

ASBURY SEMINARY
1990508992



Abstract

A Study to Identify and Describe Chaplain Role Expectations on Ships in the United States Navy

by

Herstel G. Carter

The key to an effective ministry on a Navy ship is for the ship's commander and chaplain to have a harmonized view of the chaplain's role. Occasionally, commanders expect chaplains to perform functions that are unclear and ambiguous causing *role tension*. This study examined chaplain role expectations among commanders and chaplains in order to identify differences that may exist. The purpose was to determine the extent of the need to provide clarification and enhance compatibility in perceptions.

Following the guidelines found in Paul D. Leedy's book, Practical Research, and using surveys from Ambercrombie, Cook, Gomulka, Hienke, Visser, and Zahn as examples the descriptive research method was used. This study did not attempt to establish cause and effect, but was diagnostic in its attempt to identify role expectations and discrepancies. The research questions that guided this study were: (1) What are the role expectations chaplains have of themselves? (2) What are the role expectations commanders have of their chaplains? and (3) What discrepancies exist in the way chaplains and commanders view the role of chaplains on ships?

The review of literature revealed extending Christ's ministry in the Navy is the foundation for the Christian

chaplain's *master role*. In addition, six functional roles emerged to create the chaplain's *master role* for this study. Included are administrator, teacher, pastor, priest, preacher, and project coordinator.

Although findings reveal few discrepancies between chaplains' and commanders' expectations concerning the *master role*, they do support several conclusions: (1) commanders do not know the Navy's regulations/policy concerning the role of the chaplain, and rank the chaplain last in importance; (2) commanders and chaplains agree administering the command religious program is important for the command's mission; (3) commanders rank chaplains' role of teacher as not important to commands' mission; (4) consensus exist between chaplains and commanders regarding the importance of pastoral care in accomplishing the mission; (5) commanders expect chaplains to make counseling a priority over worship and sacramental services, and chaplains disagree; (6) no significant differences exist concerning the role of preacher - chaplains are expected to be relevant/dynamic preachers; and (7) two areas of dissensus exist between commanders and chaplains concerning the role of project coordinator - commanders expect chaplains to participate in two areas considered illegitimate by chaplains, i.e., Family Advocate Representative and Damage Control Team Trainer.

DISSERTATION APPROVAL

**This is to certify that the
dissertation entitled
A STUDY TO IDENTIFY AND DESCRIBE CHAPLAIN ROLE EXPECTATIONS
ON SHIPS IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY**

presented by

Herstel George Carter

**has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for the
DOCTOR OF MINISTRY degree of
Asbury Theological Seminary
Wilmore, Kentucky**

April 24, 1997
Date

Harold W. Burgess
Mentor

April 24, 1997
Date

Anthony J. Headley
Internal Reader

April 24, 1997
Date

Leslie A. Andrews
Director of D. Min. Dept.

A STUDY TO IDENTIFY AND DESCRIBE CHAPLAIN ROLE EXPECTATIONS
ON SHIPS IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of Doctor of Ministry Department
Asbury Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Ministry

by
Herstel G. Carter

May 1997

© 1997

Herstel George Carter

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	v
Acknowledgements	vii
Preface	viii
Chapter	
1. OVERVIEW OF STUDY (THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING) ...	1
The Problem and Its Context.....	6
The Statement of the Problem and RQs.....	7
The Methodology of the Study.....	8
The Dependent and Independent Variables.....	11
The Delimitations.....	12
The Definition of Terms.....	12
The Abbreviations.....	15
The Assumptions.....	16
The Theological Reflection.....	16
The Overview of Remainder of Dissertation.....	17
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	19
Role Theory and the Chaplain.....	19
Role Problems.....	22
Coping With Role Problems.....	26
The Chaplain's Master Role.....	27
Maintaining the Master Role.....	39
Clarifying Chaplain Functional Roles.....	41
Chaplain Role Expectation Surveys.....	42
Literature Review Summary.....	52

3. DESIGN OF THE STUDY.....	48
Population and Sample.....	49
Instrumentation.....	50
Data Collection.....	52
Variables of Expectations.....	54
Data Analysis.....	58
4. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS.....	60
Overview.....	60
Demographics Data.....	60
Findings From Data About Research Questions.....	67
Findings From Interviews.....	113
Findings and Analysis Summary.....	124
5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	138
Chaplains' Master Role.....	138
Role Conclusions and Recommendations.....	139
Recommendations For Further Research.....	154

Appendixes

A. Copy of Pilot Test Questionnaire.....	155
B. First Revised Questionnaire.....	162
C. Final Revised Questionnaire.....	175
D. Copies of SECNAVINST 1730.7A and OPNAVINST 1730.1C	184
E. Navy Chief of Chaplains revised "Your Chaplain and the Command Religious Program".....	215
F. Cover Letters to Commanders and Chaplains.....	219
G. Follow-up Memorandum to Commanders.....	222
Works Cited.....	226

TABLES

Table	Page
1. Survey Log.....	59
2. Tables' Descriptors' Definitions.....	68-70
3. Demographics.....	71
4. Comparison of Chaplains' Referenced Characteristics Mean Scores Based on Rank.....	73-74
5. Comparison of Commanders' Referenced Characteristics Mean Scores Based on Rank.....	75
6. Comparison of Commanders' Referenced Characteristics Mean Scores Based on Religion.....	76-77
7. Chaplains' Perceptions of Commanders' Knowledge of Chaplains' Roles.....	79
8. Chaplains' Perceptions of Commanders' Priorities of Chaplains' Master Role.....	80
9. Chaplains' Perceptions of Commanders' Priorities of Department Heads.....	81
10. Chaplains' Expectations of Chaplains' Roles.....	82-85
11. Cronbach's Alpha Scale - Reliability Analysis.....	85-86
12. Chaplains' Areas of Limitation for Chaplains' Effectiveness.....	94
13. Chaplains' Suggestions for Improvement for Chaplain's Effectiveness.....	95
14. Commanders' Perceptions and Knowledge of Chaplains' Roles.....	96
15. Commanders' Priorities of Master Role.....	97-98
16. Commanders' Priorities of Department Heads.....	98

17.	Commanders' Expectations of Chaplains' Roles.....	99-102
18.	Commanders' Areas of Limitation for Chaplains' Effectiveness.....	111-112
19.	Commanders' Suggestions for Improvement for Chaplains' Effectiveness.....	112-113
20.	T-test for Equality of Means for Chaplains' Perceptions and Commanders' Knowledge of Roles.....	113
21.	T-test for Equality of Means for Chaplains' and Commanders' Expectations of Chaplains' Roles.....	114-116
22.	T-test for Equality of Means for Chaplains' and Commanders' Expectations of Master Role Functions.....	121
23.	T-test for Equality of Means for Chaplains' Perceptions and Commanders' Priorities of Chaplains' Roles.....	123
24.	T-test for Equality of Means for Chaplains' Perceptions and Commanders' Priorities of Chaplains' Roles.....	124
25.	Comparison of Chaplains' and Commanders' Areas of Limitation for Chaplains' Effectiveness.....	125
26.	Comparison of Chaplains' and Commanders' Suggestions for Improvement for Chaplains' Effectiveness.....	126-127

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I express my deepest gratitude to the following people who assisted me in the completion of this study:

- * The Lord Jesus Christ, who by His grace, gave me strength and endurance to accomplish this task.
- * Isabel, my wife, my best friend, and my partner in ministry, whose unconditional and unwavering love has been a constant source of strength.
- * Dr. Leslie Andrews for her patience (especially with my Navy deployment schedule), direction, and support to the end.
- * Dr. Harold Burgess who relentlessly guided and encouraged me with his wise counsel.
- * Dr. E. Dean Cook for his encouragement and valuable insights of the chaplain's role.
- * Dr. Anthony Headley for his time and efforts in serving as a reader.
- * Carroll Hunt who assisted in reading and editing.
- * Michele Powers for always being there, and processing all preliminary requirements.
- * My Congregational Reflection Group (CRG) whose diligence, guidance, and support have been vital to the successful completion of this study.

PREFACE

This study was conducted in the institutional setting of the United States Navy. With the approval of the Chief of Chaplains' office, using a descriptive research method, an attempt was made to identify chaplains' role expectations and possible discrepancies between ships' commanders and chaplains. Surveys were given to sixty ships' commanders and thirty ships' chaplains in the San Diego Naval Station area. A Congregational Reflection Group made up of six Lieutenants (junior chaplains), three Lieutenant Commanders (mid-level chaplains), and four Commanders (senior chaplains) assisted in formulating research questions, survey design, and evaluating results. The study did not attempt to establish cause and effect, but was diagnostic in its attempt to identify role expectations and discrepancies.

CHAPTER 1

Overview of the Study

As I sat in the lounge area outside Admiral Robinson's office, on January 18, 1996, awaiting a counseling session, my mind scanned the previous two and one-half months. As a passenger onboard an American Airlines Flight I had become involved in one of the Navy's recently publicized "scandals." Charlie (fictitious name), a Navy chief petty officer (E-7) had become drunk and sexually assaulted Lucy (fictitious name), a female third class petty officer (E-4).

It all began the morning of October 27, 1995. After the completion of a decommissioning ceremony for the USS SAMUEL GOMPERS (AD37) the commanding officer hosted a reception for all officers and enlisted personnel. All officers and chief petty officers were expected to attend, including me as the command chaplain. During this reception both non-alcoholic and alcoholic punch was served. Charlie, who was well known by the command to be an alcoholic, attended this reception. Whether he drank or not at this reception is not known at this time; however, the commanding officer was not expected to prevent him from drinking alcohol.

Following the reception more than two-thirds of the crew made their way to the international airport to fly back to their homeport of Alameda, California. My flight did not leave until 6:00 pm so I spent three hours walking through the airport. At 5:00 pm I began to make my way to the gate

and I saw several former USS SAMUEL GOMPERS' crewmembers sitting at a table in a lounge. As their former chaplain I felt that I was expected to spend a few minutes visiting with them. I sat down by Charlie and ordered a coke. Charlie and the other crew members were drinking alcohol but I did not think it was abnormal, so after five minutes I headed toward the gate.

At 6:00 pm approximately twenty former GOMPERS' sailors boarded an American Airlines Flight heading toward Oakland, California, via Dallas, Texas. After about thirty minutes into the flight, two female petty officers came to me and said, "Chaplain, Charlie is drunk and you need to do something to get him calmed down or he will be taken off the plane and arrested in Dallas." These young ladies assumed it was my role as a chaplain to help Charlie to keep him from getting into trouble. And they were right. So I left my seat and escorted him back to his original seat, which was next to Lucy. I reiterated the fact that if he did not calm down and control his language he would be arrested when we arrived in Dallas. He appeared to calm down and go to sleep. As I made my way back to my seat I stopped and sat in an empty aisle seat only two rows away in case I was needed again. And sure enough, fifteen minutes later I heard Lucy say something to the effect of, "leave me alone." Again as a chaplain I knew that I must intercede, so I went back to her and asked, "Are you alright? Do you need my help? What did

Charlie do to bother you?" Her response was that she was fine and she did not need any help. Once again I told Charlie that he needed to calm down and watch his language or the pilot would have him arrested when we arrived in Dallas. After that I went back to my seat. It appeared that Charlie had gone to sleep. But after approximately forty-five minutes I heard Lucy say, "You are in the military twenty-four hours a day and you should act like it," and then I looked back and saw her stand up and hit him in the face. It appeared they were fighting so I immediately went over and sat between them. At first Lucy was angry with me because of Charlie, but she would not tell me what he had done, only that she wanted his name, social security number, and address of his new duty station. I said that I could not give her that information because of the "privacy act" for all Navy personnel. She continued to be angry with me and implied that she expected me to have him arrested without knowing why. By now everyone in the back section of the plane, including an Air Force colonel, knew that I was a Navy chaplain, and they too expected me to take care of the problem without knowing what had happened. After about ten minutes Lucy finally revealed to me that Charlie had sexually assaulted her, i.e. he had groped her. With that information I agreed to assist her in taking legal action against him. She had two options, (1) have him arrested when we landed in Dallas, or (2) have him charged when we reached Alameda Naval

Air Station in California. She said her main concern was to get to Alameda and pick up her car so she could drive to San Diego to her parents' home, so she chose to wait until we arrived in Oakland and file charges in Alameda.

On the second flight, from Dallas to Oakland, I made arrangements with the flight attendant to sit next to Lucy so I could give her pastoral support and reassure her that I would assist her in filing charges. In fact, I wrote out a "voluntary statement" covering the events that had taken place on the American Airlines flight to give to the base police in Alameda. After reading her the statement she appeared to go to sleep. In Oakland Charlie was ordered to go to the Naval Air Station security office. I arranged to meet Lucy there and went directly to the security office and filed a report while I was waiting for Lucy to arrive. Lucy arrived about one hour later, but Charlie failed to show. After filing her report I offered counsel to Lucy and volunteered to assist Lucy in getting a room for the night at the Navy Lodge. She refused because her concern was to get to San Diego.

The following weeks brought many questions concerning the chaplain's role in this "scandal." The media blasted the LCDR chaplain (me) for not doing what I was expected to do. The Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) said, "We have a leadership problem and we need to fix it," implying that I did not do what he expected of me. Following orders from

above the NCIS tried to file charges against me for negligence. And now, as I sat waiting to appear before the Admiral I asked myself, "What was I supposed to do as a chaplain?" My behavior was proper and I had done everything I thought was expected of me as a chaplain and naval officer.

In Admiral Robinson's office I learned that role expectations of chaplains may change depending on the context. The context was the political atmosphere the media had created, and because I was in the middle of it I was expected to do more! What that "more" was, Admiral Robinson did not make clear, except perhaps he meant I could have stopped Charlie from drinking even though the commanding officer could or would not earlier.

This presents a dilemma for me as a Navy chaplain. As Gordon C. Zahn puts it, my role as a chaplain is in tension. He says:

It is a *role in tension* in the sense that it has two dimensions, each oriented to separate value systems which may under certain circumstances require contrasting behaviors and put the individual playing the role in a severe dilemma of decision as to which action on his part is most appropriate to the given situation. (Zahn 26).

"What are the expectations of my role as a chaplain?" As a staff-officer, was I responsible for physically stopping Charlie from drinking in the airport lounge, and physically restraining him during the flight prior to the incident even though the command was not responsible?

Although I may never be able to resolve my dilemma, this question is the catalyst for this research project.

The Problem and Its Context

The context in which the Navy chaplain conducts ministry is an institutional setting. As pastors, Navy chaplains are expected to manifest God's love, care, and concern to all personnel, regardless of religious background or preference. In this pluralistic setting the chaplain's task is a single labor, but it involves diverse responsibilities. The Bible says, "And his gifts were that some should be apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers, and some administrators for...and building up the body of Christ..." (Eph. 4:11-12). Churches and Naval Services commanders expect their Navy chaplains to perform all these duties listed in Ephesians 4. However, the chaplains serve within the mission-defined parameters of the Navy and, according to Donald W. Hadley and Gerald T. Richards, are expected to make positive contributions toward its fulfillment. They also say that, "Chaplains will understand the mission-determined priorities of the institution and integrate their pastoral priorities with institutional ones the best they can" (Hadley and Richards 25). Sometimes, however, as happened in my case, tension or conflict occurs when role expectations change or become ambiguous.

Richard Edgar Visser says, "For most clergymen today, role ambiguity and role conflict are not matters of mere

academic curiosity. Rather, these are the heart of the most difficult problems that the minister faces" (Visser 1). In his research on "pastoral role expectations" Visser found that the most frequently indicated significant problems had to do with expectations.

Navy chaplains are clergy placed in a military institutional hierarchy. As both officer and clergy the Navy chaplain is in a dual role. In this position, commanders' expectations are sometimes unclear and ambiguous causing the chaplain to experience "role tension" and or "role conflict." The chaplain faces the same problems today that Visser's findings reveal. This places my research in the context of "value research" (Zahn 7) for the Navy, thereby, providing validity for a study on chaplain role expectations.

The Statement of the Problem

This research proposed to identify and describe Navy chaplain role expectations among Naval ships' commanders and chaplains; to compare the various role expectations; and to describe differences, if any, that exist.

This study examined these expectations with a survey developed by the researcher. It was anticipated that information would be gained to identify areas of conflict, if any, in the role of Navy chaplains on ships. Also, this information was expected to aid in the determination of the necessity of providing clarification in order to enhance

compatibility in perceptions concerning the role of ships' chaplains.

The research questions that guided this study were:

Research Question # 1. What are the role expectations Navy chaplains have of themselves?

Research Question # 2. What are the role expectations Navy ships' commanders have of their chaplains?

Research Question # 3. What discrepancies, if any, exist in the way Navy chaplains and Navy commanders view the role of chaplains in the Navy?

The Methodology of the Study

Following the guidelines found in Paul D. Leedy's book, Practical Research, and in studies by Ambercrombie, Cook, Gomulka, Hienke, Visser, and Zahn, the *descriptive research method* was used. This study did not attempt to establish cause and effect, but was diagnostic in its attempt to identify role expectations and discrepancies. The research questions that guided this study were: (1) What are the role expectations chaplains have of themselves? (2) What are the role expectations commanders have of their chaplains? and (3) What discrepancies exist in the way chaplains and commanders view the role of chaplains on ships?

A literature review was conducted to discover the theological teaching on the chaplain's role, its historical development, the chaplain's master role, role theory and its implication for the chaplain, practical helps for clarifying

chaplain role expectations, and the findings of surveys on chaplain role expectations. Resources for this review were obtained from the libraries of Asbury Theological Seminary, Department of the Navy Chaplains' Resource Board, Point Loma Nazarene College, San Diego County Public Library System, UMI Dissertation Services, and University of California San Diego. This review revealed that extending Christ's ministry in the Navy is the foundation for the Christian chaplain's *master role*. In addition, six functional roles emerged to create the chaplain's *master role* for this study. Included are administrator, teacher, pastor, priest, preacher, and project coordinator.

Through group and individual meetings, a *congregational reflection group* was used to assist in the development of this dissertation; especially in evaluating and interpreting research data. After gaining permission from the Commander Naval Surface Forces Pacific Chaplain, on January 24, 1996, during a weekly area chaplains meeting, I asked for volunteers to participate in a reflection group to meet no less than eight times during the next fifteen months discussing chaplain's role expectations, survey questions, results etc. Six Lieutenants (junior chaplains), three Lieutenant Commanders (mid-level chaplains) and four Commanders (senior chaplains) agreed to meet at 9:00 am every second Wednesday of each month in the Chapel Annex conference room.

On 25 January 1996 I obtained permission from Captain Eileen O'Hickey, U.S. Navy Chief of Chaplains office (via Commander Gil Gibson by phone) to conduct a survey within the context of the Navy.

The population for the study was Navy chaplains and ships' commanders in the San Diego Naval Station area. Eighty of the 360 ships in the U.S. Navy are homeported in San Diego. Forty chaplains are assigned to provide ministry to these ships in San Diego. This represents almost one-fourth of the entire fleet of ships. Due to the transitional nature of the Navy, the San Diego ships' chaplains and commanders represent the entire Navy's population of ship's chaplains and commanders.

Using the proportional stratified sampling technique, the sample consisted of ship's commanders and chaplains in San Diego. Ninety questionnaires (60 to Commanders and 30 to Chaplains in the San Diego Naval Station area) were used to gather data needed to discover basic role expectations. The chaplains' questionnaires were hand delivered, and the commanders' questionnaires were hand delivered by ship's chaplains.

The first draft of the instrument to be used (descriptive survey questionnaire) was distributed to Navy personnel at the Norfolk Naval Shipyard in Norfolk, Virginia in October 1995, and to the congregational reflection group in January 1996 for a pilot test (Appendix A). The first

revised instrument is attached as Appendix B. Prior to distributing for data collection a second revision was made, and the final instrument is attached as Appendix C.

Also, personal interviews were conducted in an attempt to gain nuances of the interpretation of findings. These interviews were based on a simple random sampling of five ships' commanders and five chaplains. The questions were based on the descriptive survey method questionnaire and focused on the major areas related to the research questions about the *master role*. Through statements and expressed feelings from commanders (subject-persons) and chaplains (object-persons), these interviews became a powerful tool for understanding the findings. One can assume the respondents' descriptive accounts reflected their true expectations.

Dependent and Independent Variables

As with any problem there are always variables. Dependent variables are those being described, caused or explained; the "causee." The dependent variables in this study were *role expectations, role behavior, and role ambiguity*.

Independent variables are those doing the causing or explaining; the "causer." For this study nine independent variables that affect expectations were: *subject person, object person, referenced characteristics, modality, contextualization, legitimacy, formalization, stereotypy, and saliency*.

The Delimitations

Several factors limited this research. First, the problem considered only chaplain role expectations in the institutional setting of the U.S. Navy. Second, it was limited to Naval Services ships' commanders and chaplains from the Pacific Coast. Third, time played a part in limiting the participation of the reflection group; i.e. due to deployments, duties, etc., some of the chaplains were not able to attend all of the group meetings. Fourth, my own preconceived ideas may have limited the objectivity of the project; e.g. my bias of the "pastoral role" as priority over "staff officer."

The Definition of Terms

Several terms need clarification. These are:

Navy Chaplain. A minister, priest, or rabbi who has answered a specialized call of God to provide ministry to sailors and marines within the context of the Navy.

Chaplains are endorsed by their faith groups/denominations and commissioned to serve as both clergy and officer in the United States Navy.

Expectations. *Expectations* appear frequently in this study. Bruce J. Biddle defines *expectations* as statements that express reactions about characteristics of one or more persons. These *expectations* are not neutral, rather they assert, approve or evaluate human characteristics. They may be expressed in three forms: overtly (*enunciations*), covertly

(*conceptions* - holding, but not uttering) and written (*inscriptions*). For Biddle, "the expressor is known as the *subject person*, whereas the referenced person(s) whose characteristics are at issue in the expectation is called the *object person*" (122). For purposes of this research, commanding officers appear as the *subject person*, whereas the chaplain appears as the *object person*.

Role. According to Herbert F. Streaun *role* denotes "the behavioral enactment of that part of the status which describes how the status occupant should act toward one of the persons with whom his status rights and obligations put him in contact" (Morton Deutsch and R.H. Krauss from Theories in Social Psychology, 1965, qtd in Streaun 196). For purposes of this study *role* denotes the behavioral functions the chaplain should perform in the context of the institution of the Navy, specifically on ships for commanding officers. The definition of the chaplain's role in the Navy is crucial to the effective functioning of the Command Religious Program (CRP) on Navy ships.

Master Role. Visser defines *master role* as the classic over-all role that integrates all the other roles. The chaplain's *master role* identifies him/her as clergy/minister. In the context of the Navy he/she must integrate Samuel Blizzard's six practitioner roles (preacher, teacher, priest, organizer, administrator, pastor) with other functional roles

that are determined by SECNAVINST 1730.7A, and by his/her status as a staff officer.

Role-ambiguity. *Role-ambiguity* "arises from a lack of clear and adequate two-way communication concerning role expectations and is usually due to conditions of rapid change and/or inadequate management practices" (Anderson 11, Pastoral Psychology, March 1971).

Role-conflict. *Role-conflict* usually occurs for the chaplain (object-person) when the commander (subject-person) expects the chaplain to perform/function outside the parameters he/she feels is within the *master role*.

Role-tension. *Role-tension* occurs when the subject person requires the object-person to behave in his/her role in a contrasting ways. Hence, I was in *role-tension* when I was re- quired to be a "police officer" and a "pastor" at the same time.

Role-overload. *Role-overload* is a complex form of role-conflict that comes when the object-person desires to respond to all the tasks urged upon him by the subject-person(s), but finds it impossible to comply within the limits of his time and energy. "*Role-overload* is experienced as a conflict of priorities or as a conflict between quality and quantity" (Katz and Kahn, qtd. in Anderson 11, Pastoral Psychology, March 1971).

Role Theory. Bruce J. Biddle defines *role theory* as "a vehicle for discussing the thoughts of subjects concerning

social events" (141). Hence, a vehicle for studying chaplain *role expectations* among commanders and chaplains.

Commanders. Commanders denotes the commanding officers and executive officers of ships, who have direct responsibility for the Religious Ministries that are to be carried out by the chaplain.

Ministry. Ministry is related to the duties (functions) a chaplain performs to provide for the spiritual, religious, moral, corporate and personal well being of all members (and family members) of the command to which he/she is attached.

Clergy. For purposes of this study clergy was used to denote both male and female clergypersons.

SECNAVINST 1730.7A and OPNAVINST 1730.1C. Current Navy regulations which form the lens through which the Navy chaplaincy must be seen and the crucible in which the role of the Navy chaplain must be shaped. These were not established lightly; they were formulated with both the theological and historical frameworks in mind. Together these instructions state that the mission of the Chaplain Corps is to "provide appropriate ministries to support the religious needs and preferences of all members of the naval service...", implying that the Navy chaplain is *expected* to be both a professional naval officer and a *person of God, making a difference*. (See Appendix D).

Abbreviations

USN. USN is the abbreviation used for the U.S. Navy.

CRP. CRP is the abbreviation used for Command Religious Program (Religious ministries delivered for the command).

PMO. PMO is the abbreviation used for Planned Ministry Objectives planned to accomplish the mission of the CRP.

MWR. MWR is the abbreviation for Moral, Welfare and Recreation, in this study referring to the function of coordinating all MWR activities.

Assumptions

Several assumptions were surmised in this study. First, it was assumed that there are identifiable differences in expectations among commanders and chaplains as to the chaplain's role in the Navy. Second, it was assumed that because of the differences there is a potential for role-ambiguity (leads to *role tension, role conflict, and role overload*). The third assumption was that the criterion group consisting of commanders and chaplains in the San Diego area is representative of the universe of commanders and chaplains on ships in the Navy.

Theological Reflection

The theological framework for this study came from the chaplain's *master role* as defined in the literature review in chapter 2, pages 25-36. A summary follows.

The chaplain's *master role* is established by the nature and the mission of the Church. In the Old Testament church there are three distinct ministries of God: prophetic, priestly, and kingly. In Jesus Christ these ministries were

assimilated and exemplified. He gave them their ultimate definition. As a prophet he faithfully declared the whole purpose of God. As priest he represents the people before God. And as king he has authority over the church. Jesus' disciples (New Testament Church) were commissioned to carry these same ministerial roles to all the world.

As the disciples were called, so Navy chaplains are called. When we enter into this ministry, we must, as prophets, priests, and kings, integrate the offices of Ephesians 4 and Blizzard's six practitioner roles (Smart, 235, Review and Expositor, LV, qtd. in Visser 27). This should be the foundation upon which the functional roles and expectations of Navy chaplains are built.

Overview

The dissertation consists of five chapters. Chapter 1 introduces the problem and its setting as seen in pages 1-16 of this paper.

Chapter 2 gives a survey of appropriate literature. Using several writers on the role of the chaplain in the military this review established the theoretical framework for this study. Only four writers - E. Dean Cook, Gary Heinke, E. T. Gomulka and Ralph M. Stogdill - conducted actual research projects on Navy Chaplain roles/expectations.

Chapter 3 discusses the design of the study. Specifically, the research questions, the instrumentation

used in the study, data collection and analysis are discussed in detail.

Chapter 4 delineates the findings, i.e. the results of the questionnaires are analyzed and reported.

Chapter 5 summarizes the major findings. The data is interpreted and followed by a theological reflection. Also practical applications of the findings are discussed where applicable.

CHAPTER 2

Review of Related Literature

As both Cook and Visser state, studies on the ministry and nature of those called into the ministry are many while the field of resources narrows when role expectations are examined.

The purpose of this literature review was to establish a framework that provides theoretical lenses through which to view and answer my research questions. Because this study sought to identify and describe role expectations of chaplains in the Navy, a body of social science theory, particularly role theory, was germane to such an analysis.

In order to reveal how the literature review impacted my stated problem I divided this review into six themes: (1) Role Theory and the Chaplain; (2) The Chaplain's Role Problems; (3) Coping With Role Problems; (4) The Chaplain's Master Role; (5) Clarifying the Chaplain's Functional Roles; and (6) Chaplain Role Expectation Surveys.

Role Theory and The Chaplain

Role theory provides a means to study and describe the interaction of two members of a social group as they adjust to each other within a social system. Herbert F. Strean, in his examination of social and behavioral science orientations applicable to the theory and practice of social casework, says that role theory is a relatively new field that studies

real-life behavior. Quoting Bruce Biddle and Edwin Thomas he states:

A major tenet of role theory is that the real-life behavior which it studies is determined socially--much, although not all of the variance of behavior is ascribed to the operation of immediate or past external influences. Such influences include the demands and prescriptions of others, the behavior of others as it rewards or punishes the person, and the individual's understanding of these factors. (qtd. in Streaan 198).

James Anderson, in his book To Come Alive! Revitalizing the Local Church, says that the concept is a powerful tool for understanding the way social systems cohere and function. Derived from the "theater" concept, he says it enables us to move beyond static descriptions of organizational realities in order to begin to sense and describe patterned forces and processes which link the members of an organization in the dramas of their work. He states that when a person reads for a part in a play, he/she is handed a script which contains dialogue and stage directions. These are the author's expectations for the role. And according to Anderson, under the impact of interaction with the director and the remainder of the cast the role is further defined. As Anderson would say a similar process continually occurs in the Navy. The commander of the ship, as author, hands a script to the chaplain that contains directives. These are the author's expectations for the role. The chaplain, as the actor, enters the role, and under the impact of interaction he or she further defines the role.

Although, as Streaun points out, role theory encompasses both role behavior and role expectations in many settings, the core concern for this study was *role expectations* among commanders and chaplains. With this in mind, in order to understand the stated problem intelligently, it was necessary to define *expected roles and variables*, and provide a *theoretical model*.

Expected Roles. According to Visser, the behavior expectations which attach to the various statuses an individual occupies are collectively described as the role. Biddle describes the *expected role* as "the set of expectations for the behaviors, in context, of an object-person (or position) that are held consensually by one or more subject-persons (or are attributed to them by others)" (210). *Expectations* consist of subject-held or emitted statements that express a *modal reaction* (prescriptive, cathetic, or descriptive) about characteristics of object-persons. With this in mind, it follows that expectations may be differentiated from one another in at least five ways:

(a) in the subjects who hold or emit them; (b) in the object persons to whom they refer; (c) in the referenced characteristics that specify their content; (d) in their modality; and (e) in their form - either conceptions, enunciations, or inscriptions. (Biddle 132).

Variables. Several variables that may influence the *expectations* of the subject-person and the *expected roles* for the object-person on ships are the same as those mentioned in chapter one: subject-person, object-person, referenced

characteristics, modal reaction, contextualization, legitimacy, formalization, stereotypy, and saliency.

Theoretical model. Visser provides a theoretical model for role theory in his dissertation as taken from the book Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict by Robert L. Kahn, Donald M. Wolfe, Robert P. Quinn, J. Diedrick Snoek, and Robert A. Rosenthal. He calls it "role episode" and says that it provides a general orientation to the interactions of the major groups of variables. In this model the subject-person becomes the "role-sender," and the object-person becomes the "focal person." The "role episode" is part of a process which is cyclic and ongoing. By use of this model, Visser shows that, based on variables, role pressures originate in the expectations held by the role senders. The response the focal person feeds back to the role sender depends on whether he considers the expectation to be legitimate or illegitimate. If legitimate his reaction may be a submissively compliant response, which is what Streaan calls "complementarity," i.e. the reciprocal role of a role partner is carried out automatically without difficulty and in the expected way. If illegitimate, role problems may develop.

Role Problems

Streaan calls role problems "strains in the equilibrium of the system." He says these may occur because of an unstable role structure, ambiguous role definitions and

expectations, or the failure of role complementarity between role partners.

James Anderson, in his study on "Pastoral Support of Clergy-Role Development Within Local Congregations," calls role problems "role dilemmas." He says these occur when there is *role conflict* and/or *role ambiguity*.

Periskila Netty Lintang, in The Expectations of the Laity to the Roles of the Pastor in Chinese Churches, says role conflict and role ambiguity are linked together by the behavioral dynamic of expectations. According to Lintang:

When expectations are not met, there is discrepancy... Discrepancies in role expectations create many problems, e.g. stress and job dissatisfaction. No organization, not even the church, is exempt from the effects of these factors. (Lintang 77).

Visser says four categories of problems arise in the ongoing cycles of role episodes. From the review of studies by Anderson, Lintang, Strean, Visser, and Zahn there appear to be at least five categories: *role ambiguity*, *role conflict*, *role tension*, *role overload*, and *role-person-incongruity* (or failure of role complementarity).

Understanding each of these is the first step in answering research question number three, i.e. in identifying the discrepancies which create problems and conflict commanders have with chaplains and chaplains have with commanders.

Role ambiguity. As stated in the definition of terms, *role ambiguity* "arises from a lack of clear and adequate two-way communication concerning role expectations, and is

usually due to conditions of rapid change and/or inadequate management practices" (Anderson 11, Pastoral Psychology, March 1971). John R. McClure clarifies this in his study on Realities and Expectations: Roles of the Pentecostal Pastor. He says:

When boundaries and expectations of tasks in a given role are not clearly delineated and are vague to the individual assuming the role, the result is role ambiguity,...which is a source of stress because there is no sense of having completed or fulfilled expectations regarding the role. (McClure 2).

From Visser's findings one could surmise that in this situation, in the Navy, the commander who is the role sender (subject-person) may question why the chaplain is performing certain functions and neglecting others (e.g. coordinating community relations projects on Sunday instead of conducting worship). At the same time the chaplain, who is the focal person (object-person), wonders why his/her actions do not satisfy the commander. If the commander directs the chaplain to do different or even inconsistent things, he may not know what to do.

Role conflict. *Role conflict* is a clash between different role expectations and usually occurs for the chaplain (object-person) when the commander (subject-person) expects the chaplain to perform/function outside the parameters he/she feels is within the *master role*. Anderson points out that he found, in his study on pastoral

development within congregations, that *role conflict* can come from one or more of the following four sources:

- a) between different roles of the same individual;
- b) inter-sender; when two or more people of the individuals role set are communicating conflicting expectations;
- c) intra-sender; when the same person is sending conflicting expectations or role pressures to the focal individual;
- d) person-role conflict between the requirements of the role and the values, needs, or capacities of the individual. (Anderson 11, Pastoral Psychology, March 1971).

From Anderson's research, we learn that damaging effects are severe when the object-person must deal with the subject-person who is dependent on him, has high power over him, and who exerts pressure on him. Such as in my case, in response to my subject-persons (The Chief of Naval Operations and Vice Admiral Robinson) I tended to withdraw and become psychologically apathetic.

Role tension. *Role tension* occurs when the subject-person requires the object-person to behave in his role in contrasting ways. Hence, I was in *role tension* when I was required to be a police officer and a pastor at the same time.

Role overload. *Role overload* is a complex form of *role conflict* that comes when the object-person desires to respond to all the tasks urged upon him by the subject-person, but finds it impossible to comply within the limits of his/her time and energy. "*Role overload* is experienced as a conflict of priorities or as a conflict between quality and quantity"

(Katz and Kahn, qtd. in Anderson 11, Pastoral Psychology, March 1971).

Role-person-incongruity. According to Visser, quoting Joel R. DeLuca's article "The Holy Crossfire," *role-person-incongruity* comes when the focal person's (object-person) abilities, values, and/or leadership style do not match what the role sender (subject person) perceives as necessary for the role in the organizational system. This is the same as Streaan's "failure of role complementarity."

Coping With Role Problems

James Anderson, in his research, found that role confusion and conflict dictate need for a change in the system and not just in the person. He says, "change in the individual focal person without change in his community of work and life simply increases role confusion and conflict" (Anderson 14, Pastoral Psychology, March 1971). He implies that the way to cope with problems is to make a change within the actual setting of the job. Although this is not always practical for the Navy chaplain, Visser offers three possibilities.

First, the chaplain (object-person/focal person) can make it plain to the commander (subject-person/role sender) that the expectations from him/her are in contradiction with his/her own. According to Anderson, it then becomes the duty of the commander to resolve the differences, and the pressure

upon the chaplain is temporarily relieved while this process is taking place.

Second, the chaplain can seek support and counsel from endorsing agents, supervisory chaplains and others who may be in similar circumstances.

Third, if the option is available and viable, the chaplain can break off relationships with those who demand what he or she feels cannot be given. Fortunately, in my case the option is available and viable; I can select early retirement and make the change if the system is not altered. However, for the younger chaplains this may not be possible, and the damages of conflict and confusion could be as severe for them as it was for me.

The Chaplain's Master Role

What are the major role expectations given to chaplains? Most expectations are in line with what is expected of pastors. Therefore, looking at the studies of pastoral role expectations, e.g. Anderson, Blizzard, Gladding, Lintang, McClure, and Visser, we can safely say that most respondents in these studies would propose a *master role*, which would be the chaplain's unifying and dominant factor for being and doing. What, then, is the chaplain's *master role*? The literature answers this question, which is a part of research question number one. By combining findings from several research studies of both pastoral role expectations and chaplain role expectations, this *master role* is defined by

viewing the theological, historical, and contextual frameworks of the chaplain.

Theological Framework. What is the theological basis for the role of chaplains in the Navy? To understand the ministry of chaplains in the military one must first understand the nature and the mission of the church.

The theological root of our call to ministry is in the covenant into which Abraham entered with Yahweh his God (Zahn 6). Scriptures state clearly that God called Abraham for a special responsibility. Abraham responded to God's command, "Go from your country...to the land that I will show you ...so that you will be a blessing; and by you all the families of the earth shall be blessed" (Gen. 12:1-3). The Hebrew word for blessed in this passage is neberek and comes from the word barak. It has the same meaning as the word blessed in Genesis 22:18 and could read, "by you all the families of the earth shall be brought to the true knowledge and worship of God." This same responsibility was passed on to Abraham's descendants, Israel. In responding to God's call, Israel was chosen to be a kingdom of priests and a holy nation through whom God's love for all the earth was to be made known (Exodus 19:5-6).

Alvin J. Lindgren says it is in Israel that we see the beginning of the need for chaplains in the military. As Israel was going forth as a kingdom of priests and a holy nation she often encountered great obstacles, e.g. wars.

The Bible makes it clear again and again that the religious functions of a military campaign were to be performed not by the military commander, but by a man of God. First stated during the time of Moses, this differentiation was what we might call a chaplain's function.... (Abercrombie 32).

The theological framework for this began when Joshua led his troops against Amalek and Moses raised his arms above his head infusing the Israelite army with the spirit of Yahweh, thus ensuring their victory over the Amalekites (Exodus 17:11-13). Later this function became more formalized. Yahweh commanded Moses to make two trumpets of beaten silver, to be used as a battle signal. The signal of the trumpets was not to be given by Moses himself, the Israelites' leader; instead it was given to Aaronite priests (Numbers 10:9). In Joshua 6:3-5 we see that seven priests accompanied Israel's army to Jericho with seven trumpets to minister to Israel's fighting forces. In 2 Kings 3:11-27 we see that Elisha the prophet accompanied the King of Israel on a military expedition against the Moabites. He ministered to the king, delivering the message of God to him. The king obeyed the prophet's message, preserved his army, and defeated the Moabites--the chaplain makes the difference (Cook 34). Throughout the remainder of the Hebrew scriptures many other passages speak of the role of the priest or prophet in the Israeli military forces. They were *men called by God* to show forth his love and to *make a difference*. Indeed this established a biblical framework for the chaplains' role as God's instruments in the military.

In the Christian scriptures the Christian community is given the same responsibility Israel was given. The nature of the Christian church was determined by Jesus Christ. It is to be a light to the nations, a royal priesthood and a consecrated nation representing God to all the nations of the world and the needs of the world to God (Lindgren 41).

According to James Smart, Jesus' ministry incorporated three distinct ministries found in the Old Testament - prophetic, priestly and kingly (Smart 43). Smart says in the earliest examples of ministry in the Old Testament the three functions combined in the persons of Abraham, Moses and Samuel. As a prophet each was God's spokesman to Israel, bringing God's word to mankind, and mankind to a living knowledge of God. As priest each offered sacrifices, interceded with God on behalf of Israel, and led worship and instruction in the knowledge of God. As king each took on the responsibility of chief executive for administering the affairs of Israel, ruling in such a way that the people, in all their affairs, may know they cannot find the true order of their lives in any sphere except in obedience to the word of God. These ministries come to fulfillment in Jesus Christ, fulfillment in the sense of being taken up and incorporated into the ministry of Jesus himself.

Jesus Christ is prophet, priest and king, and the church is an extension of his ministry as it shares with him his prophetic, priestly, and kingly functions. In Matthew 28:19-

20 Jesus told his disciples to, "go into all the world to preach the Gospel." All the world means all the world, to include the military forces (Cook 36).

"During the New Testament period Israel is without an army, but lives under the security of the Roman Legion" (Cook 35). Clarence Abercrombie says the New Testament is often interpreted as a pacifistic document because the early Christians felt that the imminent Kingdom relegated to insignificance the things of the world, and therefore refused to participate in the wars of Rome. He says with so few Christian soldiers, there was little need for Christian chaplains. Dean Cook, in his dissertation, shows that in the New Testament is ample justification for continuing "ministry to the military." Some scriptures he uses to support this are:

Luke 3:14 - The first encounter between the Church and the military is recorded here. It takes place between John the Baptist and some Roman soldiers. They ask for advice and on this occasion John acts as a chaplain to the soldiers and gives them sound counsel.

Luke 7:1-10 - Here Jesus ministers as a chaplain to a Roman centurion who sought help for a gravely ill servant. Jesus responds immediately to the man's need.

Acts 10:1-48 - Peter's opportunity to minister in the role of a chaplain is recorded for us in this passage. Here Peter is confronted with his own prejudices against Gentiles and especially military Gentiles. God challenges Peter to counsel a Roman centurion. Peter gives a magnificent testimony to his new understanding of God's grace. He said that God is no respecter of persons but all are accepted by Him, even soldiers. (Cook 35-36).

As the Christian community is commissioned to be an extension of the ministry of Christ, so individual Christians are called to be lights to proclaim the Gospel and do Christ's work in all the world, including the military. Paul says in Ephesians 4:11-12, "And his gifts were that some should be apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors, some teachers, and some administrators for...and the building up of the body of Christ." As extensions of Christ's ministry in the military, Christian chaplains fulfill this purpose as they incorporate these gifts with Jesus' three offices of prophet, priest and king. In so doing the chaplain becomes: the prophet who is mediator, watchman and shepherd; the priest who is the representative before God (in prayers seeking to gather up the longings and desires of the people), and is leader of worship and instruction of the people in the knowledge of God; and the king who rules the church in such a way that, in all their affairs, the people know they cannot find the true order of their lives in any sphere except in obedience to the word of God.

Historical Framework. The historical framework for the contemporary ministry of chaplains begins with the story of St. Martin of Tours. Chaplain Lesley A. Northup states in his article *The Challenge of the Chaplaincy*, "...legend has it that true chaplains have as their prototypical forbear, St. Martin of Tours" (Military Chaplains Review, Winter 1990,

3). The story is told that one cold night, Martin, a young French soldier, encountered a shivering beggar and was so moved that he took his cloak off, sliced it in half and gave it to the poor beggar. That same night as he slept he dreamed that he saw Christ wearing the cloak. This experience resulted in Martin's conversion and baptism. Shortly, thereafter, he resigned from the Army and devoted himself to serving God and the Church for the rest of his life. In the Middle Ages, Martin became the patron saint of the French monarch. Believing Martin's cloak to be a sacred relic and representative of God's presence, the French Army carried it into battle. A priest was assigned to go along as custodian of the cloak and tend to the king's religious needs. The priest was called *cappellanus* from the Latin *cappella* for cloak, and the place where the cloak was kept became the chapel. From this came the word chaplain, and the chaplaincy evolved.

In 1775, during the Revolutionary War, Navy Regulations provided for chaplains to serve aboard ships. The chaplain's role was to conduct worship and act as a representative of God; i.e., serving as His instrument and delivering His message. Dean Cook says at that time, "the chaplain's role was defined as having three parts: (1) to conduct worship, (2) to obey their superiors, and (3) to act as a representative of God" (Cook 29). The *master role* of the Navy chaplain has varied somewhat over the past two hundred

years. In addition to incorporating Jesus' offices of prophet, priest and king, the offices listed in Ephesians and those mentioned by Blizzard, sometimes it has included and emphasized functional roles of counselor, social worker, MWR officer, and community relations projects coordinator. Labels and duties have changed. Nevertheless, the chaplain has been given authority, with expectations to perform certain functions as required by his/her church and Navy regulations as defined by commanding officers. Today, these role expectations depend upon the practical theology of individual chaplains, SECNAVINST 1730.7A, OPNAVINST 1730.1C, and Commanding Officers' interpretation of regulations and bias.

Contextual Framework. The context in which Navy chaplains serve is an *institutional ministry*. As Chaplain M. R. Ferguson says, "There are many fruitful avenues of discussion to approach and describe the institution in which Navy chaplains minister" (Ferguson 3). For purposes of this study this section discusses factors found within the institution that may affect chaplain role expectations.

1. Sociological. Navy chaplains serve in an environment described as a "total institution." Richard Hutcheson says:

A "total institution" is distinguished from other institutions by the fact that it controls, to a considerable extent, the entire lives of the persons involved. It breaks down the barriers that normally separate the different spheres of life - work, play, sleeping - so that they all take place

under the same authority. And it handles human needs by bureaucratic organization of whole blocks of people. (Hutcheson 3).

According to Hutcheson in his book, The Churches and The Chaplaincy, all military persons, both enlisted and officers, move repeatedly into and out of various degrees of institutional totality as they rotate from ship to shore duty, from deployment to home port, from isolated overseas bases to U.S. homebase administrative assignments. In this setting they wear the same uniform, speak the same language, receive medical care, food, lodging, recreation, worship, etc. The desired effect of this is to create a system that will embrace a whole career, reducing frustration upon transfers etc.

Jack Boozer, Dean Cook and Richard Hutcheson agree that chaplains minister from the inside of this institution, using its language, wearing its uniform, eating its food, obeying its regulations, responding to its challenges and experiencing its hardships and joys.

Jack Boozer, Dean Cook, Richard Martin, Gary Bowen, Earl Boyette and M. R. Ferguson all seem to agree that there are certain institutional factors that influence the chaplain's role inside the Navy. Three factors sum up these: the pluralistic environment, the chaplain's command involvement and relationship, and the military mission.

2. Psychological. Dean Cook asks the question, "What is the psychological context of the chaplaincy?" His answer

is that "the psychological environment in which the chaplain ministers is one of high stress" (Cook 29). Certainly the sociological factors that influence the chaplain's role have potential to produce tension which could result in stress.

The pluralistic environment requires chaplain's ministry to transcend denominational lines. Some chaplains will experience some tension when *expected* to facilitate worship for certain faith groups, e.g. a Christian chaplain facilitating a Muslim service.

As staff officer, command involvement and relationship places the chaplain in a system of accountability. Every chaplain bears institutional responsibilities to the Navy as well as pastoral responsibilities to persons. Every chaplain is obliged to support military policies and is therefore held accountable to the commanding officer. Every chaplain is *expected* to consider the best interests of the command in all relationships, even when a pastoral problem calls for a different solution, e.g. I was *expected* to restrain Charlie in the airport and on American Airlines to keep the Navy from bad publicity.

The military mission also places chaplains in positions of risk. In times of war chaplains may be *expected* to assist the medical team on the front lines. This may seem contrary or even inappropriate duty, causing *role tension* which could lead to stress.

3. Spiritual. Navy chaplains are clergy who have been ordained as pastors in their denominations and endorsed to serve as such in the Navy. A Navy chaplain's institutional call comes as a response to the One whose purpose forms his/her life's path. Accepting this call means executing his *master role* in the Navy. *Master Role* has been previously defined as "the classic over-all role that integrates all the other roles." This *master role* integrates the functions of "preacher, pastor, teacher, counselor, financier, administrator, organizer, community minded person, crusader, evangelist, social worker, healer, and all things to all men" (Visser 44). As Visser stated, this should be the theoretical foundation upon which the day-to-day functional roles and expectations are built.

Extending Christ's ministry in the Navy for the sake of others is the foundation for the Christian chaplain's *master role*. According to Ray Applequist, the chaplaincy finds its justification in the commission of Christ to go into all the world to preach the Gospel. Its example is the apostle Paul who became all things to all men for the sake of the Gospel (Applequist 71). Having diverse duties, the Christian chaplain's call, according to the apostle Paul in Ephesians 4:11-12, is "for the building up of the body of Christ." From Bernard of Clairvaux we learn that "the gift of wise and learned speech, the power to heal, to prophesy, and endowments of this kind are undoubtedly meant to be used for

our neighbor's salvation" (Cistercian Fathers Series, Sermon 18, qtd. in Williams 133).

Performing these ministries is an obligation. Warning us in his sermon "On the Song of Songs," Bernard of Clairvaux says:

If through fear or sloth or ill-judged humility, you retain for yourselves what must be expended for others, "the people's curse on the man who hoards the wheat" will be upon you. (Cistercian Fathers Series, Sermon 18, qtd. in Williams 134).

Heeding this warning means being lights, shining forth God's love and hope in the Navy. This is our call. We are ordained by God and by our denominations to be *messengers for the sake of others*.

RADM Richard G. Hutcheson, CHC, USN (Ret), states in his article, "Pastoral Leadership Within An Institutional Structure," that the pastoral function is a caring ministry with persons mediating the power and grace of a caring God (The Navy Chaplain, Vol. 4, No. 6, FY 90 3). Jack Boozer recounts that in his research he found, "the chaplain is expected to minister to all" (104). He maintains that the chaplain is *expected* as well as obligated to go where the person works, lives, is sick, confined, or in distress, rather than wait for a person to seek him/her out. RADM Neil M. Stevenson, CHC, USN (Ret), relates in his article, "Leadership Without Command," that chaplains are servant-leaders or *burden bearers* (The Navy Chaplain, Vol. 4, No. 6, FY 90 6). As such each must be a pastor who:

really has the care and feeding of God's flock on his heart and is willing to lay down his life for his sheep...not necessarily in dying for them, but in living for them. (Hendricks 26).

In the institution of the Navy, the chaplain is the hinge between God and His people; in a sense the officers and enlisted personnel all turn or swing on that hinge. Equipped by God with special gifts and abilities, the chaplain is expected and obligated to inspire them by word, example and deeds, to grow into spiritual maturity. Living for them means having "the shepherd's heart, the watchman's eye, and the craftsman's hand" (Hendricks 26). Living for them in the Navy means integrating Jesus' offices of prophet, priest, and king, the functional roles of Ephesians 4, and Blizzard's six practitioner roles - "administrator, organizer, pastor, preacher, priest, teacher" (Blizzard, Pastoral Psychology 27), with the required functional roles of Navy regulations. This integration becomes the chaplain's *master role*.

Maintaining The Chaplain's Master Role

Maintaining the *master role* in the Navy, chaplains face a powerful dilemma; i.e., an often untenable conflict between clergy role and military officer role. In his study on role conflict in the chaplaincy, Vickers found:

For the chaplain, the demands of both callings are are great. To the Church, the chaplain is bound by his vocational call, his concern for the souls of people, and the hope of eternal life. To the state, the chaplain is bound by his constitutional obligation, his concern for the soldiers in the command, and the physical and financial welfare of himself, his family, and friends. (Vickers, 61).

Quoting Waldo W. Burchard's 1953 doctoral dissertation on the military chaplain, Vickers says the conflict is natural and falls along the lines of flesh versus spirit and the world versus God. Both Abercrombie and Harwood would call this conflict one in which *Ceasar versus God*. Although Abercrombie found in his research that most chaplains do not encounter situations in which God and Ceasar come into direct conflict, Zahn found that it is very unlikely the chaplain will abide by the clergy role first in the face of such a conflict.

Because "chaplains are human and suffer all man's frailties - morally, emotionally, and physically" (Irwin, 11), threats to their call are ever present in the institutional setting of the Navy. According to Norman Shawchuck and Roger Heuser, "religious leaders often battle power, prestige, and careerism, resulting in an erosion of the spiritual life" (Shawchuck and Heuser, 105). As Zahn implies in his study in The Military Chaplaincy, commanders' expectations (*expressed modal reactions*) can exert pressure on chaplains to repress the ecclesiastical dimension of their call and behave in terms of the military dimension; God is reduced to a secondary consideration in their ministry.

Although Vickers found most chaplains agreeing that, when faced with this conflict, their first allegiance is to God, he adds:

In the life and work of the chaplain it appears likely that either the role of the military officer

or the clergy role will become the dominant one...to choose the military officer role, one can perhaps achieve career success but it may take a heavy toll on one's ministerial effectiveness. As Jesus said, each person should therefore "count the cost." (Vickers, 69).

Abercrombie found that chaplains can handle this conflict fairly well as long as they realize that their first loyalty is to God and their churches. Vickers found that chaplains' preferred methods of coping in face of this conflict are prayer, study, reflection, and talking with others.

Facing this dilemma, today's Navy chaplains' allegiance must be to God first. "Chaplains must function as pastors in a military uniform, meeting military needs; but they are to be pastors first" (Harwood, 14). They must be courageous, self-disciplined, maintaining the *master role*; preserving the shepherd's heart, the craftsman's hand, and the watchman's eye *for the sake of others*. According to Vickers and Harwood, sustaining spiritual formation through disciplines of prayer, study, reflection, etc., chaplains can avoid situations in which God and Ceasar come into conflict, and maintain their *master role*.

Clarifying The Chaplain's Functional Roles

For purposes of this study functional roles are the definite roles to be accented in the day-to-day activities of the chaplain in the context of a Navy ship. They are aspects of the *master role* and are based on the chaplain's gifts, training, experience, personal qualities and the needs and resources of the Navy.

How and by whom are these definite roles determined? As Visser found from his study in role theory, it is most important to have the chaplain (object-person/focal person) negotiate these matters with the commander (subject-person/role sender).

When attempting to clarify functional roles, the commander should provide input to the chaplain, independent of the chaplain's presence, via *inscription*, i.e. write a command instruction that is in line with SECNAVINST 1730.7A and OPNAVINST 1730.1C. Using the Navy Chief of Chaplains' pamphlet, "Your Chaplain and the Command Religious Program" (Appendix E), as a guide, this should be done as soon as the chaplain arrives at a new command. Also, according to Visser's findings, the chaplain could use an outside enabler, such as an endorsing agent or supervisory chaplain to clarify possible *role tension* areas. Accomplishing this would enabled the chaplain to begin functioning in his/her *master role* with some semblance of agreement between subject-person and object-person.

Chaplain Role Expectation Surveys

"Role surveys allow the researcher to compare theoretical knowledge with the opinions of those who perceive pastoral roles on a regular basis in their own congregations" (Visser 103). Accordingly, in order to clarify chaplain role expectations, past surveys have been examined.

A brief sketch of the Navy chaplain's role expectations and related surveys follows:

Role Expectation Surveys. Although the Navy chaplain's role was defined in 1775 in Navy Regulations, the study of role expectations is relatively new. In the literature review only four studies were found on the subject of role expectations in the Navy, and only three of these were on chaplains' role expectations.

Dean Cook, in his Study of the Transition of Free Methodist Clergy into the Military Chaplaincy, found that Free Methodist clergy suffered adjustment problems in the Navy because they did not always understand their role as a Navy chaplain. Cook used a questionnaire survey to gather data. He sent twenty-four surveys to fifteen active duty and nine retired chaplains. Twenty-two responses were received. The questionnaire was comprised of seventy-three questions. His findings showed that the major issues with which new chaplains struggled in their transition were: assignments, lack of transitional training, team ministry concept, dual roles of chaplain and officer, the promotion structure, and the chaplain-church relations. His findings convinced me that new chaplains did not always know what was expected of them, e.g. team ministry, dual roles, etc., and became a supporting validation for conducting this study.

LCDR Gary D. Heinke, CHC, USN, in his article "*The Role of the Chaplain: Field Grade Officers Speak*," discusses a

research project he conducted while attending the Marine Corps Command and Staff College at Quantico, Virginia. His survey was conducted in the spring of 1991. He distributed a questionnaire survey to the entire student body with a seventy-four percent response rate. This survey was one of attitudes toward the role of the chaplain. He said his conclusions drawn from the survey results were that field grade officers tended to see the chaplain in one of the three following roles: (1) traditional role of pastor - worship services, weddings, memorial services, ministry to wounded and dying, and daily visitation to work spaces; (2) role of professional counselor - a problem solver similar to civilian mental health, family or marriage professional counselor; and (3) additional role of special staff officer - reflects inspirational leadership, fostering morale, advising the command, showing the cross, providing guidance, and being a military officer in every regard supporting the mission. Chaplain Heinke concludes by saying that the implications of this survey require chaplains to receive ongoing orientations from commanders on their expectations of the role of the chaplain as it relates to the command. He ends his article by quoting Chaplain Don Krabbe, saying, "to be successful, a chaplain must be one who can juggle the 'lists' (of roles), the commander's and his own, and come up with a formula for ministry that is satisfying for both." This survey implies a

need for providing new chaplains with an understanding of commanders' expectations to help them "juggle the lists."

CDR E. T. Gomulka, CHC, USN, in his Chaplain Qualification Survey, lists three questions regarding qualifications Marine commanders look for in their chaplains. This survey was sent to all Generals, Regimental Commanders and Group Commanders of the USMC on 21 Aug 1991. The results were similar to Chaplain Heinke's, in that the expectations of the roles were the same but more specific, e.g. charismatic leader of worship, responsive to all faith groups, spiritual person/committed to faith, confident in his/her calling/vocation, competent teacher, etc. In addition to these qualifications/expectations Chaplain Gomulka found commanders willing to identify shortcomings that cause some chaplains to be ineffective. Some of these were: failure to completely immerse in Marine activities; sitting in office/not in field with troops; acting more like a Marine than a "Man of God;" preoccupation with fitness reports/careerism; lack of moral courage and hypocrisy; little understanding of organization and role as staff officer; rigidity of theology, etc. In his final question Chaplain Gomulka found that commanders want chaplains who are able to "juggle their lists of roles." The following quote from BGEN Gerald L. Miller will summarize all the findings in Chaplain Gomulka's survey:

Being a military chaplain is a very tough job.
Those who are the best are able to balance their

work on behalf of the troops with that for the commander. Chaplains must also be a 'part' of the service they belong to, i.e. physically fit and knowledgeable. They must also be ready to deal with the many human problems we and dependents have, i.e. deaths, injuries, family problems, crimes, loneliness, etc. Chaplains, in my view, should have ministry experience before coming into the military. They must be sage beyond their years, savvy in the problems of life, and willing to live and work in a military society... (Gomulka 12).

The findings in this study corroborate Chaplain Heinke's conclusions, i.e. commanders expect chaplains to integrate several roles, such as, pastor, counselor, staff officer, etc.

Ralph M. Stogdill, Ellis L. Scott and William E. Janes conducted a study to determine the nature and extent of discrepancies between reported behavior and expected behavior of persons occupying leadership positions in a large organization. Using the Naval Air research command data was obtained from 183 personnel (70 officers, 113 civilians; 47 seniors, 83 juniors). Through the use of group meetings, individual interviews and questionnaires (with scales and checklists) they attempted to answer the following research questions: (1) What the leader does as reported by self and two juniors; (2) What the leader ought to do as reported by self and two juniors; (3) What the junior does as described by self; and (4) What the junior ought to do as described by self. The findings of this study support the hypothesis of reciprocal influence; the behavior of seniors is to some extent related to the expectations of juniors, but the

behavior of juniors is also related to the behavior and expectations of seniors. In this study three important factors became evident to the researchers, and relate to my study: (1) Role expectations are the products of several elements, with ingredients of cultural, of personal, and of situational determination; (2) The role of a leader in formal organizations appears to be a difficult one to play to the satisfaction of all the members; (3) Faced with conflicting pressures, the leader may conform to one or the other set of expectations and prepare to take the consequences, or, as is more likely, take a compromise position and attempt to reconcile the conflicting elements in the situation.

Together the findings in the studies informed my study and validated my research questions.

Related Research Studies. Although there are no other studies on Navy chaplains' roles and expectations, several researchers who have conducted studies on the military chaplaincy that inform my study include Clarence Abercrombie III, Jack Boozer, Chaplain (Major) Robert Vickers (U.S. Army), and Gordon C. Zahn.

The purpose of Abercrombie's research on the Military Chaplaincy was to "determine if chaplains were expected to act chiefly to legitimate the goals and missions of the military or were they to proclaim a prophetic message." Using 984 Army chaplains, 447 Army commanders and 400 civilian clergymen he mailed questionnaires in an attempt to

answer the following research questions: (1) To what degree did they find conflict between two loyalties, God and Caesar? (2) Were their beliefs more akin to those held by professional military officers they serve or to those of their civilian counterparts in the ministry? (3) What roles and values are viewed differently by civilian clergymen and military commanders? (4) With respect to roles and values that are viewed differently, where along a military officer-civilian clergyman continuum are chaplains generally located? and (5) Are there any factors of military or religious background that will enable us to predict where along the continuum a particular chaplain will be found? His findings reveal that chaplains and civilian clergy, though they differ in some ways, are in general similar. He said that more important, the chaplains are no more anxious to "legitimate" the military than the civilian clergy think they should be, despite the chaplain's seeming to be a bit more patriotic. And he found that most chaplains do not encounter situations in which God and Caesar come into direct conflict. This last finding is important for my study as it shows that most Army commanders do not expect their chaplains to perform functions or duties that are in conflict with chaplains' expectations or theological positions.

Jack Boozer, in his Edge of Ministry conducts a study to determine the relationship between chaplains ministry and the regular life of clergy in mainline churches. He sent 1680

questionnaires to military chaplains and civilians who were all United Methodists. Two research questions from his study that are relevant to this study are: (1) Did the chaplaincy offer opportunities for significant ministry? and (2) Was there conflict between your role as minister and your role as representative of your command? From the first question Boozer finds that in all the categories the answers were overwhelmingly positive; the chaplains reported the same range of ministry activities that characterize the ministry of the regular parish clergy. From the second question he finds slightly less role conflict in civilian chaplaincies than in military chaplaincies; although 22.2 percent military reported some conflict between the two roles. This is significant in that *role expectations* may be causing the conflict. Boozer found that, "The Chaplain is expected to minister to all" (Boozer 104). This includes persons of all denominational and faith groups. Chaplain ministry is ecumenical. Boozer says that every person in a hospital, prison, school, industry, sanitarium, or military unit has equal right and access to the ministry of the chaplain. Accordingly, the chaplain is obligated to go where the person works, lives, is sick, is confined, or in distress, rather than wait for a person to seek him/her out.

Chaplain (Major) Robert Vickers conducted a study in role conflict. Using a random sample he sent 891 surveys to U.S. Army chaplains. Of nine research questions addressed in

his study the findings of three relate to this study: (1) Data revealed that all denominations and every rank agreed that "the position of the chaplain in the military setting leads to a conflict of roles;" (2) Data revealed that "chaplains consider their clergy roles to be more important than their officer roles;" and (3) Data revealed that "chaplains did not generally believe their commanders consider the chaplain's officer role to be more important than his clergy role." His conclusion was that role conflict is perceived by the Army chaplain as being a part of his every day world, but not as a devastating ingredient. Also he says chaplains see themselves at times as having a prophetic role where they must challenge the system, but always their first responsibility is to minister. And he adds that on one issue chaplains all agree, and that is that their first allegiance is to God.

Gordon C. Zahn conducted a study of role tension in the Royal Air Force. Two of his research questions that were supported by his findings are relevant for this study: (1) tension is present in the role of the military chaplaincy and that it could be demonstrated - even though the individual chaplain may be unaware of its existence; (2) where such tension is present and recognized by a chaplain, it is most likely to be resolved in favor of the military dimension of the role. Zahn says that these findings are not cynicism, nor are they ungracious suggestions that the chaplain would

sell out his obligation to the ecclesiastical establishment under the pressure exerted by the military and its demands.

He says:

It is, instead, a frank recognition that the social setting in which the chaplain lives and acts is one that exerts a stronger and more consistently supportive force as far as the military dimension of his role is concerned - and by the same token, may actually operate to repress or otherwise place under a disadvantage the ecclesiastical dimension of the role. As a result, performance of his military function becomes the 'norm' of his behavior; he will be more inclined to see and judge his total behavior in terms of the military dimension of the role with the ecclesiastical dimension reduced to something of a secondary consideration. (Zahn 33).

Even though Abercrombie, Boozer and Vickers emphasize a positive side to the *role expectations*, Zahn's findings are valid and suggest that further study is necessary.

Because chaplains are clergy, other relevant studies include: (1) James D. Anderson's study on "Pastoral Support of Clergy-Role Development Within Local Congregations," (2) Samuel W. Blizzard's studies on "The Parish Minister's Self-Image of His Master Role," and "The Protestant Parish Minister's Integrating Roles," (3) Stephen Evans Gladding's study on "Harmonizing Role Expectations of the Church Board and Pastor," (4) Periskila Netty Lintang's study on "The Expectations of the Laity to the Roles of The Pastor in Chinese Churches in Jakarta, Indonesia," (5) John R. McClure's study on "Realities and Expectations: Roles of the Pentecostal Pastor," (6) Norman Shawchuck and Roger Heuser cite two studies in chapter eight of Leading the Congrega-

tion - Caring for Yourself While Serving the People that discuss the changing roles of today's pastors, and (7) Richard Edgar Visser's study on "Pastoral Role Expectations In The Local Church." Even though these do not discuss the Navy chaplain's role, the findings are relevant in helping develop a theoretical framework for studying chaplain role expectations.

Literature Review Summary

The literature review shows that Navy chaplains are People of God called to be extensions of their churches, to be instruments of God's love to bring God to people and people to God through their functions. Accepting this call means executing their *master role* within the environment of the total institution of the Navy. According to Visser's research this *master role* should be the foundation upon which the chaplain builds day-to-day functional roles and expectations. As clergy and Naval officers, chaplains have been given authority, with expectations to perform certain functions as required by their church, Navy regulations and as defined by commanders.

As revealed in this review, in this environment several variables shown to influence these *expectations* are: subject-persons (commanders), object-persons (chaplains), referenced characteristics (rank, religious preference, previous experience, etc.), modal reaction (covert, overt, written), contextualization (institution of Navy on ship), legitimacy

(training, needs of Navy), formalization (Navy Regulations), stereotypy (based on hearsay), and saliency (preacher, staff officer, etc.). When ambiguous role definitions and expectations occur, or failure of role complementarity between commanders and chaplains, role problems may develop. From the review of studies on role problems, there appears to be at least five categories of problems: *role ambiguity*, *role conflict*, *role tension*, *role overload*, and *role-person-incongruity* .

Even though most of the surveys concluded that most chaplains have few problems, as Zahn found, these five categories can lead to role tension by chaplains. As Visser points out in a quote from K. Henry Koestline's book,

Controversy and Conflict:

To live is to be in conflict...The Christians task is not to deny conflict, but to resolve the conflicts of life as God directs (qtd. in Visser 82).

CHAPTER 3

Design of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify, describe and compare Navy chaplain role expectations; and to describe discrepancies between the expectations chaplains and commanders have for chaplains on ships. The research conducted in this study was descriptive. Quoting Stephen Isaac and William Michael's 1981 Handbook in Research and Evaluation, Lintang defines the purpose of descriptive research as follows:

- a. To collect detailed factual information that describes existing phenomena.
- b. To identify problems or justify current conditions and practices.
- c. To make comparisons and evaluations.
- d. To determine what others are doing with similar problems or situations and benefit from their experience in making future plans and decisions. (Lintang, 79)

The purpose of this study, to some degree, corresponds to all four purposes of descriptive research quoted by Lintang. This study did not attempt to establish cause and effect, but was diagnostic in its attempt to identify role expectations and discrepancies.

This chapter relates in detail how this study was conducted. First, population and sample are discussed. Second, the instrumentation for the study is explained. Third, procedures for data collection are summarized. Finally, procedures used in analysis of research data are identified.

The research questions that guided this study were: (1) What are the role expectations chaplains have of themselves? (2) What are the role expectations commanders have of their chaplains? and (3) What discrepancies exist in the way chaplains and commanders view the role of chaplains on ships? Two other questions influencing the final analysis and interpretation in chapter five were: (1) How do chaplains' role expectations correspond to the *master role*, and functional role requirements? and (2) How do *master role* and functional role requirements for Navy chaplains match ships' commanders' actual expectations?

Population and Sample

The population for the study was found within the institution of the Navy, namely, Navy chaplains and ship's commanders. It was limited to Naval Services ships' commanders and chaplains from the Pacific Coast. More specifically, the population consisted of Navy chaplains and ship's commanders in the San Diego Naval Station area. Eighty of the 360 ships in the U.S. Navy are homeported in San Diego. Forty chaplains are assigned to provide ministry to these ships in San Diego. This represents almost one-fourth of the entire fleet of ships. Due to the transitional nature of the Navy, the San Diego ships' chaplains and commanders represent the entire Navy's population of ships' chaplains and commanders.

Using the proportional stratified sampling technique, the sample consisted of seventy-five percent of ship's commanders and chaplains in San Diego. Ninety questionnaires (sixty to commanders and thirty to chaplains in the San Diego Naval Station area) were used to gather data necessary for discovering basic role expectations. The chaplains' questionnaires were hand delivered, and the commanders' questionnaires were hand delivered by ship's chaplains.

Instrumentation

On January 25, 1996 I obtained permission from Captain Eileen O'Hickey, U.S. Navy Chief of Chaplains office (via Commander Gil Gibson) to conduct a survey on chaplain role expectations within the context of the Navy.

The Descriptive Survey/Questionnaire was selected for two reasons: (1) it appeared to be a common method the literature called for, i.e. the four researchers who conducted studies on Navy role expectations used this method; (2) it is simple in design and can be used to process the data that demands the technique of observation.

Following the guidelines found in Paul D. Leedy's book, Practical Research, surveys from Ambercrombie, Cook, Gomulka, Hienke, Visser and Zahn were used as examples to design the questionnaire. It was researcher-designed, and was separated into two questionnaires, one for commanders and one for chaplains. It has fifty-three questions, and is found in appendix C.

The Reliability was based upon data from the examples above. Each used the graphics and/or the comparative rating scales which provided data intended to collect.

The Validity was based on face validity, and confirmation from a pilot test, my congregational reflection group, and consultation with a professional statistician. The pilot test questionnaire (Appendix A) was given randomly to seventy-five personnel at the Norfolk, Naval shipyard to evaluate. Each person was asked to fill out the survey and make comments as to the legitimacy of using this instrument to gather data concerning chaplain role expectations. It appeared that my verbal instructions were not clear. Twenty-nine were returned for a thirty-nine percent return rate. Although almost all questions were completed on the twenty-nine questionnaires, only two came back with comments as follows: (1) "Seems best to give separate survey forms to population groups, you need a cover letter to state the purpose, otherwise looks good!" (2) "I would narrow the questionnaire; perhaps compare the role expectations of no more than two groups, e.g. commanders and chaplains." This gives support to the face validation. In addition, during February and March my congregational reflection group met, and after discussing the problem and its setting, agreed that the content of the instrument was appropriate to collect the data necessary to answer my research questions. Several recommendations concerning the questionnaire were made. Two

specific, practical, and valid ones were: (1) Narrow the study down to "surface Navy", i.e. only study chaplain's role expectations in the context of ministry on ships; and (2) Compare the Navy's regulations/ requirements for chaplains with commanders' expectations. Also after reviewing the draft questionnaire they all agreed "the simpler the better." A recommendation was made that a separate questionnaire be provided for each group to be surveyed. In September, 1996, the revised instrument (Appendix B) was given to Michael Ford, a civilian statistician for validity review. He suggested, that in order to get accurate measurements, Likert-type scales be used for a majority of the survey. Thus, as can be seen in Appendix C, the questionnaire was revised again, and includes a survey for commanders and one for chaplains.

The objective was to gather data to help answer the research questions. The questions came from the literature review, pilot test results, congregational reflection group, my advisor, and from my own knowledge of chaplains' roles and functions. Questions focus on describing commanders' and chaplains' understanding and priorities of the chaplain's *master role*. I attempted to provide a balance of questions that pertain to expectation variables of role theory, such as the subject person, object person, modal reaction, referenced characteristics, and form. Also, I attempted to provide questions that measure how the commanders view the

qualifications of the chaplain and how the chaplain thinks the commander views his/her qualifications.

Data Collection

As stated previously, using the proportional stratified sampling technique ninety questionnaires (sixty to commanders and thirty to chaplains in the San Diego Naval Station area) were used to gather data needed to discover basic role expectations. During the first week in November the questionnaires for commanders were hand delivered by ships' chaplains; and I personally hand delivered the questionnaires to chaplains. Each questionnaire contained a cover letter (Appendix F) describing the purpose and inviting the addressee to cooperate by answering the questionnaire. A log was kept with numerical codes in place of the names of the respondents' names; Chaplains were CHC 01-30, and Commanders were CDR 01-60 (See Table 1).

Table 1
Chaplains' and Commanders' Survey Log

Code	Title	Command	Mail Date	F/Up Date	Rec Date

If a reply was not received within three-weeks from date of distribution a phone call was made to chaplains as reminders, and a memorandum (Appendix G) was sent to commanders, via ships' chaplains.

Also, personal interviews were conducted with five chaplains and five commanders, selected at random from ships in San Diego. The questions were based on the questionnaire and focused on the major areas related to the research questions. Specific questions concentrated on commanders' and chaplains' perceptions of the six functions of the *master* role (administration, teaching, pastor, priest, preacher, and project coordinator), on questions that measure commanders' views of chaplains' qualifications, and how chaplains perceive commanders view his/ her qualifications. The purpose of the interviews was to gain nuances of the interpretation of findings. Through statements and expressed feelings from commanders (subject persons) and chaplains (object persons) these interviews proved to be a powerful tool for identifying behaviors and points of ambiguity that may lead to role conflict. One can assume that the respondents' descriptive accounts were fairly reflective of their true expectations of chaplains' roles.

Variables of Expectations

Variables are divided into two categories, independent and dependent. The independent variables are the catalysts that effect the expectations, and the dependent variables are the expectations that influence chaplain role function/ behavior.

Independent Variables. The basic independent variables that affect expectations which influence the object person's behavior are classified into nine sub-categories.

First is the Subject-Person. That is, the one who holds or emits statements that express a *modal reaction* (prescriptive, cathectic, or descriptive) about characteristics of object- persons. In this case the commander is the subject-person who expects the chaplain to act a certain way or play a certain role, which if unclear could lead to *role ambiguity, role conflict, role tension, role overload, and role-person-incongruity* (or failure of role complementarity); but, if clarified could lead to complementarity.

Second is the Object-Person. That is, the one to whom the subject-person's expectations refer. The object-person is the chaplain and can hold personal expectations which can be shared with the commander or can be incongruence; thus influencing the chaplain's behavior, e.g. failure of role complementarity.

Third is Referenced Characteristics. This refers to the object person's and subject-person's characteristics, traits, and qualities that can influence the chaplain's behavior. Examples are: rank, religious preference, commander's previous experience with chaplains, and familiarity with SECNAVINST 1730.7A, etc.

Fourth is Modality. This refers to a subject-person's *modal reaction* (prescriptive/you should, cathectic/I feel, or

descriptive/you are) that, depending on the degree of strength, could be interpreted as a demand influencing the object-person's behavior. This modal reaction is expressed in one of three ways: (1) conception/covert - assumptions based on prior experiences, norm, preferences or belief; (2) enunciation/overt - demand, assessment or assertion; or (3) inscription/written - rule, appraisal or representation.

Fifth is Contextualization. The context in which Navy chaplains serve is an *institutional ministry*. Factors found within the institution that may affect chaplain role expectations are: sociological, psychological and spiritual. An example of this would be the prescriptions of behavior for Navy chaplains from Navy commanders on board ships, e.g. "during general quarters you must be officer in charge of the medical triage team," instead of being pastor to the wounded and dying.

Sixth is Legitimacy. Expected roles may be legitimate, e.g. chaplains are expected to be counselors on board ships. This is legitimate because most chaplains have training in counseling and are willing to accept the prescribed expected role; and/or the commander interprets the regulations to give him authority to require this role and chaplains accept the prescribed expected role leading to shared expectations and complementarity.

Seventh is Formalization. Crucial roles within contemporary social systems tend to become formalized over

time and subject- persons tend to write down the duties of object-persons. An example of this is SECNAVINST 1730.7A which has formalized chaplain duties in the Navy. This tends to help clarify chaplain roles when interpreted properly by commanders. This influences chaplains' behavior and leads to shared expectations and complementarity.

Eighth is Stereotypy. Expected roles may be stereotypic to the degree that the expectations of which they are composed are based on hearsay rather than on evidence. An example of this would be "The CNO expects chaplains to be alcohol counselors and supervisors" and therefore, the commander requires the chaplain to take on that role. This influences the chaplain's behavior and leads to role conflict and possible role-person-incongruity (failure of complementarity).

Ninth is Saliency. Salient expectations are those that stand out and are prominent. They will likely reflect contextualization, formalization, legitimacy, importance to the subject-person, and recent experiences the subject-person has had with the object-person. Examples of these for the chaplain are conducting worship services on Sunday and being a preacher/teacher. Examples for the commander are expecting the chaplain to be a staff officer and a Morale, Welfare and Recreation (MWR) Officer.

Dependent Variables. For the purposes of this study the dependent variables are those expectations that result from

the independent variables. Specifically, dependent variables in this study are *role expectations, role behavior, and role ambiguity*. The expectations will be covertly held, overtly expressed or written down. If these are shared expectations they will lead to complementarity. If they are polarized dissensus and pose problems for the object-person they can lead to *role ambiguity, role conflict, role tension, role overload, and role-person-incongruity* (or failure of role complementarity).

Scales. To measure these variables from the responses on the questionnaires three of Biddle's comparison concepts were employed. These are: similarity of expectations, consensus of expectations, and dissensus of expectations. The rating scales used were: *nominal scale* for questions 1-3 to categorize responses about reference characteristics; *Likert-type graphics scale* to measure reference characteristics in questions 4, 5, and 6; *Likert-type graphics scale* to measure descriptive questions 7-49; and *comparative rating scale* to "rank order" descriptive questions 50 and 51. Questions 52 and 53 were intentionally left as open-ended questions in order to identify salient expectations, prescribed, cathexis and descriptive modes of both subject persons and object persons.

Data Analysis

Because this study was mainly qualitative in nature, the methods of the study were adapted so as to permit respondents

to indicate not only their perceptions of the object-person's major and functional roles, but also what the object-person, in the opinion of the subject-person, ought to do in his/her *master role*. Specifically, this study was designed to: describe chaplain's role expectations; make comparisons between chaplains' and commanders' expectations; determine the association (similarities, consensus, dissensus) of discrepancies between these two categories; and to determine the nature and extent of discrepancies between chaplain's self descriptions of expectations, and descriptions of expectations by commanders.

To analyze this data a computer programmed *descriptive statistics method* was used to find the mean scores for questions 4-49. Using this data a *t-test* was used to compare views of commanders and chaplains to determine the probability that any differences between them are real. A *Pearson Chi-Square* was used to make a comparison between commanders and chaplains in questions 1, 2, and 3.

Tabulation of the results are reflected in table and narrative form in Chapter 4. Tables are also presented reflecting: (1) demographics for chaplains and commanders - cross tabulation of demographics for both, using a *Pearson Chi-Square* comparison to determine if the reference characteristics were significantly different so as to affect expectations; (2) mean ranking of chaplains' self-expectations as revealed in questions 7-49; (3) mean ranking of

commanders' expectations as revealed in questions 7-49; (4) comparison of mean rankings of chaplains' and commanders' expectations as revealed in questions 7-49; (5) mean ranking comparison of commanders' knowledge of chaplains' *master role* duties and chaplains' understanding of commanders' knowledge as revealed in questions 4-6; (6) mean ranking comparison of commanders' perceptions of *master role* priorities and chaplains' understanding of commanders' perceptions as revealed in questions 50-51; (7) reliability scale analysis, using *Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient of Internal Consistency scale* to determine if questions 7-49 could be divided into categories within the *master role*; (8) mean ranking comparison of chaplains' and commanders' *master role* groupings to determine if discrepancies existed in expectations in different functions in *master role*; and (9) comparison of responses to questions concerning limitations and suggestions for improving chaplains' effectiveness aboard ships as revealed in questions 52-53.

Data from these tables provides a clear description of chaplain role expectations and discrepancies in expectations between chaplains and commanders.

CHAPTER 4

Findings and Analysis

Findings from the collected data are presented in this chapter. In order to present the results in a clear and effective manner, the research findings are organized into four major sections: (a) demographic data is reported, (b) each research question is restated and accompanied by documentary or statistical findings, (c) the findings from the interviews are reported, and (d) a summary of the major findings is presented.

Overview

This study investigated the possible discrepancies between the role expectations commanders and chaplains have for chaplains on ships in San Diego, California. Three primary questions guided the inquiry: (1) What are the role expectations chaplains have of themselves? (2) What are the role expectations commanders have of their chaplains? and (3) What discrepancies exist in the way chaplains and commanders view the role of ships' chaplains?

The data presentation and analysis portion of this chapter corresponds to the questions that guided this inquiry. Each section restates the question and presents relevant findings. A section summary concludes each section of this chapter.

The abbreviated descriptors as relates to chaplains' roles in the tables for questions 4-49 (listed in the

Descriptive Survey Questionnaire) are defined in table 2 as follows.

Table 2
Definition of Descriptors for Questions 4-49

Question #	Descriptor	Definition of Descriptor
4	PREV EXP	Commanders' previous experience with chaplains
5	KNOWINST	Commanders' knowledge of Navy Instructions
6	KNOWDUTY	Commanders' knowledge of chaplains' duties
7	CRP1	Command Religious Program (CRP) is important
8	CRP2	Chaplains responsible for CRP
9	COUN PGM	Chaplains should establish counseling program
10	COMREL	Community Relations Projects are important
11	MWR	MWR is important collateral duty
12	PAO	Public Affairs not job for chaplains
13	DCTT	Chaplains should be Damage Control Training Team members
14	TRIAGE	Chaplains should be Medical Triage Officers
15	NMCRS	Chaplains should be shipboard Navy Relief coordinators
16	FUNDS	Chaplains should coordinate fund drives
17	FAR	Chaplains should not be Family Advocacy Representatives
18	SUICIDE	Chaplains should be suicide prevention trainer

(Table continues)

19	CAT	Chaplains should be Command Assessment Team members
20	CONFLICT	Clergy duties conflict with staff officer duties
21	MORALE	Contribution to morale is important for mission
22	SPIR WLB	Contribution to spiritual and moral well-being is important
23	PROF DEV	Professional development is important for chaplains
24	CLERGY	Role not similar to civilian clergy
25	GOOD REL	Should maintain good relations with commanders
26	DNOM REL	Should not be concerned with denominational relations
27	SPIR FOR	Should maintain spiritual formation
28	FITREPS	Fitness Reports should be a priority
29	CON DUTY	Consolidated chaplains' duty is important for mission
30	OFF MGR	Chaplain should be office manager
31	WORSHIP	Weekly worship is important
32	REL ED	Religious education is important
33	PAS CARE	Pastoral care is important
34	SAC SVCS	Sacramental services are important
35	MORAL LD	Chaplains' moral leadership and integrity have positive impact
36	OMNIPRES	Chaplains' omnipresence is necessary
37	CMD ADV	Chaplain must be candid command advisor
38	AGR W CO	Never disagree with commander

(Table continues)

39	PREACHER	Being relevant/dynamic preacher is not important
40	COM W AL	Chaplains' communication with all produces a positive effect
41	TM PLAY	Chaplains must be team players
42	COL DUTY	Must be proactive in taking on collateral duties
43	FAITH	Must be committed to faith in order to have positive effect
44	AL FAITH	Must be responsive to all faith groups
45	ADVOCAT	Must be advocates for individuals regardless of command's mission
46	CHARISMA	Must be charismatic leaders of worship
47	PHYS FIT	Physical fitness has no bearing
48	TRN COUN	Chaplains must be trained professional counselors
49	LAY LDR	Lay leaders can take place of chaplains

Demographic Data

The demographics are presented in Table 3 to help define the general parameters of the study. A cross-tabulation with a Pearson Chi-Square test was conducted to determine if reference characteristics of rank, years of active duty, and religious preference are significantly different between chaplains and commanders. Using $p \leq .05$ to measure the level of significance, Table 3 shows all three characteristics have a significant difference. Michael Ford (statistician) states this difference could contribute to differences in

expectations. This study is not attempting to describe cause and effect, therefore, t-tests, levels of significance, and other measures were not calculated to determine correlation between demographics and discrepancies of expectations between chaplains and commanders.

Table 3
Demographics

Descriptor	N / % Chaplains	N / % Commanders	Chi-Square Significance
A. Rank:			
02-03	16 / 57.1		
04-05	11 / 39.3	30 / 68.2	
06+	1 / 3.6	14 / 31.8	
Pearson			.00000 *
B. Years:			
01-04	7 / 25.0		
04-08	8 / 28.6		
08-12	5 / 17.9	2 / 4.5	
12-16	6 / 21.4	10 / 22.7	
16-20	1 / 3.6	13 / 29.5	
20+	1 / 3.6	19 / 43.2	
Pearson			.00000 *
C. Rel:			
Prot.	25 / 89.3	15 / 34.1	
Cath.	3 / 10.7	19 / 43.2	
Jewish		1 / 2.3	
Other		4 / 9.1	
None		5 / 11.4	
Pearson			.00083 *

Note: $p \leq .05$ for *Chi-Square* significance indicates significant difference between chaplains' and commanders' (*)

Chaplain's Data. The demographics of the chaplains, as revealed in questions 1-3 of the survey, are presented in Table 3. From the sample of thirty chaplains surveyed in the San Diego area, twenty-eight responded for a total of ninety-three percent. One (3.6 percent) was a senior command chaplain (06), Eleven (39.3 percent) were supervisory chaplains (04-05) and sixteen (57.1 percent) were junior chaplains (02-03). Of the twenty-eight chaplains who responded to the survey, one (3.6 percent) served more than 20 years active duty, one (3.6 percent) served 16-20 years, six (21.4 percent) served 12-16 years, five (17.9 percent) served 8-12 years, eight (28.6 percent) served 4-8 years, and seven (25 percent) served 1-4 years.

Among the twenty-eight chaplains, only three (10.7 percent) were Catholic, twenty-five (89.3 percent) were Protestant, none were Jewish or Muslim.

Although tests were not conducted to find correlation between demographics and expectations, Table 4 indicates thirteen of the chaplains' scores may have been affected by the variable of rank. The degree of influence is measured by the dispersion of scores across ranks as observed by the researcher; significant indicates a range of greater than (>) or equal to (=) ± 1 , medium indicates a range of less than (<) ± 1 but $>$ or $= \pm .5000$, and minimum indicates a range of $< \pm .5000$. Rank and years of active duty coincide, and therefore, mean scores of years of active duty were not used.

Mean scores of religion were not compared because only three catholics and no others responded. The comparison shows a possible significant influence on eight of the thirteen scores, and will be discussed in the analysis of research question 1.

Table 4
Chaplains' Referenced Characteristics Influence:
comparison of mean scores based on rank

Question # Descriptor	Overall Mean	02-03 Mean	04-05 Mean	06+ Mean	Degree of Influence
8 CRP2	3.786	4.1875	3.3636	2.000	Signif.
10 COMREL	4.000	4.1337	3.8182	4.000	Minimum
15 NMCRS	3.107	3.4375	2.5455	4.000	Signif.
17 FAR	3.750	3.5000	4.0000	5.000	Signif.
19 CAT	3.593	3.1333	4.2727	3.000	Signif.
24 CLERGY	2.750	2.7500	2.6364	4.000	Signif.
28 FITREPS	2.964	2.7500	3.1818	4.000	Signif.
30 OFF MGR	3.000	3.3125	2.5455	3.000	Medium
36 OMNIPRES	3.857	3.9375	3.7273	4.000	Minimum
41 TM PLAY	3.964	4.0000	3.9091	4.000	Minimum
42 COL DUTY	3.357	3.5000	3.0909	4.000	Medium
45 ADVOCAT	3.750	3.9375	3.3636	5.000	Signif.

(Table continues)

48 TRN COUN	2.964	3.1250	2.9091	1.000	Signif.
----------------	-------	--------	--------	-------	---------

Note: Dispersion of Scores $\geq \pm 1$ = Signif. Influence

Commanders' Demographic Data. The demographics of the commanders are also presented in Table 3. From the sample of sixty commanders surveyed in the San Diego area, forty-four responded for a total of seventy-three percent. Fourteen (31.8 percent) were senior commanders (06) and thirty (68.2 percent) were mid-grade commanders (04-05).

Of the forty-four commanders who responded to the survey, nineteen (43.2 percent) served more than twenty years active duty, thirteen (29.5 percent) served 16-20 years, ten (22.7 percent) served 12-16 years, and two (4.5 percent) served 8-12 years.

Among the forty-four commanders, nineteen (43.2 percent) were Catholic, fifteen (34.1 percent) were Protestant, one (2.3 percent) was Jewish, four (9.1 percent) were other, and five (11.4 percent) were none.

Tables 5 and 6 indicate some commanders' scores may have been affected by the variables of reference characteristics. As with the comparison of the chaplains' reference characteristics' influence, the degree of influence is measured by the dispersion of scores across ranks and religion as observed by the researcher; significant indicates a range of $>$ or $= \pm 1$, medium indicates a range of $< \pm 1$ but $>$ or $= \pm .5000$, and minimum indicates a range of $< \pm .5000$. In

this comparison, rank and years of active duty coincide, and therefore, mean scores of years of active duty were not used. Religion mean scores were measured by categories of catholic, protestant and other (Jewish, none, and other combined). The comparison shows a possible significant influence on one of the nineteen mean scores based on religion, and on none of the ten scores based on rank. This one significant influence is discussed in the analysis of research question 2.

Table 5
Commanders' Referenced Characteristics Influence:
comparison of mean scores based on rank

Question # Descriptor	Overall Mean	04-05 Mean	06+ Mean	Degree of Influence
13 DCTT	3.000	3.1034	2.7857	Minimum
29 CON DUTY	3.000	2.8929	3.2308	Minimum
30 OFF MGR	2.905	2.8571	3.0000	Minimum
31 WORSHIP	3.864	3.7333	4.1429	Minimum
32 REL ED	3.568	3.3333	4.0714	Medium
34 SAC SVCS	3.818	3.7000	4.0714	Minimum
36 OMNIPRES	3.575	3.2593	4.2308	Medium
39 PREACHER	2.841	2.7333	3.0714	Minimum
41 TM PLAY	3.977	3.8667	4.2143	Minimum
45 ADVOCAT	3.214	2.9634	3.7143	Medium

Note: Dispersion of Scores $\geq \pm 1$ = Signif. Influence

Table 6 compares commanders' mean scores based on religion as follows:

Table 6
Commanders' Referenced Characteristics Influence:
comparison of mean scores based on religion

Question # Descriptor	Overall Mean	Catholic Mean	Protestant Mean	Other Mean	Degree of Influence
7 CRP1	4.159	4.3333	4.2105	3.8000	Medium
9 COUN PGM	3.932	4.0000	3.7368	4.2000	Minimum
10 COMREL	3.477	3.4000	3.2632	4.0000	Medium
12 PAO	4.091	3.8667	4.2105	4.2000	Minimum
13 DCTT	3.000	3.6667	2.6111	2.7000	Signif.
15 NMCRS	2.818	3.0000	3.0526	2.1000	Medium
19 CAT	3.767	4.0667	3.4440	3.9000	Medium
22 SPIR WLB	4.209	3.9333	4.5000	4.1000	Medium
24 CLERGY	3.023	3.0000	3.1579	2.8000	Minimum
25 GOOD REL	3.841	3.6667	3.7895	4.2000	Medium
26 DNOM REL	3.048	2.7857	3.1053	3.3333	Medium
29 CON DUTY	3.000	3.3846	2.8333	2.8000	Medium
30 OFF MGR	2.905	2.9231	2.7368	3.2000	Minimum
31 WORSHIP	3.864	3.8667	4.0000	3.6000	Minimum

(Table continues)

34 SAC SVCS	3.818	3.8000	4.0000	3.5000	Medium
41 TM PLAY	3.977	4.0000	4.1053	3.7000	Minimum
43 FAITH	4.091	4.2667	4.1053	3.8000	Minimum
45 ADVOCAT	3.214	2.8462	3.4737	3.2000	Medium
46 CHARISMA	2.750	2.6000	2.5263	3.4000	Medium

Note: Dispersion of Scores $\geq \pm 1$ = Signif. Influence

Demographic Summary. Among the chaplains only one was a senior command chaplain, i.e. 06+. More than half were junior chaplains with fifteen having less than eight years active duty. A majority were protestant (89.3 percent).

Among the commanders fourteen were 06+. More than half were 04-05. Twenty-three had 12-20 years active duty and nineteen had 20+. A majority were catholic.

Pearson's Chi-Square tests reveals a significant difference between chaplains and commanders in rank, years active duty, and religion.

Comparison of mean scores by rank and religion shows possible influence on some expectations of chaplains and commanders.

Findings from Data about the Research Questions

The first two research questions are answered by using descriptive statistics to analyze perceptions of the chaplain's role as found in responses to the questionnaire. Findings for each are divided into three parts as found in

questions 4-6 and 50-51, 7-49, and 52-53. Responses to questions 4-49 were made on a Likert-type attitude scale, 1 being strongly disagree (SD), 2 being disagree (D), 3 being neither (N), 4 being agree (A), and 5 being strongly agree (SA). Responses to questions 50-51 were made on comparative rating scales with respondents ranking priorities. Using mean (average ratings), standard deviation (measure of dispersion or spread of scores, with a "coefficient in excess of ± 1 being unusual", Leedy, 272), median (typical performance), mode (prevailing view), and frequency/percentage of mode, Tables 7-10 and 14-17 tabulate questions 4-6, 7-49, and 50-51. Responses to questions 52-53 were open-ended and are listed in Tables 12-13 and 18-19.

Using t-tests, comparisons of mean rankings of chaplains' and commanders' expectations are made to answer research question three.

Research Question 1. What are role expectations chaplains have of themselves as revealed in responses to the questionnaire?

First, findings from Questions 4-6 and 50-51 are presented. Responses provide information on additional variables that may affect chaplains' expectations and behavior. Table 7 reflects chaplains' perceptions of commanders' *expressed modal reactions* of reference characteristics about previous experience with chaplains,

knowledge of SECNAVINST 1730.7A/ OPNAVINST 1730.1C, and knowledge of chaplains' duties. Table 7 follows:

Table 7
Chaplains' Perceptions of Commanders' Knowledge of Roles

Question # Descriptor	Mean	Std Dev	Median	Mode	Mode Freq & %
4 PREV EXP	4.214	.630	4.000	4.000	16/57.1
5 KNOWINST	3.286	.810	3.000	3.000	14/50.0
6 KNOWDUTY	3.821	.863	4.000	4.000	16/57.1

Note: $SD \geq \pm 1$ = Disagreement Among Chaplains

With a SD of <1, a prevailing view of 4.000, and twenty-five chaplains (89.2 percent) scoring 4.000 or higher, and a mean score of 4.214, responses to question 4 indicate chaplains perceive commanders have favorable previous experiences with chaplains. In response to question 5, fourteen chaplains (50.0 percent) scored 3.000, four scored 2.000 or less, and ten scored 4.000 or more; the resulting mean score of 3.286 indicates most chaplains do not know if their commanders have expressed knowledge of SECNAVINST 1730.7A/OPNAVINST 1730.1C (indication is commanders have not expressed knowledge). Although question 6 reveals a mean score of 3.821, twenty-one chaplains (75.0 percent) scored a 4.000 or higher and only 3 (10.7 percent) scored 2.000 or lower; include the SD of <1 and a mode of 4.000, and the indication is that most

chaplains agree that commanders express a knowledge of their duties.

Tables 8-9 reveal chaplains' perceptions of commanders' expressed modal reactions about priorities of chaplains' roles and position within the command as revealed in questions 50-51. For these two questions the statistician stated that he had to "reverse code" the responses in order to get a valid measurement from the computer. By programming the responses in a manner that would allow the rank number 1 to become least important, and the rank numbers 6 and 8 to become most important, he prevented a non response from becoming most important.

The descriptors in Table 8 identify the functional roles of the chaplain's *master role*: administrator, teacher, pastor, priest, project coordinator, and preacher.

Table 8
Chaplains' Perceptions of Commanders' Priorities
of Master Role

Question 50 Descriptor	Mean	Std Dev	Median	Mode	Mode Freq & %
ADMIN	2.929	1.631 *	2.000	2.000	9/32.1
TEACHER	3.107	.956	3.000	3.000	15/53.6
PASTOR	5.464	.962	6.000	6.000	19/67.9
PRIEST	3.889	1.805 *	5.000	5.000	9/32.1
PROJECT COORD	2.357	1.592 *	2.000	1.000	13/46.4
PREACHER	3.357	1.311 *	3.500	4.000	10/35.7

Note: $SD \geq \pm 1$ = Disagreement Among Chaplains (*)

According to the mean scores chaplains perceive commanders would rank the *master role* functions in the following order: pastor, priest, preacher, teacher, administrator, and project coordinator. With exception of responses to B (teacher) and C (pastor), all had a SD of >1 which shows a dispersion of scores, indicating disagreement among the chaplains. In spite of the mean scores, the frequency scores on B and C indicate these are the only two the majority of chaplains agree on.

The descriptors in Table 9 identify the command's department heads: operations officer, weapons officer, supply officer, engineering officer, medical officer, navigator, chaplain, and command master chief (CMC).

Table 9
Chaplains' Perceptions of Commanders' Priorities
of Dept Heads

Question 51 Descriptor	Mean	Std Dev	Median	Mode	Mode Freq & %
OPS OFF	6.864	1.390 *	7.000	8.000	9/32.1
WEPS OFF	4.571	2.181 *	4.000	7.000	6/21.4
SUP OFF	5.048	1.203 *	5.000	5.000	12/42.9
ENG OFF	7.000	1.095 *	7.000	8.000	9/32.1
MED OFF	2.714	1.271 *	2.000	2.000	9/32.1
NAVIGAT	4.143	1.459 *	4.000	4.000	11/39.3
CHAPLAIN	2.238	1.411 *	2.000	1.000	8/28.6
CMC	3.571	2.541 *	3.000	1.000	7/25.0

Note: $SD \geq \pm 1$ = Disagreement Among Chaplains (*)

The results of this question are based on six missing answers for 51A and seven missing answers for 51B-H; apparently seven chaplains did not desire to respond to this question.

Michael Ford (statistician) contends the results remain valid. According to the mean scores, chaplains perceive commanders ranking department heads in the following order: Engineering Officer, Operations Officer, Supply Officer, Weapons Officer, Navigator, Command Master Chief, Medical Officer, and Chaplain. All cases reveal SDs of >1, indicating disagreement among chaplains. Despite the mean scores, frequency scores indicate a dispersion of scores and disagreement among chaplains.

Second, findings from questions 7-49 are presented in Table 10.

Table 10
Chaplains' Expectations of Chaplains' Roles

Question # Descriptor	Mean	Std Dev	Median	Mode	Mode Freq & %
7 CRP1	4.393	.737	4.500	5.000	14/50.0
8 CRP2	3.786	1.475 *	4.000	5.000	12/42.9
9 COUN PGM	4.296	.609	4.000	4.000	15/53.6
10 COMREL	4.000	.784	4.000	4.000	14/50.0
11 MWR	1.750	.967	1.000	1.000	15/53.6

(Table continues)

12 PAO	4.143	1.208 *	5.000	5.000	16/57.1
13 DCTT	2.214	1.166 *	2.000	1.000	10/35.7
14 TRIAGE	2.036	1.138 *	2.000	1.000	12/42.9
15 NMCRS	3.107	1.474 *	4.000	4.000	10/35.7
16 FUNDS	1.821	1.249 *	1.000	1.000	17/60.7
17 FAR	3.750	1.295 *	4.000	4.000	11/39.3
18 SUICIDE	4.036	.637	4.000	4.000	20/71.4
19 CAT	3.593	1.010 *	4.000	4.000	11/39.3
20 CONFLICT	2.036	.793	2.000	2.000	17/60.7
21 MORALE	4.679	.476	5.000	5.000	19/67.9
22 SPIR WLB	4.893	.315	5.000	5.000	25/89.3
23 PROF DEV	4.857	.356	5.000	5.000	24/85.7
24 CLERGY	2.750	1.378 *	2.000	2.000	13/46.4
25 GOOD REL	4.464	.576	4.500	5.000	14/50.0
26 DNOM REL	1.370	.565	1.000	1.000	18/64.3
27 SPIR FOR	4.593	.888	5.000	5.000	20/71.4
28 FITREPS	2.964	1.261 *	3.000	4.000	8/28.6
29 CON DUTY	3.679	1.020 *	4.000	4.000	11/39.3

(Table continues)

30 OFF MGR	3.000	1.155 *	3.000	4.000	9/32.1
31 WORSHIP	4.500	.882	5.000	5.000	19/67.9
32 REL ED	4.321	.905	5.000	5.000	15/53.6
33 PAS CARE	4.429	.790	5.000	5.000	16/57.1
34 SAC SVCS	4.286	.713	4.000	4.000	15/53.6
35 MORAL LD	4.643	.559	5.000	5.000	19/67.9
36 OMNIPRES	3.857	1.239 *	4.000	5.000	11/39.3
37 CMD ADV	4.571	.573	5.000	5.000	17/60.7
38 AGR W CO	1.821	.905	2.000	2.000	16/57.1
39 PREACHER	2.259	1.023 *	2.000	2.000	13/46.4
40 COM W AL	4.679	.476	5.000	5.000	19/67.9
41 TM PLAY	3.964	.881	4.000	4.000	16/57.1
42 COL DUTY	3.357	.951	4.000	4.000	15/53.6
43 FAITH	4.679	.476	5.000	5.000	19/67.9
44 AL FAITH	4.571	.504	5.000	5.000	16/57.1
45 ADVOCAT	3.750	1.005 *	4.000	4.000	16/57.1
46 CHARISMA	3.214	.876	3.000	4.000	11/39.3
47 PHYS FIT	1.857	.705	2.000	2.000	17/60.7

(Table continues)

48 TRN COUN	2.964	1.170 *	3.000	4.000	9/32.1
49 LAY LDR	1.679	.983	1.000	1.000	15/53.6

Note: $SD \geq \pm 1$ = Disagreement Among Chaplains (*)

The questions focused on the *master role's* functions of administrator, teacher, pastor, priest, project coordinator, and preacher (same as Blizzards, except project coordinator has been substituted for organizer). To clarify chaplains' attitudes and expectations as revealed in Table 10, findings are summarized according to the *master role* groupings. With the assistance of my CRG and Michael Ford (statistician), the questions are arranged in groups as indicated in Table 11. To test the reliability of these groupings Cronbach's "Alpha Coefficient of Internal Consistency test" was utilized on the combined findings of chaplains and commanders. Applying a range from 0-1 (1 being a perfect fit and 0 being no fit) an Alpha score between $>.2$ and $<.5$ would indicate a reliable fit. The results indicate the groupings are reliable and can be used to describe the chaplains' views and expectations of their *master role*.

Table 11
Reliability Analysis - Cronbach's Alpha Scale

Functional Role	Questions in Group	Alpha Score	Remarks
Admin	7, 8, 23, 29, 30, 44	.3923	Reliable fit

(Table continues)

Teacher	32 (only item in group)		Not tested; assumed fit
Pastor	22, 24, 31, 33, 46	.3659	Reliable fit
Priest	9, 34, 35, 36, 43, 45, 48	.5626	Reliable fit
Preacher	39 (only item in group)		Not tested; assumed fit
Project Coord	10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 25, 28, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 47	.4975	Reliable fit

According to this test, questions 26, 27, and 49 did not fit in these groupings; however, for purposes of describing chaplains' expectations, findings from all three will be reported as elements of the functional role of pastor.

Administrator. In their role as administrator, chaplains view the Command Religious Program (CRP) as being very important in accomplishing the mission of the command. With a standard deviation (SD) of <1 the chaplains agree with a mean score of 4.393. Twenty-six chaplains scored 4.000 or higher on this question, giving a prevailing view of 5.000, i.e. strongly agreeing that the CRP is important.

With a SD of >1 there was some disagreement concerning the chaplain's responsibility for the CRP. Seven chaplains disagreed and the mean score was 3.786. However, twenty-one chaplains scored 4.000 or higher, twelve scoring 5.000. This indicates that most chaplains perceive they are responsible for the CRP. As table 4 indicates rank had a significance on

the scores in this question. The junior chaplains agreed that they were responsible for the CRP, the supervisory chaplains remained neutral, and the senior chaplain disagreed.

There was no significant difference among chaplains concerning the importance of professional development and support for the needs of all faith groups. In fact for both questions 23 and 44, the mean was >4.500 and the prevailing views were 5.000, indicating a strong agreement that these were important in creating a positive effect on the command's mission.

Although the chaplains had a prevailing view of 4.000 concerning the function of office management, only nine agreed that they should be office managers. A mean score of 3.000 and a SD of >1 indicates that most chaplains are neutral as to whether chaplains should be office managers. In addition, similar responses were recorded by chaplains concerning the importance of consolidated duties.

Teacher. Religious education was scored as very important to the command's mission. Twenty-four scored 4.000 or greater, with a prevailing view of 5.000. The SD was <1 indicating no significant difference among the chaplains.

Pastor. The chaplains unanimously agreed that the chaplain's contributions to the spiritual and moral well-being is important for accomplishing the command's mission. With a mean score of 4.893 (highest score of all questions)

all chaplains scored 4.000 or higher. Twenty-five chaplains (89.3 percent) scored 5.000 giving the prevailing view a score of 5.000, which means they strongly agreed.

With the exception of three chaplains all agreed pastoral care, worship, and the chaplain's spiritual formation are important for accomplishing the mission of the command. In all three cases the mean score was >4.400 with a SD of <1 and the prevailing view of 5.000 indicating the majority strongly agreed.

All chaplains did not agree on the issue of charismatic leadership in worship. Only twelve agreed being a charismatic leader of worship was necessary to have a positive effect on the command's mission. Even with the prevailing view of 4.000, seven disagreed and the result was a mean score of 3.214 indicating chaplains are neutral on the issue.

For questions 24, 26, and 49 chaplains had similar responses. Although there was some disagreement with a SD of >1 (nine chaplains scoring >4.000), the mean score of 2.750 and a prevailing view of 2.000 indicates chaplains view their role as similar to civilian clergy in question 24; table 4 shows that rank influenced the chaplains' scores with the senior chaplain saying it is similar, and junior and supervisory chaplains disagreeing. With a SD of <1 , a mean score of <1.679 , and a prevailing view of 1.000 for both questions 26 and 49, chaplains strongly agree they should be

concerned with denominational relationships, and lay leaders cannot take the place of chaplains.

Priest. In their priestly functions the chaplains were similar in their responses to questions 9, 34, 35, and 43. In every case mean scores were >4.286 with SDs of <1 . These scores reflect an agreement among chaplains, with no significant differences, that counseling centers, sacramental services, commitment to one's own faith, and moral leadership, are important to the command's mission.

In question 36 a SD of >1 indicates some disagreement among chaplains. With six disagreeing and two being neutral, the mean score was only 3.786; however, twenty chaplains (71.4 percent) scored 4.000 or higher. And with the prevailing view of twelve chaplains (42.9 percent) being 5.000, the indication is that most chaplains agree omnipresence is necessary for chaplains to have a positive effect on the mission of the command.

In question 45 a SD of >1 also indicates some disagreement among chaplains. With four disagreeing and three being neutral, the mean score was only 3.750. In this case, as in question 36, a majority agreed that being an advocate for individuals, regardless of the command's mission, was important. In fact twenty-one (75 percent) scored 4.000 or higher and the prevailing view of sixteen (57.1 percent) was 4.000. Chaplains' scores in Table 4 reveal a significant influence in chaplains' responses to this question; the

senior chaplain strongly agreeing with a score of 5.000, junior chaplains (almost) agreeing with a score of 3.9375, and supervisory chaplains remaining neutral with a score of 3.3636.

Question 48 proved to be a controversial subject. With a SD of 1.170 eleven chaplains (39.3 percent) agreed with scores of 4.000 or higher, eleven (39.3 percent) disagreed with scores of 2.000 or less, and six (21.4 percent) were neutral. The mean score was 2.964 and indicates most chaplains do not agree they must be trained professional counselors. As noted in table 4, rank significantly influenced chaplains' responses to this question; the senior chaplain strongly disagreeing, supervisory chaplains disagreeing, junior chaplains remaining neutral.

Preacher. Although there was a SD of >1 in response to question 39, only four chaplains (17.9 percent) agreed that chaplains did not need to be relevant/dynamic preachers in order to have a positive effect on the command's mission. Nineteen (67.9 percent) scored 2.000 or less giving a mean score of 2.259. And, with a prevailing view of 2.000 the indication is that most chaplains believe it is necessary to be relevant/dynamic preachers.

Project Coordinator. As staff officers, one of the *master role* functions involves taking on collateral duties, and planning and implementing projects. Because this is a controversial topic among chaplains and commanders, twenty of

the forty-three questions were developed to identify basic attitudes and expectations about the chaplain's role as Staff Officer.

Chaplains' responses to questions 10, 18, 21, 25, and 37 were similar. In all cases the SD was <1 indicating no significant dispersion of answers. In addition all means scores were 4.000 or higher and the prevailing views were 4.000 or higher. The indication from these scores is that chaplains agree community relations projects, suicide prevention training, contributing to morale, good relations with commanders, and being a candid command advisor are all important chaplain functions within the command's mission.

Responses to questions 11, 12, 13, 14, and 16 indicated some disagreement among chaplains. The overwhelming responses, however, were that chaplains should not be MWR coordinators, Public Affairs officers, Damage Control Training Team members, Medical Triage officers, or Fund Drive coordinators. Questions 11, 13, 14, and 16 had mean scores of 2.214 or less with prevailing views of 1.000 indicating disagreement. Question 12 had a similar response (in reverse order) with a mean of 4.143 and 16 chaplains (57.1 percent) having a prevailing view of 5.000 indicating agreement.

Questions 15, 17, and 19 had similar responses. Although the prevailing view of all these questions was a score of 4.000, each had a SD of >1 which indicated some disagreement. This resulted in chaplains remaining neutral

on the questions of chaplains being Shipboard Navy Relief coordinators, Family Advocacy representatives, and Command Assessment Team members. The mean scores of all three were 3.750 or less. Table 3 shows the mean scores of all three were significantly influenced by rank. The supervisory chaplains' score indicated chaplains should not be Navy Relief coordinators, while junior chaplains were neutral and senior chaplain's score of 4.000 showed he believed chaplains should be Navy Relief coordinators. The supervisory and senior chaplains agreed chaplains should not be Family Advocacy representatives, while junior chaplains remained neutral. Responses to the question of chaplains being Command Assessment Team members reveals supervisory chaplains agreed they should be, while junior and senior chaplains remained neutral.

In questions 20, 38, and 47 chaplains again had similar responses. Among the three questions all SDs were <1 with means of 2.036 or less and prevailing views of 1.000 indicating chaplains agreed clergy duties did not conflict with staff officer duties (only two reporting conflict), it is okay to disagree with the commanding officer, and that physical fitness and appearance do have bearing on chaplain's effectiveness.

Question 28 also proved to be a controversial subject. With a SD of 1.261, eleven chaplains (39.3 percent) agreed with scores of 4.000 or higher, eleven (39.3 percent)

disagreed with scores of 2.000 or less, and six (21.4 percent) were neutral. The mean score was 2.964 and indicates most chaplains do not agree fitness reports should be a priority. Table 4 shows rank had a significant influence on chaplains' responses to this question. The senior chaplain agreed chaplains should make fitness reports a priority, supervisory chaplains were neutral, and junior chaplains' scores revealed they did not agree.

Chaplains responded to question 40 with one of the highest mean scores, i.e. 4.679. All chaplains scored 4.000 or higher (i.e. none were neutral or disagreed). With a prevailing view of 5.000, the chaplains clearly indicated there is a positive effect on the command's mission when they communicate and relate effectively with both officers and enlisted.

Question 41 had a mean score of 3.964 with a SD of <1, indicating no significant difference among chaplains. Twenty-three chaplains (82.1 percent) had scores 4.000 or higher. Only three chaplains disagreed and sixteen had a prevailing view of 4.000, indicating that most chaplains agree that chaplains must be team players and participate in all wardroom functions.

Question 42 had similar responses with a mean score of 3.357 and a SD of <1, indicating no significant difference among chaplains. Even though fifteen chaplains (53.6 percent) had a prevailing view of 4.000, six chaplains were

neutral and six disagreed, indicating chaplains tend to be neutral on the subject of being proactive in taking on collateral duties.

Third, findings from chaplains' responses to questions 52-53 are presented in Tables 12 and 13. Responses to question 52 identifies and describes chaplains' perceptions of areas of limitations that may cause conflict. Responses to question 53 identifies and describes suggestions that would help in possible conflict resolution.

Table 12
Areas of Limitation for Chaplains' Effectiveness
(Survey Question 52)

Comments	Chap Freq
Lack of spiritual life/credibility within command	6
Too many or inappropriate collateral duties	4
Lack of command support	12
Negative attitude toward other faith groups	6
Poor communication/language skills	2
CO/XO lack of knowledge on how to effectively utilize chaplains	3
Inadequate space for counseling/worship	1
Gapped billets; Inadequate staffing	1
Preoccupation with fitreps, politics, looking good in eyes of commander	2
No reply/none	6

Table 13
 Suggestions for Improvement for Chaplains' Effectiveness
 (Survey Question 53)

Comments	Chap Freq
Accessibility	2
Become a "team player"	2
Improve knowledge and involvement in ship's mission/Participate in collateral duties	2
Frequent, honest communication with Commanding Officer (CO) and Chain of Command (COC)	2
Better Administrative training: Attend Department Head and Division Officer Schools	1
Better chaplain to chaplain support and mentoring	2
Limit collateral duties	2
Provide succinct CO and Executive Officer (XO) training on role of chaplain	5
Build ships with more dedicated Religious Ministries Spaces	1
Provide spiritual training that is relevant to Navy's mission i.e. ethics of war	2
Make an effort to build credibility in command	4
Maintain moral integrity and a spiritual life	3
Provide innovative, proactive outreach and training to crew and families	3
Increase counseling skills	1
Send more experienced chaplains to sea billets	1
Provide logistical support for continuing education	1
Appoint chaplains as Ombudsman Coordinators	1
No Reply/None	8

Research Question 2. What are the role expectations commanders have of chaplains as revealed in responses to the

questionnaire? The method used to describe the expectations commanders is the same used for chaplains.

First, findings from Questions 4-6 and 50-51 are presented. Responses to these questions provide additional information about variables that may affect commanders' responses and behavior. Table 14 reflects commanders' *expressed modal reactions* of reference characteristics about previous experience with chaplains, knowledge of SECNAVINST 1730.7A/ OPNAVINST 1730.1C, and knowledge of chaplains' duties.

Table 14
Commanders' Perception and Knowledge of Chaplains' Roles

Question # Descriptor	Mean	Std Dev	Median	Mode	Mode Freq & %
4 PREV EXP	4.114	.841	4.000	4.000	22/57.1
5 KNOWINST	2.953	1.194 *	3.000	4.000	15/34.1
6 KNOWDUTY	4.068	.625	4.000	4.000	30/68.2

Note: $SD \geq \pm 1$ = Disagreement Among Commanders (*)

With a SD of <1, a prevailing view of 4.000, and thirty-seven commanders (84.1 percent) scoring 4.000 or higher, and a mean score of 4.114, responses to question 4 indicate that commanders have favorable previous experiences with chaplains. In response to question 5, seventeen commanders (38.6 percent) scored 4.000 or higher, thirteen commanders (29.5 percent) scored 3.000, and thirteen (29.5 percent)

scored 2.000 or less; with one score missing, the resulting mean score of 2.953 indicates most commanders do not have knowledge of, or understand SECNAVINST 1730.7A/OPNAVINST 1730.1C. Responses to question 6 reveal a mean score of 4.068, indicating most commanders understand duties of chaplains; thirty-nine (88.7 percent) scored a 4.000 or higher and only 1 (2.3 percent) scored 2.000 or lower.

Tables 15-16 reveal commanders' *expressed modal reactions* about priorities of chaplains' roles and position within the command, as revealed in questions 50-51. The responses of these two questions were "reverse coded" in the same manner the chaplains' were. The rank number 1 became least important and the rank numbers 6 and 8 became most important.

The descriptors in Table 15 identify the functional roles of the *master role*; administrator, teacher, pastor, priest, project coordinator, and preacher.

Table 15
Commanders' Priorities of *Master Role*

Question 50 Descriptor	Mean	Std Dev	Median	Mode	Mode Freq & %
ADMIN	2.700	1.305 *	3.000	4.000	13/29.5
TEACHER	4.025	1.475 *	5.000	5.000	18/40.9
PASTOR	5.700	.564	6.000	6.000	30/68.2
PRIEST	4.649	1.438 *	5.000	6.000	13/29.5
PROJECT COORD	2.325	1.095 *	2.000	2.000	12/27.3

(Table continues)

PREACHER	3.865	1.311 *	4.000	6.000	9/20.5
----------	-------	---------	-------	-------	--------

Note: $SD \geq \pm 1$ = Disagreement Among Commanders (*)

According to the mean scores commanders rank the *master role* functions in the following order: pastor, priest, teacher, preacher, administrator, and project coordinator. With exception of responses to C (pastor), all had SDs of >1 and low mode percentages, which indicates a dispersion of scores and disagreement among commanders.

The descriptors in Table 16 identify the command's department heads: operations Officer, weapons officer, supply officer, engineering officer, medical officer, navigator, chaplain, command master chief (CMC).

Table 16
Commanders' Priorities of Dept Heads

Question 51 Descriptor	Mean	Std Dev	Median	Mode	Mode Freq & %
OPS OFF	6.931	1.067 *	7.000	7.000	11/25.0
WEPS OFF	5.621	2.025 *	6.000	6.000	8/18.2
SUP OFF	5.233	1.194 *	5.000	5.000	17/38.6
ENG OFF	7.286	.810	7.500	8.000	14/31.8
MED OFF	2.897	2.093 *	2.000	1.000	9/20.5
NAVIGAT	3.964	1.915 *	4.000	4.000	10/22.7
CHAPLAIN	2.793	2.177 *	2.000	1.000	12/27.3
CMC	4.759	2.278 *	4.000	4.000	7/15.9

Note: $SD \geq \pm 1$ = Disagreement Among Commanders (*)

Fifteen commanders (34.1 percent) did not respond to this question, and some made remarks like, "this question is not

valid," "this question should not be included," and "you can't compare department heads, it would be like comparing apples and oranges." Again, Michael Ford (statistician) argues the results remain valid. According to the mean scores commanders rank department heads in the following order: Engineering Officer, Operations Officer, Weapons Officer, Supply Officer, Command Master Chief, Navigator, Medical Officer, and Chaplain. All cases reveal SDs of >1, indicating disagreement. As in question 50, the SDs and low mode percentages indicate a dispersion of scores and disagreement among commanders for all department heads except engineering officer. As noted commanders ranked the chaplain last.

Second, the findings from questions 7-49 are presented in Table 17.

Table 17
Commanders' Expectations of Chaplains' Roles

Question # Descriptor	Mean	Std Dev	Median	Mode	Mode Freq & %
7 CRP1	4.159	.745	4.000	4.000	25/56.8
8 CRP2	3.591	1.207 *	4.000	4.000	17/38.6
9 COUN PGM	3.932	.900	4.000	4.000	20/45.5
10 COMREL	3.477	1.089 *	4.000	4.000	18/40.9
11 MWR	2.045	.861	2.000	2.000	23/52.3

(Table continues)

12 PAO	4.091	1.007 *	4.000	5.000	18/40.9
13 DCTT	3.000	1.134 *	2.000	3.000	16/36.4
14 TRIAGE	2.568	.974	3.000	3.000	16/36.4
15 NMCRS	2.818	1.018 *	3.000	3.000	16/36.4
16 FUNDS	2.455	.999	2.000	2.000	17/38.6
17 FAR	2.614	1.224 *	2.000	2.000	18/40.9
18 SUICIDE	4.023	.886	4.000	4.000	24/54.5
19 CAT	3.767	.947	4.000	4.000	20/45.5
20 CONFLICT	2.250	1.037 *	2.000	2.000	17/38.6
21 MORALE	4.295	.594	4.000	4.000	25/56.8
22 SPIR WLB	4.209	.773	4.000	4.000	24/54.5
23 PROF DEV	4.295	.734	4.000	4.000	20/45.5
24 CLERGY	3.023	1.131 *	3.000	2.000	15/34.1
25 GOOD REL	3.841	.914	4.000	4.000	27/61.4
26 DNOM REL	3.048	1.103 *	3.000	2.000	16/36.4
27 SPIR FOR	3.436	.968	4.000	4.000	17/38.6
28 FITREPS	2.214	.898	2.000	2.000	18/40.9
29 CON DUTY	3.000	.922	3.000	3.000	16/36.4

(Table continues)

30 OFF MGR	2.905	.906	3.000	3.000	20/45.5
31 WORSHIP	3.864	.905	4.000	4.000	22/50.0
32 REL ED	3.568	.789	4.000	3.000	18/40.9
33 PAS CARE	4.159	.680	4.000	4.000	26/59.1
34 SAC SVCS	3.818	.815	4.000	4.000	26/59.1
35 MORAL LD	4.273	.727	4.000	4.000	21/47.7
36 OMNIPRES	3.575	1.035 *	4.000	4.000	14/31.8
37 CMD ADV	4.488	.768	5.000	5.000	25/56.8
38 AGR W CO	2.095	1.031 *	2.000	2.000	23/52.3
39 PREACHER	2.841	1.098 *	3.000	2.000	18/40.9
40 COM W AL	4.114	.754	4.000	4.000	25/56.8
41 TM PLAY	3.977	.762	4.000	4.000	22/50.0
42 COL DUTY	3.523	.876	4.000	4.000	19/43.2
43 FAITH	4.091	.858	4.000	4.000	18/40.9
44 AL FAITH	4.205	.823	4.000	4.000	22/50.0
45 ADVOCAT	3.214	1.335 *	3.000	2.000	14/31.8
46 CHARISMA	2.750	1.059 *	3.000	2.000	16/36.4
47 PHYS FIT	1.977	1.035 *	2.000	2.000	18/40.9

(Table continues)

48 TRN COUN	3.477	1.131 *	4.000	4.000	17/32.1
49 LAY LDR	2.295	.734	2.000	2.000	29/65.9

Note: $SD \geq \pm 1$ = Disagreement Among Commanders (*)

The questions focused on commanders' perceptions of the chaplain's *Master* role, which includes role functions of administrator, teacher, pastor, priest, project coordinator, and preacher (same as Blizzards, except project coordinator has been substituted for organizer). To give a clear picture of commanders' attitudes and expectations as revealed in Table 17, the findings are summarized according to the *Master* role groupings as seen in Table 11. For purposes of describing commanders' expectations, findings from questions 26, 27, and 49 are included as elements of the functional role of pastor.

Administrator. When scoring the chaplain's role as administrator, commanders view the CRP as being important for accomplishing the mission of the command. With a standard deviation (SD) of <1 and only two disagreeing, commanders had a mean score of 4.159. Thirty-nine (88.6 percent) scored 4.000 or higher and twenty-five had a prevailing view of 4.000 indicating a majority agrees the CRP is important.

With a SD of >1 some disagreement exists among commanders concerning the chaplain's responsibility for the CRP. Eleven disagreed and five were neutral, contributing to a mean score of 3.591. With twenty-eight (63.6 percent)

scoring 4.000 or higher, and with the prevailing view of 4.000, it is clear that most commanders perceive chaplains to be responsible for the CRP.

There was no significant difference among commanders concerning the importance of chaplains' professional development and support for the needs of all faith groups. In fact, for both questions 23 and 44, the mean was 4.205 or higher with the prevailing views being 4.000. indicating an agreement that these were important in creating a positive effect on the command's mission.

Although commanders had a prevailing view of 3.000 concerning the function of office management, thirteen (29.5 percent) disagreed, and only nine (20.4 percent) agreed chaplains should be office managers. A mean score of 2.905 and a SD of <1 indicates most commanders are neutral as to whether chaplains should be office managers. In addition, similar responses were recorded concerning the importance of chaplains' consolidated duties; the difference was a mean score of 3.000.

Teacher. Religious education was not scored as very important to the command's mission by commanders. In fact their view could be considered neutral. Even though twenty-three (52.3 percent) scored 4.000 or greater, with the prevailing view of 3.000 by eighteen commanders, the mean score was 3.568. The SD was <1 indicating no significant difference among commanders.

Pastor. Commanders overwhelmingly agreed that the chaplain's contributions to the spiritual and moral well-being is important for accomplishing the command's mission. With a mean score of 4.209, thirty-nine (88.6 percent) scored 4.000 or higher. With only one strongly disagreeing and a SD <1, no significant difference in the commanders responses indicates a majority agreed.

With the exception of five commanders, all agreed that pastoral care is important for accomplishing the mission of the command. Thirty-nine (88.6 percent) scored 4.000 or higher, giving a mean score of 4.159. With a SD of <1 and twenty-six scoring a prevailing view of 4.000 the data confirms commanders agree pastoral care is important.

The mean score of 3.864 for question 31 indicates commanders do not agree weekly worship is important in the command's mission. Nevertheless, with a SD of <1, a prevailing view of 4.000, with only three disagreeing, and thirty-two (72.7 percent) agreeing, data suggests most commanders consider weekly worship important for accomplishing the command's mission.

Commanders' response to question 27 indicates they are neutral concerning chaplains' spiritual formation. With only twenty-one (47.6 percent) agreeing, the mean score was 3.436. Also, a SD of <1 indicates no significant differences in commanders' responses.

A SD of 1.059 on question 46 indicates all commanders did not agree on the issue of charismatic leadership in worship. Only ten agreed chaplains needed to be charismatic leaders of worship in order to have a positive effect on the command's mission. With twenty (45.5 percent) scoring 2.000 or less the mean score 2.750 reveals most commanders did not think chaplains needed to be charismatic leaders of worship.

Commanders had similar responses for questions 24 and 26. Although SDs of >1 indicates some disagreement, the prevailing scores of 2.000 and the mean scores of 3.023 and 3.048 respectively reveal commanders neutral concerning these two questions. That is, they are indifferent about these two questions (chaplain's role being similar to civilian clergy, and chaplains' denominational relationships being important).

In response to question 49 commanders overwhelmingly agreed lay leaders cannot take the place of chaplains. Thirty-one (72.7 percent) scored 2.000 or less, giving a mean score of 2.295. A SD of <1 indicates there were no significant differences among commanders on this question.

Priest. Responding to questions about chaplains' priestly functions, commanders were similar in responses to questions 9, 34, 35, 36, 43, 45, and 48, i.e. they did not respond with 1.000s or 5.000s in any of the questions.

Question 9 commanders show a mean score of 3.932. Thirty-two commanders (72.8 percent) scoring 4.000 or higher, a SD of <1 , and only two disagreeing, indicates most

commanders expect chaplains to establish counseling programs in their commands.

Although commanders responded to question 34 with a mean score of 3.818, the data indicates most commanders agree sacramental services are important to the command's mission. Thirty-three (75.0 percent) scored 4.000 or higher, and only four disagreed.

Commanders were stronger in their responses to questions 35 and 43. Their mean scores were 4.273 and 4.091. Both had SDs of <1 . Only one disagreed in question 35, and only two in question 43. This data indicates that a majority agree chaplains have a positive effect on the command's mission by modeling moral leadership and integrity, and by being committed to his/her faith.

Responses to question 36 indicated not all commanders agreed omnipresence was important for chaplains to be effective. A SD of >1 , twenty-two commanders (50.0 percent) scoring 4.000 or higher, and a mean score 3.575 reveals a neutrality among commanders.

A SD of >1 in question 45 also indicates some disagreement among commanders. Seventeen (38.6 percent) disagreed and the mean score was only 2.750. This data indicates the overall opinion of commanders is chaplains cannot be advocates for individuals regardless of the command's mission.

Question 48 proved to be somewhat controversial for commanders too. Ten commanders disagreed and nine were neutral giving a SD of 1.131. Although the mean score was only 3.477, twenty-five commanders (56.8 percent) scored 4.000 or higher indicating that a majority of commanders agree chaplains must be trained professional counselors in order to have a positive effect on the command's mission.

Preacher. Although there was a SD of >1 in their response to question 39, only fourteen commanders (31.8 percent) agreed and only nine were neutral. Twenty-one (47.7 percent) scored 2.000 or less, giving a mean score of 2.841. With eighteen commanders having a prevailing view of 2.000, the indication is commanders believe chaplains need to be relevant/dynamic preachers.

Project Coordinator. Commanders often view the chaplain's role of staff officer as one of taking on collateral duties, and planning and implementing projects. As stated previously, because this is a controversial topic among chaplains and commanders, twenty of the forty-three questions were developed to identify attitudes and expectations about the chaplain's role as Staff Officer. Commanders' responses to these questions as listed in Table 17 reflect their perceptions.

Question 10's mean score of 3.477 indicates commanders neutral concerning community relation projects; however, with only nine disagreeing and twenty-five (56.8 percent) scoring

4.000 or higher, the data indicates a majority of commanders agree that community relation projects are an important part of the CRP.

Commanders' responses to questions 11, 12, 14, 15, and 16 were similar. Their mean scores revealed that MWR coordinator, Public Affairs officer, Medical Triage officer, Shipboard Navy Relief coordinator, and Fund Drive coordinator were not chaplains' collateral duties.

Responses to question 13 revealed a SD of >1 , indicating some disagreement among commanders. Seven scoring 4.000 or higher and sixteen scoring 3.000 gave a mean score was 3.000. This shows commanders neutral about chaplains serving as DCTT members. As noted in table 5 and 6 rank had no influence while religion may have contributed to commanders responses to this question; protestant and other commanders disagreed, while the catholics remained neutral.

Ten commanders scoring 4.000 or higher on question 17, and twenty-five scoring 2.000 or lower gave a mean score of 2.614. This indicates commanders expect chaplains to be Family Advocacy representatives.

Commanders' responses to question 18 reveals an overwhelming agreement that chaplains should be Suicide Prevention Trainers. Thirty-six (81.8 percent) scoring 4.000 or higher, only three disagreeing, and a mean score of 4.023, the indication is commanders agree with the question.

The mean score in question 19 was 3.767 indicating commanders were neutral concerning chaplains serving as Command Assessment Team (CAT) members; however, with only four disagreeing and twenty-nine (66.0 percent) scoring 4.000 or higher, the data indicates a majority agree chaplains should be CAT members.

Although some disagreement exists among commanders about question 20, the mean score reveals most agreeing chaplains' clergy duties do not conflict with those of staff officer. Only four commanders scored 4.000 or higher. Twenty-eight (63.6 percent) scoring 2.000 or less gave a mean score of 2.250, indicating commanders did not agree with the question.

Responses to questions 21, 37, and 40 were similar. Mean scores were 4.295, 4.488, and 4.114 respectively, indicating commanders agreed chaplain's contributions to morale is important, chaplains must be able to effectively communicate with officers and enlisted, and chaplains must be candid advisors to commanders.

Commanders also had similar responses to questions 28 and 38. The mean scores revealed commanders do not expect chaplains to concentrate on fitness reports, or on trying to always please them. Two commanders scoring a 4.000 or higher and twenty-seven (61.4 percent) scoring 2.000 or lower gave question 28 a mean score of 2.214. Responses to question 38 reveal only five commanders scored 4.000 or higher and

thirty-four (77.3 percent) scored 2.000 or lower, giving a mean score of 2.095.

Responses to questions 25, 41, and 42 were similar. In all cases the SDs were <1 indicating no significant difference among commanders' perceptions. All three questions' mean scores indicate commanders neutral on the issues of chaplains' relationships with commanders, chaplains' participation as staff officers in wardrooms, and chaplains taking on collateral duties. Even though the mean score was 3.841 in question 25, only five disagreed, and thirty-five commanders (79.6 percent) scored 4.000 or higher indicating the majority agreed that chaplains should be concerned with good relationships with commanders. The mean score for question 41 was 3.977; however, only one commander disagreed, and thirty-three (75.0 percent) scored 4.000 or higher, indicating the majority agreed that chaplains must be team players and participate in wardroom functions. Question 42 had a mean score of 3.523; but, with only six commanders disagreeing, and twenty-four (54.6 percent) scored 4.000 or higher, the indication is that a majority expected chaplains to be proactive in taking on collateral duties.

A SD of >1 for question 47 indicates some disagreement among commanders concerning chaplains' physical fitness; however, a mean score of 1.977 reveals most disagreeing with the question. Five commanders scored 4.000 or higher and thirty-four (77.3 percent) scored 2.000 or less indicating

commanders agree chaplains' physical fitness and personal appearance do have bearing on chaplains' effectiveness on ships.

Third, findings from commanders' responses to questions 52-53 are presented in Tables 18 and 19. Responses to question 52 identifies and describes commanders' perceptions of areas of limitations that may cause conflict. Responses to question 53 identifies and describes suggestions that would help in possible conflict resolution.

Table 18
Areas of Limitation for Chaplains' Effectiveness
(Survey Question 52)

Comments	Cmdr Freq
Lack of spiritual life/credibility within command	12
Too many or inappropriate collateral duties	3
Lack of command support	5
Negative attitude toward other faith groups	4
Poor communication/language skills	1
Inadequate space for counseling/worship	2
Chaplain is inaccessible	4
Chaplain's lack of shipboard knowledge/experience	7
Off-ship duty rotations	1
Over involvement in non-Navy ministries	1
Inflexible to operational needs of ship	1
Being misled by manipulative sailors	1
Preoccupation with fitreps, politics, "looking good"	2

(Table continues)

No established safeguards for mixed gender counseling	1
Chaplains who are unable to work "with" senior officers and not just "for" seniors	1
No reply/none	14

Table 19
 Suggestions for Improvement for Chaplains' Effectiveness
 (Survey Question 53)

Comments	Cmdr Freq
Accessibility	10
Become a "team player"	2
Improve knowledge and involvement in ship's mission/Participate in collateral duties	8
Frequent, honest communication with Commanding Officer (CO) and Chain of Command (COC)	3
Better Administrative training: Attend Department Head and Division Officer Schools	1
Better chaplain to chaplain support and mentoring	1
Limit collateral duties	1
Provide spiritual training that is relevant to Navy's mission i.e. ethics of war	1
Make an effort to build credibility in command	3
Maintain moral integrity and a spiritual life	2
Provide innovative, proactive outreach and training to crew and families	5
Provide aggressive lay leader training	1
Integrate officer and chaplain roles: chaplains are officers and chaplains; neither job is above the other	3
Increase counseling skills	1
Chaplains are clergy; do away with rank structure	1

(Table continues)

No Reply/None	10
---------------	----

Research Question 3. What discrepancies exist in the way commanders and chaplains view the role of ships' chaplains? The answer to this question is found in making five comparisons of chaplains and commanders responses to the questionnaire.

First, a t-test for equality of means was used to measure differences between chaplains' and commanders' responses to questions 4-6 (see Table 20). T-test significance scores of $<.05$ indicate significant differences.

Table 20
Differences Between
Chaplains' Perception and Commanders' Knowledge of Roles

Question # Descriptor	Chap Mean	Cmdr Mean	t-value	t-test signif
4 PREV EXP	4.2143	4.1136	.54	.589
5 KNOWINST	3.2857	2.9535	1.29	.201
6 KNOWDUTY	3.8214	4.0682	-1.41	.164

Note: $p \leq .05$ for t-test signif = Significant
Differences Between Chaplains and Commanders (*)

No differences were found in chaplains' perceptions and commanders' modal reactions. Commanders' previous experience with chaplains has been favorable. They proclaim an understanding of chaplain's duties, but, do not have

knowledge of or understand SECNAVINST 1730.7A/OPNAVINST 1730.1C.

Second, a t-test for equality of means was used to measure discrepancies between chaplains' and commanders' scores in questions 7-49 (see Table 21). Again, t-test significance scores of $<.05$ indicate significant differences.

Table 21
Differences Between Chaplains' and Commanders'
Expectations of Chaplains' Roles

Question # Descriptor	Chap Mean	Cmdr Mean	t-value	t-test Signif
7 CRP1	4.3929	4.1591	1.30	.197
8 CRP2	3.7857	3.5909	.61	.543
9 COUN PGM	4.2963	3.9318	1.86	.067
10 COMREL	4.0000	3.4773	2.17	.033 *
11 MWR	1.7500	2.0455	-1.35	.181
12 PAO	4.1429	4.0909	.20	.844
13 DCTT	2.2143	3.0000	-2.82	.006 *
14 TRIAGE	2.0357	2.5682	-2.12	.038 *
15 NMCRS	3.1071	2.8182	.98	.328
16 FUNDS	1.8214	2.4545	-2.38	.020 *
17 FAR	3.7500	2.6136	3.76	.000 *

(Table continues)

18 SUICIDE	4.0357	4.0233	.06	.949
19 CAT	3.5926	3.7674	-.73	.466
20 CONFLICT	2.0357	2.2500	-.93	.354
21 MORALE	4.6786	4.2955	2.88	.005 *
22 SPIR WLB	4.8929	4.2093	4.44	.000 *
23 PROF DEV	4.8571	4.2955	3.77	.000 *
24 CLERGY	2.7500	3.0227	-.92	.363
25 GOOD REL	4.4643	3.8409	3.22	.002 *
26 DNOM REL	1.3704	3.0476	-7.30	.000 *
27 SPIR FOR	4.5926	3.4359	4.93	.000 *
28 FITREPS	2.9643	2.2143	2.91	.005 *
29 CON DUTY	3.6786	3.0000	2.87	.005 *
30 OFF MGR	3.0000	2.9048	.39	.701
31 WORSHIP	4.5000	3.8636	2.94	.004 *
32 REL ED	4.3214	3.5682	3.73	.000 *
33 PAS CARE	4.4286	4.1591	1.54	.128
34 SAC SVCS	4.2857	3.8182	2.49	.015 *
35 MORAL LD	4.6429	4.2727	2.29	.025 *

(Table continues)

36 OMNIPRES	3.8571	3.5750	1.02	.312
37 CMD ADV	4.5714	4.4884	.49	.626
38 AGR W CO	1.8214	2.0952	-1.14	.258
39 PREACHER	2.2593	2.8409	-2.22	.030 *
40 COM W AL	4.6786	4.1136	3.54	.001 *
41 TM PLAY	3.9643	3.9773	-.07	.947
42 COL DUTY	3.3571	3.5227	-.76	.452
43 FAITH	4.6786	4.0909	3.31	.001 *
44 AL FAITH	4.5714	4.2045	2.12	.038 *
45 ADVOCAT	3.7500	3.2143	1.81	.075
46 CHARISMA	3.2143	2.7500	1.93	.057
47 PHYS FIT	1.8571	1.9767	-.54	.594
48 TRN COUN	2.9643	3.4773	-1.85	.068
49 LAY LDR	1.6786	2.2995	-3.04	.003 *

Note: $p \leq .05$ for t-test signif = Significant Differences Between Chaplains and Commanders (*)

To give an intelligible depiction of the discrepancies (similarity, consensus, dissensus), findings are summarized according to *master role* groupings. Statistics for twenty-two scores reflect significant differences. Twelve of these reflect differences in the same grouping of scores, e.g.

4.000, 3.000, or 2.000. Comparing these mean scores reflects a practical similarity rather than a statistical dissensus.

Administrator. T-test significant scores reveal a consensus among Chaplains and commanders on two questions in the *master role*. The two groups agree that the CRP is important in accomplishing the mission of the command. T-test scores also reveal a consensus of neutrality for question 8; however, observation of statistics in Tables 10 and 17 indicates most commanders and chaplains agree that chaplains are responsible for the CRP.

Scores show a significant difference or dissensus among chaplains and commanders for questions 23, 29, and 44. All are in the same mean groupings, i.e. chaplains and commanders scored 4.000s for question 23 and 44, and 3000s for question 29. These mean scores indicate chaplains and commanders disagree about the degree of agreement concerning the importance of chaplains' professional development and support for the needs of all faith groups. The mean scores for question 29 also indicate disagreement as to the degree of neutrality concerning the importance of chaplain's consolidated duties.

A t-test significant score of $>.05$ for question 30 shows Chaplains and commanders are similar in their perceptions about chaplains' role of office manager.

Teacher. Religious education was not scored important to the command's mission by commanders. Table 21 t-test

scores reflect a significant difference or dissensus between chaplains and commanders on this issue. Commanders are neutral and chaplains perceive religious education as important.

Pastor. Consensus exists between chaplains and commanders concerning the importance of pastoral care. Table 21 scores indicate both groups agree pastoral care is important for accomplishing the command's mission.

Dissensus appears for questions 24, 26, 27, 31, and 46. Chaplains perceive their role similar to civilian clergy and commanders are neutral, i.e. they are indifferent. Chaplains perceive denominational relationships, spiritual formation, and weekly worship important, while commanders are neutral. Commanders perceive charismatic leadership is not necessary for chaplains' effectiveness, while chaplains are neutral.

T-test scores for questions 22 and 49 show a dissensus between commanders and chaplains. Observation of mean scores reveals dissensus to be on the degree of agreement or disagreement. Both agreed chaplain's contributions to the spiritual and moral well-being is important for accomplishing the command's mission, and they agreed lay leaders cannot replace chaplains.

Priest. Chaplains' and commanders' responses show a consensus to questions 36 and 45. Both are neutral concerning importance of omnipresence and advocacy for individuals.

T-test scores reveal no significant differences in chaplains' and commanders' responses to questions 9 and 48. Similarity exists in their perceptions of importance of chaplains establishing counseling programs and being professional trained counselors. Both agree establishing counseling programs is important, and both are neutral on the necessity of chaplains being professional trained counselors; however, 56.8 percent of the commanders agree chaplains must be trained professional counselors in order to have a positive effect on the command's mission.

Scores in Table 21 reveal chaplains and commanders respond significantly different to questions 34, 35, and 43. Chaplains agree sacramental services are important, and commanders are neutral in their mean scores; however, data from Table 17 indicates most commanders agree sacramental services are important to the command's mission. The difference in questions 35 and 43 is in the degree of agreement. Both agree chaplains must be models of integrity and committed to their faith.

Preacher. A significant difference exists between chaplains' and commanders' responses to question 39. The difference is in the degree of disagreement. Mean scores indicate both expect chaplains to be relevant/dynamic preachers to be effective.

Project Coordinator. Chaplains and commanders agree in their responses to questions 12, 18, 19, 20, 37, and 47.

Both agree chaplains must be candid advisors, Public Affairs officer is not the job for chaplains, suicide prevention training is an important role for chaplains, and conflict does not exist between chaplains' clergy role and staff officer. Mean scores show both neutral on the issues of collateral duties, Command Assessment Team membership, and team players attending all wardroom functions; however, Tables 10 and 17 indicate the majority of chaplains and commanders agree chaplains must be team players. Both perceive physical fitness as important for chaplains' effectiveness.

T-tests reveal similarity in chaplains' and commanders' responses to questions 11, 15, and 38. Both agree chaplains should not be MWR coordinators, and that they do not have to always agree with the commanding officer. Although t-tests indicate no significant difference concerning chaplains serving as shipboard Navy Relief coordinators, mean scores show commanders disagreeing and chaplains neutral.

T-tests reveal chaplains and commanders disagree on responses to questions 10, 13, 14, 16, 17, 21, 28, and 40. Scores show chaplains perceive community relation projects important and commanders neutral; however, data from Table 15 indicates a majority of commanders agree community relation projects are an important part of the CRP. Mean scores on the issue of Damage Control Training Teams indicate chaplains disagree, while commanders remain neutral. Chaplains and

commanders disagree on the degree of disagreement on the issues of fund drive coordinators, Medical Triage officers and priority of fitness reports. They disagree on the degree of agreement on the issues of the importance of chaplains' contribution to morale and effective communication in questions 21 and 40. And, scores indicate commanders expect chaplains to be Family Advocacy representatives, while chaplains remain neutral.

Third, a t-test for equality of means was conducted on Chaplains' and commanders' responses to *master role* groupings as illustrated in Table 22. The questions were grouped as listed in Table 11.

Table 22
Differences Between Chaplains' and Commanders'
Expectations of *Master Role* Functions

Functional Role	Chap Mean	Cmdr Mean	t-value	t-test Signif
Admin	4.0476	3.6829	3.46	.001 *
Teacher	4.3214	3.5682	3.73	.000 *
Pastor	3.5309	3.5041	.26	.795
Priest	4.0476	3.7786	2.17	.033 *
Preacher	2.2593	2.8409	-2.22	.030 *
Project Coord	3.2135	3.1932	.27	.787

Note: $p \leq .05$ for t-test signif = Significant Differences Between Chaplains and Commanders (*)

Using the level of significance of $< .05$ Table 22 reveals significant differences between commanders and chaplains expectations in the roles of administrator, teacher, priest,

and preacher. Differences in the administrator role appear for questions 23, 29, and 44; mean scores indicate chaplains and commanders disagree about the degree of agreement that chaplains' professional development and support for the needs of all faith groups are important, and about the degree of neutrality concerning the importance of chaplain's consolidated duties. Scores reflect a significant difference concerning the role of teacher; commanders are neutral and chaplains perceive religious education as important. The responses to the role of priest reveal significant differences to questions 34, 35, and 43; chaplains agree sacramental services are important, and commanders are neutral in their mean scores; the differences in questions 35 and 43 is in the degree of agreement concerning chaplains modeling integrity and being committed to their faith. A significant difference exists between chaplains' and commanders' responses to the role of preacher; the difference is in the degree of disagreement, i.e. both expect chaplains to be relevant/dynamic preachers to be effective. For the roles of pastor and project coordinator, Table 22 indicates no significant differences.

Fourth, comparisons between chaplains' perceptions and commanders' priorities of chaplains' roles and department heads were made. T-tests (reverse coded) are conducted to reveal significant differences. The descriptors in Tables 23

identify the functional roles of the *master role*; Table 23 follows on page 123.

Table 23
Differences Between Chaplains' Perceptions
And Commanders' Priorities of Chaplains' Roles

Question 50 Descriptor	Chap Mean	Cmdr Mean	t-value	t-test Signif
Admin	2.9286	2.7000	.64	.524
Teacher	3.1071	4.0244	-2.90	.005 *
Pastor	5.4643	5.7000	-1.27	.208
Priest	3.8889	4.6486	-1.87	.066
Preacher	2.3571	2.3250	.10	.922
Project Coord	3.3571	3.8649	-1.34	.186

Note: $p \leq .05$ for t-test signif = Significant Differences
Between Chaplains and Commanders (*)

Table 23 reveals significant differences between chaplains' perceptions and commanders' priorities in ranking the teacher role and the role of priest (marginal significance). Mean scores reflect chaplains' perceptions somewhat different than commanders' priorities. Both ranked pastor as 1, priest as 2, and administrator as 5; commanders ranked teacher as 3, chaplains ranked it as 4; commanders ranked project coordinator as 4, chaplains ranked it as 6; commanders ranked preacher as 6, chaplains ranked it as 3.

The descriptors in Table 24 identify commands' department heads; Table 24 follows on page 124.

Table 24
Differences Between Chaplains' Perceptions
And Commanders' Priorities of Department Heads

Question 51 Descriptor	Chap Mean	Cmdr Mean	t-value	t-test Signif
OPS OFF	6.8636	6.9310	-.20	.845
WEPS OFF	4.5714	5.6207	-1.75	.086
SUP OFF	5.0476	5.2333	-.54	.588
ENG OFF	7.0000	7.2857	-1.05	.299
MED OFF	2.7143	2.8966	-.35	.725
NAVIGAT	4.1429	3.9643	.36	.723
CHAPLAIN	2.2381	2.7931	-1.02	.312
CMC	3.5714	4.7586	-1.73	.090

Note: $p \leq .05$ for t-test signif = Significant Differences
Between Chaplains and Commanders (*)

No significant differences were found between chaplains' perceptions and commanders' priorities in ranking department heads. A marginal significant difference of .090 ($>.05$) was found in responses to the role of command master chief. Mean scores reflect chaplains' perceptions correct concerning their position on commanders' "lists," i.e. they were ranked eighth (least important) by commanders.

Fifth, a comparison is made between chaplains' and commanders' responses to questions 52-53. Tables 25 and 26 delineate the frequency of responses to areas that may cause conflict and possible ways of resolving conflict. Table 25 follows on page 125, and Table 26 is shown on pages 126-127.

Table 25
 Areas of Limitation for Chaplains' Effectiveness
 (Survey Question 52)

Comments	Chap Freq	Cmdr Freq
Lack of spiritual life/credibility within command	6	12
Too many or inappropriate collateral duties	4	6
Lack of command support	12	5
Negative attitude toward other faith groups	6	4
Poor communication/language skills	2	1
CO/XO lack of knowledge on how to effectively utilize chaplains	3	0
Inadequate space for counseling/worship	1	2
Gapped billets; Inadequate staffing	1	0
Chaplain is inaccessible	0	4
Chaplain's lack of shipboard knowledge/experience	0	7
Off-ship duty rotations	0	1
Over involvement in non-Navy ministries	0	1
Inflexible to operational needs of ship	0	1
Being misled by manipulative sailors	0	1
Preoccupation with fitreps, politics, "looking good"	2	2
No established safeguards for mixed gender counseling	0	1
Chaplains who are unable to work "with" senior officers and not just "for" seniors	0	1
No reply/none	6	14

Table 26
 Suggestions for Improvement for Chaplains' Effectiveness
 (Survey Question 53)

Comments	Chap Freq	Cmdr Freq
Accessibility	2	10
Become a "team player"	2	2
Improve knowledge and involvement in ship's mission/Participate in collateral duties	2	8
Frequent, honest communication with Commanding Officer (CO) and Chain of Command (COC)	2	3
Better Administrative training: Attend Department Head and Division Officer Schools	1	1
Better chaplain to chaplain support and mentoring	2	1
Limit collateral duties	2	1
Provide succinct CO and Executive Officer (XO) training on role of chaplain	5	0
Build ships with more dedicated Religious Ministries Spaces	1	0
Provide spiritual training that is relevant to Navy's mission i.e. ethics of war	2	1
Make an effort to build credibility in command	4	3
Maintain moral integrity and a spiritual life	3	2
Provide innovative, proactive outreach and training to crew and families	3	5
Provide aggressive lay leader training	0	1
Integrate officer and chaplain roles: chaplains are officers and chaplains; neither job is above the other	0	3
Increase counseling skills	1	1

(Table continues)

Chaplains are clergy; do away with rank structure	0	1
Send more experienced chaplains to sea billets	1	0
Provide logistical support for continuing education	1	0
Appoint chaplains as Ombudsman Coordinators	1	0
No Reply/None	8	10

Responses to question 52 identifies and describes chaplains' and commanders' perceptions of areas of limitations that may cause conflict. Responses to question 53 identifies and describes suggestions that would help in possible conflict resolution.

Findings Summary. What are the role expectations chaplains have of themselves? Findings for this question were divided into three parts as found in questions 4-6 and 50-51, 7-49, and 52-53. Results from Questions 4-6 and 50-51 indicate chaplains perceive commanders have favorable previous experiences and express knowledge of duties, but have not expressed knowledge of SECNAVINST 1730.7a/OPNAVINST 1730.1C. Responses to question 51 shows chaplains perceiving commanders placing them at the bottom of the list when ranked with other department heads. Findings from questions 7-49 focused on chaplains' perceptions of their *master role*, which includes role functions of administrator, teacher, pastor, priest, project coordinator, and preacher. In their role as administrator, chaplains view the Command Religious Program

(CRP) as being important in accomplishing the mission of the command, and most perceive they are responsible for the CRP. Findings from chaplains' responses to questions 52-53 identify and describe nine areas of limitations that may cause conflict, and seventeen suggestions that may help in possible conflict resolution.

What are commanders' role expectations for chaplains? The method used to describe commanders' expectations is the same used for chaplains. Findings were divided into three parts as found in questions 4-6 and 50-51, 7-49, and 52-53. Findings from Questions 4-6 and 50-51 indicate commanders have favorable previous experiences with chaplains and understand the duties of chaplains, but most do not have knowledge of or understand SECNAVINST 1730.7A/OPNAVINST 1730.1C. Responses to question 51 reveal commanders ranking chaplains as least important among department heads. Findings from commanders responses to questions 7-49 also focused on their perceptions of the chaplain's *master role*. Responses to the chaplain's role as administrator indicate commanders view the CRP important in accomplishing the mission, and chaplains responsible for the CRP. Findings from commanders' responses to questions 52-53 identify and describe fifteen areas of limitations that may cause conflict, and fifteen suggestions that may help in possible conflict resolution.

What discrepancies exist in the way commanders and chaplains view the role of chaplains on Navy ships? The answer to this question was found in making five comparisons. A t-test for equality of means found no differences between chaplains' perceptions and commanders' modal reactions. Commanders' previous experience with chaplains has been favorable and they proclaim an understanding of chaplain's duties, however, they do not have knowledge of, or understand SECNAVINST 1730.7A/OPNAVINST 1730.1C. A t-test for equality of means was used to measure discrepancies between chaplains and commanders scores according to the *master role* groupings. A t-test for equality of means was conducted on Chaplains' and commanders' responses to *master role* groupings as illustrated in Table 22 to validate scores in comparisons in research question three. Using t-tests, comparisons between chaplains' perceptions and commanders' priorities of chaplains' roles and department heads were made. And, a comparison was made between chaplains' and commanders' frequency of responses to areas that may cause conflict and possible ways of resolving conflict.

The differences in role expectations are shown in the analysis of the three research questions.

Findings From Interviews

Using the Descriptive Survey questionnaire as a guide, five chaplains and five commanders were interviewed. The purpose was to gather additional data to be used as a tool

for understanding the findings. The chaplains and commanders were selected at random from ships on the waterfront in San Diego. The validity of this portion of research is based on "face validity" and the respondents' descriptive accounts are fair reflections of their true expectations of chaplains' roles. In order to present a clear description of chaplains' and commanders' perceptions, the data is summarized using the *master role divisions* for each.

Chaplain's Perceptions. Prior to examining the *master role divisions*, four referenced characteristics which may affect the chaplains' perceptions are discussed: (1) Of the five chaplains interviewed, three were protestant and two were catholic. (2) Three stated their commanders had not expressed having favorable experiences with chaplains - one stating his commander was "unchurched" and did not need contact with chaplains. Two stated their commanders expressed having favorable experiences with chaplains - one stating his commander would take the advice of his chaplain over the executive officer. (3) When asked about their commanders familiarity with SECNAVINST 1730.7A, three said their commanders did not have knowledge of the contents. Two stated their commanders were familiar with the instruction - one stating his commander expressed a "somewhat" because of a letter sent to commanders by the Chief of Chaplains. (4) All five chaplains "strongly agreed" the Command Religious Program (CRP) was important in accomplishing the mission of

the ship. The reason stated was, "faith affects performance and the CRP is a way of allowing individuals to express their faith, especially during deployments."

The First *master role* division is administrator. All five chaplains stated the commander is responsible for the CRP, but planning and implementing it is the most important function a ship's chaplain has. One chaplain stated, "this justifies the chaplain's existence on a ship." Three agree the chaplain should be highly skilled as an office manager and administrator, while two were neutral, stating "the real work of chaplains is being where the troops are."

The second division is teacher. All five chaplains agreed teaching is necessary. Three chaplains stated this role is absolutely necessary - one stating, "it cannot be separated from the chaplain's roles of pastor and priest, which are the most important part of the chaplain's purpose as a clergyperson." Two chaplains considered teaching secondary to all other roles, and being necessary only for indoctrination classes, suicide prevention classes, and stress management classes.

The third division is pastor. Four chaplains stated the pastoral role is absolutely necessary for a chaplain to be effective. One chaplain stated, "although it is necessary, with the exception of the project officer role, the pastoral role should be at the bottom of the *master role* list." Two stated the roles of pastor, priest, and preacher cannot be

separated; one combined only pastor and priest; and two stated the pastoral role was an important role separate from all other roles. A common thread in chaplains' responses to this role is that all chaplains related it to worship, which is of utmost importance for the CRP. Four chaplains do not feel that chaplains need to be charismatic leaders of worship, stating, "different chaplains have different styles and skills, and should never be evaluated on style because we can not all be a Charles Stanley." One chaplain said, "as pastors, chaplains must be charismatic leaders in order to be effective."

The fourth division is priest. All chaplains agreed that, setting aside the catholic chaplains' title of "priest," the priestly role includes counseling, ministry of presence, and ministry of advocacy before God and people. From a counseling standpoint, all agreed that it is an important role in ministry. Three agreed counseling is not the essence of ministry; stating, "chaplains are not psychologists, and therefore, should not be perceived as counselors, rather they should be seen as pastoral counselors providing spiritual guidance." Two chaplains felt that, due to the nature of the chaplain's role on a ship, chaplains are required to be more than spiritual counselors; i.e. chaplains must be prepared to counsel Sailors in any crisis situation. One chaplain (a catholic priest) stated crisis counseling was the most important part of ministry. All agreed Clinical

Pastoral Education would be helpful, but is not required to be effective. All chaplains agreed *ministry of presence* is an essential part of ministry, but is not the essence. Three of the five chaplains stated individual's needs take priority over the command's mission; one felt loyalty to the commander was equal to the individual's needs; and one was indifferent.

The fifth division is preacher. Although not declaring the preaching role as the most important, three chaplains stated it is separate from all other roles. As a proclaimer of God's Word, they feel this is the essence of ministry to all Sailors. As state previously, two chaplains stated they perceived the roles of pastor, priest, and preacher to be combined. All five agreed this role is absolutely necessary for chaplains to be effective.

The final division is project coordinator. This portion of the interview proved to be a "delicate" issue among chaplains because it dealt with collateral duties, which were independent variables of *legitimacy, modality, and saliency*. Three of five said that as clergy, chaplains should not be expected to be project officers - two had experienced *role ambiguity and role conflict*, with one experiencing *role overload*. However, as staff officers, if they had to rate this it would be last on their list of non-ministerial roles. One person was neutral on the subject and said there are occasions when chaplains can be servants to all through special projects. One chaplain believed this was even more

important than the other five roles because it provides avenues of ministry to both enlisted and officers.

All agreed that, as staff-officers, chaplains should support community relations projects, however, in the areas of Public Affairs (PAO) and Morale, Welfare, and Recreation (MWR), there was some *dissensus*. One chaplain perceived being a PAO or MWR officer would provide entry into other areas of ministry if the chaplain has the skills; two chaplains agreed "assisting only" was appropriate; and two strongly opposed any support of these areas, stating, "this is absolutely not the chaplain's responsibility."

Only two chaplains agreed chaplains should take on other collateral duties, e.g. damage control team trainers (DCTT), family advocacy representatives (FAR), suicide prevention trainers (SPT), and medical triage officers (MTO). Three disagreed, stating, "chaplains should be team players, not leaders, this would constitute a conflict of interest in the chaplain's role as a clergy-person."

As stated previously, only two of the five chaplains experienced role conflict as a staff officer. They stated their commanders' expectations were inappropriate, i.e. requiring them to be DCTT, FAR, SPT, AND MTO leaders, and making decisions that alienate them from ship's company (e.g. as FAR, recommending a Sailor's punishment because of an error in judgment).

When asked to rank department heads in the order as expressed by their commanders, four of five eagerly did so - three rating the chaplain as 8 and one rating the chaplain as 6. One refused stating, "when in port the commander would rank them all equal, but when at sea the chaplain may not be recognized as important to the mission, depending on the schedule of operations."

When asked to list areas that would limit the effectiveness of chaplains on ships, their responses were:

- Too many collateral duties
- Chaplains' lapses of moral integrity
- Violating privilege communication with commander
- Having attitude of "I am an officer"
- Focusing on Fitness Reports/Careerism
- Not being involved with the crew; not being a part of the team
- Being complacent and lacking enthusiasm in call and ministry; loss of primary identity as clergyperson.

When asked to list suggestions for improving chaplains' effectiveness aboard ships, their responses were:

- Chaplains must learn how to be God's servant of all
- Be innocent as a dove and wise as a serpent
- Teach Spiritual life-giving skills
- Learn how to be a member of the ship's community; do deck-plate ministry; meet people on their turf
- Commanders provide more time for chaplains to prepare for worship and religious education programs
- Chaplains provide instruction/training for commanders in order to clarify chaplain's role.

Commanders Perceptions. Prior to exploring commanders' perceptions of the chaplain's *master role*, the same four referenced characteristics which may affect chaplains' perceptions, must be observed: (1) Of the five commanders

interviewed, three were catholic and two were protestant.

(2) Three commanders stated their previous experience with chaplains had been favorable. The reasons were not related to spiritual growth. Commanders stated their chaplains were able to take care of the kids' problems, e.g. marital, psychological, and emergency AMCROSS messages etc. Two commanders did not have favorable experiences and stated their chaplains did not "connect" with the crew; they concentrated on PMOs, budgets, stayed in their staterooms *studying*, and did not keep the command informed of sailors' problems (emphasized confidentiality and individual's needs as more important than command's mission). (3) When asked about their familiarity with SECNAVINST 1730.7A, one commander stated he had read the instruction, and understood its intent. Two stated they remembered it being mentioned at their Prospective Commanding Officer's school, but did not know the details or intent. The two remaining commanders had never read the instruction, did not know its intent, and did not see a need for reading it. (4) When asked if the CRP was important to the mission of the ship, one said, "it is critical for the mission." Two said it was important, but not critical. The remaining two agreed "it was not on their list as necessary."

The first role of administrator. One of five stated, "the commander is responsible for the CRP, and it is the chaplain's duty to design and implement the program" (this

commander knew SECNAVINST). Three said the chaplain is responsible. One said, "the lay leader can do the job, and therefore, chaplains are not needed on ships." All agreed chaplains must be pluralistic in planning for the needs of all faith groups. One stated administration and teaching go hand-in-hand, and to be effective in administering the CRP, chaplains must know all resources available (e.g. social services, etc.), teaching them to sailors. One commander believed administration is not necessary for chaplains, saying, "that is what Administrative Officers are for."

The second role of teacher. Four of five stated teaching should be the chaplain's number two priority, i.e. religious education, spiritual formation and moral values. One stated religious education should be based on *needs of the crew* and not on the desires of the chaplain; "chaplains do not do enough in teaching the Navy's Core Values of honor, courage and commitment, and therefore, this should be a number one priority."

The roles of pastor, priest, and preacher. All commanders stated these three roles constitute pastoral care and should never be separated (i.e. when the priestly role is defined as counseling, ministry of presence, and ministry of advocacy before God and people). Four of five stated pastoral care should be chaplains' number one priority, and one stated it should be the number two priority. Two stated pastoral care, including worship, and religious education, is

important for "combat readiness," because young people have a need for faith; one stating worship and religious education should be the chaplain's number one priority. All agreed chaplains do not have to be relevant/dynamic preachers to be effective, and that their presence sets a moral tone that automatically makes people think of God. This presence can have a positive impact on the mission providing the chaplain connects with the crew. Three stated chaplains are more valuable as counselors. Four commanders agree that within the pastoral care role, counseling should be the chaplains' number one priority "because of the many individual problems sailors face on ships." For these commanders, worship and religious education should be secondary. Two agreed that chaplains are spiritual leaders and not trained social workers/psychologists, but need to be attuned to special needs and available to assist.

The role of project coordinator. Although, all five commanders agreed this should be last on their list of priorities, all agreed that, as staff officers, chaplains must be supportive team players. All agreed chaplains should take on collateral duties of FAR, SPT, and Navy Relief Society (NMCRS) officers to be a part of the team. Also they stated chaplains must participate in general shipboard training, e.g. firefighting, and preventative maintenance. One commander suggested that chaplains participate as DCTT leaders. Four commanders stated chaplains should take on the

leadership role in community relations projects; one stating, "this is not the chaplain's job, it is the command's PAO's responsibility." Four stated chaplains should not coordinate shipboard training, PAO or MWR activities; one stated these are appropriate duties for chaplains if they desire to do them. All agreed that, as staff officers, chaplains should maintain good relationships with, and be supportive of their commanders, but FITREPS should be a low priority. Three commanders stated they did not see chaplains' clergy duties conflicting with duties as staff officers; one commander felt all chaplains have some conflict as staff officers; and one said this would depend on the commander's attitude.

When asked to rank department heads in order of importance, all commanders refused to do so. Their responses include:

- You can't prioritize the list, all are equal
- All have different roles
- All have importance
- All are equal on level playing field
- To prioritize them would be like comparing apples and oranges; chaplains are not always needed for the mission, but the others are.

When asked to list some areas that would limit the effectiveness of chaplains on ships, their responses were:

- Lack of moral courage
- Lack of honest appraisal
- Lack of commitment to faith
- Sits in office and does not tour ship
- Inability to connect with the crew
- Emphasis on PMOs and budget, instead of concentrating on people problems
- Too denominational and not pluralistic.

When asked to list some suggestions for improving chaplains' effectiveness aboard ships, their responses were:

- Relate spiritual values to Navy's "Core Values" and mission
- Get involved in shipboard activities, e.g. DCTT, MWR, community relations projects, general military training, etc.
- Connect with the crew by getting "out and about," touching all onboard; the crew must know they have a chaplain onboard to help with their problems
- As the monitor of the "pulse" of the ship, find out what people problems need attention and report to the commander
- Know local referral resources available
- When deployed, plan community relations projects and keep crew informed
- Attend PAO classes in order to be ready and available to respond to Media
- Strengthen CRP by facilitating services for other faith groups by bringing other chaplains aboard when deployed and when in homeport.

Interviews' Summary. The majority of chaplains do not perceive commanders having favorable experiences with chaplains. Chaplains view their commanders ranking them as least important. They believe commanders do not know or understand the *master role* duties of the chaplain. With the exception of one chaplain, the overall perception is that the essence of the chaplain's *master role* is found in pastoring, preaching, and teaching; counseling and administration are necessary, but not as important. Again, with the exception of one chaplain, the majority believe chaplains should not be expected to be project officers and take on non-ministerial collateral duties. Chaplains' perceive their primary role focusing on being servants of God.

The variables of referenced characteristics (previous experience with chaplains, knowledge of SECNAVINST, and understanding of chaplains duties in CRP) influenced the commanders expectations. Commanders divide chaplains' *master* role into three parts: teacher, pastoral care, and staff officer. Although they rated pastoral care as number one priority and teaching as number two, only one commander was concerned with the spiritual aspects of the CRP. The majority of commanders emphasized chaplains' role of counselor and project coordinator as their primary expectations; i.e. "to help sailors with problems, and provide activities for these kids."

Findings and Analysis Summary

Findings from the collected data were presented in this chapter. The research findings were organized into four major sections: (a) demographic data is reported, (b) each research question is restated and accompanied by documentary or statistical findings, (c) the findings from the interviews are reported, and (d) a summary the major findings is presented.

Demographic Data Summary. The demographics presented defined the general parameters of the study. A cross-tabulation with a Pearson Chi-Square test determined reference characteristics of rank, years of active duty, and religious preference are significantly different between chaplains and commanders. Comparison of mean scores by rank

and religion shows possible influence on some expectations of chaplains and commanders.

From the sample of thirty chaplains surveyed, twenty-eight responded, for a ninety-three percent return rate. One was a senior command chaplain, eleven were supervisory chaplains, and sixteen were junior chaplains. One served more than twenty years active duty, one 16-20 years, six 12-16 years, five 8-12 years, eight 4-8 years, and seven 1-4 years.

From the sample of sixty commanders surveyed, forty-four responded, for a seventy-three percent return rate. Fourteen were senior commanders, and thirty were mid-grade commanders. Nineteen served more than twenty years active duty, thirteen 16-20 years, ten 12-16 years, and two 8-12 years. Among the forty-four, nineteen were Catholic, fifteen Protestant, one Jewish, four other, and five none.

Findings Summary. The first two research questions (RQs) were answered by using descriptive statistics to analyze perceptions of the chaplain's role as found in responses to the questionnaire. Using t-tests, comparisons of mean rankings of chaplains' and commanders' expectations were made to answer research question three.

What are the role expectations chaplains have of themselves? Findings for this question were divided into three parts as found in questions 4-6 and 50-51, 7-49, and 52-53.

First, results from Questions 4-6 and 50-51 indicate chaplains perceive commanders have favorable previous experiences and express knowledge of duties, but have not expressed knowledge of SECNAVINST 1730.7a/OPNAVINST 1730.1C. According to mean scores, chaplains perceive commanders ranking *master role* functions in the following order: pastor, priest, preacher, teacher, administrator, and project coordinator. The responses to question 51 show chaplains perceiving commanders placing them at the bottom of the list when ranked with other department heads.

Second, findings from questions 7-49 focused on chaplains' perceptions of their *master role*, which includes role functions of administrator, teacher, pastor, priest, project coordinator, and preacher. In their role as administrator, chaplains view the Command Religious Program (CRP) as important in accomplishing the mission of the command, and most perceive they are responsible for the CRP. No significant difference exists among chaplains concerning the importance of professional development and support for the needs of all faith groups; most agree these are important in creating a positive effect on the command's mission. Neutral scores for office manager and consolidated duties indicate chaplains do not have strong expectations about these functions.

Chaplains agree their role as teacher and religious educator is important to the command's mission.

As pastor, chaplains agreed contributions to the spiritual and moral well-being, pastoral care, worship, and the chaplain's spiritual formation are important for accomplishing the mission of the command. Most chaplains were neutral concerning charismatic leadership in worship. Results indicate chaplains view their role as similar to civilian clergy, strongly agreeing they should be concerned with denominational relationships, and lay leaders cannot take the place of chaplains.

Findings concerning their role as priest indicate an agreement among chaplains that counseling centers, sacramental services, commitment to one's own faith and moral leadership, are important to the command's mission. Most chaplains agree omnipresence and being an advocate for individuals are necessary for chaplains to have a positive effect on the command's mission. Finally, results indicate most chaplains do not agree they must be trained professional counselors to have a positive effect.

Responses about their role as preacher indicate most expect chaplains to be relevant/dynamic preachers.

One of the most controversial roles in the survey was project coordinator. As staff officers, one of the *master role* functions involves taking on collateral duties, and planning and implementing projects. Chaplains agree community relations projects, suicide prevention training, contributing to morale, good relations with commanders, and

being candid command advisors are all important chaplain functions within the command's mission. Although there was some disagreement among chaplains, responses indicated chaplains should not be MWR coordinators, PAOs, DCTT members, MTOs, or fund drive coordinators. Some disagreement resulted in chaplains remaining neutral on the questions of chaplains being Shipboard NMCRS coordinators, FARs, and CAT members. Chaplains overwhelmingly agreed clergy duties did not conflict with staff officer duties (only two reporting conflict), it is okay to disagree with the commanding officer, and physical fitness and appearance do have bearing on chaplains' effectiveness. Another staff officer controversial subject in this survey is fitness reports. Although the senior chaplain stated fitness reports should be a priority, most chaplains agreed fitness reports should not be a priority. Responses clearly indicated a positive effect on the command's mission when chaplains are team players, participate in all wardroom functions, and relate effectively with officers and enlisted. Chaplains remained neutral concerning collateral duty assignments.

Third, findings from chaplains' responses to questions 52-53 identify and describe nine areas of limitations that may cause conflict, and seventeen suggestions that may help in possible conflict resolution. The most frequent limitations listed are: lack of spirituality and credibility within the command, lack of command support, and negative

attitude toward other faith groups. The most frequent suggestions for improvement and conflict resolution are: provide training to command about the chaplain's role, build credibility in the command, maintain moral integrity and spirituality, and provide outreach and training to crew and families.

What are commanders' role expectations for chaplains? The method used to describe commanders' expectations is the same used for chaplains. Findings were divided into three parts as found in questions 4-6 and 50-51, 7-49, and 52-53.

First, findings from questions 4-6 and 50-51 indicate commanders have favorable previous experiences with chaplains, understand the duties of chaplains, but do not have knowledge of or understand SECNAVINST 1730.7A/OPNAVINST 1730.1C. According to the mean scores commanders rank the *master role* functions in the following order: pastor, priest, teacher, preacher, administrator, and project coordinator. Responses to question 51 reveal commanders ranking chaplains least important among department heads.

Second, findings from commanders responses to questions 7-49 focused on their perceptions of the chaplain's *master role*. Responses to the chaplain's role as administrator indicate commanders view the CRP important in accomplishing the mission, and chaplains responsible for the CRP. No significant differences exist among commanders concerning the importance of chaplains' professional development and support

for the needs of all faith groups; most agree these are important in creating a positive effect on the command's mission. Neutral scores for office manager and consolidated duties indicate commanders do not have strong expectations about these functions.

Commanders do not view the chaplain's role of teacher important to the command's mission.

Responses to the chaplain's pastoral role indicates commanders agree chaplain's contributions to the spiritual and moral well-being and pastoral care are important for the mission. Statistical data indicates commanders do not agree weekly worship is important for the mission; however, other data suggests most commanders consider weekly worship important. Scores indicate commanders are not concerned about chaplains' spiritual formation, denominational relationships, or whether the chaplain's role is similar to civilian clergy. Commanders agree chaplains do not need to be charismatic leaders of worship, and lay leaders cannot replace chaplains.

Findings concerning the chaplain's role as priest indicate commanders expect chaplains to provide counseling centers, sacramental services, moral leadership and integrity, and remain committed to their faith. Commanders' agree omnipresence is not necessary, and that chaplains should not be advocates for individuals regardless of the command's mission. Results indicate most commanders agree

chaplains must be trained professional counselors to have a positive effect.

Responses to the role of preacher indicate commanders believe chaplains need to be relevant/dynamic preachers.

As stated previously, commanders often view the chaplain's role as staff officer, as one of taking on collateral duties and planning and implementing projects. Commanders' responses indicate that chaplains are expected to be community relation project coordinators, FARs, SPTs, and CAT members. Scores reveal they do not expect chaplains to take on collateral duties of MWR coordinator, PAO, MTO, Shipboard NMCRS coordinator, or fund drive coordinator. Although disagreement exists among a few commanders, most agree chaplains' clergy duties do not conflict with those of staff officer. Commanders agreed chaplain's contributions to morale is important, chaplains must be effective communicators to officers and enlisted, and chaplains must be candid advisors. Responses indicate commanders do not expect chaplains to concentrate on fitness reports, or on trying to always please them. Commanders are neutral on the issues of chaplains' relationships with commanders, participation as staff officers in wardrooms, collateral duties, and DCTT membership; however, additional data indicates most agree chaplains should be team players, participate in wardroom functions, be concerned with good relationships with

commanders, be proactive in taking on collateral duties, and keep physically fit.

Third, findings from commanders' responses to questions 52-53 identify and describe fifteen areas of limitations that may cause conflict, and fifteen suggestions that may help in possible conflict resolution. The most frequent limitations listed are: lack of spirituality and credibility within the command, lack of command support, negative attitude toward other faith groups, inaccessibility, and chaplains' lack of shipboard knowledge and experience. The most frequent suggestions for improvement and conflict resolution are: accessibility, improve knowledge and involvement in ship's mission/participate in collateral duties, frequent and honest communication with commanding officer, increase credibility in command, provide outreach and training to crew and families, and integrate officer and chaplain roles.

What discrepancies exist in the way commanders and chaplains view the role of the chaplain on Navy ships? The answer to this question was found in making five comparisons.

First, a t-test for equality of means found no differences between chaplains' perceptions and commanders' modal reactions. Commanders' previous experience with chaplains has been favorable, they proclaim an understanding of chaplain's duties, but, they do not have knowledge of or understand SECNAVINST 1730.7A/OPNAVINST 1730.1C.

Second, a t-test for equality of means was used to measure discrepancies between chaplains' and commanders' scores according to the *master role* groupings. Comparing scores for the role of administrator, t-test significant scores reveal a consensus that the CRP is important and that chaplains are responsible for the CRP. Scores also reveal a significant difference or dissensus about the degree of agreement concerning chaplains' professional development and support for the needs of all faith groups. Scores indicate a disagreement about the degree of neutrality concerning the importance of chaplain's consolidated duties, and they indicate a similarity in their perceptions of neutrality about chaplains' role of office manager.

T-test scores reflect a significant difference or dissensus between chaplains and commanders about the role of teacher. Commanders are neutral and chaplains perceive religious education as important.

Tests for the role of pastor show a consensus exists between chaplains and commanders concerning the importance of pastoral care; both groups agree it is important for accomplishing the command's mission. Chaplains perceive their role similar to civilian clergy and commanders are neutral. Chaplains perceive denominational relationships, spiritual formation, and weekly worship important, while commanders are neutral. Commanders perceive charismatic leadership is not necessary for chaplains' effectiveness,

while chaplains are neutral. Commanders and chaplains agreed chaplain's contributions to the spiritual and moral well-being is important for accomplishing the command's mission, and they disagreed that lay leaders could replace chaplains; however, t-tests show a dissensus among commanders and chaplains on the degree of agreement or disagreement on these issues.

Tests for the role of priest reveal a consensus concerning the importance of chaplains' omnipresence and advocacy for individuals; both groups are neutral. T-test scores reveal similarity exists in commanders' and chaplains' perceptions of the importance of chaplains establishing counseling programs and being trained as professional counselors; both agree establishing counseling programs is important, and both are neutral on the necessity of chaplains being professional trained counselors; however, 56.8 percent of the commanders agree chaplains must be professionally trained counselors to have a positive effect on the command's mission. Scores show chaplains agree sacramental services are important while commanders are neutral; but additional data indicates most commanders agree sacramental services are important to the command's mission. A significant difference exists between chaplains and commanders over the issues of models of integrity and commitment to faith; the difference, however, is in the degree of agreement; both agree chaplains must be models of integrity and committed to their faith.

A significant difference exists between chaplains' and commanders' responses about the role of preacher. The difference is in the degree of disagreement. Both expect chaplains to be relevant/dynamic preachers to be effective.

T-tests on the role of project Coordinator indicate a consensus in commanders' and chaplains' responses to sensitive and controversial issues. Both agree chaplains must be candid advisors, PAO is not the job for chaplains, SPT is an important role for chaplains, and conflict does not exist between chaplains' clergy role and staff officer. Scores show both neutral on the issues of collateral duties, CAT membership, and team players attending all wardroom functions; however, additional data indicates the majority of chaplains and commanders agree chaplains must be team players. Both perceive physical fitness important for chaplains' effectiveness. Chaplains' and commanders responses show both agree chaplains should not be MWR coordinators, and they do not have to always agree with the commanding officer. Although t-tests show no significant difference concerning chaplains serving as shipboard Navy Relief coordinators, mean scores show commanders disagreeing and chaplains neutral. T-tests also reveal chaplains and commanders disagree on responses to some sensitive issues. Scores show chaplains perceive community relation projects as important and commanders are neutral; however, additional data indicates a majority of commanders agree community

relation projects are an important part of the CRP. Mean scores on the issue of damage control training teams indicate chaplains disagree, while commanders remain neutral. Chaplains and commanders disagree on the degree of disagreement on the issues of fund drive coordinators, medical triage officers and priority of fitness reports. They disagree on the degree of agreement about the issues of the importance of chaplains' contribution to morale and effective communication. And, scores indicate commanders expect chaplains to be family advocacy representatives, while chaplains remain neutral.

Third, a t-test for equality of means was conducted to compare Chaplains' and commanders' responses to *master role* groupings as illustrated in Table 22. This shows a significant difference of expectations in the roles of administration, teacher, priest, and preacher.

Fourth, comparisons between chaplains' perceptions and commanders' priorities of chaplains' roles and department heads were made. T-tests reveal significant differences between chaplains' perceptions and commanders' priorities in ranking the roles of teacher and priest (marginal significance). Mean scores reflect chaplains' perceptions somewhat different than commanders' priorities. Both ranked pastor 1, priest 2, and administrator 5; commanders ranked teacher 3, chaplains 4; commanders ranked project coordinator 4, chaplains 6; commanders ranked preacher 6, chaplains 3.

No significant differences were found between chaplains' perceptions and commanders' priorities in ranking department heads. Mean scores reflect chaplains' perceptions correct concerning their position on commanders' department head lists, i.e. they were ranked least important.

Fifth, a comparison was made between chaplains' and commanders' frequency of responses to areas that may cause conflict and possible ways of resolving conflict. These responses indicate two significant differences in the areas of limitations: twelve commanders listed "a lack of credibility and spirituality within the command," while only six chaplains listed it; twelve chaplains listed "lack of command support," while only five commanders listed it. They also indicate only two significant differences in suggestions for improvement: ten commanders listed "accessibility," while only two chaplains listed it; five chaplains listed "provide chaplain role training for commanding officers and executive officers," while no commanders listed it.

Interviews' Findings Summary. Using the Descriptive Survey questionnaire as a guide, five chaplains and five commanders were interviewed. To present a clear description of the chaplains' and commanders' perceptions, the data was summarized using the *master role* divisions for each.

The majority of chaplains do not perceive commanders as having favorable experiences with chaplains. Chaplains see their commanders ranking them as least important. They

believe commanders do not know or understand the *master role* duties of the chaplain. Chaplains perceive their primary role focusing on being servants of God.

The variables of referenced characteristics (previous experience with chaplains, knowledge of SECNAVINST, and understanding of chaplains duties in CRP) influenced the commanders expectations. The majority of commanders emphasized chaplains' roles of counselor and project coordinator as their primary expectations.

CHAPTER 5

Conclusions and Recommendations

This study examined possible discrepancies between role expectations Navy chaplains and commanders had for ships' chaplains. Chapter 1 introduced the problem and its setting, expressed in terms of three research questions to be investigated through research. Chapter 2 reviewed existing literature in seven areas: (1) Role Theory and the Chaplain; (2) The Chaplain's Role Problems; (3) Coping With Role Problems; (4) The Chaplains Master Role; (5) Maintaining the Master Role; (6) Clarifying the Chaplain's Functional Roles; and (7) Role Expectation Surveys. The design for the study, instrumentation, sample selection, and procedures for data analysis was discussed in chapter 3. Findings of the research were presented in chapter 4; each research question was addressed in order, and the data collected was reported and interpreted.

The purpose of this final chapter is threefold: (1) to present a brief summary of the chaplain's *master role* in light of the theological and theoretical literature review, (2) to give conclusions and recommendations based on major findings, and (3) to offer recommendations for further study.

Conclusions are addressed to ships' chaplains and ships' commanders.

Chaplains' Master Role

The review of literature revealed extending Christ's ministry in the Navy for the sake of others is the foundation for the Christian chaplain's *master role*. Based on the nature and mission of the church, in the institution of the Navy, the chaplain is the hinge between God and His people; in a sense, the sailors - officers and enlisted, turn or swing on that hinge. Called and equipped by God, endorsed by the church, and commissioned by the Navy, the chaplain is *expected* and obligated to inspire them by word, example and deeds, to grow into spiritual maturity. As servant-leaders, chaplains are pastors who live for them, or as Hendricks puts it, "really has the care and feeding of God's flock on their hearts." Living for them means having "the shepherds heart, the watchman's eye, and the craftsman's hand" (Hendricks 26). Living for them in the Navy means integrating Jesus' offices of prophet, priest, and king, the functional roles of Ephesians 4, and Blizzard's six practitioner roles of administrator, organizer, pastor, preacher, priest, and teacher, with the required functional roles of Navy regulations as outlined in Appendixes D and E. This integration becomes the chaplain's *master role*.

Maintaining this *master role* in the Navy, chaplains face an often untenable conflict between clergy role and military officer role. The conflict is natural and falls along the lines of flesh versus spirit and *Ceasar versus God*. Because

chaplains are human and suffer all man's frailties - morally, emotionally, and physically, commanders' expectations (*expressed modal reactions*) can exert pressure on them to repress the ecclesiastical dimension of their call and behave in terms of the military dimension; reducing God to a secondary consideration in their ministry. Chaplains can handle this conflict fairly well as long as they realize that their first loyalty is to God and their churches. They must maintain the *master role*; preserving the shepherd's heart, the craftsman's hand, and the watchman's eye *for the sake of others*. Using Mullholland's advice and practicing the classical spiritual disciplines of *silence, solitude, prayer, liturgical celebration, spiritual reading, meditation, contemplation, and serving God in the world*, chaplains can avoid situations in which God and Ceasar come into conflict.

Six functional roles emerged from the literature review to create the chaplain's *master role* for this study. These are administrator, teacher, pastor, priest, preacher, and project coordinator. These are identical to Blizzard's pastoral role functions, except project coordinator replaces organizer.

Role Conclusions and Recommendations

Findings presented in chapter 4 support several conclusions regarding the expectations chaplains and commanders have for ships' chaplains' *master role*.

Variables that may have influenced the *expectations* are subject-person, object-person, referenced characteristics, modal reaction, contextualization, legitimacy, formalization, stereotypy, and saliency.

Role theory literature describes five categories of problems in the ongoing cycles of role episode that are linked by the behavioral dynamic of expectations. Included are role ambiguity, role conflict, role tension, role overload, and role-person-incongruity. When expectations are not met, there is discrepancy. When there is discrepancy, role problems may develop.

Conclusions are discussed for each functional role. Each includes a description of the role in light of the literature review, a description of expectations based on statistical findings and interviews, and recommendations for improving chaplains' effectiveness and preventing role problems on ships. The findings of this study confirm the existence of few discrepancies between chaplains' and commanders' role expectations.

Administrator. SECNAVINST 1730.7A, paragraph 6a, states "In keeping with Department of the Navy policy, commanders and commanding officers shall provide appropriate CRPs in support of the religious needs of all members of the naval service..." In the administrator role the chaplain manages the commander's CRP. This involves facilitating, planning and implementing religious programs in a pluralistic

environment. As administrator, the chaplain extends Christ's *kingly* ministry to the sailors, i.e. through managing the CRP sailors see God's love demonstrated. As Visser writes, "...ministry involves both doing and managing" (Visser, 57). Maintaining administration/management skills and abilities requires continued professional development. SECNAVINST 1730.7A encourages commanders to provide opportunities for chaplains to attend professional development training sponsored by the Chaplain Corps and the chaplain's faith group.

Findings reveal chaplains' and commanders' expectations concerning this role are the same. The CRP is important to the mission of the ship, chaplains are expected to be responsible for the CRP and support all faith groups, and chaplains' professional development is important. Agreeing chaplains are responsible for the CRP, neutral scores on question thirty (office manager), and ranking the role of administrator fifth, indicate a lack of understanding of the Navy's policy concerning the CRP. As the literature review reveals, commanders are responsible for the CRP and chaplains are managers. Variables that may have influenced this are *subject persons'* (commanders') modal reactions, *object persons'* (chaplains') personal expectations, and *saliency*. As indicated by responses to question five commanders do not have knowledge of SECNAVINST 1730.7A/OPNAVINST 1730.1C. Without this knowledge commanders express a prescribed

salient expectation that the command religious program (CRP) is the chaplain's responsibility. These variables influence chaplains' personal expectations, which in-turn match commanders'. Commanders' lack of knowledge of Navy policy indicates ambiguity for chaplains and commanders, which could lead to lack of proper planning of religious ministries programs and role tension over management practices.

The CRP is important, and so is administering Christ's ministry *for the sake of others*. As one chaplain stated, "planning and implementing the CRP is the most important function of ships' chaplains." Ministry involves managing. To meet sailors' needs of experiencing God's love and spiritual growth, four *recommendations* are given.

First, chaplains and commanders must consider making the role of administrator/manager of religious ministries the foundation upon which all other roles are built. Those who fail to plan, plan to fail.

Second, to help commanders understand the importance of this role, chaplains must provide training concerning the Navy's policies. Using SECNAVINST 1730.7A/OPNAVINST 1730.1C and Harwood's manual Ministry Aboard Ship, chaplains should develop General Military Training (GMT) classes to instruct commanders about the chaplains' functional roles.

Third, to enhance chaplains' gifts for serving God and His people, commanders should provide opportunities and logistical support for chaplains to attend *Total Quality*

Leadership courses. The goal of these courses is not to train chaplains how to be office managers, rather it is to train them to become able administrators of religious ministries *for the sake of others.*

Fourth, to show the value of this role, chaplains should formalize their *master role*; i.e. submit a ship's instruction with standard operating procedures (SOP) defining chaplains' functions and responsibilities. As a supplement to the SOP a *design for ministry* should be submitted annually. Chaplains must follow through, providing monthly reports to commanders.

Teacher. Quoting John Stott in his book One People, Visser says, "the ordained ministry is fundamentally a teaching ministry" (Visser, 53). The chaplain, as teacher, obviously provides for religious instruction. As outlined in Appendix E, one of the required duties of the chaplain is to organize programs of religious education. Jesus taught God's Word to people through worship and instruction. Through Sunday schools, Bible studies, spiritual growth retreats, etc., ships' chaplains transmit, expound, explain, and relate the Word of God to sailors. Quoting Andrew T. Lincoln, Lintang says, "teachers should be the experts in teaching of Christian norms, values, and behaviors" (Lintang 114). Through teaching chaplains extend Christ's ministries of the Living Word of God to sailors.

Although commanders ranked this role third in priority, statistical findings indicate a significant difference

between chaplains' views and commanders'. Even though interviews revealed commanders considered religious education important, survey scores indicated it was not important to commands' missions. Commanders' cathectic modal reactions (feelings) may be a reflection of their assumptions that "chaplains do not do enough teaching on Navy core values," and therefore, teaching is not an important role for their mission. Most chaplains disagreed with this by scoring it as important. Looking through the lenses of role theory, the subject person's (commander's) expressed cathectic modal reactions could influence the object person's (chaplain's) behavior. This dissensus could create tension and lead to *role conflict* and lack of complementarity.

Teaching is a necessary and important role for chaplains on ships. Although religious instruction should be the primary focus, commanders expect chaplains to provide training relevant to the Navy's mission. To literally extend Christ's ministry, three recommendations are made *for the sake of others*.

First, chaplains must include in their design for ministry opportunities for religious instruction, requesting commanders' logistical support.

Second, chaplains should use their teaching skills in a proactive way and reach out to sailors by teaching suicide prevention, stress management, and Navy core values classes.

Third, commanders should encourage chaplains to participate in indoctrination classes and weekly General Military Training (GMT) by providing CRP informational briefs.

Pastor. James Harwood states ships' chaplains' first priority is to be a pastor. He says:

They are to minister in the name of God to the military institution. The chaplain's purpose is to become a part of the solution to the challenge of developing a spiritual and moral fiber within the military framework. They function as pastors in a military uniform meeting the military needs. But they are first a pastor. Sailors should be able to look past the officer uniform to the pastor when they need to pour out their heart. But if the chaplain places emphasis upon the uniform by exercising rank above pastoral leadership, the sailor will not be able to relate to the chaplain. (Harwood 14).

Samuel Blizzard says, "pastor is an English appropriation of the Latin word for *shepherd*" (Visser 54). Jesus was described as *Shepherd of the soul* (1 Peter 5:25) and *Chief Shepherd* (Hebrews 13:20). According to Periskila Netty Lintang:

the roles of a shepherd are: to look after the spiritual welfare of the flock (1 Peter 5:2-4, Acts 20:28, John 21:15-17), to be the example for the flock (1 Peter 5:3), and to seek the lost (Matthew 18:12-14, 12:30). (Lintang 14).

Lintang describes the Greek word for *shepherd* as imperative with an aorist tense, which implies the situation required dynamic action. Adding that the Greek word for "being examples" meant to leave an impression or be a model, Lintang says to seek the lost shows the love of God for each soul.

Extending Christ's ministry as pastor in the Navy includes tending, feeding, guiding, and guarding the spiritual and moral well-being of all sailors.

RADM Stevenson, CHC, USN (Ret), says the Navy chaplain is a *servant-leader* living for sailors with a *shepherd's* heart. Specific duties, found in Appendixes D and E, are similar to those of civilian pastors, i.e. as ordained clergy providing weekly worship, daily devotions, evening prayers, and regular visits to work centers, sick bay, and brig.

To preserve a *shepherd's* heart chaplains must do two things: maintain spiritual formation through disciplines of study and prayer, and "periodically affiliate with those of their own theological persuasion (denominations) in order to receive spiritual strength and guidance to conduct ministry" (Harwood 16). In the institutional setting of the Navy, most chaplains are able to maintain these disciplines, extending Christ's ministry as pastors. The absence of disciplines causes chaplains to repress their pastoral/ecclesiastical role, preventing them from functioning in their *master* role. According to Vickers and Harwood, these disciplines are essential for maintaining the *master* role and preserving the *shepherd's* heart in the Navy.

As pastor, a ship's chaplain is both Naval officer and denominational representative. "The ship's chaplain not only renders unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, but also renders unto God the things that are God's" (Harwood 16).

Consensus exists between chaplains and commanders regarding the importance of pastoral care. Findings indicate both groups agree chaplains' pastoral role contributions to the spiritual and moral well being of sailors are important for accomplishing the mission. Commanders rank this role number one, and therefore, expect chaplains to make it a priority. A common thread running through this role is worship; both groups agree worship is important in the CRP. Commanders state lay leaders cannot take the chaplain's place, indicating a salient expectation that chaplains are to provide worship services. Within this role commanders do not expect chaplains to be charismatic leaders to be effective. Statistics reveal a dissensus between chaplains and commanders on three crucial pastoral role issues. Chaplains view denominational relationships and spiritual formation important, and commanders are indifferent. Chaplains also see similarity between their role and civilian clergy's, while, again, commanders are neutral or indifferent. For chaplains these areas are legitimate and formal variables that affect their behavior. Commanders' indifferences may be a result of their lack of knowledge of chaplains' *master role*. These differences could certainly influence chaplains' role behavior. Commanders cathetic modal reaction may be ambiguity concerning support for chaplains in these crucial areas. Chaplains' expressed need for spiritual formation, and pressure from denominations to maintain contact could

produce tension. If not resolved, conflict and incongruence could ensue.

The chaplain's purpose is to become a part of the solution to the challenge of developing a spiritual and moral fiber within the Navy. To accomplish this, and to preserve the *shepherd's heart*, four recommendations are suggested.

First, chaplains must implement the design for ministry with the role of pastor as number one priority. They must be proactive in tending, feeding, guiding, and guarding the spiritual and moral well-being of the sailors. As several commanders suggested, chaplains must "be accessible, connect with the crew by getting out and about, touching all onboard."

Second, chaplains must build into their design for ministry a plan for spiritual formation. "Spiritual formation is a process of being conformed to the image of Christ for the sake of others" (Mulholland 12). After emphatically stating that spiritual formation is not an option, Mulholland defines the spiritual formation journey as an intentional and continual commitment to a lifelong process of growth toward wholeness in Christ. It is a process of "growing up in every way unto him who is the head, into Christ" (Eph 4:15), until we "attain to...mature personhood, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ" (Eph. 4:13). It is a journey into becoming persons of compassion, persons who forgive, persons who care deeply for

others and the world, persons who offer themselves to God to become agents of divine grace in the lives of others. The plan for spiritual formation and wholeness in God *for the sake of others* can progress through *spiritual disciplines*. In his book, Invitation to a Journey: A Road Map for Spiritual Formation, Mulholland provides a list of spiritual disciplines that can assist chaplains in their spiritual formation process. He states that this life can be maintained only by continuous practice of classical spiritual disciplines of *silence, solitude, prayer, liturgical celebration, spiritual reading, meditation, contemplation, and serving God in the world*. Dwayne O. Ratzlaff says that spiritual disciplines are absolutely necessary in maintaining our spiritual lives. He adds that spiritual disciplines are concentrated efforts to create some inner and outer space in our lives, where obedience can be practiced; they make us more sensitive to the voice of God and prevent the world (*Ceasar*) from filling our lives with so many voices that there is no inner or outer space to listen to the voice of God and to practice obedience (Ratzlaff 7). Susan Muto believes that "spiritual disciplines are avenues to maturity in faith which help us meet God in everyday life" (Muto and Van Kaam 192). Using Mulholland's book as a guide for spiritual formation in their design for ministry, chaplains can avoid situations in which God and *Ceasar* come into

conflict, thus, maintaining their *master role for the sake of others*.

Third, chaplains must include in their design for ministry a schedule for denominational conferences and retreats. As Harwood says, chaplains receive spiritual strength and guidance to conduct ministry by periodically affiliating with those of their own theological persuasion (denominations).

Fourth, chaplains should ensure that the GMT for commanders includes purpose and justification for maintaining spiritual formation and denominational relationships. Also, a brief outline on the similarities between chaplains' and civilian clergy's roles should be included.

Priest. Extending Christ's ministry as priest in the Navy means providing appropriate sacramental ministry, pastoral counseling, and interceding with God and commands on behalf of sailors. To accomplish this, chaplains must be committed to their faith, examples of moral integrity, and provide a strong ministry of presence. According to Jack Boozer, the chaplain must be omnipresent to be effective; he maintains the chaplain is expected to go where the person works, lives, is sick, confined, or in distress. As priests, chaplains are expected to be skilled (not professionally trained) pastoral counselors, and care providers at work centers, hospitals, and brigs, "who must preserve legally

privileged communication and professional confidentiality" (Hugh L. Lecky, Jr. 4).

Chaplains and commanders agree moral leadership and integrity, sacramental services, and counseling are important in accomplishing the command's mission. Survey results reveal commanders and chaplains differ in their opinions concerning functions of the priestly role. Although scores show both neutral on the necessity of chaplains being professionally trained counselors, 56.8 percent of the commanders expect chaplains to be professionally trained counselors. While chaplains view advocacy for individuals important, commanders expect chaplains to be loyal to the mission regardless of the individual's needs. The findings also indicate commanders expect chaplains to make counseling a priority over worship and sacramental services. One commander suggested, "the reason is because of the many individual problems sailors face on ships." Another commander stated, "worship services aren't necessary because only six people attend anyway!"

Variables involved in these differences could cause *role conflict*. Called by God, endorsed by denominations, and commissioned by the Navy, chaplains are charged to manage religious ministries; providing pastoral care and worship opportunities are legitimate priorities. Although chaplains must be prepared to counsel sailors in crisis situations, they are not psychologists, and therefore, should not be

perceived as counselors; rather, they should be seen as pastoral counselors providing spiritual guidance. When commanders express a prescribed modal reaction that counseling should be number one priority and religious ministries secondary, chaplains behavior may be influenced. Tension can result, leading to role conflict and possible failure of role complementarity. Role tension could also result from ambiguity expressed by commanders concerning counseling and advocacy for individuals. Findings indicate commanders do not want chaplains to be advocates for individuals regardless of the mission, while at the same time expecting them to make counseling a priority. An illustration of this was given by one of the chaplains interviewed. He stated:

My commander ordered me to reveal confidential information expressed during a counseling session. The information disclosed was not of a sensitive nature that would jeopardize the ship's mission. I refused stating that my role as a pastoral counselor required me to preserve privileged communication. Pressure from the commander resulted in conflict, and I requested a transfer.

The chaplain's behavior was influenced by the commanders' overt expressed modal reaction. Expected to betray his legitimate role, tension resulted, and chaplain experienced conflict. Complete failure of role complementarity followed. Fortunately, the conflict was resolved by an appeal to the Force chaplain, who briefed the commander on the illegitimacy of his request.

Commanders expect the chaplain's presence to set a moral tone that automatically makes people think of God. *Role conflict* could impede this, causing chaplains to be ineffective. To help maintain this moral tone, and prevent role conflict, four recommendations are proposed.

First, chaplains must build strong relationships with commanders, maintaining frequent and honest communication; establish credibility.

Second, chaplains ensure GMTs for commanders include briefings by the Force chaplain on the priestly functions; e.g. legitimate priorities and privileged communications.

Third, chaplains prepare to provide pastoral counseling in any crisis situation; increase counseling skills by attending clinical pastoral education courses, or local graduate level counseling seminars.

Fourth, commanders provide logistical support for chaplains' continuing education in counseling.

Preacher. Extending Christ's ministry as preacher means serving as God's spokesperson to sailors, bringing God's Word to them, and them to a knowledge of the living God. Quoting Blizzard, Visser says, "The preacher prepares and delivers sermons" (Visser 54). The church and the Navy expects chaplains to be preachers, but do not require them to be charismatic in their delivery of sermons. Harwood says:

Ships' chaplains may have to deliver sermons at a different level than they do in the church with a large congregation. The normal attendance at worship services onboard ships range from three to

ten; therefore, presenting great theological discourses may not be appropriate for each service. The sermon may need to be more of a conversational lecture than a directed exposition. The chaplain will have to determine through prayer what type of delivery is best suited to the ship's crew. Whatever the method chosen, the sermon is not the end in itself, but the means to the end of leading sailors to a unique relationship with God. (Harwood 18).

Findings reveal no significant differences concerning the role of preacher. Chaplains and commanders expect chaplains to be relevant/dynamic preachers. This agreement produces role complementarity. The chaplain's behavior will communicate a desire to meet the commander's expectation.

To maintain complementarity one recommendation is proposed, i.e. chaplains must place in their design for ministry a regularly scheduled time for daily sermon preparation. As God's spokespersons, to lead sailors to a unique relationship with God, chaplains must discipline themselves to keep this sacred time.

Project Coordinator. SECNAVINST 1730.7A/OPNAVINST 1730.1C ensure chaplains are *required* only to perform duties which relate to spiritual matters, pastoral care, and pastoral counseling. As staff officers, ships' chaplains are members of *wardrooms* where all officers have several collateral duties in addition to their primary billets. The collateral duties of a chaplain must not conflict with the *master role* of religious ministry, and conform to Geneva Convention rules of non-combatants. Any duty which detracts

from the primary duty of religious ministry is prohibited.

Harwood says:

it is a matter of interpretation left largely to chaplains concerning which collateral duties detract from their primary religious duty. Chaplains should consider that the more collateral duties they accept the more they become accepted team members of the wardroom by other officers. Collateral duties can be aids to ministry by giving chaplains access to many areas of shipboard life they otherwise might not have. (Harwood 10).

Commanders view chaplains as having fewer duties than other officers, and often expect them to coordinate special projects. *Volunteering for the collateral duty of project coordinator for the sake of others* can aid in extending Christ's ministry. Projects that are appropriate or legitimate collateral duties, as outlined in Appendix D and E are: library officer, community relations projects coordinator, quality of life advisory boards, CAT membership, Thanksgiving/Christmas food basket projects coordinator, etc. Duties that are inappropriate or prohibited by regulation are: combatant duties of any form, e.g. DCTT and watches other than duty chaplain, duties violating faith group practices, administering funds or coordinating fund raising other than Religious Offering Funds, e.g. Navy Relief and MWR. Although public affairs is not listed, PAO is not a legitimate duty, and could detract from religious ministry.

Findings reveal two significant differences between chaplains and commanders in this role. Both agree chaplains should be candid advisors, suicide prevention trainers, and

community relations projects coordinators. They agree chaplains should not function as PAO, MWR coordinator, fund drive coordinator, or medical triage officer. And, they agree conflict does not exist between clergy roles and staff officer roles. Results also show commanders expect chaplains to maintain physical fitness, but they do not expect chaplains to make fitness reports a priority. Although only two areas of dissensus exist, these differences could result in role conflict. Chaplains declare they should not be DCTT members, and commanders are indifferent, indicating they do not object to chaplains taking on this duty. Commanders expect chaplains to be FARs, while chaplains disagree. Expressing these attitudes and expectations through covert or overt modal reactions influences chaplains' behavior. Feeling pressure to participate in these two illegitimate areas, chaplains may experience tension and even conflict.

As staff officers, one of chaplains' *master role* functions may be project coordinator. Normally, a controversial subject, findings indicate chaplains do not have role conflict as staff officers. To prevent tension or resolve possible conflict as project coordinator, four recommendations are presented.

First, chaplains approach the role of project coordinator as an avenue of providing ministry to officers and enlisted.

Second, chaplains build credibility as team players by volunteering for appropriate collateral duties.

Third, chaplains include a "collateral duties" section in their GMT for commanders to delineate between appropriate and inappropriate duties.

Fourth, commanders read and study SECNAVINST 1730.7A/OPNAVINST 1730.1C, and then exhibit sensitivity to individual chaplains' behavior, understanding it is a matter of interpretation left largely to chaplains concerning which collateral duties detract from their primary religious duty.

Recommendations for Further Research

This study portrays a very limited beginning in examining chaplains' role expectations, and possible discrepancies between chaplains' and commanders' expectations. Much remains to be done. Three recommendations for further research are offered.

First, studies could explore the relationship between chaplains' expectations, commanders' expectations, and chaplains' reported behavior.

Second, a comparative study of role expectations between enlisted, officers, and chaplains could be conducted.

Third, a study could be made to identify and describe chaplains' internal stressors that could lead to role tension and a propensity to leave the Navy.

APPENDIX A

- I. Copy of Pilot Test - "A Questionnaire on Chaplain Role Expectations Among Churches, Naval Commanders, Chaplains, and Sailors" (attached, 178-183).

5. Type of command?

- a. ship b. shore c. overseas shore d. FMF

(Purpose of question: determine if type of duty influences expectations of chaplain's role or servicemember's needs).

6. What is your Religious Preference?

- a. Protestant d. Muslim
 b. Catholic e. Other (_____)
 c. Jewish f. None

(Purpose of question: determine if any faith group had "idiosyncratic" (particular) expectations of role of chaplain (e.g. Catholic wished for more "priestly" role for their chaplain).

7. How often do you practice your faith each month (e.g. Worship/Mass, Bible Study, Prayer Services, Personal Devotions, etc.)?

- a. 1-4 d. 12-20
 b. 4-8 e. 20 +
c. 8-12

(Purpose of question: determine/find indication of respondent's predisposition to chaplains (i.e. the more active, the better their relationship to the chaplain, and thus, the better their grasp of the chaplain's role)).

8. Are you familiar with SECNAVINST 1730.7b that states the purpose and mission of the Chaplain Corps Religious Ministries and lists the functions and duties of the chaplain?

- a. Yes b. No

(Purpose of question: determine if this influenced understanding of role of chaplain).

9. In your opinion, which of the following best describes the mission the chaplain should have at your command? (More than one answer may be valid.)

- a. Conduct church services on Sunday
b. Establish and manage a counseling center
 c. Plan, facilitate and implement the Command Religious Program
d. Coordinate morale, welfare, recreation activities
e. Coordinate public affairs activities, e.g. community relations projects
f. Advise the commander on religious and moral and moral matters

(Purpose of this question: determine if respondent understands proper mission of chaplain according to SECNAVINST 1730.7b).

Score the following ministries as to the degree you feel they are necessary in the Command Religious Program (1 being not necessary and 5 being absolutely necessary):

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10. Worship/Mass | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. Seasonal religious services
(e.g. Easter, Christmas, Passover) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. Sacramental services
(e.g. Baptism, Weddings, Communion) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. Religious education classes/services
(e.g. spiritual formation, Sunday School, Bible studies, retreats etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. Pastoral care
(e.g. counseling and visitation) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. Duty chaplain watch | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. Administrative services
(e.g. office work, professional and personal training) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

(Purpose of questions 10 - 16: determine the degree of necessity of certain ministries to meet the needs of the respondents).

17. Prioritize the top five functions that you feel are most important for chaplains serving with Naval Services (note possible responses below; feel free to create functions not listed below):

- # 1 _____
- # 2 _____
- # 3 _____
- # 4 _____
- # 5 _____

Conductor of Worship
Preacher
Intercessor/Mediator
Minister of Visitation
Staff Officer
Religious Educator
- turgist

Administrator of Sacraments
Teacher
Counselor
Administrator of religious program
Advisor to CO

(Purpose of question: identify what roles respondent would find meaningful in meeting their needs; especially in relating to Prophet, Priest and King).

Score the following qualifications as to the degree you feel they are necessary for a chaplain serving in the Naval Services (1 being not necessary and 5 being absolutely necessary):

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18. Charismatic leader of worship | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. Physically fit/personal appearance | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20. Wise counselor | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 21. Professional | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22. Moral leader | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23. Omnipresent (in workspaces/shares hardships/team player) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24. Supportive, trusted and candid <u>command advisor</u> ("not afraid to disagree with CO") | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 25. Relevant/dynamic preacher | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 26. Communicates and relates effectively with all, both officer & enlisted | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 27. Physically, mentally and temperamentally willing and eager to serve in all circumstances | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 28. Approachable/accessible to all (including family members) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 29. Competent staff officer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 30. Pro-active (shows initiative and enthusiasm) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 31. Spiritual person/committed to his/her faith | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 32. Responsive to needs of all faith groups | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 33. Possesses genuine and sincere concern for all in need | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 34. Person of integrity | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

35. Competent teacher	1	2	3	4	5
36. Confident in his/her calling	1	2	3	4	5
37. Knows his/her flock well	1	2	3	4	5
38. Family advocacy/suicide prevention expert	1	2	3	4	5
39. Balances organizational needs with advocacy for individual	1	2	3	4	5
40. Loyal to command	1	2	3	4	5
41. Loyal to individual	1	2	3	4	5
42. Empathetic	1	2	3	4	5
43. Compassionate	1	2	3	4	5
44. Consistent	1	2	3	4	5
45. Accountable	1	2	3	4	5
46. Well <u>educated</u> /well read	1	2	3	4	5

(Purpose of question: identify and compare qualifications churches, Naval commanders, supervisory chaplains and chaplain candidates look for in chaplains in meeting their needs; especially in relating to Prophet, Priest and King).

47. What are some areas of concern you feel would limit chaplains performing effective ministry? (e.g. "sits in office/inaccessibility, pre-occupation with fitness reports, lack of moral courage, lack of commitment to faith, etc."; feel free to add areas not listed.)

- Not out & about
- More of an officer than a chaplain
- Not a team player, both in command as well as w/ other chaplains
- Clear sense of "calling"

(Purpose of question: identify some areas that may cause some junior chaplains to become ineffective - i.e. to recommend that chaplains avoid).

48. What are some positive areas you feel would help junior chaplains become more effective? (e.g. "know the mission of the command, pro-active programs, community action projects, etc."; feel free to add areas not listed.)

- Increased opportunities for dialogue w/ senior chaplains: share the wisdom & experience - we're all in this together!

(Purpose of question: identify areas that would assist chaplains in becoming more effective as Prophets, Priests and Kings).

49. What kinds of programs would you expect the chaplain to provide? (e.g. "Gospel services, Bible studies, Vacation Bible School, morning prayers, stress management classes, etc."; feel free to add programs not listed.)

The "normal" ones e.g. Worship, Bible studies, prayer times and pertinent, innovative ones e.g. financial & management training, reading classes, domestic violence, etc.

(Purpose of question: identify programs churches, Navy commanders, chaplains and sailors think necessary to carry out ministry as a chaplain).

50. Prioritize the following items in the order that you would expect the chaplain to place them to enhance his/her ministry:

- # 1 _____
- # 2 _____
- # 3 _____
- # 4 _____
- # 5 _____

- 5. Fitness Reports
- 1. Spiritual Formation
- 3. Relationship with Commanders
- 2. Professional Development
- 4. Denominational Relationships

(Purpose of question: identify and compare churches, commanders, supervisory chaplains and sailors expectations of junior chaplains professional priorities).

APPENDIX B

- I. Copy of First Revised Questionnaire - "A Questionnaire on Chaplain Role Expectations for Navy Chaplains" (attached, 185-190).
- II. Copy of First Revised Questionnaire - "A Questionnaire on Chaplain Role Expectations for Naval Commanders" (attached, 191-196).

**A QUESTIONNAIRE
ON CHAPLAIN ROLE EXPECTATIONS
FOR NAVY CHAPLAINS**

Instruction: Circle your response. For those questions that require a response on a scale of 1-5, consider 1 to be the negative end of the scale and 5 the positive end unless otherwise instructed.

1. What is your rank?

- a. 02-03 c. 06
b. 04-05

(Purpose of question: determine if rank influences chaplain role expectations among chaplains)

2. Number of years active duty?

- a. 1-4 d. 12-16
d. 4-8 e. 16-20
c. 8-12 f. 20+

(Purpose of question: determine if more time in service gives respondent a better understanding of chaplain's role)

3. What is your Religious Preference?

- a. Protestant d. Muslim
b. Catholic e. Other (_____)
c. Jewish f. None

(Purpose of question: determine/find indication of respondent's faith group's influence on "idiosyncratic" (particular) expectations of chaplain's role?)

4. On a scale of 1-5 how favorable do you think your commander's experience with chaplains effected his/her understanding of the chaplain's major function. (Please circle your response).

1 2 3 4 5

(Purpose: determine if chaplains think commander's previous experience had positive or negative effect on role expectations)

5. On a scale of 1-5 how familiar are you with SECNAVINST 1730.7A/OPNAVINST 1730.1C. (Please circle your response).

1 2 3 4 5

(Purpose of question: determine if chaplain role expectations are based on major role requirements as outlined by Navy regulations that state the purpose and mission of the Chaplain Corps Religious Ministries and list the functions and duties of the chaplain)

6. On a scale of 1-5 how important do you think the following are in relation to the chaplain's major role in your command's mission? (Please circle your response with 1 being non-essential, 3 being somewhat essential, and 5 being absolutely essential).

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Establish and manage a counseling center | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b. Plan, facilitate and implement the Command Religious Program | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c. Coordinate MWR activities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| d. Coordinate public affairs activities, e.g. community relations projects | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| e. Advise the commander on religious and moral and morale matters | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

(Purpose of question: determine and compare chaplains' understanding of chaplain's major/master role with that of commanders; help determine if role ambiguity, role tension, or role conflict exist, and if so to what degree)

Score the following ministries as to the degree you feel they are necessary in the Command Religious Program (1 being not necessary, 3 being necessary, and 5 being absolutely necessary):

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7. Worship/Mass | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. Seasonal religious services (e.g. Easter, Christmas, Passover) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. Sacramental services (e.g. Baptism, Weddings, Communion) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. Religious education classes (e.g. spiritual formation, Sunday School, Bible studies, retreats etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. Pastoral care (e.g. counseling and visitation) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. Duty chaplain watch | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. Administrative services | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

(Purpose of question: determine and compare chaplains' understanding of chaplain's major/master role with that of commanders; help determine if role ambiguity, role tension, or role conflict exist, if so to what degree)

14. Prioritize the following functions in the order that you feel chaplains should list them in his daily activities:

- # 1 _____
- # 2 _____
- # 3 _____
- # 4 _____
- # 5 _____

Preacher
Teacher
Administrator

Priest
Pastor
Organizer

(Purpose of question: determine chaplains' priority expectations of chaplains' functions and compare with commanders' expectations)

Score the following qualifications as to the degree you feel they are necessary for a chaplain serving in the Naval Services (1 being not necessary and 5 being absolutely necessary):

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15. Charismatic leader of worship | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. Physically fit/personal appearance | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. Wise counselor, empathetic/
compassionate | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. Moral leader/person of integrity | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. Omnipresent (in workspaces/shares
hardships/team player) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20. Supportive, trusted and candid
<u>command advisor</u> ("not afraid to
disagree with CO") | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 21. Relevant/dynamic preacher | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22. Communicates effectively with
all, both officer & enlisted | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

23. Competent staff officer	1	2	3	4	5
24. Pro-active (shows initiative and enthusiasm)	1	2	3	4	5
25. Spiritual person/committed to his/her faith	1	2	3	4	5
26. Responsive to needs of all faith groups	1	2	3	4	5
27. Confident in his/her calling	1	2	3	4	5
28. Family advocacy/suicide prevention expert	1	2	3	4	5
29. Balances organizational needs with advocacy for individual	1	2	3	4	5
30. Loyal to command	1	2	3	4	5
31. Well educated/well read	1	2	3	4	5

(Purpose of questions 15-31: identify and compare qualifications chaplains expect chaplains to have in relation to commanders' expectations within their commands; will reveal possible differences that lead to role tension, etc.)

32. What are some areas of concern you feel would limit chaplains performing effective ministry? (e.g. "sits in office/ inaccessibility, pre-occupation with fitness reports, lack of moral courage, lack of commitment to faith, etc."; feel free to add areas not listed.)

(Purpose of question: identify some areas that chaplains and commanders have conflict with and would like to change)

33. What are some positive areas you feel would help chaplains become more effective? (e.g. "know the mission of the command, pro-active programs such as "Gospel services, Bible studies, Vacation Bible School, morning prayers, stress management classes, etc.", community action projects, etc."; feel free to add areas not listed.)

(Purpose of question: determine if chaplains are having possible role conflict)

38. In what order of importance do you think your commander would rate the following personnel? (Mark the most important with a 1, the second most important with 2, etc.):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Operations Officer | <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Officer |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Weapons Officer | <input type="checkbox"/> Navigator |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Supply Officer | <input type="checkbox"/> Chaplain |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Engineering Officer | <input type="checkbox"/> Command Master Chief |

(Purpose of question: identify what chaplains think commanders expect of chaplains role in relation to the overall mission of the ship)

39. On a scale of 1-5, how important is your professional development? (Please circle your response, 1 being not important, 3 being important, and 5 being very important):

1 2 3 4 5

(Purpose of question: determine and compare chaplains' feelings regarding the importance of their professional development with those of commanders' expectations)

40. On a scale of 1-5, how similar do you think the chaplain's role is to a civilian pastor's from same denomination? (Please circle your response, 1 being not similar, 3 being somewhat similar, 5 being very similar):

1 2 3 4 5

(Purpose of question: determine if chaplains and commanders agree on chaplain's master role; or if there is possible conflict, the degree of difference that could lead to "failure of complementarity" for the chaplain)

**A QUESTIONNAIRE
ON CHAPLAIN ROLE EXPECTATIONS
FOR NAVAL COMMANDERS**

Instruction: Circle your response. For those questions that require a response on a scale of 1-5, consider 1 to be the negative end of the scale and 5 the positive end unless otherwise instructed.

1. What is your rank?

- a. O4-05
- b. O6+

(Purpose of question: determine if rank influences chaplain role expectations among commanders)

2. Number of years active duty?

- a. 8-12
- d. 16-20
- c. 20+

(Purpose of question: determine if more time in service gives respondent a better understanding of chaplain's role)

3. What is your Religious Preference?

- a. Protestant
- b. Catholic
- c. Jewish
- d. Muslim
- e. Other (_____)
- f. None

(Purpose of question: determine/find indication of respondent's predisposition to chaplains, i.e. does any faith group have "idiosyncratic" (particular) expectations of chaplain's role?)

4. On a scale of 1-5 how favorable has your previous experience with chaplains effected your understanding of the chaplain's major function. (Please circle your response).

1 2 3 4 5

(Purpose: determine if previous experience had positive or negative effect on role expectations)

5. On a scale of 1-5 how familiar are you with SECNAVINST 1730.7A/OPNAVINST 1730.1C. (Please circle your response).

1 2 3 4 5

(Purpose of question: determine if chaplain role expectations are based on major role requirements as outlined by Navy regulations that state the purpose and mission of the Chaplain Corps Religious Ministries and list the functions and duties of the chaplain)

6. On a scale of 1-5 how important are the following in relation to the chaplain's major role in your mission? (Please circle your response with 1 being non-essential, 3 being somewhat essential, and 5 being absolutely essential).

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Establish and manage a counseling center | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b. Plan, facilitate and implement the Command Religious Program | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c. Coordinate MWR activities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| d. Coordinate public affairs activities, e.g. community relations projects | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| e. Advise the commander on religious and moral and morale matters | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

(Purpose of question: determine commanders' understanding of chaplain's major/master role; help determine if role ambiguity, role tension, or role conflict exist)

Score the following ministries as to the degree you feel they are necessary in the Command Religious Program (1 being not necessary, 3 being necessary, and 5 being absolutely necessary):

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7. Worship/Mass | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. Seasonal religious services (e.g. Easter, Christmas, Passover) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. Sacramental services (e.g. Baptism, Weddings, Communion) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. Religious education classes/services (e.g. spiritual formation, Sunday School, Bible studies, retreats etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. Pastoral care (e.g. counseling and visitation) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. Duty chaplain watch | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. Administrative services (e.g. office work, professional and personal training) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

(Purpose of question: determine commanders understanding of chaplain's major/master role; help determine if role ambiguity, role tension, or role conflict exist)

14. Prioritize the following functions in the order that you feel chaplains should list them in their daily activities:

- # 1 _____
- # 2 _____
- # 3 _____
- # 4 _____
- # 5 _____

Preacher
Teacher
Administrator

Priest
Pastor
Organizer

(Purpose of question: determine commanders' priority expectations of chaplain's functions)

Score the following qualifications as to the degree you feel they are necessary for a chaplain serving in the Naval Services (1 being not necessary and 5 being absolutely necessary):

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15. Charismatic leader of worship | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. Physically fit/personal appearance | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. Wise counselor, empathetic/
compassionate | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. Moral leader/person of integrity | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. Omnipresent (in workspaces/shares
hardships/team player) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20. Supportive, trusted and candid
<u>command advisor</u> ("not afraid to
disagree with CO") | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 21. Relevant/dynamic preacher | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22. Communicates effectively with
all, both officer & enlisted | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23. Competent staff officer | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

24. Pro-active (shows initiative and enthusiasm)	1	2	3	4	5
25. Spiritual person/committed to his/her faith	1	2	3	4	5
26. Responsive to needs of all faith groups	1	2	3	4	5
27. Confident in his/her calling	1	2	3	4	5
28. Family advocacy/suicide prevention expert	1	2	3	4	5
29. Balances organizational needs with advocacy for individual	1	2	3	4	5
30. Loyal to command	1	2	3	4	5
31. Well educated/well read	1	2	3	4	5

(Purpose of questions 15-31: identify and compare qualifications commanders expect chaplains to have in their commands; will reveal possible differences that lead to role tension etc.)

32. What are some areas of concern you feel would limit chaplains performing effective ministry? (e.g. "sits in office/ inaccessibility, pre-occupation with fitness reports, lack of moral courage, lack of commitment to faith, etc.;" feel free to add areas not listed.)

(Purpose of question: identify some areas that commanders have conflict with and would like to change)

33. What are some positive areas you feel would help chaplains become more effective? (e.g. "know the mission of the command, pro-active programs such as Gospel services, Bible studies, Vacation Bible School, morning prayers, stress management classes, community action projects, etc.;" feel free to add areas not listed.)

(Purpose of question: identify some areas that would help in possible conflict resolution)

34. On a scale of 1-5 how do you think most chaplains would rate their own contribution to the morale, spiritual and moral well-being of your command? (Please circle, 1 being not necessary, 3 being necessary, and 5 being absolutely necessary):

1 2 3 4 5

(Purpose of question: compare commanders' expectations with chaplains' self-expectations of roles)

35. Prioritize the following items in the order that you feel the chaplain should place them:

- # 1 _____
- # 2 _____
- # 3 _____
- # 4 _____
- # 5 _____

Fitness Reports	Professional Development
Spiritual Formation	Denominational Relationships
Relationship with Commanders	

(Purpose of question: determine extent that commanders' and chaplains' priorities differ)

36. On a scale of 1-5 how important is the chaplain's role in contributing to the strengthening and maintaining of the morale and the moral and spiritual well-being of your crew for accomplishing your mission. (Please circle your response, 1 being not important, 3 being important, and 5 being very important):

1 2 3 4 5

(Purpose of question: determine and compare commanders' feelings regarding the importance of chaplain's role with chaplain's feelings)

37. To what degree do you see the chaplain having role conflict between being a "staff-officer" and a clergyperson? (Please circle your response, 1 being low and 5 being high):

1 2 3 4 5

(Purpose of question: determine if commanders are aware of chaplains having possible role conflict)

38. As commanding officer of a deployable ship, in what order of importance would you rate the following personnel? (Mark the most important with a 1, the second most important with 2, etc.):

<input type="checkbox"/> Operations Officer	<input type="checkbox"/> Medical Officer
<input type="checkbox"/> Weapons Officer	<input type="checkbox"/> Navigator
<input type="checkbox"/> Supply Officer	<input type="checkbox"/> Chaplain
<input type="checkbox"/> Engineering Officer	<input type="checkbox"/> Command Master Chief

(Purpose of question: identify and compare commanders' expectations of chaplain's role in relation to the overall mission of the ship)

39. On a scale of 1-5, how important is the chaplain's professional development to you? (Please circle your response, 1 being not important, 3 being important, and 5 being very important):

1 2 3 4 5

(Purpose of question: determine and compare commanders' feelings regarding the of importance of chaplain's professional development with chaplains' feelings).

40. On a scale of 1-5, how similar do you think the chaplain's role is to a civilian pastor's from same denomination? (Please circle your response, 1 being not similar, 3 being somewhat similar, 5 being very similar):

1 2 3 4 5

(Purpose of question: determine if commanders and chaplains agree on chaplain's master role; or if there is possible conflict, the degree of difference that could lead to "failure of complementarity" for the chaplain)

APPENDIX C

- I. Copy of Final Revised Questionnaire Used in Survey - "A Questionnaire on Chaplain Role Expectations for Naval Commanders" (attached, 198-201).
- II. Copy of Final Revised Questionnaire Used in Survey - "A Questionnaire on Chaplain Role Expectations for Navy Chaplains" (attached, 202-205).

**A QUESTIONNAIRE
ON CHAPLAIN ROLE EXPECTATIONS
FOR NAVAL COMMANDERS**

Instructions: Circle your response. For those questions that require a response on a scale of 1-5, consider 1 to be strongly disagree (SD), 2 disagree (D), 3 neither (N), 4 agree (A), and 5 strongly agree (SA), unless otherwise instructed.

1. What is your rank?
 - a. 02-03 c. 06+
 - b. 04-05

2. Number of years active duty?
 - a. 1-4 d. 12-16
 - b. 4-8 e. 16-20
 - c. 8-12 f. 20+

3. What is your Religious Preference?
 - a. Protestant d. Muslim
 - b. Catholic e. Other (_____)
 - c. Jewish f. None

Please circle the number that expresses your agreement with the following statements:

	SD	D	N	A	SA
4. My previous experience with chaplains has been favorable	1	2	3	4	5
5. I am familiar with SECNAVINST 1730.7A/OPNAVINST 1730.1C	1	2	3	4	5
6. I understand the duties of a chaplain	1	2	3	4	5
7. A Command Religious Program (CRP) is important for accomplishing the command's mission	1	2	3	4	5
8. Chaplains are responsible for the CRP	1	2	3	4	5
9. Chaplains should establish a counseling program	1	2	3	4	5
10. Community Relation Projects are an important part of the CRP	1	2	3	4	5
11. An important collateral duty for Chaplains is coordinating MWR	1	2	3	4	5
12. Public Affairs Officer is not the job for chaplains	1	2	3	4	5
13. Chaplains should be Damage Control Training Team (DCTT) members	1	2	3	4	5

	SD	D	N	A	SA
14. Chaplains should be Medical "Triage" Officers	1	2	3	4	5
15. Chaplains should be Shipboard Navy Relief coordinators	1	2	3	4	5
16. Chaplains should coordinate fund drives for Navy Relief, AMCROSS, and CFC	1	2	3	4	5
17. Chaplains should not serve as Family Advocacy representatives	1	2	3	4	5
18. Chaplains should be the Suicide Prevention Trainer	1	2	3	4	5
19. Chaplains should serve as Command Assessment Team members	1	2	3	4	5
20. The chaplain's duties as a clergy person conflict with those of a "staff officer"	1	2	3	4	5
21. The chaplain's contributions to morale is important for accomplishing the command's mission	1	2	3	4	5
22. The chaplain's contributions to the spiritual and moral well-being is important for accomplishing the command's mission	1	2	3	4	5
23. The chaplain's professional development is important	1	2	3	4	5
24. A chaplain's role is not similar to a civilian clergy-person's	1	2	3	4	5
25. Chaplains should be concerned with maintaining good relationships with commanders	1	2	3	4	5
26. Chaplains do not need to be concerned with denominational relationships	1	2	3	4	5
27. Chaplains should be concerned with maintaining spiritual formation	1	2	3	4	5
28. Chaplains should make "Fitness Reports" a priority	1	2	3	4	5
29. Consolidated duty/Chaplains' area-wide duty is important for accomplishing the command's mission	1	2	3	4	5
30. A chaplain should be an office manager	1	2	3	4	5
31. Weekly Worship/Mass is important for accomplishing the command's mission	1	2	3	4	5
32. Religious education classes (e.g. Bible studies, Sunday School, retreats, etc.) are important for accomplishing the command's mission	1	2	3	4	5

	SD	D	N	A	SA
33. Pastoral care (e.g. counseling & visitation at the brig and hospital) is important for accomplishing the command's mission	1	2	3	4	5
34. Sacramental services (e.g. Baptisms, Communion, etc.) are important for accomplishing the command's mission	1	2	3	4	5
35. Chaplains have a positive effect on the command's mission by modeling moral leadership and integrity	1	2	3	4	5
36. Omnipresence is necessary in order for a chaplain to have a positive effect on the command's mission	1	2	3	4	5
37. The chaplain must be a supportive, trusted and candid command advisor	1	2	3	4	5
38. Chaplains should be loyal to the command and never disagree with the commanding officer	1	2	3	4	5
39. Being a relevant/dynamic preacher is not important for a chaplain to have a positive effect on the command's mission	1	2	3	4	5
40. Chaplains have a positive effect on the command's mission by communicating and relating effectively with all, both officers and enlisted	1	2	3	4	5
41. As staff officers, in order to be effective, chaplains must be team players and participate in all ward-room functions	1	2	3	4	5
42. As staff officers, chaplains must be proactive in taking on collateral duties	1	2	3	4	5
43. A chaplain must be committed to his/her faith in order to have a positive effect on the command's mission	1	2	3	4	5
44. Chaplains must be responsive to needs of all faith groups in order to have a positive effect on the command's mission	1	2	3	4	5
45. Chaplains must be advocates for individuals regardless of command's mission	1	2	3	4	5
46. Chaplains must be charismatic leaders of worship in order to have a positive effect on the command's mission	1	2	3	4	5
47. Physical fitness/personal appearance has no bearing on the effectiveness of chaplains on ships	1	2	3	4	5

SD D N A SA

- 48. Chaplains must be trained Professional Counselors in order to have a positive effect on the command's mission 1 2 3 4 5
- 49. Lay Leaders can take the place of chaplains with little effect on the mission of the command 1 2 3 4 5

50. Prioritized the following chaplain roles in the order of their importance to the command; 1 being the most important and 6 being the least important:

- Administrator
- Teacher
- Pastor
- Priest
- Project Coordinator
- Preacher

51. Prioritize the following personnel in order of their importance to the overall mission; 1 being most important and 8 being least important:

- Operations Officer
- Weapons Officer
- Supply Officer
- Engineering Officer
- Medical Officer
- Navigator
- Chaplain
- Command Master Chief

52. What are some areas of concern you feel would limit chaplains performing effective ministry aboard ship?

53. What are your suggestions for improving the chaplain's effectiveness aboard ship?

**A QUESTIONNAIRE
ON CHAPLAIN ROLE EXPECTATIONS
FOR NAVY CHAPLAINS**

Instructions: Circle your response. For those questions that require a response on a scale of 1-5, consider 1 to be strongly disagree (SD), 2 disagree (D), 3 neither (N), 4 agree (A), and 5 strongly agree (SA), unless otherwise instructed.

1. What is your rank?

- a. 02-03 c. 06+
b. 04-05

2. Number of years active duty?

- a. 1-4 d. 12-16
b. 4-8 e. 16-20
c. 8-12 f. 20+

3. What is your Religious Preference?

- a. Protestant d. Muslim
b. Catholic e. Other (_____)
c. Jewish f. None

Please circle the number that expresses your agreement with the following statements:

	SD	D	N	A	SA
4. My commander has expressed to me that his previous experience with chaplains has been favorable	1	2	3	4	5
5. My commander expresses his familiarity with SECNAVINST 1730.7A/OPNAVINST 1730.1C	1	2	3	4	5
6. My commander expresses that he understands of the duties of a chaplain	1	2	3	4	5
7. A Command Religious Program (CRP) is important for accomplishing the command's mission	1	2	3	4	5
8. Chaplains are responsible for the CRP	1	2	3	4	5
9. Chaplains should establish a counseling program	1	2	3	4	5
10. Community Relation Projects are an important part of the CRP	1	2	3	4	5
11. An important collateral duty for Chaplains is coordinating MWR	1	2	3	4	5

	SD	D	N	A	SA
12. Public Affairs Officer is not the job for chaplains	1	2	3	4	5
13. Chaplains should be Damage Control Training Team (DCTT) members	1	2	3	4	5
14. Chaplains should be Medical "Triage" Officers	1	2	3	4	5
15. Chaplains should be Shipboard Navy Relief coordinators	1	2	3	4	5
16. Chaplains should coordinate fund drives for Navy Relief, AMCROSS, and CFC	1	2	3	4	5
17. Chaplains should not serve as Family Advocacy representatives	1	2	3	4	5
18. Chaplains should be the Suicide Prevention Trainer	1	2	3	4	5
19. Chaplains should serve as Command Assessment Team members	1	2	3	4	5
20. The chaplain's duties as a clergy person conflict with those of a "staff officer"	1	2	3	4	5
21. The chaplain's contributions to morale is important for accomplishing the command's mission	1	2	3	4	5
22. The chaplain's contributions to the spiritual and moral well-being is important for accomplishing the command's mission	1	2	3	4	5
23. The chaplain's professional development is important	1	2	3	4	5
24. A chaplain's role is not similar to a civilian clergy-person's	1	2	3	4	5
25. Chaplains should be concerned with maintaining good relationships with commanders	1	2	3	4	5
26. Chaplains do not need to be concerned with denominational relationships	1	2	3	4	5
27. Chaplains should be concerned with maintaining spiritual formation	1	2	3	4	5
28. Chaplains should make "Fitness Reports" a priority	1	2	3	4	5
29. Consolidated duty/Chaplains' area-wide duty is important for accomplishing the command's mission	1	2	3	4	5
30. A chaplain should be an office manager	1	2	3	4	5
31. Weekly Worship/Mass is important for accomplishing the command's mission	1	2	3	4	5

	SD	D	N	A	SA
32. Religious education classes (e.g. Bible studies, Sunday School, retreats, etc.) are important for accomplishing the command's mission	1	2	3	4	5
33. Pastoral care (e.g. counseling & visitation at the brig and hospital) is important for accomplishing the command's mission	1	2	3	4	5
34. Sacramental services (e.g. Baptisms, Communion, etc.) are important for accomplishing the command's mission	1	2	3	4	5
35. Chaplains have a positive effect on the command's mission by modeling moral leadership and integrity	1	2	3	4	5
36. Omnipresence is necessary in order for a chaplain to have a positive effect on the command's mission	1	2	3	4	5
37. The chaplain must be a supportive, trusted and candid command advisor	1	2	3	4	5
38. Chaplains should be loyal to the command and never disagree with the commanding officer	1	2	3	4	5
39. Being a relevant/dynamic preacher is not important for a chaplain to have a positive effect on the command's mission	1	2	3	4	5
40. Chaplains have a positive effect on the command's mission by communicating and relating effectively with all, both officers and enlisted	1	2	3	4	5
41. As staff officers, in order to be effective, chaplains must be team players and participate in all ward-room functions	1	2	3	4	5
42. As staff officers, chaplains must be proactive in taking on collateral duties	1	2	3	4	5
43. A chaplain must be committed to his/her faith in order to have a positive effect on the command's mission	1	2	3	4	5
44. Chaplains must be responsive to needs of all faith groups in order to have a positive effect on the command's mission	1	2	3	4	5
45. Chaplains must be advocates for individuals regardless of command's mission	1	2	3	4	5
46. Chaplains must be charismatic leaders of worship in order to have a positive effect on the command's mission	1	2	3	4	5

	SD	D	N	A	SA
47. Physical fitness/personal appearance has no bearing on the effectiveness of chaplains on ships	1	2	3	4	5
48. Chaplains must be trained Professional Counselors in order to have a positive effect on the command's mission	1	2	3	4	5
49. Lay Leaders can take the place of chaplains with little effect on the mission of the command	1	2	3	4	5

50. Prioritized the following chaplain roles in the order of their importance to the command as expressed by your commander; 1 being the most important and 6 being the least important:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Administrator | <input type="checkbox"/> Priest |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Teacher | <input type="checkbox"/> Project Coordinator |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pastor | <input type="checkbox"/> Preacher |

51. Prioritize the following personnel in order of their importance to the overall mission as expressed by your commander; 1 being most important and 8 being least important:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Operations Officer | <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Officer |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Weapons Officer | <input type="checkbox"/> Navigator |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Supply Officer | <input type="checkbox"/> Chaplain |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Engineering Officer | <input type="checkbox"/> Command Master Chief |

52. What are some areas of concern you feel would limit chaplains performing effective ministry aboard ship?

53. What are your suggestions for improving the chaplain's effectiveness aboard ship?

APPENDIX D

- I. Copy of SECNAVINST 1730.7A (attached, 207-211).
- II. Copy of OPNAVINST 1730.1C (attached, 212-214).

SECNAVINST 1730.7A

THE CHAPLAIN CORPS

1. General

a. Establishment. Congress established the Chaplain Corps as a staff corps of the Navy under the provisions of reference (b), section 5142. The Chaplain Corps shall be comprised of professionally qualified clergy received from the nation's faith groups under reference (d).

b. Mission. The Chaplain Corps shall provide appropriate ministries to support the religious needs and preferences of all members of the naval service, eligible family members, and other authorized personnel throughout the Department of the Navy.

c. Endorsement. Chaplains shall be professionally qualified clergy, certified and endorsed by their ecclesiastical endorsing agency under reference (d). Navy chaplains shall maintain their endorsement as an essential element of their professional qualification. Loss of ecclesiastical endorsement requires administrative processing under the provisions of reference (e).

d. Responsibility. Command chaplains shall be assigned as department heads or principal staff officers directly under the executive officer/chief of staff. Subordinate chaplains shall be assigned under the command chaplain. As the principal advisor to the commander/commanding officer on religious and moral matters, the command chaplain shall have direct access to the commander/commanding officer as provided in article 1151.3 of reference (a). The command chaplain shall report to the executive officer/chief of staff in matters related to the administration of the chaplain's office, and to the appropriate supervisory chaplain at the next higher echelon in the chain-of-command for professional guidance.

e. Bearing of Arms. It is Department of the Navy policy that chaplains shall not bear arms.

f. Manner of Addressing Chaplains. The manner of addressing chaplains in oral or written communication is set forth in reference (a), article 1010. Traditionally, chaplains are addressed as "Chaplain" regardless of rank. Terms of oral address such as "Rabbi," "Father," "Pastor," etc., may also be used under appropriate circumstances.

g. Uniforms. Chaplain Corps officers assigned to Marine Corps or Coast Guard organizations may wear the appropriate service or field uniform prescribed for Marine Corps or Coast Guard officers.

h. Functions and Duties of Chaplains. Chaplains shall:

(1) Advise the commanding officer or commander on all matters related to religious ministries.

(2) Administer the CRP. Conduct divine services; administer sacraments and ordinances; perform rites and ceremonies in accordance with the manner and forms of the chaplain's faith group; provide outreach programs, spiritual growth retreats and religious education; and facilitate religious ministries for personnel of other faith groups.

(3) Provide pastoral care and pastoral counseling, including visiting the sick and confinees, and subject to the limitations of reference (f), or other applicable rules regarding privileges, safeguard the privileged communication of servicemembers, eligible family members and other authorized personnel throughout the Department of the Navy.

(4) Advise the commanding officer or commander on moral issues and provide input to programs which emphasize the core values of the naval service.

(5) Report to an assigned position or battle station in combat, at general quarters or similar situations to provide ministry as required.

(6) Assist in the Casualty Assistance Calls Program by providing ministry to the next of kin of deceased and seriously ill personnel. Chaplains shall not be designated as the Casualty Assistance Calls Officer.

(7) Develop plans, programs, and budgets to execute religious ministries within the command.

(8) Advise the command chaplain of the unit, or of the command to which the unit is attached, of necessary actions concerning programming of chaplain and Religious Program Specialist (RP) billets and other support requirements.

(9) Maintain liaison with local religious groups in the U.S. or foreign countries.

(10) Fulfill faith group requirements for maintaining ecclesiastical endorsement.

(11) Provide supervision and training for assigned junior officers, enlisted members, and civilian personnel.

(12) Prepare and maintain directives and procedures pertinent to the CRP, including chapel usage instructions, turnover files, etc.

(13) Report semi-annually a summary of activities to the major claimant staff chaplain; on a report form to be determined by the same.

(14) Inform the command's Public Affairs Officer of CRP activities of public interest.

i. Coordinating Chaplains. Coordinating chaplains are those chaplains assigned to Area Coordinators. Per reference (g), coordinating chaplains shall have the authority and responsibility to initiate action among commands within a designated geographic area, to assure that adequate support and opportunity are provided for religious ministry and training. Marine Corps and Coast Guard activities are also understood to be included in area coordination for ministry and training purposes.

j. Collateral Duties.

(1) Per article 1063 of reference (a), while assigned to a combat area during a period of armed conflict, chaplains shall be assigned and permitted to perform only such duties as are related to religious ministries and the administration of religious units and establishments.

(2) Additionally, chaplains may not, as a matter of Department of Navy policy, be assigned collateral duties which:

(a) Violate the religious practices of the chaplain's faith group.

(b) Require service as director, solicitor, or treasurer of funds or fund drives, except when assigned as administrator or custodian of a Religious Offering Fund (ROF) or the Chief of Chaplains Fund.

(c) Involve serving on a court-martial or rendering judgment in disciplinary cases.

(d) Require standing watches other than that of duty chaplain.

(e) Conflict with the chaplain's primary duty of religious ministry or with privileged communication, e.g., Family advocacy Point of Contact or Equal Opportunity Officer.

2. Organization

a. Chief of Chaplains

(1) Position. The Chief of Chaplains of the Department of the Navy shall direct a major staff office under the Chief of Naval Operations as specified in reference (b), section 5142. The Chief of Chaplains as the single manager of the Chaplain Corps shall manage resources to meet the religious needs of the Department of the Navy.

(2) Responsibilities. The Chief of Chaplains shall:

(a) Represent the Department of the Navy to the nation's faith groups and advise the Secretary of the Navy on faith group policies, programs, and positions.

(b) Serve as the Director of Religious Ministries directing and administering the training, management and readiness of the Navy Chaplain Corps; and implement religious ministries in support of the free exercise of religion among personnel in the naval service, their families, and other authorized personnel.

(c) Advise the Secretary of the Navy on moral issues in the Department of the Navy and provide input for programs which emphasize the core values of the sea services.

(d) Report regularly to the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, the Commandant of the Coast Guard and officials of the Merchant Marine on meeting the religious and ethical concerns and needs of members of the sea services.

(e) Serve as the senior advisor to the Secretary of the Navy on religious, spiritual and ethical implications of policies and actions of the Department of the Navy. In these matters, the Chief of Chaplains shall provide such advice and counsel to the Secretary, the Civilian Executive Assistants, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, the Commandant of the Coast Guard, and officials of the Merchant Marine on any issue they may direct or which should be brought to their attention.

(f) Represent the Department of the Navy on the Armed Forces Chaplains Board. Advise the Secretary of the Navy on religious and ecclesiastical matters as per reference (h), and maintain liaison with other boards, committees, and agencies in matters pertaining to religious activities.

(g) Represent the Department of the Navy in meeting with the Chiefs of Chaplains/Senior Chaplains of the armed forces of other nations and in international forums affecting religious ministry and the well-being of persons in the naval service.

b. Deputy Chief of Chaplains

(1) The Deputy Chief of Chaplains as the principal assistant to the Chief of Chaplains shall perform such duties and exercise such authority as the Chief of Chaplains shall prescribe.

(2) The Deputy Chief of Chaplains shall serve as the second representative of the Department of the Navy to the Armed Forces Chaplains Board.

c. Chief of Chaplains Staff. Chaplains, RPs and other enlisted administrative support, and civilian personnel shall be assigned to the office of the Chief of Chaplains to assist in the accomplishment of its mission, functions, and responsibilities.

d. Claimant Chaplains. A claimant staff chaplain shall be the senior chaplain assigned to the staff of a manpower claimant; e.g., the Commander in Chief of the U.S. Atlantic Fleet, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, the Chief of Naval Education and Training.

COMMAND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR RELIGIOUS MINISTRIES

1. General. Under reference (a) and this instruction, commanders and commanding officers shall:

a. Provide for the free exercise of religion of all members of the Navy, including family members and other authorized personnel by offering a CRP responsive to their rights and needs.

b. Use all proper means to foster high morale, develop and strengthen the moral and spiritual well-being of all personnel, and ensure necessary logistic support is provided to enable chaplains to carry out the CRP, as cited in reference (e), article 0820.

c. Accommodate the religious faith practices of individual members, as appropriate under the guidelines in reference (d).

2. Specific. Commanders and commanding officers shall:

a. Comply with the stipulations of reference (e), article 0817 in the conduct of divine services.

(1) Except by reason of necessity or in the interest of the welfare and morale of the command, the performance of work shall not be required on Sunday. The religious convictions and practices of those who worship on a day other than Sunday are to be respected and, except by reason of military necessity, they shall be afforded equal opportunity to observe the requirements of their religion. Where such personnel are excused from duty on a day other than Sunday, their work week may include work on Sundays as equitable compensation.

(2) Reference (e), article 0817, states that ships shall not be sailed or aircraft or troops deployed on Sunday, except by reason of military necessity. Daily routine in ships and activities shall be modified, as practicable, to achieve this end. The provision of this paragraph need not apply to commands engaged *in* training Reserve components.

(3) Determination of military necessity rests entirely with the commander or commanding officer.

b. Approve applications for leave or liberty whenever possible to allow personnel to observe significant holy days of their faith with their families. This is particularly important where appropriate services are not available in the local area.

c. Provide personnel, funding, and logistical support for the CRP as directed by reference (a). Additional guidance is provided in enclosure (2) of this instruction.

d. Position the command chaplain either as a department head directly under the executive officer or as a principal staff officer directly under the chief of staff. In order to preserve the unique role of pastoral care in health care delivery, the chaplain shall be assigned as a director at naval medical centers and in naval hospitals where size and unique circumstances vary, the chaplain may be assigned as a director, department head, or principal staff officer to the commanding officer.

e. Per reference (e), article 0820, use all proper means to foster high morale, and develop and strengthen moral and spiritual well-being of the personnel under his or her command, and ensure chaplains are provided the necessary logistic support for carrying out the command's religious programs to provide maximum opportunity for the free exercise of religion by members of the naval service.

f. Adhere to the noncombatant status of chaplains under reference (e), article 1063, when assigning duties in combat. It is Department of the Navy policy that chaplains shall not bear arms.

g. Assign Religious Program Specialists (RPs) to primary duties supporting chaplains in implementing the CRP, consistent with occupational standards provided by NAVPERS 18068 series. RPs' primary role of supporting religious ministries within the command must be given appropriate consideration when assigning a collateral duty. RPs shall be assigned to units which have chaplains, unless otherwise approved by the rating sponsor, Chief of Chaplains (N097).

h. Appoint lay leaders to meet specific faith group needs in accordance with article 5810150 of reference (f). The commander or commanding officer should seek the advice of the command chaplain, or if no chaplain is assigned, the chaplain attached to a higher echelon, regarding the selection of qualified lay leaders. RPs shall not serve as lay leaders but may assist with lay leader training.

i. Safeguard the privileged communications counselees may claim under reference (g) for communications made to chaplains and RPs.

3. Command Chaplains. Command Chaplains as described in reference (a), enclosure (1), shall perform the following functions:

- a. Advise the commander or commanding officer on all matters related to religious ministries within the command.
- b. Identify religious needs within the command; plan, program, and budget for the CRP; and coordinate the ministries of assigned chaplains to execute a proactive program of religious ministry.
- c. Advise the commanding officer or commander on moral issues and provide input to programs which emphasize Navy core values.
- d. Monitor religious ministry facility requirements and advise the commander or commanding officer of the material status of all facilities assigned to the CRP.
- e. Advise the force or equivalent level chaplain on ministry matters within the command which require attention.
- f. Monitor chaplain and RP billets and billet requirements, and advise the force or equivalent level chaplain on manpower issues affecting the command.
- g. Submit reports to the claimant staff chaplain, via the appropriate force or equivalent level chaplain, as required by the claimant.
- h. Supervise and evaluate all assigned officer, enlisted and civilian personnel.
- i. Represent the commander or commanding officer to local religious bodies, dignitaries, and community organizations.
- j. Ensure every assigned chaplain with a 3701 Navy Officer Billet Code (NOBC) has a mentor.

APPENDIX E

- I. Copy of Navy Chief of Chaplains revised "Your Chaplain and the Command Religious Program" (attached, 216-218).

YOUR CHAPLAIN AND THE COMMAND RELIGIOUS PROGRAM

The following is intended as a “start-up” guide to Commanding Officers for the effective employment of their command chaplain. Detailed information on these topics may be found in the list of directives on page 3.

What You Can Expect From Your Chaplain

- A highly qualified officer to run your Command Religious Program which includes: conducting divine services, guiding spiritual formation, facilitating free exercise of religion for all, and providing sacramental ministry, pastoral care, and outreach.
- A leader in areas of: faith and moral values, professional ethics, group dynamics, personal growth and adjustment, implementation of TQL initiatives.
- A skilled pastoral counselor and care provider at work centers, hospitals, and brigs; and liaison with numerous support services, such as the American Red Cross and Family Service Centers.
- A resource providing input on issues affecting mission and morale, Core Values and ethics, suicide prevention, pre- and post-deployment briefs for families, Critical Incident Stress debriefings, family violence, and problem solving skills.
- A liaison for ombudsmen and key volunteers.
- A moral, spiritual, and ethical advisor on issues involving people, policy, and procedures. Your chaplain is equipped and placed to provide guidance on First Amendment issues, the impact of religious issues on the command’s mission, religious and cultural information on ports-of-call, morale and personnel issues, and community relations.

Unique Requirements For Chaplains

- A professional who is expected to remain continually updated through regular faith group, Navy, and Chaplain Corps professional development opportunities.
- A counselor who must preserve legally privileged communication and professional confidentiality.
- An officer who is in all circumstances a non-combatant.

What Your Chaplain Needs From You

- To be treated with equality as a professional staff officer.
- Honest, timely feedback and formal evaluation in at least these areas:
 - **Spirituality:** the demeanor of a person of God who communicates appropriate values in a believable way
 - **Care for all:** the proactive concern for everyone's religious needs, inclusively and without prejudice
 - **Staff officer skills:** the requisite leadership tools to administer properly your Command Religious Program
 - **Team building:** a catalyst for command morale
- Assignment to appropriate collateral duties which do not detract from primary ministry. Some of these are:
 - Library Officer
 - Project Handclasp
 - Quality of Life advisory boards
 - TQL: ESC, QMBs, PATs
 - Sharing Thanksgiving

- **Relief from collateral duties which are inappropriate or prohibited by regulation or policy. Some of these are:**
 - **Duties violating faith group practices**
 - **Combatant duties in any form**
 - **Watches other than duty chaplain**
 - **Administering any non-appropriated funds other than a Religious Offering Fund**
 - **Family Advocacy Representative**
 - **Serving on a court martial or rendering judgment in disciplinary cases, except as required by Navy Regulations**

REFERENCES

The following references are the foundation for the chaplain's ministry and the Command Religious Program.

- **SECNAV INSTRUCTION 1730.7 Series: Promulgates policy and assigns responsibilities for religious ministries in the Department of the Navy.**
- **SECNAV INSTRUCTION 7010.6: Provides guidance for administering the Religious Offering Fund.**
- **OPNAV INSTRUCTION 1730.1 Series: Promulgates policy for religious ministry in the Navy.**
- **MARINE CORPS ORDER 1730.6: Promulgates policy for religious ministry in the Marine Corps.**
- **MANUAL FOR COURTS MARTIAL Article 503: Provides legal basis for privileged communication.**

APPENDIX F

- I. Survey Cover Letter/Memorandum to Chaplains (attached, 220).
- II. Survey Cover Letter/Memorandum to Commanders (attached, 221).

MEMORANDUM FOR U.S. NAVY SHIPS' CHAPLAINS

From: LCDR Herstel G. Carter, CHC, USN
To:

Subj: Chaplain Role Expectations Survey

Encl: (1) Chaplain Role Expectation Survey Form
(2) Self-Addressed, Self-Stamped Envelope

1. SECNAVINST 1730.7A states that the primary purpose of the Navy chaplain is to provide for religious ministries appropriate to the rights and needs of Navy personnel and their families.
2. As a command chaplain on a ship, you are in a position to articulate and prioritize functions you feel chaplains should be performing to provide effective religious ministries.
3. With the goal of identifying and describing chaplains' role expectations by both commanders and chaplains, I ask that you take a few minutes to complete and return enclosure (1) not later than_____.
4. The results of this survey will be used to provide information to other chaplains and commanders as to chaplain role expectations on Navy ships in the San Diego area; i.e. through training and/or information guides, at some time in the future, this information may lead to more effective ministries.
5. Enclosure (2) is provided for you to return enclosure (1) to me. Also in order to ensure confidentiality enclosure (1) has been given a numerical code at the top, and therefore, it is not necessary for you to put your name on it.
6. Your support of this project is greatly appreciated.

Very respectfully,

Herstel G. Carter

1730
REL

MEMORANDUM FOR U.S. NAVY SHIPS' COMMANDERS

From: LCDR Herstel G. Carter, CHC, USN
To:

Subj: Chaplain Role Expectations Survey

Encl: (1) Chaplain Role Expectation Survey Form
(2) Self-Addressed, Self-Stamped Envelope

1. SECNAVINST 1730.7A states that the primary purpose of the Navy chaplain is to provide for religious ministries appropriate to the rights and needs of Navy personnel and their families.
2. As a commander or executive officer of a Navy vessel with particular "spiritual needs" of your own, you are in a position to articulate and prioritize functions you feel chaplains should be performing to provide effective Religious Ministries.
3. With the goal of identifying and describing chaplains' role expectations by both commanders and chaplains, I ask that you take a few minutes to complete and return enclosure (1) not later than_____.
4. The results of this survey will be used to provide information to other commanders and chaplains as to chaplain role expectations on Navy ships in the San Diego area; i.e. through training and/or information guides, at some time in the future, this information may lead to more effective ministries.
5. Enclosure (2) is provided for you to return enclosure (1) to me. Also in order to ensure confidentiality enclosure (1) has been given a numerical code at the top, and therefore, it is not necessary for you to put your name on it.
6. Your support of this project is greatly appreciated.

Very respectfully,

Herstel G. Carter

APPENDIX G

- I. Survey Follow-up Memorandum to Commanders (attached, 245).

MEMORANDUM FOR U.S. NAVY SHIPS' COMMANDERS

From: LCDR Herstel G. Carter, CHC, USN
To:

Subj: Chaplain Role Expectations Survey

1. During the first week in November you were given a survey form (with a stamped, self-addressed envelope) by your chaplain which was to be filled out and returned to me. Perhaps due to operational schedules and various training evolutions your time did not permit you to return the completed survey.
2. If you have recently mailed the form please accept my thanks and disregard this memorandum.
3. If you have not returned your survey form would you please take a few minutes to complete it and mail it to me.
4. Your response is important for this study and your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Very respectfully,

Herstel G. Carter

Works Cited

- Abercrombie, Clarence L. III. The Military Chaplain. London: Sage Publications, 1977.
- Anderson, James D. and Ezra Earl Jones. The Management of Ministry. San Francisco: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1978.
- Anderson, James D. To Come Alive. San Francisco: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1979.
- . "Pastoral Support of Clergy-Role Development Within Local Congregations." Charles Wheeler Scott, Pastoral Psychology, (March 1971): 9-14.
- Appelquist, A. Ray. Church, State and Chaplaincy. Wash. D.C.: The General Commission on Chaplains and Armed Forces Personnel, 1969.
- Blizzard, Samuel W. "The Minister's Dilemma." Christian Century LXIII, Chicago, (April 25, 1956): 508-510.
- . "The parish Minister's Self Image of His Master Role." Pastoral Psychology, (December 1958): 25-32.
- . "The Parish Minister's Integrating Roles." Religious Education LII, (1958): 374-380.
- Biddle, Bruce J. Role Theory Expectations, Identities, and Behaviors. New York: Academic Press, 1956.
- Boozer, Jack. Edge of Ministry...The Chaplain Story. Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1984.
- Bowen, Gary. "Opportunities for Ministry", Military Chaplains Review, Vol. 15, No. 2, (Spring 1986), 44-59. Wash. D.C.: Dept. of the Army.
- Boyette, Earl L. "The Future Face of Faith and Practice", The Navy Chaplain, Vol. 4, No. 2, (4 Dec 1989), 20-26. Wash. D.C.: Dept. of the Navy.
- Brunner, Emil. The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption-Dogmatics: Vol. II. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1974.
- Cook, E. Dean. A Study of the Transition of Free Methodist Clergy into the Military Chaplaincy. Diss. Wilmore, Ky.: Asbury Theological Seminary, 1990.

- Ferguson, M. R. "A Chaplain's Spirituality in Institutional Ministry", The Navy Chaplain, Vol. 3, No. 4, (12 Jun 1989), 3-12. Wash. D.C.: Dept. of the Navy.
- Gladding, Stephen Evans. Harmonizing Role Expectations Of The Church Board and Pastor. Diss. Wilmore, Ky.: Asbury Theological Seminary, 1993.
- Gomulka, E.T. Chaplain Qualification Survey. Wash. D.C.: USMC Headquarters, 1991.
- Gordon, Gerald. Role Theory and Illness: A Sociological Perspective. New Haven, Conn.: College & University Press, 1966.
- Hadley, Donald W. and Gerald T. Richards. Ministry With The Military: A Guide for Churches and Chaplains. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1992.
- Harwood, James G. Ministry Aboard Ship: The Navy Chaplain at Sea. Norfolk, Virginia: Chaplains' Resource Board, 1995.
- Heinke, Gary. "The Role of The Chaplain: Field Grade Officers Speak." The Navy Chaplain. Wash. D.C.: Dept. of the Navy, Chief Of Chaplains, Vol. 6, No. 2, (FY 92): 24-27.
- Hendricks, Howard G. When All Else Fails...Read the Directions. Waco, Texas: Word Books Publishers, 1974.
- Hutcheson, Richard G. "Pastoral Leadership Within An Institutional Structure", The Navy Chaplain, Vol. 4, No. 6, (FY 90), 2-5. Wash. D.C.: Dept. of the Navy.
- . The Churches and The Chaplaincy. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975.
- Irwin, Edwin F. "A Divine Commission?", Military Chaplains Review, PAM 165-115, (Fall 1977), 11-17. Wash. D.C.: Dept. of the Army.
- Lecky, Hugh L., Jr. Your Chaplain and The Command Religious Program. Norfolk, Virginia: Chaplains' Resource Board, 1984.
- Leedy, Paul D. Practical Research: Planning and Design. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1993.
- Lindgren, Alvin J. Foundations for Purposeful Church Administration. New York: Abingdon Press, 1965.

- Lintang, Periskila Netty. The Expectations of the Laity to the Roles of the Pastor in Chinese Churches in Jakarta, Indonesia. Diss. Ann Arbor, Mich.: UMI Dissertation Services, 1993.
- Martin, Richard K. "Unit Ministry: A View from the Other Side", Military Chaplains Review, (Winter 1990), 9-17. Wash. D.C.: Dept. of the Army.
- McClure, John R. Realities and Expectations: Roles of the Pentecostal Pastor. Diss. Ann Arbor, Mich.: UMI Dissertation Services, 1988.
- Mullholland, M. Robert Jr. Invitation to a Journey: A Road Map for Spiritual Formation. Downers Grove, Ill.: Intervarsity Press, 1993.
- Muto, Susan and Adrian Van Kaam. Commitment: Key to Christian Maturity. Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1989.
- Niebuhr, H. Richard. The Purpose of the Church and Its Ministry. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956.
- Northrup, Lesley A. "The Challenge of the Chaplaincy", Military Chaplains Review, (Winter 1990), 3-14. Wash. D.C.: Dept. of the Army.
- Oates, Wayne E. The Christian Pastor. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1951.
- Oden, Thomas C. Pastoral Theology...Essentials of Ministry. New York: Harper and Row Publisher, 1983.
- Ratzlaff, Dwayne O. Spiritual Formation In Theological Education Utilizing Classical Spiritual Disciplines. Diss. Wilmore, KY.: Asbury Theological Seminary, 1985.
- Shawchuck, Norman and Roger Heuser. Leading the Congregation - Caring for Yourself While Serving Others. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1993.
- Stevenson, Neil M. "Leadership Without Command", The Navy Chaplain, Vol. 4, No. 6, (FY 90), 6-8. Wash. D.C.: Dept. of the Navy.
- Stogdill, Ralph M., Ellis L. Scott, and William E. Jaynes. Leadership and Role Expectations. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1956.
- Strean, Herbert F. Social Casework: Theories in Action. Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1971.

Vickers, Robert. "The Military Chaplaincy: A Study in Role Conflict." Military Chaplains' Review. (Spring 1986), 60-74. Wash. D.C.: Dept. of the Army.

Visser, Richard Edgar. Pastoral Role Expectations in the Local Church. Diss. Wilmore, Ky.: Asbury Theological Seminary, 1983.

Williams, Watkin. St. Bernard of Clairvaux. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1953.

Zahn, Gordon C. The Military Chaplaincy. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969.

