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FINAL MODEL (X)
This chapter consists of three major sections: firstly, an account of the
development of the model; secondly, a detailed description of the model and
the ideal types it contains, including applying the model to analyse changes
in the 13 parishes and their use of ancillary buildings; and thirdly, a
discussion of the relationship of the model and the ideal types with
theoretical concepts, including previously identified types of leadership of
religious groups.

1. The Development of the Model

(a) The Preliminary Model
The primary aim of this research has been to develop a sociological model
which could explain some of the differences between local Church of England
churches. (1) From examination of the literature about existing models and
typologies we identified a number of criteria relevant to the proposed
model. (2)

These were:-

(i) A model was needed which illuminated the "church" end of the
"church-sect" model.
(ii) The fundamental defining feature of sectarianism is its
"separateness".
(iii) Clear criteria were needed for the model in order that it be
analytical and not just descriptive.
(iv) The model must be dynamic: that is, take account of changes
between types. The model should not, however, attempt to reflect any
fixed pattern of development for all local churches.

From consideration of the process of secularisation two further elements of the desired model were recognised. These were:-

(v) The variety of ways in which the tension between religious and secular values can be resolved. (3)

(vi) The four different options for the "serving" church: namely, losing distinctive form and ethic, retaining distinctive form and losing distinctive ethic, seeking to penetrate and transform the world, and keeping entirely apart from the world. (4)

Analysis of the postal survey produced three conclusions about the model to be developed. These were:-

(vii) There is no simple polarity between sacred and secular orientations of the life of the local church. (5)

(viii) The "outward" type of local church, one of the types investigated by analysis of the postal survey, is a coherent type. (6)

(ix) The typical New Town church is the converse of a "civic church". (7)

These nine factors were discussed and gathered together in Chapter Six. (8)

The preliminary model of local Church of England was thus constructed, with the four types of church: sectarian, missionising, civic and community.

Diagram 6:3 summarises this model. (9)
Diagram 6:3

A Preliminary Model of Church of England Churches

Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sacred orientated</th>
<th>Secular orientated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sectarian Church</strong></td>
<td><strong>Civic Church</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remains separated.</td>
<td>Conforms by accepting &quot;specialist&quot; religious role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps apart from the world.</td>
<td>Retains distinctive form but loses distinctive ethic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sacred orientated</th>
<th>Secular orientated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missionising Church</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community Church</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(&quot;Outward&quot; Church)</td>
<td>Conforms by becoming secular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tries to change the world.</td>
<td>Loses both distinctive form and distinctive ethic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Refinement of the Model

A major purpose of the interviews in the 13 parishes was to test the validity of the preliminary model and to look for ways in which it might be amended and refined.

To test the model each of the 13 parishes was allocated to one of the four boxes representing the four types contained within the model. This exercise immediately demonstrated that the model was too rigid. There were three reasons for this. Firstly, quite dissimilar parishes were being allocated to the same box: for example the conservative evangelical parish of Polton with a marked lack of weekday and community activity would be in the same box as West Kirby with its busy parish life and elaborate social responsibility activities. Secondly, some parishes seemed to be pretty much on the borderline between categories, and it was misleading to put them into any one box. Upper Bagley, for example, exhibited features of church life
associated with both the Missionising Church and the Sectarian Church.
Thirdly, most parishes appeared to have "moved between boxes" between the
time of the postal questionnaire and the interviews. All this indicated
that the model should be constructed without the four separate boxes into
which any one parish would need to be placed.

A further apparent inadequacy of the preliminary model was that there was no
way of showing which parishes in any box were closest to the ideal type
identified with the box. Osgarth was, for example, the closest to being of
the Community Church type and Fieldsend and Polton closest to the Sectarian
Church type. Some form of graduation from one type to another was,
therefore, necessary. Similarly there was no way of showing which parishes
were "run of the mill" or "average" kinds of parishes, in that they seemed
not to be especially close to any one of the four types, but equidistant
between them: East Ecton, with the conscious balancing of different
emphases, is the most obvious example of this. This indicated that the
model should allow for parishes to be plotted on the model in a way which
shows how near they are to any of the four types and also how close they are
to some "medial" position between the types.

In all of this it was also clear that plotting parishes on the model is an
exercise in comparing one parish with another. How close any parish is to
any of the ideal types is determined by how much more like that type it is
than other parishes. Thus all plotting on the model is a relative exercise.
The larger the sample of parishes being plotted at any one time, then the
less provisional would be the result. If all Church of England parishes
that existed were plotted onto the model relative to each other, then their
positions would have some absolute significance. This is, however, never
likely to be possible and so the model must be understood as a comparative model for the particular sample of parishes plotted onto it at any one time.

We have noted that the preliminary model was a two dimensional cross section of a three dimensional body: the axis which would be perpendicular to the page would show sacred and secular orientated activities increasing and decreasing together. (10)

These considerations all led to the construction of the model shown in diagram 10:2.
Diagram 10:2

A Model of Church of England Parishes

A predominance of SACRED ORIENTED ACTIVITIES

Sectarian Church

Civic Church

A predominance of SACRED ORIENTED PRIORITIES

Missionising Church

Community Church

A predominance of SECULAR ORIENTED PRIORITIES

(Inner circle: churches which are medial)

(Outer ring: churches of a more distinctive nature)

A predominance of SECULAR ORIENTED ACTIVITIES

Note: levels of sacred and secular orientated activity increase and decrease together along the axis perpendicular to the plane of the circles.
2. Description of the Model

(a) General Properties

The model in the Diagram 10:2 retains the two axes of sacred/secular orientation of activity and sacred/secular orientation of priorities. There is a given level of sacred orientation in all local Church of England churches: this relates not only to activities (all churches, for example, retain regular Sunday acts of worship) but to priorities (all churches, for example, retain basic Christian doctrines about God as revealed in Jesus at the heart of their self understanding). There are, however, wide variations of emphasis, and the poles shown by the arrows on the model represent tendencies for one emphasis to predominate over another: namely secular orientation over sacred orientation and vice versa.

At the mid-point between each pole comes one "ideal type" as described in sections (b) to (e) below. No local church, however distinctive in nature, will ever be a perfect example of any one of the four ideal types, although, as will be seen later, some may come very close.

The inner circle in the model indicates the general area within which "run of the mill", or "medial" local Anglican church will lie. The centre of the whole model is located by the theoretical medians along the two axes for the activity and priority scores of the entire population (in the statistical sampling sense of that word) of Church of England churches. The diameter of the inner circle is notionally located by the second and third quartiles of the scores for the same population.

The absence of any rigid boxes within the diagram makes it clear that there
is infinite graduation between any two points within the model. Thus the model attempts to describe various kinds of local church operations in contrast and comparison with each other, but does not attempt any kind of taxonomy so as to absolutely categorise any one local church.

The note and the inset in Diagram 10:2 point out that the drawing of the model is a cross-section of a three dimensional model which shows levels of sacred and secular orientation increasing or decreasing together along an axis perpendicular to the planes of the circles. Thus the two dimensional drawing allows representation of the balance between sacred and secular orientated activities but not their absolute levels, since these do tend to increase or decrease together.

(b) The Sectarian Church

This ideal type was briefly described in Chapter Six. (11) It is a church whose activities and priorities are predominantly sacred orientated. It promotes other-worldly directed activities such as a large range of religious services, prayer groups or Bible study meetings. The life of the church is almost exclusively about these sacred orientated activities. The activities also reflect the priorities which are held by church leaders and members, that religious matters are of such importance that other matters are of hardly any significance at all. This attitude was very apparent in Polton where the church determinedly pursued its policy of "teaching the faith", quite undiverted by social pressures in the community.

This concern for the sacred orientated means that the church will tend to separate itself off from its secular environment. Both its priorities and its activities will be quite different from other groups in the community.
In terms of the church-sect model, it is the most sectarian of the religious groups in the church side of the model.

Its membership will generally be associational. This is to say, people will belong to the church because they choose to belong, rather than because they just happen to live in the parish. Thus the church may well have an eclectic membership: people from outside of the parish are attracted by its style of worship or the distinctive nature of its teaching. This was very much the case in Fieldsend, whose churchwardens were proud of the way in which their church attracted people from a very wide area outside of the parish. Within the Church of England there are two principal types of Sectarian Church: Anglo-catholic and evangelical. These two types were clearly represented in the interview sample by Fieldsend and Polton respectively. The Anglo-catholic type emphasises sacramental worship, church order and traditional values and beliefs. Membership will be sharply defined in terms of those who have undergone the rites of baptism and confirmation and continue to attend public worship.

The evangelical type emphasises personal belief and personal morality: belief and values will again be defined in traditional terms, especially in terms of more literalist interpretations of the Bible. Membership will be clearly defined, not so much in terms of attendance at worship or submission to any ceremony, but by personal statements both about belief and about commitment to Christianity.

(c) The Missionising Church

This church has a similarly high level of commitment to sacred orientated priorities as does the Sectarian Church. Yet it also has a predominantly
secular orientated range of church activities. Programmes of social caring are undertaken because they are seen as good ways both to recruit new members and to promote Christian values in wider society. The "outward" parish, identified in the postal survey, shares characteristics with the Missionising Church. (12)

Like the Sectarian Church it will tend to have an associational membership: people will choose to join rather than being born into it. It will, however, maintain a much more extensive range of contacts with the wider community. These contacts will be seen both as potential members and as people who might give opportunities for promoting Christian values within the wider community.

Francis describes the Missionising Church very accurately as she writes about the "extension of pastoral care" as a way of penetrating the local community. (Francis (1986) p.20). Beasley-Murray and Wilkinson pointedly write of the Church accomplishing its primary objectives of increasing and strengthening the worshipping fellowship: "By acts of social service they perform, not only for the fellowship but also in the community, both local and widespread". (Beasley-Murray and Wilkinson (1981) p.66).

Potter captures the intent of the Missionising Church in the title of his article "By all possible means" in which he describes the way in which the church building can be used for community purposes and thus give the church the opportunity of influencing a wider range of individuals. (Potter (1980) p.2). Ballard also describes some church community work as "not far from evangelism in that it is a form of explicit witness". (Ballard (1986 p.39).
From these comments it is apparent that the missionising Church may be consciously using some community project either as a thinly disguised tool of direct proselytisation or as a more passive demonstration of Christian concern. The former type of activity puts the church towards the Sectarian Church edge of Missionising Churches, the latter puts it on the Community Church edge. Both are, however, examples of the activities of the missionising Church whose sacred orientated priorities motivate it to engage in secular orientated activities.

In the parish interviews the laity were more explicit than the clergy in their comments about meeting sacred orientated priorities through secular orientated activities. Several churchwardens said that they thought their church should attract more members by being involved in the life of the community by, for example, running special activity groups for children or for men. Some saw that the vicar, in particular, could recruit new members from amongst the wide range of contacts he made through his involvement in the secular life of the parish.

(d) The Community Church
This type of church is committed to secular orientated activity for the sake of that activity itself. Like all the ideal types within the model, it is unlikely to exist in its pure form. Even the most disinterestedly altruistic church running some social welfare project is likely to hope that it, the church, will benefit indirectly in some way. For example, Cattrill obviously enjoyed increased congregations as a result of community work with young families, although the purpose of the community work was not evangelistic. The Community Church's distinctiveness lies in its being
motivated to engage in secular orientated activities by its secular priorities.

In the case, for example, of establishing an open youth club, the Church's priorities might be to keep young people out of trouble with the police and provide something constructive for them to do. Its intention will not primarily be to show young people what a caring community the church is.

Membership of the Community Church will tend to be communal since the boundaries between the church and the wider community will be ill-defined: this was well illustrated in Osgartha where churchwardens praised the vicar for encouraging everyone to feel that they "belonged" in the church/parish community. The Community Church will probably minimise the importance of the precise beliefs of individuals and the significance of rites of initiation.

Carr describes this type of church as "placing itself at the disposal of the society in which it lives" (Carr (1985) p.10). He goes on to write:

"Under the guise of care or service such activity makes the church think of itself, and be thought of by others, as a welfare body".

(op.cit. p.25 - underlining mine).

Cryer produces an excellent description of a Community Church in Crawley New Town. In this church, members are involved in a whole range of community organisations at the expense of their supporting "more traditional" church activities. (Cryer (1967) p.6). One member is said to have felt "especially as a Marriage Guidance Counsellor, that it was in these front line jobs that local church folk were needed", (op.cit.)
(e) The Civic Church

This type of church is, at first glance, the most unlikely of the four types within the model. It is not immediately obvious why a church should be motivated by predominantly secular motives to promote predominantly sacred activities. Like the Community Church, the Civic Church seeks to respond disinterestedly to the needs of the community. Unlike the Community Church, it does this by organising acts of worship, especially for civic occasions (for example, Remembrance Sunday) and "folk religion" festivals (13) (for example, Harvest).

The membership of the Civic Church tends to be communal. The Civic Church is understood to "belong" to the community in much the same way as the Town Hall or Public Library. Membership is seen as related to physical residence within the parish, or within the town of which the Civic Church is the principal Parish Church.

Although there was no clear example of a Civic Church within the sample of the 13 parishes, some features of Civic Church life were apparent. In West Kirby, the incumbent spoke of a forthcoming Civic Service almost as though it were a project for the good of the district. Harvest festivals at Bourne Keaton, Scout and Guide services at Topley Parva and British Legion parades at Upper Bagley were all described in similar ways as meeting the needs of the secular community.

The roots of the Civic Church lie in former times when the church was more "basic" to the community than is now the case. These roots will be examined in more detail when we analyse the Civic Church in section 3(e) of this chapter.
In order both to test and to explore the usefulness of the model, the 13 parishes in which interviews took place were plotted on the model. The parishes were plotted according to their relative emphasis on sacred and secular priorities and activities. This was done by examination of the results of the interviews and the allocation of numerical scores based on the ranking of churches for sacred and secular priorities and activities. It must again be emphasised that plotting parishes on the model is a relative exercise: the position of each parish is entirely relative to the position of the other parishes.

The plot of the parishes on the model is shown in Diagram 10:3, and the following paragraphs describe the significance of the location of each parish on the diagram.
A predominance of SACRED ORIENTED ACTIVITIES

A predominance of SECULAR ORIENTED ACTIVITIES
Diagram 10:3 shows that a number of the churches tend towards particular types. Two churches (Fieldsend and Polton) are close to the sectarian type and one (Osgarth) is close to the community type.

Fieldsend and Polton were parishes which were very clear about their churchmanship traditions. As seen from the previous descriptions of the parishes, Polton was standing explicitly "against modern trends" both in church life and in the world. (15) The consistency between priorities and activities in these two parishes was quite clear: they were concerned almost exclusively with "religious" matters and confined their church activities to such.

Osgarth is the parish nearest to the Community Church ideal type. Whilst it had a good range of religious services, and certainly did not understand itself as a secular institution, it was a church deeply concerned about, and involved in, the life of the local community. For example, the vicar and lay members of the church put a lot of energy into the local carnival. This was not, it seemed, for any reason other than the importance of the event for building up the self esteem of the local community. It comes as no surprise to see Osgarth plotted close to the Community Church ideal type.

None of the 13 parishes comes particularly close to the Civic Church or Missionising Church ideal-types. Nearest to the Civic Church type is Topley Parva. This is a parish in which church activities were determined by community expectations rather than any clear policy by the church. In this they exhibit some characteristics of the Civic Church. It should be noted that not one of the churches in the sample of 13 parishes was a large town centre Parish Church. Such churches as these are the most obvious examples
of a Civic Church.

Two churches, Upper Bagley and South Wiston, fell into the Missionising Church quadrant of the model. South Wiston was moving towards operating as a Missionising Church: the desire to establish a youth club in order to gain access to young people was an example of this. (16) In Upper Bagley the incumbent tended to talk in sectarian terms about the prime importance of personal commitment. The churchwardens, however, spoke more about meeting the needs and expectations of the wider community. Thus, it is not surprising to find the parish located in the Missionising quadrant: that is, in between the Sectarian and Community quadrants.

It came as something of a surprise that Langby, with its high sacred priorities and a large amount of secular activity, did not appear closer to the Missionising Church ideal type on the model. It was a church in which sacred priorities were decidedly predominant and also had a number of social welfare projects. It may be that the incumbent's failing to mention his involvement in several areas of secular concern was quite significant. (17) It could be that the employment scheme and the vicar's involvement with local schools were peripheral to the life of the parish, and thus didn't influence the interview responses which determined the position of Langby on the model.

The other two churches which occupy distinctive positions when plotted on the model are Bridge Town and East Ecton. They are both very close to the centre of the circle and are, therefore, closest to being entirely medial.

Given the quite conscious effort by leaders in East Ecton to maintain a
balance between "praying" and "caring" this central position might be expected. (18)

Bridge Town's perception of themselves was recorded as: "Church with corporate leadership and blurred boundary between it and the wider community". (19) This suggests that it is a Community Church or a Civic Church, since both of these types are regarded as having the communal membership which the incumbent of Bridge Town seemed to be describing. Yet in the actual responses made during the interviews, the incumbent said "Nothing is absolutely vital except the Sunday Eucharist". This was said alongside comments about, for example, the importance of church buildings being well used by the community. There certainly was some preoccupation with leadership in the parish: the desirability of corporate leadership, with high lay involvement, was stressed several times. This was expressed in laity being involved in sacred orientated activities (for example, participation in worship and an "extended home communion group" (20)) as well as in secular orientated activities (for example, pastoral work and youth organisations).

Examination of what the incumbent and churchwardens actually said at the interviews, demonstrated that the position in which parish Bridge Town was plotted on the model was more accurate than my own immediate impressions. I had actually expected the parish to appear near the Community Church pole: this was largely because it was clearly "avant-garde". The plotting of the parish on the model came as a surprise, so I returned to reading the record of the responses made during the interview. These showed a parish in which sacred and secular emphases were held in balance. This, more than any other plotting of an individual parish, demonstrated to me the effectiveness of
the model as a "disclosure model", actually revealing something of which I
was not aware in an individual parish.

(g) Changes over Time

As has been said, a distinctive feature of this research has been the gap of
five years between the postal survey and the interviews. (21) A substantial
positive benefit derived from this has been the ability to look at changes
in the 13 parishes which took place over this period.

The original postal questionnaire was not drawn up with a view to parishes
being plotted on the model, since the model has only been developed
subsequent to the postal survey. It was, however, possible to categorise
the parishes according to some of the results of the postal questionnaire.
(22) This, in turn, made it possible to locate each of the parishes on the
model, as at 1981. (23)

Diagram 10:4 shows the directions in which the parishes appear to have moved
on the model between the time of the postal survey and at the time of the
interviews. It must be emphasised that the former positions are estimates
and that the only conclusions which may be drawn are about the likely
general direction of movement.

Of immediate note from Diagram 10:4 is the discovery that Fieldsend and
Polton do not seem to have moved at all. This is very much what might be
expected from parishes in which there are clear commitments to distinctive
traditions. Or, to put it another way, Sectarian Churches maintain their
fixed positions regardless of contemporary changes and influences.
A comparative plotting of the 13 Parishes showing direction of changes since the postal survey.
The apparent movements of Langby and South Wiston would have been expected. In both parishes clergy and laity spoke enthusiastically about renewals of church life having taken place as a result of study programmes. In Langby this was to do with developing a more rigorous membership policy: in South Wiston the programme concentrated on commitment of church members to one another. Both programmes moved the priorities of respective parishes in a sacred orientated direction, but had different effects on their activities. Langby became more sacred orientated with the long established employment scheme diminishing in significance. South Wiston became more secular orientated, as lay members wanted to have more contact with the secular community.

A major movement was indicated for Bridge Town: from a position in the Community Church quadrant to one at the centre of the model. The parish did seem to have moved from being a "Community Church" to the medial position. (24)

Upper Bagley had moved in a predictable way. A new incumbent had arrived just before the postal questionnaire was sent out and he had been urging a more sacred orientated policy on the parish: emphasising the "inner life" of the church and its members and making the parish more aware of its churchmanship position.

The incumbent of Osgarth had also been very new at the time of the postal questionnaire. In the interviews he spoke directly of being pre-occupied with putting right the internal affairs of the church during his early years in the parish before moving the church to meet the needs of the community in later years.
Comments have been made already about the change of emphasis from social welfare to the spiritual life in West Kirby. Thus the movement in this parish's position on the model, although not very great, was certainly in the expected direction.

The two parishes Bourne Keaton and Topley Parva both showed substantial movement. As has been said previously, there were discrepancies in each of these parishes between how the clergy and the laity saw the life of the church. (25) In one it was difficult to see how they could actually be talking about the same parish church! Both parishes were facing uncertainties in the future: one about buildings and the other about clergy staffing. Both parishes gave the impression of there being a general unhappiness about the state of the church life: feelings shared by clergy and laity. Finally, in both parishes, the incumbents were about to move. Since there was no consensus about church policies in either of these two parishes, the total life of neither parish developed in a coherent way. Thus the direction of movements on the model could not be attributed to developments in the lives of the parishes. Bourne Keaton and Topley Parva were also two of only three parishes in which there was no agreement between clergy and laity about changes in the parish and in church life during the past five years. (26)

It is important that the model is able to take account of the changes in the practices and policies of local churches. Understanding these changes is at the heart of understanding any single local church.

To summarise, there were four kinds of "movement" in the 13 parishes:
(i) Self conscious developments of church life arising out of considered policies.

(Langby, South Wiston, Osgartha)

(ii) Less consistent movements arising largely out of clergy initiatives.

(West Kirby, Upper Bagley)

(iii) Clear and determined lack of movement: that is, preserving a valued and distinctive position.

(Fieldsend, Polton)

(iv) Almost random movements resulting from a lack of agreed policies within the parish.

(Bourne Keaton, Topley Parva)

This ability of the model to take account of changes in parishes is important. The model actually enables the changes to be understood, and this is a valuable part of an analysis of the local church.

(h) Use of Ancillary Buildings

The data on the use of church halls was quite different from that arising from other questions. The way in which church halls were used was obviously affected by the kind of building the hall was, and indeed whether or not the church had a hall! Thus the data on the use of the church hall is used to construct a separate index. (27)
Diagram 10:5 shows this index plotted onto the model (only 12 parishes were plotted since Bridge Town didn't have a church hall or church rooms which could be made available for community use). The same rank scores for the orientation of priorities were used as in Diagram 10:3, but the Church Hall Index was used to plot orientation of activity.
A comparative plotting of 12 parishes, including plotting of parishes according to the use of ancillary premises

A predominance of SACRED ORIENTED ACTIVITIES

A predominance of SECULAR ORIENTED ACTIVITIES

The small circles show the positions of the parishes as determined by their use of their respective church halls or church meeting rooms.
From Diagram 10:5 it will be seen that eight of the 12 parishes (Osgarth, Cattrill, Chalton, Polton, Fieldsend, Upper Bagley, East Ecton and South Wiston) are in fairly similar positions to the original plotting. Given the external constraints on the use of church halls (namely the nature of building, the level of secular community activity and availability of other premises in locality), it is significant that only four parishes were plotted in very different parts of the diagram. The priorities of West Kirby as has been said, had become more sacred orientated. The extensive use of church premises by secular groups is a result of the earlier phase of the church's life in the parish, namely the major emphasis on "social welfare" to which two church halls had been almost exclusively devoted. Thus the "church hall position" on the model was determined by policies initiated in about 1978, and which have subsequently changed.

Langby had also undergone a major development of its pattern of church life through its commitment to a rigorous membership policy. Again, however, obligations to secular groups regarding the use of church premises had been acquired during the previous stage of development of the church's life. For Langby, and to a lesser extent West Kirby, the direction of movement from 1981 to 1986 is similar to the relationship of the "church hall position" to the final position of the parish on the model.

Bourne Keaton and Topley Parva were the most difficult parishes to understand in terms of the model due to a lack of agreement between the priorities and aspirations of the clergy and those of the laity. There was no apparent reason for the "church hall position" on the model to be different from the position of these parishes in Diagram 10:3. What this again demonstrates is the lack of coherent policy in these two parishes.
Positions for church life in general and for the use of the church hall can be meaningfully plotted, but it is difficult to understand the reason for the different positions on the two plots.

Although plotting of parishes on the model using the "church hall" index did produce a different pattern of positions, the similarities were more noticeable than the differences: especially since the latter had clear explanations. This encourages the view that the model, as proposed, is a useful tool: it makes clear what is happening within Church of England parishes. Furthermore, the model is helpful in analysing one aspect of church life, use of buildings, against the more general pattern of the activities and priorities. The general conclusion about the use of premises was that it was a conservative and reactionary factor in the life of the local church. It is a commonplace perception by church leaders that any proposal to alter the decor, furnishings or use of a church building tends to meet with local opposition. Church buildings are perceived as "holy", that is, set apart for special use, and not, therefore, to be interfered with. There is also a more mundane aspect to conservatism about the use of buildings: namely, the use of buildings seems to lag behind other features of church life. How the church halls were used was determined by policies pursued in the parishes four or five years ago, as much as by current policies. It is expected that this phenomenon would be even more apparent when it comes to the use of the church building itself.

Plotting parishes on the model in relation to particular aspects of church life is valuable in two respects. Firstly, the plotting of a number of parishes can help understand the particular aspect of church life in question. This is illustrated here by the conclusion that the use of church
halls lags behind developments in parish policy. Secondly, the plotting can help analyse what is happening in a particular parish by highlighting the consistency, or otherwise, between the particular aspect and the overall life of the church. A number of aspects of church life could be considered in this way: for example, the time commitments of church members, church finance, Parochial Church Council agendas and church publications. (28)

(i) The Facility of the Model

We have now seen five features of the model which facilitate the analysis of the local church:

I) It is a comprehensive model based on an analysis of those factors which contribute to the differences between parishes. These factors are the sacred and secular orientation of both priorities and activities.

II) It is a model onto which parishes can be plotted relative to each other. This enables the distinctiveness of any one parish to be more clearly understood.

III) It is a model which illuminates the changes which have taken place in the local church over a period of time.

IV) It is a model which provides a means of comparing one feature of a local church with the total life of that church. Thus it allows investigation into the constituency of the local church.

V) It is a model which makes it possible to investigate one feature of church life across a number of parishes. This means that general conclusions can be drawn about these features.
3. The Model in Relation to Theoretical Concepts

In this section the model is examined in the light of sociological theory. Particular reference will be made to the theories of Weber and Durkheim, and to the way in which the process of secularisation has its effect on the ideal types contained within the model.

Firstly, we will consider the model as a whole. Then we shall look at the four ideal types, one by one. Then leadership types are related to the model.

(a) The Whole Model

(i) Correspondence with Weberian analysis
The point has been made that Weber saw the religious group responding in different ways to the tension between its ethic and that of secular society.

This analysis finds a more complete expression in Mehl's distinction between the four possible responses of the religious group to its secular environment:

- Keeping entirely apart from the world
- Seeking to penetrate and transform the world
- Retaining its distinctive form but losing its distinctive ethic
- Losing both its distinctive form and its distinctive ethic.

Mehl incorporates some of the features of Weber's distinction between mysticism (being resigned to conditions of the world) and asceticism (overcoming the conditions of the world); each of these modes being possible in "inner worldly" (within this world) or "other-worldly" ways. We have compared our ideal types of Church of England church with Mehl's
analysis as follows:

Sectarian Church - keeps apart from the world.
Missionising Church - seeks to penetrate the world.
Civic Church - retains distinctive form but not ethic.
Community Church - loses distinctive form and ethic. (33)

Because of the influence of Weberian analysis in the development of the model we shall note the ways in which the ideal types exhibit features of Weber's notion mysticism and asceticism. (34) Before doing that, however, we must comment on two dangers of Weberian analysis and on how these dangers are avoided in this study. Firstly, Weber tends to "hypostatize motives", almost imputing a separate metaphysical existence to motives. (35) Secondly, as Weber splits types successively into two further types, he tends to produce a whole series of separate and unrelated types. The model proposed here counters the first weakness of Weberian analysis by never dealing with motives, in our case priorities, without linking them with some mode of action. By using "priorities" our model refers to choices made by individuals in local churches between different activities which they might regard as important. We are not postulating some independently existing state of consciousness within the local church, but referring to choices about priorities.

The second weakness of Weber's analysis is to produce a fragmented list of types which are always defined over against each other. This is avoided by the very structure of the model. The continuum which exists within the model between one point and any other point means that the model is one coherent whole. No parish may be an exact example of any ideal type, by
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definition of the nature of an ideal type. Thus any parish plotted on the model will have some elements of all four types within its life: its nearness to any ideal type being determined by the predominance of certain features within its life. Hence we avoid splitting off one from another, the defect of Weberian analysis which leads to a chaos of multiplicity of types rather than an coherent total picture.

(ii) Role of the Church within wider society

Durkheim looks at the way in which the religious group unites people into "a moral community" (Durkheim (1976 edn..) p.47). This contrasts with Weber's concern with religion as a vehicle of man's search for meaning. (36) Our model relates to Durkheimian concerns for the function of the religious group in society. This will be most clearly seen in the discussion of the Civic Church. (37)

A major strand running through this thesis is the way in which secularisation has tended to isolate religion from other affairs. (38) This provides the agenda for the local church as it determines how it relates to the wider community. This has implications for whether or not the church attempts to unify the community in the way described by Durkheim. With the exception of the Community Church, each of the ideal types within the model succumbs to the secular expectation that the church is a specialist religious institution, but in different ways. These are summarised in the following paragraphs, prior to more extended discussion of each type in section (b) below.

The Sectarian Church metaphorically closes its door on the secular world. Thus it abrogates any responsibility towards society as a whole. It is
deeply concerned with the beliefs, morals and sense of belonging of its own members. Although it might wish that all others shared their beliefs and moral values, in the end it sees itself, distinct from and neither responsible for, nor responsible to, secular society.

The Missionising Church has a similar ethos, except that it engages vigorously with the world in order to try to change it. It doesn't see itself as having to serve as the unifying agent within society, but it does attempt to transform the world. It does this by trying to increase its own membership: a task which is never completed until the whole human race is recruited/evangelised! It also tries to persuade the secular world to adopt the church's values.

The Civic Church accepts the role of unifying society by placing its religious services at the disposal of society. It encourages the secular society to express its corporateness through religious ceremonies. It is concerned with secular matters, but only acts towards the secular through religious practices, and, in this respect, accepts the role of the specialist religious institution.

The Community Church resists assuming the role of the specialist religious institution. It is concerned with everything with which the secular world is concerned. Its true function is expressed just as much when running a playgroup or organising a residents' association as it is during Sunday worship. Whereas the Missionising Church attempts to unify society by "exporting" religious values, the Community Church does so by "importing" secular values. (39) Similarly, whereas the Civic Church attempt to unify society through religious ceremony, the Community Church does this through
secular activities.

(iii) The Axis of Passive and Active Responses

Weber's analysis of religious groups relies heavily on his distinction between asceticism and mysticism. (40) Part of the distinction between these two types of religious response is between active and passive reactions to the tension between the secular ethic and the religious ethic. The Ideal types of our model of the local church will, where appropriate, be compared to types proposed by Weber. (41) An overall matching of Weber's analysis with the model is not possible because of the fragmented nature of Weber's analysis, as mentioned above. (42) The active/passive dimension of the church's response to the world does, however, relate to Weber's analysis and can be explored in relation to the model.

As the different types of local church have been considered, attention has been paid to how each responds to the pressures of secularisation. (43) There is, however, a more general aspect of the local church's response to the secular world, which is to do with how passive or active the church is.

The Missionising Church is unambiguously active. It takes its concerns out into the world in order to win members and to promote the Church's views. The Civic Church is passive: It waits for the world to make its secular demands and responds in the sacred orientated way that the world expects. We noted this "reactive" feature of the life of the Civic Church, in our earlier discussion. (44)

The Sectarian and Community Churches both have attitudes which display both passive and active characteristics. The Sectarian Church is "active" in
that it does not passively accept any secular priorities or promote secular activities. Yet it passively accepts a role which separates it out from the rest of society. It is, if anything, rather more passive than active.

The Community Church passively engages in secular activities, often seeming to mimic secular welfare and community organisations. Yet it actively resists the role of a specialist religious institution, and its community and political involvements will often bring it into conflict with secular authorities. On balance, it is more active than passive.

From this we locate the active/passive axis on the model of the local church as shown in Diagram 10:6.

The location of the active/passive axis on the model is a matter of judgment. It does, however, help to describe the kind of response which each ideal type of church makes to the secular world.

(b) Examination of the Ideal Types of the Local Church

(1) The Sectarian Church

There is an ambiguity in the very designation "Sectarian Church", since "church" and "sect" refer to different kinds of religious organisation. The Sectarian Church is that church which is most like a sect, that is most separate from its secular environment and pursues predominantly sacred activities, because of its predominantly sacred priorities. (45) This represents a clear way in which the church responds to what was called the "new situation" at the conclusion of our discussion on secularisation. (46) This "new situation" is of religion being a separate category of human life,
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rather than bound up with all other aspects of life. In this sense, the Sectarian Church is very much the result of secularisation. If secularisation had not separated the religious institution, then sectarianism would not have been possible within the church. The Sectarian Church accepts separateness in theory and in practice: the "theory" is that priorities are sacred orientated and the "practice" is that activities are sacred orientated.

This resignation to religion being separated-out means that the Sectarian Church tends toward mysticism in Weber's analysis. (47) (48) Its mysticism is "other-worldly" in Weber's terms, since the Sectarian Church dissociates itself from its contemporary context.

Troeltsch makes the point that the sect and the church differ in their attitude towards the supernatural. The sect involves its members directly in the supernatural, whereas the church prepares its members for a future encounter with the supernatural. (Troeltsch (1981 edn.) p.331). This immediacy of the supernatural is reflected in the life of the Sectarian Church. The more catholic Sectarian Church emphasises the sacraments as direct contact of the worshipper with the supernatural. The more evangelical Sectarian Church emphasises the direct way in which God reveals himself in scripture and, is immediately available as companion and guide to each individual believer. The most dramatic form of this immediacy of God's presence is to be found amongst charismatic churches which place enormous emphasis on direct experience of the presence of God the Holy Spirit.

In Durkheimian terms the Sectarian Church tends towards being a "negative cult" (Durkheim (1976 edn.) p.308). In the "negative cult" sacred
things are separated out from profane things and members avoid the profane world in order to be closer to the sacred world (op-cit. p.326). An example of this was seen in how Polton avoided the use of contemporary language by using older orders of service. Sunday worship was thus separated from everyday life by the use of ancient language.

The two kinds of Sectarian Church within the Church of England, catholic and evangelical, both trace some of their origins to 19th century movements. The evangelical revival and the Tractarian Movement were, in part, two responses in the Church of England to the pressures of industrialisation. (49) In more recent times the Sectarian Church has evolved as a response to the processes of secularisation and metropolisation. (50)

Not only is religion separated out by secularisation, metropolisation creates an environment which is often hostile to the religious institution. (51) The church may respond by emphasising its own ethic and practices. For example, the Sectarian Church uses more distinctively "religious" language than other parts of the church. (52) The point is sometimes reached where religious language, as distinct from technical theological language, becomes quite incomprehensible to those outside the fellowship. (53)

The Sectarian Church is, therefore a response to the modern secularised situation, which emphasises, at all points, the difference between the Church and the rest of the world. Representatives of Sectarian Churches would claim to be successfully resisting secular influences: Ironically, their type of church is a direct result of secular influences. In that it accepts the role of a distinctive religious group concerned with religious
things, it succumbs more than any other type of church to the influence of the modern world.

(ii) The Missionising Church

The response of this type of church to the modern world is both compliant and resistant at the same time. In that the Missionising Church has predominantly sacred orientated priorities, it confines its concerns to religious affairs as determined by the process of secularisation. Yet its activities are directed at the secular world. It seeks to convert and change the world.

In Weberian terms its response is ascetic rather than mystical. The Missionising Church approximates to what Weber called "inner-world asceticism" (Weber (1964 edn.) p.166).

A number of writers have identified a type of religious group which approximates to the Missionising Church. The relationship between Christianity and the contemporary world which Niebuhr describes as "Christ the Transformer of Culture" shows similarities with the Missionising Church (Niebuhr (1956) pp. 190-229). (54) The Missionising Church has, however, a rather more negative attitude towards the secular world. The world is not particularly to be transformed by somehow becoming a better place in its own terms. The world is to be used as a place in which the Missionising Church can extend its influence.

Carr distinguishes between the "mission of the church" and the "service of the world" (Carr (1985) p.9). The Missionising Church is concerned with the former. Its priorities are sacred orientated, and so it is not concerned
with serving on the world's terms. Yet its activities are secular orientated, so it is concerned with serving the world, but on the church's terms.

When changes in the 13 parishes were plotted on the model (Diagram 10:4) four parishes moved in the general direction of the Missionising Church (Upper Bagley, South Wiston, Chalton and Cattrill). Upper Bagley and South Wiston markedly so. Upper Bagley was moving towards becoming a Missionising Church out of an unhappy past: it wanted to be more successful by recruiting more members. South Wiston had moved towards becoming a Missionising Church out of a successful situation. It now felt strong enough and confident enough to address the world.

Upper Bagley and South Wiston represent two reasons for responding to the processes of the modern world by becoming a Missionising Church. As irreligiosity increases (55) some churches will be reduced in strength. Their response to this might well be to recruit more members, or at least try! One way of doing this is to engage in secular orientated activities, this puts the church in touch with new people who might then become members.

The strong suburban church will have quite different reasons to address the secular world. Having accomplished its task of maintaining itself, it seeks to influence its social environment. Social welfare activities are an obvious way for a church to do this. Rather than extending its membership, it is extending its ethic. Thus again sacred priorities lead to secular activities.
There is a contrast between the Sectarian Church which affirms its separate identity by remaining separate, and the Missionising Church which affirms its identity by using secular activities to extend the church's membership and influence.

(iii) The Community Church

This is the type of church about which there is perhaps least to say. It responds to the secularising process by rejecting the exclusively religious role. It seeks to meet the world on the world's terms, and to retain the integration of the religious group with the rest of society.

In Weber's terms it travels along the road of "universal brotherly love". (Weber (1964 edn.) p. 212) It retains its identity as a religious group by emphasising the connection between its religious beliefs and contemporary humanitarian values. In Niebuhr's analysis this is acknowledging the "Christ of Culture" (Niebuhr (1956) pp. 83-115).

The anonymous pluralistic society created by metropolisation provides the causes which the Community Church seeks to address. The secular orientated priorities of the Community Church are the physical, social and emotional needs of groups and of individuals in modern society.

A vivid example of a local church understanding itself in Durkheimian terms was contained within the small sample of 13 parishes. Osgarth, the nearest to the ideal type of Community Church, put much energy into building up the self confidence of the local community. The sense of identity of the community was being severely undermined by the old township of the parish
being divided between three local authority areas. The Church of England parish was the only geographical unit which covered the whole area. The incumbent, in particular, saw the necessity of the church taking a lead in trying to restore the sense of belonging to one community.

The Community Church is easily seen as a church which is simply accepting secular values and succumbing to these worldly influences. Yet the Community Church is the church which is most resistant to secularising pressures to be confined to religious activities, and most likely to be in conflict with secular authorities about different aspects of community life.

(iv) The Civic Church
The idea that a church is pursuing sacred activities because of having secular orientated priorities might well be regarded as offensive by the believer. Christianity is most usually regarded as having to do with motives, priorities and beliefs, and religious observance springs out of these. To be organising a religious ceremony for secular reasons could be perceived as hypocrisy! Yet this is how the Civic Church strives to meet the needs of the community. It is also an important part of religious practice in any society in which religion has been "established" as part of the undergirding of society. (56)
Weber sees this kind of religious group as tending to be ritualistic or legalistic. An ethical religion would experience too much tension between its ideals and those of the secular world, to function as a Civic Church. (57) Since Weber is so concerned with the tension between the ethic of the church and the ethic of wider society, neither the Civic Church nor the Community Church are easily accommodated within his analysis. Hence Mehl's analysis is used as the immediate reference for our model. (58)

The ideal type of the Civic Church fits much more easily into Durkheim's analysis. He draws attention to the positive cult. (59) This is a religion which regards secular matters as positive. Religious rites and ceremonies are seen as promoting mundane concerns: such as ensuring a good harvest. Hence, in modern society, an annual Civic Service might take place to affirm the importance of the secular authority (local council) and even to pray for their success in meeting the needs of their electorate.

Today's Civic Church has its roots in 19th century society. (60) Geddes developed a model of the Civic Church within the "City". This is reproduced, for the sake of illustration rather than analysis, as Diagram 10:7.
The Civic Church in Geddes' "City"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOWN</th>
<th>FOLK</th>
<th>POLITY</th>
<th>CITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLACE</td>
<td>WORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURVEY</td>
<td>KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td></td>
<td>ART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td>MORALS</td>
<td>IDEAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>CLOISTER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Geddes (1906) in Meller (1979) p.154)

The Civic Church, in Geddes' model is not confined to one quarter of "the Cloister". So pervasive is religion that it spills out into the rest of the model. A few years earlier Barnet wrote of "the cathedral brooding over the city, gathering together, as it were, its various interests, its manifold activities...." (Barnet (1894) p.9).

The ideal type of the Civic Church has its immediate historical origins in concepts such as those of Geddes and Barnet. There is a real question now
about the future of the Civic Church. Williams describes the "public superstructure" of the Civic Church as "vestigal Christianity" (Williams (1985) p.17). Williams is primarily concerned with the Civic Church at a national level, but the parallels with the local Civic Church are obvious, especially at times such as Remembrance Sunday when local churches the length and breadth of the country mimic national ceremonies.

In the discussion of the Church in the New Town we noted the way in which features of the Civic Church were absent in New Towns. (61) It seems that the existence of the Civic Church is dependent on traditions from the past. These traditions have been built up before the religious institution was separated out from the rest of society. The tradition may well not develop to any significant extent in the modern secularised world. New Towns will provide a good context in which to investigate this in a few generation's time.

It might also be the level of collective consciousness in society, as much as anything specifically to do with religion, which will determine the future of the Civic Church. (62) If the sense of solidarity within a society weakens there will be less demand for ritual expression of solidarity in the Civic Church. This draws attention to the way in which the Civic Church is reactive to the wider community: it depends, more than any other church, on society "wanting" the sacred orientated activities which it has to offer. We saw this when we examined the passive/active axis of the model. (63)

(c) Church Leadership

The nature of the leadership exercised within any religious group is an
important feature of that group. Although this study is not primarily about leadership of religious groups in general, nor about the clergy in particular, both these subjects have been discussed. (64)

Four types of leaders were suggested earlier in this work. (65) These four types, derived from a combination of Weber's and Van Vleck's analyses, are:

I Priestly
II Exemplary
III Prophetic
IV Democratic

These ideal types of leadership of religious groups relate very clearly to the ideal types of local church in the model devised in this study.

The priestly leader is one who stands between the sacred and the profane. His role is, through religious ceremony, to bring blessing upon the secular world. This is the function of the religious leader in the Civic Church. As the Civic Church uses sacred orientated activity to accomplish secular orientated priorities, so its leader performs rituals on behalf of the whole secular community. In discussion of the Civic Church, we noted Weber's comment about this religious group tending to be ritualistic. (66) Leading ritual on behalf of the whole community is the primary function of the priestly leader of the Civic Church.

The exemplary leader is one who leads by example. He leads "elitist movements of those who achieve superior status" and leaves "others in a state of dubious belongingness, apart from the belongingness they derive
from their secular status". - this is how Weber sees the exemplary leader and his followers. (67) Weber is looking at a broad range of religions and religious groups, so the "exemplary" leader, in his terms, is somewhat different from any ordinary Church of England vicar. The distinctiveness of the type is, however, similar to the leader of the Sectarian Church. This is the most elitist and separatist of the types in our model. The exemplary leader of the Sectarian Church is concerned about the members of his church. He is concerned for their purity of beliefs, morals and religious practice. He expresses that concern through the purity of his own beliefs, morals and religious practice: Or, to put it another way, by his example.

The **prophetic leader** is one whose prime concern is to promote the truth as he apprehends it. This is clearly the function of the leader in the Missionising Church. Not only is the message to be proclaimed to the faithful, it is to be proclaimed by word and deed to all people: and proclaiming by "deed" is at the centre of the concept of the Missionising Church. (68) The prophetic leader is concerned with preaching and demonstrating the Gospel in, through and beyond the Missionising Church which he leads.

The **democratic leader** is one who seeks to hold together and express the consensus of all the members of the religious group. Outside the Church of England a most separatist and elitist sectarian group could have a democratic form of church organisation. Yet this may still result in an entirely undemocratic leadership being exercised by the one who implements the democratic decisions. Within the Church of England, democratic leadership is implicit in the Community Church. If the local church is committed to responding to the expressed needs of its local community, how
much more must the leader of that church be committed to responding to the expressed wishes of its members? Since neither sacred priorities nor sacred activities play determining parts in the life of the Community Church, there can hardly be anything "sacred" about its leadership. The democratic leader derives his authority, not from his ritual role like the priestly leader, nor from his special grasp of the revealed truth like the prophetic leader, but from the consent of those whom he leads. His authority being so mundane, the democratic leader is the most secular of leaders of religious groups.

These types of leadership are thus plotted onto the model of the local church as shown in Diagram 10:8.

Since the data collection of this research was not designed to test out models of religious leadership, the leadership of the clergy of the 13 parishes cannot be specifically plotted onto the model. Further research, gathering more detailed data directly about perceptions of the leadership roles of the clergy, would be needed to use the model to analyse leadership of specific local churches. In the course of the interviews, however, some features of different types of leadership were observed in the behaviour of the clergy in the 13 parishes.

The Incumbent of Polton was an exemplary leader: his own personal devotion and study of the Bible was at the heart of his leadership role. Typically of the exemplary leader, he seemed none too anxious about organisation or even the numerical success of the local church. If he was faithful to his calling, it was for others to decide for themselves if they would follow.
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The nearest to a clear example of a prophetic leader was the Incumbent of Upper Bagley. He was concerned to proclaim the truth as he saw it, and to proclaim it to the wider community in the expectation that some would respond. There was little evidence of his acting out his preaching in signal programmes of social welfare, but, as shown in Diagram 10:3, Upper Bagley is towards the sacred edge of the Missionising Church, where secular orientated activity is less prominent.

Although a number of the more catholic of the clergy of the 13 parishes would have described their role as "priestly", none were very close to the priestly ideal type. This is illustrated by the fact that none of them spoke of their representative role in relationship to the wider community. Since there was no clear example of a church approaching the Civic Church ideal-type, this is what we would expect.

Since Osgarth was a church close to the Community Church type, the Incumbent of that parish could be expected to be a leader of the democratic type. The churchwardens did comment on the way in which he included everyone in the life of the church and its decision making. Yet he was still a strong leader whose own personal perceptions determined the direction of parish policies. In this regard he exhibited traits of the prophetic leader. In as far as he saw his personal role as key to the life of the wider community, he showed something of the characteristics of the priestly leader. His churchwardens saw his major areas of influence as "Keeping contact with other Institutions and groups" and "Meeting the needs of the parish in general", whereas he saw his own influence as "Meeting the needs of the parish in general" and "Public worship". (69) This seems to show the churchwardens as regarding him as a democratic leader, but he seeing himself
as a priestly leader.

We must recall what we discovered about the role of clergy in general in Church of England parishes: namely, that their predispositions and priorities dominate the local church. Since this is the case, we wouldn't expect to find any very good example of the democratic leader. The incumbent of Bridge Town thought of himself in these terms, in that he emphasised lay leadership so greatly. His responses to the question about his major area of influence were, however, entirely unspecific. His churchwardens cited "Public worship" and "Finance and Fundraising" as his areas of greatest influence. So there was little in these responses to indicate that he was a democratic leader.

There is no conclusive data from this research about individual clergy matching ideal types of leadership roles: to repeat, the research was not set up to investigate this. The above discussion does, however illustrate how the four types of leadership relate to the model of the local church.

At a theoretical level, there is not necessarily a precise match between exemplary, priestly, democratic and prophetic leadership and sectarian, civic, missionising and community churches respectively. Just as church types merge across the model, leadership types also merge, and, for example, a church very close to the community church ideal type might have a clergyman whose leadership tended towards the prophetic type. A strength of this model is, however, that it provides a theoretical schema relating ideal types of leadership with ideal types of churches. It is thus possible to investigate the styles of leadership of the clergy in particular parishes, comparing these styles with the overall life of the respective local
churches. This illustrates the power of the model in general, to show what is happening in particular local churches against the background of sociological theory of religion.
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49. In Chapter II, section 3(e) (page 33) some elements of 18th and 19th century England non-conformity were mentioned. The possibility of sectarianism within the church is clearly seen in Methodism, which was a movement within the Church of England before establishing its identity as a separate denomination.

50. See Chapter III, section 2(b). (page 53 et seq.)

51. See Chapter III, section 2(b). (page 53)

52. See Fenn (1982) p.97ff, in which he describes religious language as distinct from secular language.

53. Expressions such as "slain by the Spirit" (meaning fainting during a particularly emotional religious service), or "I have it in my heart" (meaning "I think") or "the burden is laid on me" (meaning "I believe God is telling me this") are becoming the commonplace language within some Sectarian Churches.
54. See Chapter II, section 2(e). (page 21)
55. See Chapter III, section 3(a). (page 57)
56. Metz sees this dissociation of theory and practice in the life of the contemporary church in Germany. He regards the real role of religion in modern Germany as supporting the political and economic status quo. "Messianic" religious ideals are replaced by "bourgeois" priorities which then become the real reasons for religious activities. (Metz (1981) pp.1-17).
57. See Weber (1964 edn.) p.207.
58. See Section 1(a) of this chapter. (page 281)
60. The development of the Civic Church is associated with urbanisation. The Civic Church was a focus of identity of the town in the same way that the parish church had been a focus for the village.
61. See Chapter VII, section 6(a). (page 192)
63. See Section 3(a)(iii) of this chapter. (page 313)
64. A typology of leadership of religious groups was suggested in Chapter II, section 4. (page 38) The role of the clergy was considered, at rather greater length in Chapter VIII. (page 199 et seq. esp. page 222)
65. Chapter II, section 4. (page 38)
68. In the Judeo-Christian tradition the prophet has often been seen as one who acts out his prophecies in dramatic form.
69. These were the responses to question Q6 on the interview schedule - see Appendix II, section 1(c)(I). (page AII-4)
1. The Aim of the Research

The principal aim of this research has been to discover a conceptual framework which would analyse differences between local Church of England churches. During the progress of the research it has become increasingly clear that it is the effect of secularisation which defines the policy options for the local church in the modern world. The type of membership, the style of leadership and the church’s relationship to its social environment are all bound together in how the church deals with the pressure to be a specialist religious institution. The policies of the local church which emerge from resolving this are made up of theory (the priorities of the church) and practice (the activities of the church).

The model developed in this study holds these together in one framework against which fundamental differences between parishes can be analysed. The model is derived from theoretical discussion of the range of models and typologies of religious groups and of the process of secularisation. Yet the model has also been developed and refined by the results of analysis of data from both the postal survey and the selected interviews. It is a model resting on both theoretical and empirical foundations.

2. Applications of the Model

The process of developing and applying the model has brought some surprises. The most significant has been the way in which information from the 13 parishes led to the refinement of the model, which, in turn, has brought
clearer insights into these same parishes. The most spectacular example of
this was the case of Bridge Town, where my own misconceptions about the
parish were shown up by the position in which this parish was located on the
model. (1)

An unexpectedly useful property of the model is its application in analysing
particular features of church life. The original intention in plotting the
use of ancillary buildings and the changes over the past five years in the
parishes, was to check the accuracy of the model. What I discovered was
that the model helped me to understand these two features of the parishes.
Plotting the use of ancillary buildings demonstrated how the consistency of
the policies of a particular parish could be examined and how one feature of
church life could be looked at over a number of parishes. (2) At that point
in the research I had to discipline myself not to be diverted into exploring
how such matters as 'Parochial Church Council agendas, the expenditure of
money, the content of church magazines and even the content of clergy
sermons might also be plotted onto the model.

It was also exciting to discover that the typology of leadership of
religious groups, derived from the work of Weber and Van Vleck related so
closely to the model. (3) (4) This was reinforced when I realised that
looking at some of the clergy from the 13 parishes, in the light of their
parish's position on the model, made it possible for me to interpret their
roles as church leaders. The Incumbent of Polton had, for example, seemed
something of an enigma when he was interviewed. His apparent indifference
to either the success of his church, or the social and community pressures
within the parish, was difficult to reconcile with his seemingly sensitive
and conscientious personality. It was seeing him as an Exemplary leader,
which suddenly brought the whole interview impression into focus. (5)

3. The subsidiary areas of investigation

What developed as subsidiary areas of inquiry within the research contained more interest than I had originally expected.

(a) The Distinctive New Town Church

It came as no surprise to discover that church life in New Towns was quite distinctive, even in comparison with church life in other areas of new housing. My experience of working as a clergyman in a New Town had already led me to think that New Towns are quite different from other places. (6) I had, however, expected that the "tabula rasa" situation in the New Towns would have led to church activities being much more consistent with clergy and lay priorities than in other places. (7) That the opposite is true seems to happen because clergy bring their priorities with them into a New Town, rather than developing priorities relating specifically to New Town needs. They then find that just keeping the church going actually requires all their energies, so their abstract priorities remain unfulfilled. This also seemed to explain the lower levels of both sacred and secular orientated activity in New Town churches. (8)

An important insight into New Town church life was the discovery that New Town churches lacked so many of the features of the Civic Church. (9) This then raised the question as to whether or not the Civic Church is a form of church which will actually disappear over the next few generations. This may be a real possibility, especially since the Civic Church pattern is derived from the past, before secularisation had so clearly separated
religious institutions from the rest of society. (10)

(b) The predominant and Sacred Orientated clergy

It soon became apparent that a study of the role of the clergy might have formed the whole basis for this research. Given the substantial amount of previous work done on this subject, this would have been a less appropriate direction to follow. (11) Yet the conclusions about clergy form an important part of the findings of this study. The lack of agreement between clergy and laity about priorities for the local church was remarkable. (12) The principal conclusions about the role of clergy coincide exactly with those of Martin (13): clergy have become increasingly separated from secular affairs and increasingly preoccupied with running the local church.

That the clergy seem to dominate the life of the local church may cause dismay amongst those who have been committed to the development of lay leadership in the church. This has clear implications for the Church of England's policies for the development of effective lay leadership.

The predominance of sacred orientated priorities amongst the clergy (14) must mean that the clergy tend to lead the church in a sectarian direction. This impression is reinforced since preoccupation with his own devotional life is typical of the "exemplary" leader found in the Sectarian Church. (15)

(c) The church being well

If it had not been for the similar results from my previous research (16), I should have been very surprised by the discovery that such a large proportion of the parishes investigated claimed to have grown significantly
in church membership and attendance. (17) What emerged were the two principal factors behind this. These are the persistence of private religious belief and the need, met by the suburban church, for individuals to experience a sense of belonging to a community. These are the two aspects of the function of religion which, in this study, have been referred to as Weberian and Durkheimian emphases, respectively. (18)

4. Further Research

A number of avenues for further research have become apparent during the course of this study.

(a) Church members

The relationship between personal belief and a sense of belonging by church members, could form the basis of a survey of members of church congregations. This study has dealt only with leaders, clerical and lay, and not with the opinions of ordinary church-goers. Exploratory research picking up some of the concepts in this study and investigating several church congregations might be exciting and worthwhile.

(b) The future of the Civic Church

I have already suggested that the New Town provides an opportunity for investigating whether or not the Civic Church can develop in the contemporary situation. A comparison of the development of church life in New Towns of different ages, and over a period of time, would reveal whether the Civic Church was dependant upon patterns of relationship between the church and the local community having been laid down in the early parts of this century. (19) This might also show whether or not the Civic Church is
disappearing in modern Britain.

(c) Clergy and types
The development of patterns of leadership within local Church of England churches is another area for further research. The exemplary, priestly, democratic and prophetic types of leadership could be investigated more by empirical observations and survey. This study has provided a model against which this could be explored, and the conclusions of such a study might have considerable significance for the training and appointment of clergy.

5. Putting the Model to work
This model is, however, of much more immediate and practical use than just pointing the way to further research. The model, as it stands, can be used to investigate a deanery of 10 parishes or a diocese of 400 parishes. Different instruments for data collection would be needed for different sample sizes: an interview schedule might suit a deanery survey and a postal questionnaire would probably be required for a diocese. The basis of both of these instruments could be found in the data collection methods used in this study.

Nothing is more basic to the life of the local church than how it deals with living in two worlds, the sacred world of its religious values and activities and the secular world of its contemporary social environment. This model offers sociologists and church leaders alike, a way of comprehending how this tension is resolved in any group of local churches.
1. See Chapter X, section 2(f). (page 294)
2. See Chapter X, section 2(h). (page 303)
3. See Chapter II, section 4. (page 38 et seq.)
4. See Chapter X, section 3(c). (page 324)
5. See Chapter X, section 3(c). (page 327)
6. See Chapter VII, section 2. (page 182)
7. See Chapter VII, section 3. (page 184)
8. See Chapter VII, section 4. (page 190)
9. See Chapter VII, section 6(a). (page 192)
10. See Chapter X, section 3(b)(iv). (page 321)
11. See, for example, Russell (1980). Towler and Coxon (1979) and Towler (1969), all major pieces of work looking at the role of Anglican clergy.
12. See Chapter VIII, section 5. (page 212)
14. See Chapter VIII, section 2. (page 202)
15. See Chapter X, section 3(c). (page 325)
17. See Chapter IX, section 1(b). (page 238)
19. First generation New Towns, such as Harlow (designated in 1947), second generation New Towns, such as Skelmersdale (designated in 1961) and third generation New Towns, such as Telford (designated in 1967), could make interesting comparisons. This is because of the different length
of time which the communities and their churches have now been
developing and also because different assumptions about the role of the
church in the wider community were made at the different designation
dates.
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APPENDIX I

THE POSTAL SURVEY

1. Preliminaries

(a) Sample Selection The sample of parishes selected for investigation by postal questionnaire was required to include parishes within New Towns and parishes outside of New Towns. (1) Parishes were required to be urban, suburban or rural on the edge of urban developments. This was to avoid the inclusion of factors relating to isolated rural parishes, such matters being beyond the scope of the inquiry.

Second and third generation English New Towns (namely, those designated since 1960) were sought. Excluding expanded towns such as Northampton, the possible towns were Skelmersdale, Redditch, Runcorn, Washington, Milton Keynes and Telford. (2) Skelmersdale was eliminated because the radical restructuring of church organisation was felt to make sensible comparison with other areas impossible. Washington was eliminated because of its geographical remoteness and because of the distinctiveness of the socio-cultural situation in which it is set in the North East of England. This left the four New Towns of Runcorn, Telford, Redditch and Milton Keynes. Within these New Towns were parishes from the Deaneries of Frodsham, Telford Severn Gorge, Telford, Edgmond, Wrockwardine, Bromsgrove and Milton Keynes.

There were a number of factors, both practical and theoretical, governing the selection of parishes from non-New Town areas. The two major practical constraints were the likelihood of permission and support for the research from diocesan authorities, and the physical proximity of the parishes which would be necessary to make visits and interviews possible. The first theoretical constraint was comparability of the areas with the New Towns which had been chosen. The New Towns of Redditch and Telford were to yield the small sample of New Town parishes for interview. Thus non-New Town parishes from the West Midlands would be most comparable. The second theoretical constraint was that the non-New Town part of the sample contained both parishes with a large amount of post-1960 housing development and parishes with very little such housing.

These factors combined to lead to the decision to include in the sample all parishes from the deaneries in the Diocese of Lichfield which were part of the West Midlands conurbation and its immediate suburban fringes. These deaneries were as follows: Himley, Rugeley, Walsall, Wednesbury, West Bromwich and Wolverhampton.

Together this produced a sample of 144 parish units of which 60 were New Town parishes. Districts within Team Ministries were treated as separate parishes where they sustained a separate congregational life.

(b) The Pilot Survey It was judged necessary to carry out a pilot survey, prior to the full postal survey, in order to test and refine the questionnaire. Church of England churches in the town of Stafford were chosen for this purpose. This pilot sample contained parishes with a range of mixtures of old and new housing, and the Rural Dean of Stafford very readily gave his support and encouragement.

The seven incumbents of the churches involved were approached and dates for interviews arranged; all seven agreed to help. The interviews were carried out using the draft questionnaire as an interview schedule.

The questionnaire was based on that used in previous research in the
Dioceses of Ripon and Sheffield. (3) The major changes to that questionnaire were an enlargement of the range of questions; complete revision of the questions about clergy priorities (substituting a response scale for the previous unsatisfactory questions about ranking of priorities) and the inclusion of several new sections. Since these new sections had not been tested at all before, great attention was paid to how the interviewees responded and to the meaningfulness, or otherwise, of the data which was produced. The new sections contained questions on the following topics: the nature of the parish/church magazine; what donations were made by the parish to various charities; the use to which ancillary buildings such as church halls were put; the proportion of new housing in the parish; crude descriptions of the social make-up of the parish (e.g. "urban parish with large amount of new housing"); and details of the ecumenical activities in which the church was engaged.

The outcome of the pilot study was very helpful. All the interviewees proved very willing to respond to the questions: the only difficulty was that of terminating the interview, because of the clergy wanting to volunteer more information!

As a result of the pilot study, the section on parish magazines in the questionnaire was omitted since it produced answers which totally blurred the distinction between activities and priorities. The section on charitable donations was retained, with some revision. It clearly did pick up differences about the kinds of causes which churches supported, and not just information about how much 'spare money' they had. The questions about the use of church buildings were removed from the postal questionnaire; they required substantial re-statement and clarification by the interviewer and were clearly unsuitable for a postal questionnaire. They were subsequently revised and retained for the small sample interviews. Responses to the question about the type of area produced responses based on such a wide variety of premises that this section was also removed. Other questions in the questionnaire were modified, largely to remove ambiguities which had not previously been apparent.

Although not actually part of the pilot study, another helpful exercise carried out at about the same time were extended conversations with the three other rural deans responsible for the New Town parishes. (4) Their comments also helped in revising the questionnaire.

(c) Questionnaire design As will now be clear, the final form of the questionnaire resulted from taking the Ripon/Sheffield questionnaire (which had itself been piloted, revised and then used in that survey). (5) This was revised and enlarged, piloted and revised again producing the final questionnaire. (6) The elements of the questionnaire are described and commented upon below; the numbering used is that contained in the questionnaire itself.

A.1 A simple question asking when the respondent became responsible for the parish.

2, 3 & 4 Questions aim at identifying major changes which might affect changes in church strength between 1976 and 1980 (see questions F.1 to 4 below).

B.1, 2 & 3 Questions aim to elicit information about the number and frequency of a range of sacred orientated activities in which church members, as well as clergy, would be involved.

4, 5 & 6 Questions seek information about the extent of sacred orientated activities which the clergyman would undertake.
C. Scaled response questions about the priorities held by the clergy.

Items a, f, i, k, l and o are secular orientated priorities.
Items c, e, h, i, j, m and p are sacred orientated priorities.
Items b, d, g and n are neutral regarding secular/sacred orientation and are included in order to prevent the respondent from easily perceiving the other two types.

D. Aims at eliciting information about the range of secular orientated activities undertaken by the local church. The items specified in 1 to 10 are those which were most apparent from the Ripon/Sheffield research and from the wider range in the pilot questionnaire, plus some volunteered by interviewees in the pilot study. The distinction is made between 'church based' and 'church supported' activities in order to judge the level of reliance the activity has on church involvement.

11 & 12 Seek to discover the existence of relevant church committees and paid or voluntary officers.

E. Asks about donations made by churches to various charitable causes, and whether or not they are 'one off' or recur annually.

F. Seeks information about the numerical strength of the church in both 1976 and 1980.

1 The electoral role figure is one which parishes are required to record.

2 & 3 Likewise, parishes are required to record numbers of people receiving the Holy Communion at Easter and Christmas.

4. This 'estimate' was requested so that the number of people in church on a fairly ordinary Sunday might be judged. 'Spring' was chosen to make clear that distortions caused by bad weather, summer holidays and major festivals were to be avoided. Dioceses vary in their practice of requiring the week by week recording of attendance; although church registers provide a column for this to be entered. All clergy are, however, required to enter a figure similar to this on official returns, and would be most unlikely to enter the first number that came into their head!

G.1 A question of marginal use which simply allowed some picture of the urban, rural suburban spread of the sample to be obtained.

2 In the pilot study interviewees were found to take a good deal of trouble about judging what percentage of housing in the parish was post-1960.

Local authorities were consulted with a view to obtaining detailed information from them about housing age. The mis-match between civil and ecclesiastical boundaries, and the lack of uniform information from local authorities made it impossible to obtain the required information from them.
H.1 Requests information about the extent of ecumenical activity, lists possibilities in a clear hierarchy ranging from completely united churches to simple levels of co-operation.

2 Seeks to discover how important to the life of the local church such ecumenical co-operation is.
(d) The Questionnaire

Please note: The questions in all sections apply to the principal church in your parish or district, that is to say the parish church or the church with the largest number of names on its electoral roll.

Section A

1. When did you become incumbent, priest-in-charge, or team vicar? [ ]

2. Has there been any demolition or vacation or property resulting in a significant (see Note 1 below) decline in the population of the parish/district since 1st January 1976? [ ]

3. Has there been any building of new houses, or other residential development, resulting in a significant (see Note 1 below) increase in the population of the parish/district since 1st January 1976? [ ]

4. (a) Has the parish undergone any major scheme of pastoral re-organisation since 1st January 1976? (excluding such things as minor boundary adjustments) [ ]

(b) If "Yes" please give brief details

---

Note 1

"Significant" is to be taken to mean "such as might noticeably affect church membership or church attendance."
section 1

1. How many weekday services do you hold in Church each week? (Write in the number. E.g. Write 1 as 01 etc.)

2. Do you have any regular Bible Study Groups and/or separate Prayer Groups?

   If so, how many meet

   Please tick appropriate box (es)

   a) Weekly
   b) Fortnightly or three weekly
   c) Monthly
   d) Less than monthly or seasonally (e.g. during Lent)

3. Do you have any extra services, other than those mentioned under B1 (above) in order to observe:-

   Please tick appropriate box

   a) Most major and minor feast days (i.e. "black and red letter" feasts)
   b) Most major feast days (i.e. "red letter" feasts)
   c) Principal major feast days (e.g. Ascension day)
   d) Christmas and Good Friday only

4. Please give a rough estimate of the percentage of your working time as a clergyman which, during a typical week, is spent in preparing for, and conducting public worship and devotional meetings (including sermon preparation and Sunday Worship)

   Please tick appropriate box

   [10% or less 11 -20% 21 -30% 31 -40% 41 -50% 51 -60% 61%]

   B4a B4b B4c B4d B4e B4f B4g

5. How frequently would you normally administer the H.C. to a housebound church member who is not critically ill?

   Please tick appropriate box

   a) Weekly
   b) Fortnightly or three weekly
   c) Monthly
   d) Less than monthly
   e) Hardly ever

6. Would you normally pray with a family you are visiting?

   Please tick box adjacent to an attitude nearest to your own

   a) Whenever at all possible
   b) when you feel there is a particular circumstance which might warrant prayer
   c) Only when prayer seems to be expected
   d) Hardly ever, if at all

   [For researcher's use only]
Below are fifteen selected activities in the life of a parish priest. Please place a cross on the scale next to each item to indicate how important you think it is compared with the other items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absolutely</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
<th>Fairly</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Relatively</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ca</td>
<td>Cb</td>
<td>Cc</td>
<td>Cd</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>Cf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cg</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td>Cj</td>
<td>Ck</td>
<td>Cl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cm</td>
<td>Cn</td>
<td>Co</td>
<td>Cp</td>
<td>Cu</td>
<td>Cq</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If there are any other activities which you think important, please write them here:

---

(For researcher's use only)
Section D

The following are activities in the area of social responsibility which may be undertaken by local churches. In column A please tick box to indicate any activities or organisations associated with your church and its members. In Column B please indicate the extent of the involvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Is your church involved in this?</th>
<th>If 'Yes' is the activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Organised visiting of elderly or housebound (involving at least 5 lay people, at not less than monthly intervals)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A &quot;Luncheon Club&quot; for the elderly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A social club for the elderly (e.g. &quot;Darby and Joan&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A pre-school playgroup for children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mother and child group for mothers and small children (excluding those where the primary activity is a church service)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Holiday play scheme where the primary activity is not religious education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Hospital visiting scheme — including &quot;Trolley shops&quot; etc. (involving at least 3 lay visitors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Uniformed Youth Organisations whose primary activity is not religious education and with membership open to those who do not attend Church or Sunday School (answer separately for each age group)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) for 7 to 17 year olds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) for 14 to 21 year olds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

Note II

"Church based" is defined as an organisation, etc., to which at least two of the following criteria apply:
a) Operating from Church owned premises
b) Relying largely on church members for manpower
c) Being under direct control or incumbent or P.C.C.
d) Having been initiated by the Church within the last three years

"Church supported" is defined as an organisation, etc., which does not meet any two of the above criteria, but looks to the church for such things as leadership, finance, or manpower.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is your church involved in this?</th>
<th>If 'Yes' is the activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Church based supported (see note ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. A non-uniformed youth group whose primary activity is not religious education and with membership open to those who do not attend Church or Sunday School (answer separately for each age group)
   a) for 7 to 14 year olds
   b) for 14 to 21 year olds

10. Any other services or organisations operating primarily in the area of social responsibility, such as Holiday Play Scheme, Community Newspaper, Unemployment Centre, Advice Centre, Transport scheme. Please describe activity

11. Is there an officer acting on behalf of the P.C.C. or congregation as an officer for social responsibility, community or social worker, or similar, but not primarily a representative on a deanery or diocesan body for social responsibility
   If "Yes" please give the title of the Officer
   Is the officer paid or voluntary
   Paid Voluntary

12. Is there a group (such as a sub-committee of the P.C.C.) which considers matters of social responsibility and welfare on behalf of the local church
   Yes No

For researcher's use only
Section E

Please name those missionary societies, religious organisations, voluntary organisations, charities and appeals to which your church has made a donation during 1980, placing in Column A those organisations to which you have made donations annually for at least three years, and in Column B those other organisations to which donations were made during 1980.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column A</th>
<th>Column B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Groups to which donations made annually for at least 3 years)</td>
<td>Groups to which donations made during 1980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For researcher's use only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LASE</th>
<th>ESA</th>
<th>LSD</th>
<th>ESSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Section F

1. How many people were there on the Electoral Roll of the parish or district?
   - [ ] 1976
   - [ ] 1980

2. How many communicants at Church on Easter Day?

3. How many communicants at Church on Christmas Day, including midnight service?

4. Please estimate number of people attending public worship at the parish church on an "ordinary" Sunday in Spring.
   - [ ]

Section G

1. Which of the following categories most nearly describes your parish/district?
   a) Urban
   b) Suburban
   c) Rural
   
   Please tick one box.

2. What proportion of the housing in your parish/district do you estimate was built before 1960?
   - [ ]
   - [ ]

Section H

1. Which of the following ecumenical activities is present in your church, specifying denominations involved:

   a) A completely united congregational life of more than one denomination
   
   b) A sharing of Church Buildings under 1968 "Sharing of Church Buildings Act"
   
   c) A formally constituted "Local Ecumenical Project"
   
   d) Regular joint worship with a congregation of another denomination
   
   e) Ongoing joint social welfare project (a)
   
   f) Other co-operative activities with churches of other denominations (e.g., exchange of pulpit, etc.)

   Tick if Yes
   
   Denominations involved
   
   a) 
   
   b) 
   
   c) 
   
   d) 
   
   e) 
   
   f) 

2. Which of the following statements best describes how much ecumenical co-operation affects the life of your church? (Please tick one box)

   a) Fundamentally
   
   b) Extensively
   
   c) To some extent
   
   d) Very little
   
   e) Not at all

   Please tick one box.
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2. The Survey

(a) Preliminary approvals. Prior to the commencement of the postal survey it was necessary to obtain the approval of ecclesiastical authorities. This was not only a matter of courtesy, but also of gaining the support of these authorities in encouraging clergy to co-operate with the survey. A further effect would be to enable bishops to warn me against sending out the questionnaire hot on the heels of some other research request or similar inquiry from another source. Permission and support for the research was given by the following diocesan and suffragan bishops: Chester, Lichfield, Hereford, Worcester, Oxford, Shrewsbury, Buckingham, Wolverhampton and Birkenhead.

The rural deans of all the deaneries involved were also approached in order that they might, where opportunity arose, give some positive encouragement to clergy to complete the questionnaire.

(b) Sending of the questionnaire. Clergy who were being asked to complete the questionnaire received two letters. A preliminary standard letter was sent about two weeks before the questionnaire was posted. This is reproduced below, and it will be seen that it attempts to generate a positive attitude prior to the questionnaire being sent.

"Dear Brother,

Under the auspices of the New Town Study Unit of the Open University, I am conducting research into the characteristics of church life in Church of England parishes in different kinds of housing areas. During 1977 I researched a third of the parishes in the dioceses of Ripon and Sheffield, and the present project is a more substantial follow-up to that study.

The parishes which are to be included in my sample are in Redditch, Runcorn, Telford and Milton Keynes and in on the edge of the West Midlands conurbation, and your parish has been chosen to be a part of that sample. The Bishops of Oxford, Chester, Hereford, Lichfield and Worcester have all been approached concerning the project, and have given me encouragement to proceed. The Rural Deans of Milton Keynes, Bromsgrove and Frodsham (the other three 'New Town' rural deans) have already been particularly helpful, and have been very willing to commend my approaches to the clergy in their respective deaneries.

The purpose of this letter is to tell you of my work and to ask that you might treat my questionnaire with sympathy when it arrives on your desk in a short while. I am acutely aware of how busy most of us clergy are, but I do hope that this will not prevent you from responding to (maybe even enjoying!) the questionnaire. It is vital to the success of my project that information is forthcoming from almost all churches in the sample.

Yours sincerely, .......

A more personalised letter was then included with the questionnaire. This letter, reproduced below, aimed at:

(i) affirming the value of parish work about which the inquiry was made;
(ii) assuring respondents of the anonymity of individual responses;
(iii) generally encouraging recipients to respond positively.
"Dear Mr Smith,

A short while ago I wrote to you to tell you of the research project in which I am involved, which is seeking to investigate the characteristics of church life in a number of parishes in differing housing areas.

You will find enclosed herewith a copy of the questionnaire. It is intended that this will be followed up, at a later stage, by visits to a small sample of the parishes presently being approached. You will see that I am largely concerned with the very practical aspects of local church life, for it is at that level that the majority of important Christian work is done. I hope that you will, therefore, be able to complete the questionnaire, and return it to me.

You may be sure that, in any reporting of the research, no individual parish or incumbent will be identified without their explicit permission. If you would like to be kept in touch with the initial results of my inquiries, please enclose a stamped addressed envelope with your completed questionnaire.

It would assist greatly if you were able to return the completed questionnaire to me, in the enclosed envelope, by 2nd October.

Thank you, in anticipation of your help.

Yours sincerely, ....."

In sending out the questionnaire care was taken that it did not arrive on clergy desks at an obviously difficult time. Posting was thus delayed until early autumn so as to avoid the summer holiday period and to complete the process well before Christmas.

The questionnaire was sent by first class post with a first class stamped and addressed return envelope; it was hoped that this would help clergy to see the research as a piece of serious work.

(c) Reminders. Previous experience with the Ripon/Sheffield research had shown that the manner of any reminder to those who did not immediately return the questionnaire was critical.

The following procedure was adopted; a volunteer helper was recruited who had wide experience of talking to clergy together with an easy and agreeable telephone manner. She was told very little of the content of the research.

She was asked to telephone non-respondents, introducing herself as someone helping with a little of the administration only of the research. She was then to inquire if the questionnaire had been received, and if so to gently encourage its completion and return, maintaining a positive relationship throughout the conversation. If there was any doubt about the receipt of the questionnaire, a duplicate was sent. The volunteer was instructed not to enter into any kind of discussion about the content of the questionnaire, or the research, but simply to help clergy feel positive about responding.

The care taken over this and other details which aimed at encouraging a response were well justified by the eventual 83% response rate.
(d) Additional data

(i) From Diocesan Handbooks and "Crockford's Clerical Directory" The Diocesan Handbook for each of the dioceses involved had been obtained in order to identify parishes, incumbents and addresses. These books were further used to obtain population figures for the parishes concerned. The figures were subsequently judged to be of limited significance. This was because of the variety of ways in which populations were estimated in different dioceses and the reliance, in some dioceses, on figures supplied by the parishes themselves who often had clear reasons for maximising or minimising their estimates (for example, to strengthen the case for additional staff, or to keep down the financial levy to the diocese).

"Crockford's Clerical Directory" supplied both the year of ordination of the individual clergy and the name of the theological colleges at which they were severally trained.

(ii) Theological College and "churchmanship": In order to assess the churchmanship of the theological colleges at which the clergy were trained, help was enlisted from two former chief secretaries to the Advisory Council for the Church's Ministry. (7) In their post as chief officer for this body these men had intimate contact with Anglican theological colleges. Together they worked for the Council from 1966 to immediately prior to the commencement of this research.

The following questionnaire was sent to the two people concerned, asking them to indicate their impression of the churchmanship tradition of the colleges. Full responses were obtained.
THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE QUESTIONNAIRE

Please mark the respective boxes according to what you regard as the predominant tradition of the institution, as follows:

- Institutions of a strong "catholic" or "high church" tradition mark "C"
- "moderate" or "" mark "m"
- "strong evangelical" tradition mark "E"
- moderate "evangelical" tradition mark "e"
- tradition which may be described as "central" mark "o"

St Aidan's College, Birkenhead
St Augustine's College, Canterbury
Bishop's College, Cheshunt
Chichester Theological College
Clifton Theological College
Cranmer Hall and St John's College, Durham
Cuddesdon College
Edinburgh Theological College
House of the Sacred Mission, Kelham
Kings College, London
St Michael and All Angels' College, Llandaff
St David's College, Lampeter
Lichfield Theological College
Lincoln Theological College
London College of Divinity
College of the Resurrection, Mirfield
Oakhill Theological College
Queen's College, Birmingham
Ridley Hall Cambridge
Ripon College, Cuddesdon
Ripon Hall, Oxford
Rochester Theological College
St Chad's College, Durham
St John's College, Nottingham
St Stephen's House, Oxford
Sarum Theological College
Salisbury and Wells Theological College
Trinity College, Dublin
Trinity College, Bristol
Tyndale Hall
St Boniface College, Warminster
Wells Theological College
Westcott House, Cambridge
Worcester Ordination Course
Wycliffe Hall, Oxford
North West Ordination Course

(see below for the evaluation and scoring resulting from the response to this)
3. Data Analysis

(a) Scoring

The following is a description of the method used to arrive at the scores for the variables (numbered 1 to 33) used in the subsequent analysis. The number of the variable is followed by a description of the variable and the abbreviation used in computer analysis. Codes "A1"-"A4", "B1"-"B6d" etc. indicate the boxes on the questionnaire itself. (8)

Variable 1: Identification of the parish: ID.
Each parish numbered in range 1 to 144.

Variable 2: Number of years of clergy in parish: YRSPA.
Subtract "A1" from 82 producing scores in range 1-27.

Variable 3: Whether or not demolition: DEMOL.
"Yes" or "No" for "A2" = 1 or 2 respectively.

Variable 4: Whether or not new building: NEWBD.
"Yes" or "No" for "A3" = 1 or 2 respectively.

Variable 5: Whether or not pastoral re-organisation: P/REG.
"Yes" or "No" for "A4" = 1 or 2 respectively.

Variable 6: Corporate Sacred Activity score: CORSA.

For "B1" score as follows:
Answer 5 or more = 4
2 to 4 = 3
1 = 2
0 = 0

For "B2" score "B2a" and "B2e" as 4
"B2b" and "B2f" as 3
"B2c" and "B2g" as 2
"B2d" and "B2h" as 1

For "B3" score "B3a" as 4
"B3b" as 3
"B3c" as 2
"B3d" as 1

Add total scores for "B1", "B2" and "B3" to produce score in range 0-15.

Variable 7: Clerical Sacred Activity score: CLRSA

For "B4" score "B4a" as 0
"B4b" as 1
"B4c" as 2
"B4d" as 3
"B4e" as 4
"B4f" as 5
"B4g" as 6

For "B5" and "B6" score "B5a" as 4
"B5b" and "B6a" as 3
"B5c" and "B6b" as 2
"B5d" and "B6c" as 1
"B5e" and "B6d" as 0
Add total scores for "B4", "B5" and "B6" to produce score in range 0-10.

**Variable 8**: Clerical Sacred Time score: CLSAT

Use above scores for "B4" producing scores in range 0-6.

**Variable 9**: Clerical and Corporate Sacred Activity Score: BSAC

Add CORSA and CLRSA producing scores in range 5-22.

**Variables 10 & 13**: Score for number of sacred orientated charities: SACCH

Score for number of secular orientated charities: SECCH

Charities etc. in section "E" designated as "sacred" if they are church organisations for promotion or maintenance of religion; designated "secular" if they are non-church organisations for humanitarian causes; and designated as "sacred/secular" if they are church organisations supporting humanitarian causes (e.g. Christian Aid).

Each charity scored as follows:
2 for each sacred, 2 for each secular, 1 for each sacred/secular.

"EASE" = total of secular and sacred/secular in column "A"
"EASA" = total of sacred and sacred/secular in column "A"
"EBSE" = 2 x total of secular and sacred/secular in column "B"
"EBSA" = 2 x total of sacred and sacred/secular in column "B"

"ESE (Raw) = "EASE" + "EBSE"
"ESA (Raw) = "EASA" + "EBSA"

Scores "ESE" (Raw) and "ESA" (Raw) were separately tabulated and ranked. Each set of marked scores was then divided into 7 equal parts of the whole of each range. (The division by 7 was to produce scores for 0 to 6 comparable to CLSAT scores of Variable 8.)

"ESA" = Score in range 0-6 from "ESA (Raw)" (sacred scores) above
    = Variable 10 (SACCH)

"ESE" = Score in range 0-6 from "ESE (Raw)" (secular scores) above
    = Variable 13 (SECCH)

**Variable 11**: Total Sacred Activity Score: T-SA (actually denoted 10T-SE on the computer matrix by error)

Add "CLSA", "CORSA" and "SACCH" to produce scores in range 6-23.

**Variable 12**: Corporate Secular Activity Score: COSE

In items "D1" to "D10" score 1 for each "church supported" activity and score 2 for each "church based" activity.

For "D11" score 1 for "Yes"
For "D12" score 1 for "paid"
For "D13" score 2 for "Yes"

"DSE" = total of scores producing scores in range 0-24.

**Variable 13**: See Variable 10 above (SECCH).
Variable 14: Total secular activity score: T-SE (Actually denoted 13T-SE)

Add "COSE" and "SECCH" producing scores in range 0-25.

Variable 15: Sacred Priority Score: SACP

Variable 16: Secular Priority Score: SECP

For both SACP and SECP score items "Ca" to "Cp" as follows:

Absolutely | Extremely | Fairly | Moderately | Relatively
Vital       | Important | Important | Important | Unimportant

|   6   |   5   |   4   |   3   |   2   |   1   |   0   | -1   | -2   |

For "Cq", score 2 ("CqSE") for each clearly secular priority volunteered and 2 ("CqSA") for each clearly sacred priority volunteered.

"CSEP" = Total for "Ca", "Cf", "Ck", "Cl", "Co" & "CqSE"
"CSAP" = Total for "Cl", "Ce", "Ch", "Cj", "Cm", "Cp" & "CqSA"

SACP = "CSAP" ÷ ("CSAP" + "CSEP") producing scores in range 0.167-1.
SECP = "CSEP" ÷ ("CSEP" + "CSAP") producing scores in range 0-0.833.

(Note that, since "priority" means one item as against another, variables SACP and SECP are the inverse of each other for any one parish).

Variable 17: Priority Clusters: PRIU

In the returned questionnaires the top priority for each respondent was either one of items a to p, or a group of two or more of these items scoring equal top priority (e.g. h, c and m).

These top priorities and groups of equal top priorities were allocated categorised scores as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group of Priorities</th>
<th>Combinations of top priorities included</th>
<th>Frequency of all combinations</th>
<th>Categorised score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td>a, i, ai</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on exclusively private prayer</td>
<td>c, m, cm, cjm</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer with corporate dimension</td>
<td>h, hcm, ha, hc, hp</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on study of scripture</td>
<td>p, j, hjp</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping well informed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(Combinations of priorities which were regarded as unclassifiable were: ah, hj, cj, jn, hm and ahp, in addition to the "neutral" priorities b, d, g and n).

Thus PRIU scores are categorised scores 1 to 5.

**Variable 18**: Size of church membership: MEMB
1980 scores of "F1", "F2" and "F3" added together and divided by 3 to produce scores in range 22-612.

**Variable 19**: Size of church attendance: ATT
1980 scores of "F4" produce scores in range 16-330.

**Variable 20**: Membership change: MEMC
\[
\frac{(F1 + F2 + F3\text{ for 1980}) - (F1 + F2 + F3\text{ for 1976})}{F1 + F2 + F3\text{ for 1976}} \times 100
\]
produces percentage scores in range -219 to +335.

**Variable 21**: Attendance change: ATTC
\[
\frac{F4(1980) - F4(1976)}{F4(1976)} \times 100
\]
produces percentage scores in range -45 to +333.

**Variable 22**: Parish type: P-TY
Categorised scores allocated as follows:
"G1a" = 1, "G1b" = 2, "G1c" = 3.

**Variable 23**: Percentage of post 1960 housing: AGE
Scores of "G2b" produce scores in range 0-100.

**Variable 24**: Ecumenical Activity Score: ECU
Score positive responses to questions in section "H" as follows:
"Ha" score 6
"Hb" score 5
"H2a" & "Hc" score 4
"H2b" & "Hd" score 3
"H2c" & "He" score 2
"H2d" & "Hf" score 1
"H2e" score 0
Add all scores to produce score in range 0-18.

**Variable 25**: Whether or not in New Town: NT
For "yes" score 1, for "no" score 2.

**Variable 26**: Which New Town: TOWN
Categorised scores as follows:
Telford: 1
Runcorn: 2
Redditch: 3
Milton Keynes: 4
Not a new town: 5
**Variable 27 : Which Deanery : DNRY**

Categorised scores as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deanery</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telford Severn Gorge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telford</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrockwardine</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgmond</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frodsham</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromsgrove</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Keynes</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himley</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugeley</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsall</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesbury</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bromwich</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolverhampton</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Variable 28 : Speed of questionnaire return : Q/RE**

The following categorised scores were used:

- For questionnaire returned without reminder  -1
- For return after telephone reminder        -2
- For no return of questionnaire             -3

**Variable 29 : Clergy's theological college : THEO**

The following categorised scores were used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Aiden's, Birkenhead</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Augustines, Canterbury</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop's College, Cheshunt</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramner Hall</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuddesdon</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sacred Mission, Kelham</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's, London</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St David's, Lampeter</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Aiden's, Birkenhead</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Augustines, Canterbury</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London College of Divinity</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirfield</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakhill</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridley, Cambridge</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripon, Oxford</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Chad's, Durham</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John's,</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Stephen's,</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarum</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury &amp; Wells</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity, Dublin</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity, Bristol</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tydals</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Boniface,</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warminster</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westcott, Cambridge</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wycliffe, Oxford</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Variable 30 : Year of ordination of clergy : ORDN**

The year in the century was taken as the score (e.g. 1932 = 32, 1933 = 33 etc.), producing scores in range 32-80.

**Variable 31 : Estimated population : POP**

The actual number from the respective diocesan directory produced scores in range 40-38,000.

**Variable 32 : Churchmanship of clergyman's college : CHSH**

The two advisors (former Chief Secretaries for the Advisory Council for the Church's Ministry) had responded to the questionnaire sent to them as follows: (9)
**Table AI:1**

Churchmanship of Colleges as assessed by Advisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theological College (as per variable 29)</th>
<th>Advisor 1</th>
<th>Advisor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C denoted strong catholic tradition  
c denoted moderate catholic tradition  
E denoted strong evangelical tradition  
e denoted moderate evangelical tradition  
0 denoted a "central" tradition

For clergy trained prior to 1972 Advisor 2's opinion was used, and for clergy trained from 1973 onwards Advisor 1's opinion was used.

The following categorised scores were then used:
E = 0, e = 1, 0 = 2, c = 3, C = 4

**Variable 33 : Extreme of Churchmanship :** (No separate column entry in data matrix).
Using variable 32 values 0 and 4 were categorised against 1, 2 and 3.

(b) Computer Analysis

The IDA (Interactive Data Analysis) programme was used in the form of the "IDA (STATS-LIB)" package on the Open University mainframe computer accessed via a DEC-20 terminal.
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The data having been scored, the following files were created:

- **PARPOL.TXT** - raw data as entered
- **PARPOL-IDA** - raw data with names to columns (variables)
- **PARPOL-MIS** - data with all missing values set to -900
- **PARPOL-CAT** - variables categorised for cross tabulation
  (see table 3d(i) of this appendix)
- **IDAFL** - variables categorised for chi-square analysis of 2x2 tables
- **IDA23A** - IDAFL with CH123 (chi-square categorised score of column 23) replacing column 1 (ID)
- **IDA23B** - IDA23A but excluding data on New Town parishes and with CH123 re-calculated.
- **IDA23C** - IDAFL with New Town parishes only.

Histograms were printed for most variables and cross tabulations and scatter diagrams were produced for appropriate pairs of variables. Variables were identified as being grouped categories, ranked scales or interval scales and statistical tests for correlation or association between single variables by pairs were carried out. The chi-square, phi, point-biseral correlation, product moment correlation, Spearman's rank correlation coefficient, student t and 'z' tests were applied to variables as appropriate, depending on the nature of the variable. In general only the chi-square test and Spearman's rank correlation coefficient were judged to be appropriate to the majority of pairs of variables; with other tests occasionally being able to be used (for example, the product-moment correlation coefficient was calculated when both variables were continuous and roughly "normal" distributions).

The results of these tests are found in the table contained in section 4(b) of this appendix.

Other facilities of the IDA programme were used for tabulation and some exploratory analysis of data, but not extensively so.

Since the information from the postal questionnaire was being put to fairly limited use, regression analysis seemed inappropriate. Multi-variate analysis of the data may have been helpful, but the computing facilities made available were not adequate for this to be undertaken: there was again the possibility that this level of statistical analysis might be inappropriate to the nature of the research. (10)

(c) Grouping of Variables

In order to try to evaluate a number of possible preliminary models the extent of associations between and within a number of groups of variables was considered. This was done by a simple count of the number of statistically significant associations between the variables concerned. The very rough evaluation of models was used to indicate which models, or parts of models, might be worth exploring when the preliminary model was being devised. (11)

(1) "Outward" type of Local Church

This preliminary model was of a type of church which is "outward looking"; namely, has a large membership (variable 18), supports a large number of sacred and secular charities (variables 10 and 13), engages in a large number of secular orientated activities (variables 12 and 4), has an incumbent with high secular orientated priorities (variable 16), engages in high levels of ecumenical activity (variable 24) and has shown a positive response to the present study by returning the questionnaire promptly (variable 28).
Eliminating relationships between variables which are computationally associated, 26 significant correlations or associations were possible between variables. There were nine such positive associations and no negative associations. This was denoted as a score $+34.62\% \left(\frac{9}{26} \times 100\right)$ - see table AI:2 below. If the ideal type being considered had been found the score would have been $+100\%$; if relationships between variables had been exactly contrary to the ideal type (that is, all variables negatively associated) the score would have been $-100\%$; and a score of 0 would have indicated a complete lack of evidence of any association between variables. Thus the score was $+34.62\%$ in the range $-100\%$ to $+100\%$.

Table AI:2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ = positive association
0 = no significant association
X = variable computationally dependent

(ii) "Inward" Type of Local Church

In this model the variables considered are those indicating that the local church is primarily concerned with its own internal life: large attendance (variable 19), large number of corporate and clerical sacred orientated activities (variables 6 and 7), high score for sacred orientation (variable 11), supports large number of sacred charities (variable 10), incumbent has high sacred priority score (variable 15) and incumbent trained at college with an "extreme" churchmanship (variable 33).

The associations and "trends" towards association of these variables with each other are set out in Table AI:3.
Table AI:3

Associations between "Inward" variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key - see Table A1:2 above.

The score given to the associations and trends is 3 out of a possible 18 = 16.67% in a range of -100% to +100%.

(iii) A model of "Outward" versus "Inward" polarity types of Local Church

This model posits two "opposed" ideal types of local church: the "outward", as in (a) above, over against the "inward", as in (b) above.

The variables considered are those used for the two types independently with the exception of the extent of support of sacred charities which appeared in both and the membership and attendance levels which are computationally associated.

In (a) and (b) above the coherence and consistency of the model was being examined by looking at how much the variables were associated with each other, here the polarity (that is, negative association) of the two sets of variables against each other is being considered.

The associations and trends towards association of the two sets of variables is represented in Table AI:4.

Table AI:4

Associations of "Outward" with "Inward" variables

"Outward" variables | "Inward" variables
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: see Table AI:2 above with - = negative association.
For a perfectly polarised ideal type the two sets of variables would be negatively associated with each other producing a score of -100%, perfectly random associations would produce a score of zero, and an ideal type perfectly contrary to that being investigated would score +100%. In fact the score is 3/30 = +10%.

(iv) Clerical Factors and Sacred Orientation

The question explored next is what models for the local church might be worthy of consideration which involve the variables relating to the attitudes, background, and activities of the clergy, namely: length of time in the parish (variable 2), clerical sacred orientated activity score (variable 7), sacred and secular priority scores (variables 15 and 16), year of ordination (variable 30), churchmanship and extreme of churchmanship of incumbent's theological college (variables 32 and 33).

Firstly, the clerical factors are considered in relation to sacred orientation: the general model under consideration being that of the local church having its level of sacred orientation closely associated with the various clerical factors. Thus the variables cross-scored against the clerical variables are the ones indicating sacred orientation, namely: corporate sacred orientated activity score (variable 6) and the score for number of sacred charities supported (variable 10).

The associations are set down in Table AI:5.

**Table AI:5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clerical variables</th>
<th>Sacred variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>+ +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>+ +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Keys: see Table AI:2 above.

There is, at this point, no consideration being given as to whether or not the associations are positive or negative, only that they do or do not exist. In the scoring no account is, therefore, taken of the "sign" of any associations. Thus, out of a possible score of 14 associations there are 4 giving a score of 4 \div 14 \times 100 = 28.57% in the range zero (for a total absence of any association) to 100% (for complete associations between the two sets of variables).

(v) Clerical Factors and Secular orientation

The model being considered here is similar to that above except that the variables indicating secular orientation, rather than sacred orientation,
are used, namely: corporate secular orientated activity score (variable 12) and the score for the number of secular charities supported (variable 13).

The associations between the clerical and secular variables are set out in Table AI6.

Table AI6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clerical variables</th>
<th>Sacred variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: see Table AI4 above.

The scoring method is the same as for Table AI4 and produces a score of 4/14 = 28.57% in the range 0 to 100%.

(vi) Clerical Factors and Church Membership and Attendance

This model is based on the proposition that a useful model for understanding the local church could be constructed from various clerical factors and considerations of the size of, and changes in, levels of church membership and attendance. Hence associations are examined between the clerical variables and membership size (variable 18), attendance level (variable 19), change in membership (variable 20) and change in attendance (variable 21).

These associations and trends towards associations are set out in Table AI7.

Table AI7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clerical variables</th>
<th>Attendance and membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: see Table AI4 above.
The scoring method is the same as for Table AI:5 and produces a score of 17.66% in the range 0 to 100%.

(vii) Clerical and Contextual factors

The model here explored is one based on clerical factors and what are described as "contextual" factors. These latter are the factors related by variables which indicate some feature of the physical or social nature of the parish, namely: whether the parish is rural, suburban or urban (variable 22); the percentage of post-1960 housing in the parish (variable 23); and whether or not the parish is in a new town (variable 25).

The associations between these contextual variables and the clerical variables is set down in Table AI:8.

Table AI:8

Associations of clerical with contextual variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clerical variables</th>
<th>Contextual variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Keys: see Table AI:4 above.

The method of scoring is the same as for Table AI:5 above, and produces a score of 4.76% in the range 0 to 100%.

(viii) A model of sacred orientated versus secular orientated polarity types of local church

As in the "Outward versus Inward" model we are here looking at the possibility of a model which contains two "opposed" types: namely, the church that concentrates on activities within the realm of social welfare (secular activities) as against the church which concentrates on "other worldly" (sacred) matters.

The variables used are the four "sacred orientation" variables (12) and the three "secular orientation" variables (13) as mentioned above. Note that the association between the two priority scores is ignored since it arises directly from their method of calculation.

The associations are set out in Table AI:9.
Table A1i9

Associations between secular and sacred variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sacred variables</th>
<th>Secular variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Keys: see Table AIi4 above.

the score is in the range -100% (for a perfectly fitted polarity) through zero (for perfectly random, if any, associations) to +100% (for a model exactly contrary to that being explored).

The score for the proportion of associations is +9.0%. 

(ix) Summary of the models and their viability

In this somewhat crude evaluation of possible models three kinds of models have been considered: single type models ("Inward" and "Outward"); polarised models ("Outward" versus "Inward" and "Secular" versus "Sacred"); and non-polarised double type models (the various "clerical" models). The models and respective scores are listed below in Table AIi10.

Table AIi10

Scores of models evaluated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single type models:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Score range -100 to +100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Perfect fit = +100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Outward&quot;</td>
<td>+34.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Inward&quot;</td>
<td>+16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarised models:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Score range -100 to +100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Perfect fit = -100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Outward vs Inward&quot;</td>
<td>+10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Secular vs Sacred&quot;</td>
<td>+9.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-polarised double type models:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Score range 0 to 100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Perfect fit = 100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Clerical and Sacred&quot;</td>
<td>26.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Clerical and Secular&quot;</td>
<td>26.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Clerical and Church size&quot;</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Clerical and contextual&quot;</td>
<td>4.76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the scores shown in Table AIi10, the "outward" type of local church seemed worthy of further investigation. (14) The two polarised models indicated the inappropriateness of a simple polarity as the basis of our model. (15) The "clerical and sacred" and "clerical and secular" models showed something of the influence of the clergy in determining the emphasis of local church life. (16)
### 4. Tables

**(a) Distribution Tables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AI11</td>
<td>No. of years in Parish</td>
<td>1 - 2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 - 27</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Numbers in range 1-27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NI = Number of parishes for which there is no information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI12</td>
<td>Whether demolition - Yes or No.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No:</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI13</td>
<td>Whether new building - Yes or No.</td>
<td>Yes:</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No:</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI14</td>
<td>Whether Pastoral reorganisation - Yes or No.</td>
<td>Yes:</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No:</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI15</td>
<td>Corporate Sac. Activity - Score in range 0 - 15</td>
<td>0 - 7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 - 10</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI16</td>
<td>Clerical Sac. Activity - Score in range 0 - 10</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 - 10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI17</td>
<td>Clerical Sac. Time - Score in range 0 - 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 6</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI18</td>
<td>Sum of 5 &amp; 6 - Score in range 5 - 22</td>
<td>5 - 12</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13 - 15</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 - 22</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Number</td>
<td>Variable Description</td>
<td>Score Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1:19</td>
<td>Score for No. of Sec. Charities</td>
<td>0 - 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1:20</td>
<td>Sacred Activity Score (8+5+6)</td>
<td>6 - 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 - 13</td>
<td>14 - 17</td>
<td>18 - 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1:21</td>
<td>Corporate Sec. Activity</td>
<td>0 - 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - 4</td>
<td>5 - 8</td>
<td>9 - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1:22</td>
<td>Score for No. of Sec. Charities</td>
<td>0 - 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1:23</td>
<td>Sec. Activity Score (10 + 11)</td>
<td>0 - 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 - 4</td>
<td>5 - 9</td>
<td>10 - 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1:24</td>
<td>Sacred Priorities</td>
<td>0.167 - 1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.167-0.509</td>
<td>0.510-0.629</td>
<td>0.630-1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1:25</td>
<td>Secular Priorities</td>
<td>0 - 0.833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-0.370</td>
<td>0.371-0.490</td>
<td>0.491-0.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1:26</td>
<td>Top priorities - one of categories ai, cm, h, jp and 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ai, cm, h, jp, 1, NI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7, 28, 25, 3, 4</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1:27</td>
<td>Nominal Membership No.</td>
<td>Number in range 22 - 612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22-50</td>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>101-150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Distribution Tables (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AI:28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Attendance - Number in range 16 - 330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16-50</td>
<td>51-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI:29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Membership change - % in range -219 to +335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+50% to +335%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+25% to +49%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+10% to +24%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-9% to +9%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-10% to -24%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-25% to -49%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-50% to -219%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI:30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Attendance change - % in range -45 to +333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+50% to 330%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+25% to +49%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+10% to +24%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-9% to +9%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-10% to -24%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-25% to -49%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-50% or less</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI:31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Parish type - one of U, S or R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI:32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Amount of New Housing - % in range 0 - 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-24</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-49</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50-74</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75-100</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI:33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Index of Ecumenical Activity - Score in range 0 - 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 - 2</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 - 18</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI:34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>New Town or Not - Yes or No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI:35</td>
<td>26  Which Town – one of T, Ru, Re, M or X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T:  23  R:  8  Re:  11  M:  18  X:  84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X = Not New Town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI:37</td>
<td>28  Returned with or without reminder – one of Yes, R or No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes:  86  R:  34  No:  24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R = Returned after reminder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI:38</td>
<td>29  Theological College of Clergy – one of 32 colleges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5  7  1  5  5  4  6  2  9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2  4  9  6  3  6  4  4  8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rip. St C. St J. St S. Sar. Sal. TrinD. TrinD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4  3  2  7  9  2  2  2  1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tyn. War. Well. West. Wye NW NI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3  8  4  4  1  1  1  3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI:39</td>
<td>30  Date of Ordination – Year in range '32 to '80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32-54  55-61  62-66  67-72  73-80 NI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22  28  34  29  29  2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI:40</td>
<td>31  Population estimate – Number in range 40 - 38000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-1999  2000-4999  5000-8999  9000-12999  13000-38000 NI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13  23  33  30  19  26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI:41</td>
<td>32  &quot;Churchmanship&quot; of College – Score in range 0 - 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0  1  2  3  4  NI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27  9  18  57  30  3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Key 1</td>
<td>Key 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Total secular score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Total sacred score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No. of sacred charities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Corporate sacred activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Clerical sacred activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Clerical sacred time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Corporate secular activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Clerical secular activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Total secular score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>No. of sacred charities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Corporate sacred activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Clerical sacred activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Clerical sacred time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Corporate secular activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Clerical secular activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Total secular score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>No. of sacred charities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Corporate sacred activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Clerical sacred activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Clerical sacred time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Corporate secular activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Clerical secular activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Total secular score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>No. of sacred charities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Corporate sacred activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Clerical sacred activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Clerical sacred time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Corporate secular activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Clerical secular activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Total secular score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>No. of sacred charities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Corporate sacred activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Clerical sacred activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Clerical sacred time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Corporate secular activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Clerical secular activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Total secular score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>No. of sacred charities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Corporate sacred activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Clerical sacred activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Clerical sacred time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Corporate secular activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Clerical secular activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Total secular score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>No. of sacred charities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Corporate sacred activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Clerical sacred activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Clerical sacred time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Corporate secular activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Clerical secular activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key 1: 1 = phi value, 2 = point-biserial correlation, 3 = product-moment correlation, 4 = rank correlation, 5 = standard deviation, 6 = mean

Chi-Square Values and Correlation Coefficients between Variables - Table A.1 - 42
(c) Other Tables (code reference in brackets identifies the table from the file of tables resulting from computer analysis)

Table AI43 (code 11/15 NT)
Sacred Priorities and Activities in New Town Parishes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nos. of parishes</th>
<th>Sacred Priorities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = 0.006 (p = 0.938)

Table AI44 (code 11/15 H)
Sacred Priorities and Activities in non-New Town Parishes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nos. of parishes</th>
<th>Sacred Priorities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = 0.518 (p = 0.472)

Table AI45 (code 11/16 NT)
Secular Priorities and Sacred Activities in New Town Parishes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nos. of parishes</th>
<th>Secular Priorities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = 0.161 (p = 0.688)
### Table AI:46 (code 11/16 H)

**Secular Priorities and Sacred Activities in non-New Town Parishes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nos. of parishes</th>
<th>Secular Priorities</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred Activities</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = 0.518 (p = 0.472)

### Table AI:47 (code 18/19)

**Increases in Membership and Attendance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nos. of parishes</th>
<th>Increases in Attendance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases in Membership</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = 47.778

### Table AI:48 (code 15/32 - cond. %)

**Conditional Distribution of Churchmanship against Sacred Priority Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Churchmanship of Incumbent's Theological College</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low Church</td>
<td>Moderately Low Church</td>
<td>Central Churchmanship</td>
<td>High Churchmanship</td>
<td>Very High Church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred Priority</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Med.</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Percentages</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table AII:49 (code 6/33)

Extreme of Churchmanship against Corporate Sacred Activity Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nos. of parishes</th>
<th>Churchmanship</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Sacred Activity Score</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 3.512 (p = 0.06093)

Table AII:50 (code 7/33)

Extreme of Churchmanship against Clerical Sacred Activity Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nos. of parishes</th>
<th>Churchmanship</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical Sacred Activity Score</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 0.126 (p = 0.723)

Table AII:51 (code 11/15 - cond. %)

Conditional Distribution of Sacred Priorities against Sacred Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sacred Priority Scores</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Numbers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Spearman rank order correlation coefficient = 0.027)
Notes on Appendix I

1. See Chapter IV, section 3(b)(ii).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Generation New Towns</th>
<th>Date of Designation</th>
<th>Original Population</th>
<th>Population at 31.3.87</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stevenage</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>75,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawley</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>72,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemel Hempstead</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>78,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nailow</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aycliffe</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>29,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterlee</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatfield</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>25,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welwyn</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>40,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basildon</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>103,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracknell</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>5,149</td>
<td>50,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corby</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>15,700</td>
<td>48,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2nd Generation New Towns</th>
<th>Date of Designation</th>
<th>Original Population</th>
<th>Population at 31.3.87</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skelmersdale</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>41,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redditch</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runcorn</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>28,500</td>
<td>68,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>61,590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3rd Generation New Towns</th>
<th>Date of Designation</th>
<th>Original Population</th>
<th>Population at 31.3.87</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milton Keynes</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>133,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>132,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>133,000</td>
<td>170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrington</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>122,300</td>
<td>146,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telford (previously designated as Dawley in 1963)</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>111,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Lancashire</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>234,000</td>
<td>252,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


4. Rural Deans of Frodsham, Bromsgrove and Milton Keynes; the researcher himself being Rural Dean of Telford Severn Gorge and of Telford.


6. See Section 1(d) of this Appendix (page AI-5).


8. See section 1(d) above (page AI-5).

9. See section 2(d)(ii) above (page AI-14).

10. The general range of information sought from the sample used for the postal questionnaire was as follows:
(a) Simple initial testing of the crude hypotheses:
   (i) Sacred and secular orientation are divergent trends
   (ii) Priorities and activities are more closely related in New Towns
   (iii) Priorities and activities are generally not closely associated.

(b) Information gathering about the following:
   (i) Extent of sacred and secular orientation
   (ii) Nature of clergy priorities
   (iii) Any distinctiveness of New Town parishes
   (iv) The "well-being" of the congregation

(c) Screening of the larger sample to produce a selected sample of parishes in which interviews could be conducted.

(a) and (b) above are primarily concerned with preliminary model evaluation.

11. See Chapter VI, section 1(c) (page 153).


15. See Chapter VI section 1(c)(i) (page 153).

APPENDIX II

THE INTERVIEWS

1. Conducting the Interviews

(a) Sample Selection

The parishes chosen for the interviews were selected by using the information obtained in the postal survey as a sampling screen. The screening process had two elements: division of responding parishes by housing type and division of parishes by scoring in sacred and secular orientation.

After parishes with a change of incumbent since the postal survey were removed, the responding parishes were divided into three groups: New Town parishes, non-New Town parishes with a high proportion of post-1960 housing and non-New Town parishes with a low proportion of post-1960 housing. (1)

The second screening then involved dividing parishes according to sacred/secular orientation score groups as follows (note that all groups are not mutually exclusive):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>VIII</th>
<th>IX</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>XI</th>
<th>XII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Sacred Activity Score</td>
<td>High Sacred Activity Score</td>
<td>Low Sacred Activity Score</td>
<td>Low Sacred Activity Score</td>
<td>High Sacred Activity Score</td>
<td>High Sacred Activity Score</td>
<td>Low Sacred Activity Score</td>
<td>High Sacred Activity Score</td>
<td>Low Sacred Activity Score</td>
<td>High Sacred Activity Score</td>
<td>Low Sacred Activity Score</td>
<td>High Sacred Activity Score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given that Sacred Priority scores are the exact inverse of Secular Priority scores, then the above twelve categories cover all combinations of high/low, sacred/secular and activity/priority scores.

A sample of between 12 and 16 parishes was required, since this number was judged to be as large as the researcher could manage in which to conduct extended interviews personally. A minimum of one New Town parish and one non-New Town parish was required for each of the categories I to XII.

The data matrix editing facilities of the IDA (Interactive Data Analysis) programme were used to identify parishes in each of the categories I to XII. Random numbers were then used to select parishes until at least one parish had been identified for each category and at least 4 each of New Town, non-New Town with high proportion of new housing and non-New Town with low proportion of new housing.

During this process, parishes from Runcorn and Milton Keynes were eliminated so as to confine the eventual sample to the West Midlands. It was not apparent that this would be possible until the sampling procedure was underway; it might have been necessary to include these New Towns in order to complete the desired sampling grid.

The sampling grid which resulted from this process is set down in Table AIII.1.
### Table AIIIi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>New Town Parishes</th>
<th>Non-New Town Parishes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Proportion of new housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td>133, 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>16, 32, 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66, 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>130, 66, 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>16, 34</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>16, 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The numbers in the grid indicate the reference numbers of the parishes within the data matrix).

By the completion of the sampling procedure, 13 parishes had been identified. Of these, 4 were New Town parishes and 9 were non-New Town, with the latter including 5 with high proportions of new housing and 4 with low proportions of new housing. There was at least one parish in each of the twelve categories I to XII.

### (b) Interview Method

Crucial to the procedure for interviewing was the intention to conduct the interviews personally, rather than employ research assistants. The reflexive nature of the research method used required me to visit the parishes personally and to spend time talking with clergy and lay leaders.
The model which is eventually devised as a result of the interviews is comparative; that is, it enables one parish to be compared with another. Thus, if the same person conducts all the interviews, the same personal biases will be at work in each case and their effect will be substantially eliminated by the comparative nature of the plotting on the model.

(I) Type of Interview

Since what was required from the interview was an indication of what was really going on in the churches of the parishes selected, and why it was happening, rather than simple quantifiable data, an informal interview technique was deemed the most suitable. This would, it was hoped, enable some factual data to be disclosed in response to specific questions, such as might be involved in a formal interview which allowed no elaboration of answers beyond the data required. It was, however, also hoped to encourage the interviewees to volunteer information beyond strict categories which could be predicted beforehand.

Moser (1967 p.205f) describes three basic kinds of informal interview used in social investigations: namely, non-directive, conversational and focused. It was this latter type which was judged most appropriate. This style of interviewing avoids the inflexibility of formal methods but still gives the interview a set form, so as to ensure all relevant topics are covered. Whilst being asked for particular information respondents are, within the time available, given the opportunity to develop their views and add information beyond that which is initially requested.

Although Moser (op. cit p.206f) says that this should give the interviewer the opportunity to decide how and in what order to put questions, a slightly more structured approach was adopted in this case, with the same questions being asked in the same order in each interview, but a variety of "cues" being available for optional use to encourage elaboration of responses.

Another reason for deciding upon a less formal interview technique is to gain some benefit of what Ackroyd and Hughes (1951 p.136f) term the "triangulation" effect. This refers to the verification and refinement of results by using different methods of investigation of the same phenomenon. Denzin (1970 p.350) upon whom Ackroyd and Hughes draw, described a number of ways in which this effect can be achieved; namely, investigation of one phenomenon at different times, in different places, and using different methods. In the interviews carried out in this study it was intended that the lapse of time between postal questionnaire and interview, the inclusion of lay church leaders (churchwardens) amongst those to be interviewed, and the contrast between the postal questionnaire and the interview technique would all help to create something of this "triangulation".

A consequence of creating this flexibility within the interviews was the need for other influences creating variations in response to be minimised. The major safeguard in this respect was my conducting all the interviews personally and thus eliminating variation arising from different interviewers. It is noted below that a price had to be paid for this in relation to some of the interview sample.

(ii) Stages of Interview

The adequacy of the interviews in producing accurate and relevant data depended on the stages through which a successful interview must pass. Ackroyd and Hughes (1981 pp 77ff) describe six stages: establishing legitimacy, creating rapport, ensuring equality of freedom of interviewee and interviewers to enter relationship, relaxing the respondent, ensuring relevance and adequacy of answers, and recording answers verbatim.
The legitimacy of the interview was established by reference to the interviewee's previous response to the postal questionnaire and by the use of carefully written introductory letters prior to an appointment being sought.

Reference to the postal questionnaire and its success, the inclusion of the ecclesiastical titles of the researcher and a deliberately friendly and affirming telephone call to set up the appointment were all intended to help establish rapport with the respondent. Being very flexible about possibilities for the time and date of the interview enabled the interviewees to feel some freedom in entering into the interview relationship.

The wearing of conventional clerical dress, meticulous punctuality for the interview appointment, preliminary pleasantries and courtesies and the acceptance of hospitality offered were all factors in helping to relax the respondents. Important in this regard were the explanatory remarks with which every interview began. Also of importance in relaxing the respondent was the order in which questions were asked - commencing with those requiring factual answers before moving to ones asking for opinion or interpretation by the respondent.

The relevance and adequacy of the responses was ensured by the careful phrasing of the questions and by the use of a number of "cues", particularly when respondents appeared not to understand (or misunderstand) the question, or to have some difficulty in applying the question to their own situation.

Prior to the interviews taking place careful consideration was given to the technique to be used to record the responses of those being interviewed. It was eventually decided that the use of recording equipment would be likely to antagonise and/or intimidate interviewees, and, in particular, undermine the effort to encourage respondents to be relaxed by the interviewer presenting himself as a working priest rather than a specialist researcher. Previous personal experience indicated that clergy would be likely to be annoyed by the use of a tape recorder and lay church officers would be likely to be inhibited by the prospect of having their words recorded. Hence the interview schedule was printed in such a way as to allow responses and comments to be written in easily by hand during the interview.

(c) Interview Schedule

(i) Text of the Schedule

What follows is the schedule used in the interview. It contains the notes used as a basis for the questions as well as the format into which responses were written:

Introduction

Ask for copies of the parish magazine and expenditure side of balance sheet of church accounts, if these are available (as requested in letter confirming interview appointment).

Comment on the helpfulness of the questionnaires returned (83% response) - but data from these was, of course very generalised.

Have, therefore, chosen 13 from 144 parishes, using random technique, to try to fill out the picture - your parish one of those chosen.

Looking for three kinds of things:
1. limited amount of factual data
2. a little more subjective data about how you see your/vicar's work
3. some impressions of your own judgments about what makes the parish tick.

All-4
Please be assured that information will be treated anonymously, except with your explicit permission to do otherwise (and there are no plans to do this.)

04 Premises
What buildings are there in the parish which are directly under the control of the local church (churches, mission churches, church halls, community buildings etc.) (Place these on schedule)
Can we now go through them and look at how they are used.

(Complete a schedule for each building; a separate sheet of paper was used for this purpose)

01. Work of the incumbent
What bodies of groups do you personally belong to, other than local parish/church groups, falling into the following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>How come to join</th>
<th>How relate to your ministry?</th>
<th>Any office held?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deanery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocese etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other church:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secular bodies*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* cues: school governors, pressure groups, campaigns etc.

02. What proportion of your working time do you give to being involved with non-church people and non-church groups (including pastoral work with non-church parishioners but excluding direct evangelistic work)?

(Cue: exclude day off (1) and Sunday - Looking for number of morning/afternoon/evening blocks of time in a fairly typical week viz. how many tenths of a week - after your impression not time and motion figure!)
Q3. Sunday services apart, what are the two most inviolable items in your own diary excluding family obligations?

(Cue: things you would do/attend with priority over everything else except pastoral emergency)

Parish: Now we move to things about the parish rather than the vicar/rector.
Q4a. What are the two most important events/activities in the life of the local church in this parish during any month?

(Cue: things without which the local church would perhaps be failing to do its real job)
Q4b. What aspects of the life of the local church which resulted from your initiative are you most pleased about? and how did it come about?

Q4c. What aspects of the life of the local church which resulted from other people's initiative are you most pleased about?

Q5. What aspects of the life of the local church would you have different? and why are they not different?

Q6. In which of the following areas of life of the local church do you think you have most influence? In which area do you have next greatest influence? 

Public Worship ( )
Finance & Fundraising ( )
Keeping contact with other institutions & groups ( )
The "Spiritual" lives of your church members
Meeting the needs of the Parish/Area in general

Q7. (Now for a bit of daydreaming)
Imagine that you were having a man to come to work with you to serve his second curacy in the parish: to look after a new daughter church that you had just had built. Imagine (1) you had several men, good men, from which to choose. How important would it be for you that a particular man was trained at a college which had a similar tradition (churchmanship & the like) to the one you attended?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance Level</th>
<th>Clues about level of importance</th>
<th>Clues about changes in attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very important</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderately important</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hardly important at all</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check
The questionnaire went out a little while ago now, have there been any really major changes in the parish, or in the local church, during the past five years?

Parish

Local church

(Dguna: congregation size, patterns of Sunday or weekday worship, projects in which church is involved, organisations starting up or closing down, housing developments???)

Conclusion

Thanks and leave copy of summary

Check arrangements for seeing churchwardens at end of interview with clergy.

Notes:
Commentary on the questions

The numbering of sections below refers to the questions as numbered in the interview schedule.

Q1. As will be seen from the schedule reproduced above, the first question asked, after preliminary remarks had been made, concerned the use of the church owned buildings in the parish. A separate sheet was used for each parish on which details of the nature of the building(s) was recorded together with what groups or organisations used the building, for what purpose, with what frequency and what charges were levied for use. (This latter information was subsequently found to be of no use since charges for use of rooms were greatly influenced by local market forces!)

Being entirely factual this information was readily produced by respondents: the clergy generally had the information at their immediate disposal, and quickly ascertained it from the appropriate lay officer of the church if necessary.

Q1. The next series of questions concerned the involvement of the incumbent in groups and organisations to which he was not strictly obliged to belong because of his appointment. The object of these questions was to discover the balance of how the incumbent allocated his time and energies to church or non-church groups and activities.

These questions were repeated to the churchwardens, both to make up any omissions by the clergy, and to ascertain how the incumbents' affiliation to different groups was perceived by the churchwardens.

The use of "cues" to stimulate responses was found to be particularly important in disclosing the secular bodies to which the clergy belonged.

Q2. The next question concerned the proportion of his working time that the incumbent thought he spent with non-church members, and similarly what the churchwardens thought this proportion was. An effort here was made to gain an "impressionistic" (rather than carefully calculated) response so as to identify how the division of clergy time was actually felt by respondents.

Q3. The question concerning "inviolable" items in the incumbents' diary was the most direct question about the incumbents' own priorities, as perceived both by him and his churchwardens.

Q4. The question about important parish events and activities was also aimed at eliciting information about relative importance attached to different aspects of the church activity. The question was developed (Q4(b) and Q4(c)) to obtain information about things resulting from both clergy and lay initiatives.

Q5. Questions about "priorities" continued with that asking about areas giving rise to dissatisfaction. The answers to this question were particularly revealing, not only in helping build the total picture about priorities, but also producing direct comments about the direction in which both clergy and laity felt their church should be moving.

Q6. The respondents now having "warmed up", the question was asked about perceptions of clergy influence. Juxtaposed to the question about areas of dissatisfaction, this question looked for a fairly studied opinion about where clergy were actually influential.
Q7. The question about a possible curate was included to obtain information about the importance to the incumbent, and the importance to him as perceived by churchwardens, of the churchmanship tradition of his theological college. This data is dealt with in Chapter Eight. (4)

The interview concluded with a question about changes in the parish and local church since the postal questionnaire had been sent out. Responses here helped greatly in interpreting apparent movements of some churches on the model which was devised. (5)

(d) Perceptions of the interviewees

Mention has already been made of the conducting of all interviews by me personally. (6) This did raise difficulties in three of the interviews. In two of the 13 parishes the primary perception of me was not likely to be as an impartial interviewer but as their Rural Dean and local ecumenical officer. In one case this seemed to substantially influence how the churchwardens responded to my questions, in the other it noticeably affected how the incumbent behaved. An awareness of this helped in minimising distortions by reassuring the respondents about the nature of the interview, as did my own intimate knowledge of the two parishes concerned. There is, however, a distinct possibility that results have been distorted in relation to these parishes. It is of note that, had I been plotting the position of West Kirby from my own subjective assessment, and not from the interview data, I should have located it more towards the Community Church quadrant than it has been plotted. It may well have been that the incumbent, in particular, was trying to impress me with the quality of his own "spirituality".

2. Evaluation

(a) Quantifying responses and impressions

The intention to clarify the perception of what is happening in local churches by "triangulation" has already been mentioned. (7) One element of this involved comparison of data which is substantially impressionistic, from the interviews, with "harder" and more readily quantifiable data from the postal questionnaire. This has resulted in the attempt to transpose the interview results into ordinal data which could be used for plotting on the model.

Problems presenting themselves here have included the inapplicability of most statistical analysis to this impressionistic information; having a wide deviation in some of the devised scores and then having to combine these scores into one rank score; (8) and the unsuitability of techniques such as cluster analysis to such a small sample.

It must be noted, however, that there is no attempt here to seek "hard" data susceptible to statistical analysis; what is required is threefold:

(i) impressions and understandings not exact scores. This is why the scale is omitted from the diagrams which plot positions of parishes on the model; a scale was used, but to include it would have given a wrong impression of the nature of the information. (9)

(ii) an aggregated score showing something of the secular and sacred emphasis across the range of areas discussed in the interview.

(iii) comparative, rather than absolute, information, so as to see where one parish is in relation to another.
The following procedure was adopted:

(i) A simple count was made for each question of the appearance of both secular orientated and secular orientated items in the interview responses from each parish. (For example, for the question about "inviolate diary items", Q3, the number of items from combined response of clergy and churchwardens might be three sacred and one secular).

For question Q2 this stage was omitted and a straightforward ranked scores table constructed from the combined clergy/laity responses.

(ii) The resulting scores were then divided into either four categories (for questions Q1, Q3, Q4, Q6) or five categories (for questions Q1 and Q2), and labelled "all sacred, mostly sacred, mixed" etc. (10)

(iii) Scores were allocated of either 0, 4, 8, 12 or 0, 3, 6, 9, 12 for each question. (11)

(iv) The scores for each question, except use of church hall, were added together and then used to obtain simple rank scores. (11)

(v) The parishes were plotted onto the model using the two rank scores: priority scores from 1 to 8 on the horizontal axis and activity scores from 1 to 12 on the vertical axis using the centre of the major circles of the diagram as mid-point for the two scales. (12)

This resulted in a picture of how clergy and laity interviewed perceived the emphasis on sacred orientated and secular orientated matters, in both what was done and what was felt to be important in their local church. The picture for each parish was a comparative one, based on seeing that parish against all the other parishes in the sample.
(b) Summary of Interview Results

Table AIII2

SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF INTERVIEWS WITH CLERGY AND LAITY OF 13 PARISHES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Groups to which clergy belong</th>
<th>Interview Schedule</th>
<th>Clergy time spent on item(s)</th>
<th>Inviolable</th>
<th>Important featureschurch life</th>
<th>church life areas of tradition of Clergy</th>
<th>Perceived influence</th>
<th>Importance of tradition of Curate's Church</th>
<th>Proportion of use of college</th>
<th>'outsiders'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W.Kirby</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Mod. Imp.</td>
<td>V.High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalton</td>
<td>Mostly Sec.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Hardly Imp.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Keaton</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Mostly Sec.</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Mostly Sec.</td>
<td>Mod. Imp.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catrill</td>
<td>All Sec.</td>
<td>Low to Mod.</td>
<td>Vague Sec.</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Hardly Mod.</td>
<td>V.High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osgarth</td>
<td>All Sec.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mostly Sec.</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mostly Sec.</td>
<td>Hardly Mod.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Wiston</td>
<td>All Sec.</td>
<td>Mod. to High</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Mostly Sec.</td>
<td>Sec.+ One</td>
<td>Mostly Sec.</td>
<td>Mod. Imp.</td>
<td>Very Imp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.Bagley</td>
<td>Mostly Sec.</td>
<td>Low to Mod.</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>All Sec.</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Very Imp.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Ecton</td>
<td>Few to One Sec.</td>
<td>Mod. to High</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Mostly Sec.</td>
<td>Mostly Sec.</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Hardly Mod.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollton</td>
<td>Few to One Sec.</td>
<td>Low to Mod.</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>All Sec.</td>
<td>Sec.+ One</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Very Imp.</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.Parva</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Mostly Sec.</td>
<td>Mostly Sec.</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Mostly Sec.</td>
<td>Hardly Mod.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addison</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>All Sec.</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Very Imp.</td>
<td></td>
<td>V.Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Town</td>
<td>Many/Mostly</td>
<td>Mod. to High</td>
<td>Vague-Sec.</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Hardly Mod.</td>
<td>V.Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longby</td>
<td>All Sec.</td>
<td>Low to Mod.</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Mostly Sec.</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Sec.</td>
<td>Hardly Imp.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sec. = of secular orientation
Sec. = of sacred orientation
### Ordinal Scores

#### Numerical Representation of Interview Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Activity Indices</th>
<th>Index for Use of Church Hall</th>
<th>Priority Indices</th>
<th>Combined Priority Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groups Time on Clergy joined non-Church Influence by people</td>
<td>Combined Activity Rank</td>
<td>Inviolable Important Aspects Church life be different</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(01) (02) (06) AR (GH)</td>
<td>(Q3) (Q4) (Q5) PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Kirby</td>
<td>4 12 0 6 12 08 3</td>
<td>6 12 0 8 0 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalton</td>
<td>8 .6 8 9 9 0 8</td>
<td>9 9 8 0 8 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Keston</td>
<td>4 0 4 3 6 0 4</td>
<td>3 6 0 4 0 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattrill</td>
<td>12 3 8 10 12 4 8</td>
<td>10 12 4 8 0 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osgarth</td>
<td>12 6 12 12 9 8 12</td>
<td>12 9 8 12 12 8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Wiston</td>
<td>12 9 4 11 9 0 4</td>
<td>11 9 0 4 4 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Bagley</td>
<td>8 3 8 6 6 0 0</td>
<td>8 6 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Ecton</td>
<td>0 9 8 7 3 0 4</td>
<td>0 7 0 4 8 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polton</td>
<td>0 3 0 1 0 0 4</td>
<td>0 1 0 0 4 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Perve</td>
<td>4 6 4 4 9 12 12</td>
<td>4 9 12 12 0 7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldsend</td>
<td>4 0 0 2 3 0 0</td>
<td>4 0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Town</td>
<td>8 9 0 7 0 4 8</td>
<td>8 7 0 4 8 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langby</td>
<td>12 3 0 5 9 0 4</td>
<td>12 3 5 9 0 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indices used are arbitrary scores based on categorisation of levels of sacred/secular priority or activity in each parish.

Each index is based on 0 - 12 range from high sacred orientation (low scores) to high secular orientation (high scores).
(ii) Plotting on the model

The scores shown in columns AR and PR in table AII:3 above were plotted onto the model as follows:

Two axes, vertical scaled 0 to 12, and horizontal scaled 1 to 8, and equal in length were drawn as indicated in Diagram AII:1. Parishes were plotted onto the resultant grid using the scores for AR against the vertical axis and scores PR against the horizontal axis. Using the point 4.5, 6 as centre, two circles were drawn: the outer circle with a radius equal in length to the range of the two scales; the inner circle with a radius $\frac{4}{10}$ of the length of the range of the two scales.

The information regarding the use of church halls was plotted using the scores in column QH in Table AII:3 for the vertical scale in place of AR.

Diagram AII:1

Scales used for plotting on the Model

[Diagram showing two concentric circles with AR and PR scales from 0 to 12 and 1 to 8 respectively.]
(d) Categorised results from Postal Questionnaire

Table AII-14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Sacred Activity</th>
<th>Secular Activity</th>
<th>Sacred Priority</th>
<th>Secular Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Kirby</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalton</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourne Keaton</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattrill</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osgarath</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Wiston</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Bagley</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ecton</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polton</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topley Parva</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldsend</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Town</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langby</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table is used as basis for defining approximate location of each of 13 parishes on model as at 1981.
Notes on Appendix II

1. These groups are described in Chapter V, section 1(b) (page 100).

2. Section 1(d) (page All-9).

3. See section 1(c)(ii) (page All-8).

4. See Chapter VIII section 3(b)(i) (page 207).

5. See Chapter X section 2(g) (page 299).

6. See section 1(b)(i) above (page All-3).

7. See section 1(b)(i) above (page All-3).

8. See, for example, the Activity indices for parish Wk in Table All:3 in section 2(c)(i) below (page All-12).

9. See section 2(c)(ii) below for the method of plotting individual parishes on the model (page All-13).

10. See Table All:2 in section 2(b) below (page All-11).

11. See Table All:3 in section 2(c)(i) below (page All-12).

12. See section 2(c)(ii) below (page All-13).
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