completed.

Thank you for your help with this important study. If you have any questions concerning this study please feel free to contact the primary researcher, Mitch Whitman, at mwhitman@discoverycounsel.com or by telephone at 360.676.9535, ext. 1. You are also welcome to contact the Director of Research at Seattle Pacific University, Dr. Margaret Diddams, at 206.281.2174.

Sincerely,

Mitch Whitman, M.Ed.
Project Director
Subject line: Follow-up Invitation to Study Participation

Dear Arrow Leader,

A couple of weeks ago I wrote to you with an invitation to participate in a research study of Christian clergy. If you have already completed the survey please accept our sincere thanks and disregard this message.

The purpose of the study is to explore factors that contribute to the hazards of ministry by Christian clergy. This study is being conducted through the Department of Graduate Psychology at Seattle Pacific University (SPU), and is approved by the SPU Institutional Review Board. Your participation is voluntary, and your responses to the survey are completely confidential.

We are writing to you again because of the significance each survey has to the usefulness of this study. We hope you will take a few minutes to participate at this time by logging on to our secure website at: www.dphsolutions.com/spu. When prompted, please enter your secure ALP code to start the survey: __________.

As an added incentive to complete this survey, your name will be placed in a drawing to win a Palm or Sony Clie Personal Data Assistant (PDA) once your survey has been completed.

Thank you for your help with this important study. If you have any questions concerning this study please feel free to contact the primary researcher, Mitch Whitman, at mwhitman@discoverycounsel.com or by telephone at 360.676.9535, ext. 1. You are also welcome to contact the Director of Research at Seattle Pacific University, Dr. Margaret Diddams, at 206.281.2174.

Sincerely,

Mitch Whitman, M.Ed.
Project Director
Dear

We are pleased to tell you that over half of your fellow Arrow Leaders have responded to our invitation to participate in a research study of Christian clergy. We almost have enough respondents for a very significant study. If you have not already taken the opportunity to respond, we hope you will take a few minutes to participate before we close the survey site (on March 2nd). Please log on to our secure website at: www.dphsolutions.com/spu. When prompted, please enter your personal secure ALP code to start the survey:

The purpose of this study is to explore factors that contribute to the hazards of ministry. This doctoral dissertation research is being conducted through the Department of Graduate Psychology at Seattle Pacific University (SPU), and is approved by the SPU Institutional Review Board. Your participation is voluntary, and your responses to the survey are completely confidential.

As an incentive to complete this survey, your name will be placed in a drawing to win a Palm or Sony Clie Personal Data Assistant (PDA) once your survey has been completed. You will also receive a summary of the research results.

Thank you for your help with this important research. If you have any questions concerning this project or difficulties taking the survey, please feel free to contact me at mwhitman@discoverycounsel.com or by telephone at 360.676.9535, ext. 1. You are also welcome to contact the Director of Research at Seattle Pacific University, Dr. Margaret Diddams, at 206.281.2174. Please do not hesitate to contact Dr. Carson Pue if you have any questions about Arrow Leadership Ministry's encouragement of this research: 604.576.5613 or carsonp@arrowleadership.org.
Sincerely,

Mitch Whitman, M.Ed.
Project Director
Appendix B

16PF – 5th Edition

The full Cattell 16PF – 5th Edition Questionnaire was not included in the online survey, but was previously administered to the ALP students and alumni and was available as part of the archival Arrow Leadership Ministries records. Due to copyright laws, a copy of this instrument was not placed in this appendix.
Appendix C

Clergy EMI Online Survey