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I. Introduction to the Research Problem

Contemporary man functions in an organizational milieu. He is born into organizations, is socialized and educated by organizations, and is even buried by an organization (cf. Etzioni, 1961). This paper is a study of an organization, and more specifically of what Etzioni (1961) calls a "normative organization." While there are almost as many ways to undertake an organizational study as there are researchers making such investigations, the present analysis will be concerned with only two organizational variables: control and effectiveness.

The first section of this paper has five objectives:

(a) to examine the concept of control as it has been discussed by both early and contemporary organizational theorists;

(b) to examine the concept of effectiveness and how it has been utilized in the sociological literature;

(c) to present a brief review of the social research literature on religious orders;

(d) to discuss how the two variables, control and effectiveness, may be integrated into a research problem;

(e) to formulate the main hypotheses of the present analysis.
Organizational Control

The process of control is an important factor in the make-up of any organization. As Tannenbaum (1968:3) says:

Organizations are of vital interest to the social scientist, because one finds within them an important juncture between the individual and the collectivity. Out of this juncture comes much in our pattern of living that has been the subject of both eulogy and derogation. That man derives a great deal from organizational membership leaves little to be argued; that he often pays heavily for the benefits of organizational membership seems an argument equally compelling. At the heart of this exchange lies the process of control.

Discussion of the process of control, of course, does not originate with Tannenbaum, but can be traced back to the earliest organizational theorists.

According to Michels (1962:365), for example, control in organizations must inevitably become oligarchic. "It is organization which gives birth to the dominion of the elected over the electors, of the mandataries over the mandators, of the delegates over the delegators. Who says organization says oligarchy."¹ Michels cites a number of arguments in support of the tendency of control to produce organizational oligarchy. In his view, as the official apparatus of an organization becomes more extended and ramified, it becomes increasingly difficult for direct control to be exercised by the rank and file and they are usually replaced by the mechanism of committees which soon acquire increasing power. At the same

¹For a conflicting view see Lipset et al. (1956).
time, leadership is assumed by men with more specialized knowledge and skill—characteristics which widen the gap between themselves and the rank and file. Leaders are further estranged from the rank and file members when they develop a life-style which, although compatible with their current social class affiliations, is incompatible with their original social class origins. Finally, working class-originated leaders can become vain and obsessed with their own infallibility; consequently they develop a love for power itself and make use of many ulterior devices in order to enhance their power. According to Michels, "domocratic" political parties provide an apt example of this oligarchic imperative in the phenomenon of leadership—self-perpetuation. Leaders nominate each other at party congresses as delegates, thus eliminating intergroup competition. The same leaders also control the party press and use it to describe themselves in the most favorable light. They control the party funds and exploit their special information and knowledge of the organization to outmaneuver opponents. The logical conclusion of Michel's pessimistic analysis is inevitable: even if such leaders can be overthrown, the new leaders inevitably become subject to the same oligarchic process and the structure which results from it.

Another early discussion of the question of organizational control can be found in Max Weber. In his classic work The Theory of Social and Economic Organization (1947), Weber
argues that the stability of social systems depends upon the legitimacy, i.e. acceptance by the members of society of the right of leaders to exercise control. Commenting on the Weberian position, Etzioni (1964:51) points out that according to Weber, bureaucratic organizations set norms and need to enforce them if the organization is to function effectively. To a degree, an organization can rely on its own power to make its members obey. In other words, it can use some of its resources to reward those who follow its rulings and to penalize those who do not. But such an exercise of power has the major limitation of keeping the conforming subject alienated. Furthermore, when the power structure of the organization is weakened, the members will tend to prefer whatever other norms they subscribe to rather than the organization's. When, however, the exercise of power is seen by those subject to it as legitimate, i.e. when the rules set down conform to the values to which the subjects are committed, compliance will be deeper and more effective. As Etzioni emphasizes, it is crucial to realize the nature of the power increment which legitimation bestows. It fulfills the need to follow norms which match rather than conflict with one's values. Weber's study of legitimation introduces a whole new dimension to the study of organizational discipline. The concept of legitimation, therefore, underlies Weber's thesis that the stability of social systems depends upon the acceptance by followers of the right of leaders to exercise control.
In elaborating his thesis, Weber (1947:328) defines and distinguishes three types of legitimate authority. First, there is rational legal-authority, which rests on a dual belief in the legality of normative patterns and the right of those elevated to authority under such rules to issue commands according to statutes or rules. Second, there is traditional authority, which rests on an established belief in the sanctity of immemorial traditions and the legitimacy of the status of those exercising authority under them. Finally, there is charismatic authority, which rests on devotion to the specific and exceptional sanctity, heroism, or exemplary character of an individual person and of the normative patterns or order he reveals or ordains. It is quite obvious, therefore, that for Weber the concepts of power, legitimation, and authority were most important in any discussion of organizational control. Power refers to the ability to induce acceptance of orders. Legitimation refers to the acceptance of the exercise of power because it is in line with values held by the subjects. Authority is equal to a combination of the two; it exists when power is seen as legitimate.

Emphasis on the concept of control is also to be found in the writings of organizational theorists coming from the managerial, in contrast to the sociological tradition. Their position is best epitomized in the writings of Frederic W. Taylor (cf. Etzioni, 1964:21 and Mouzelis, 1968:79-88).
Viewing the organization from a managerial frame of reference, such theorists assumed that what was good for management was good for the workers. Workers were looked upon as motivated mainly by economic rewards and enlightened self-interest; the organization was characterized by a clearly defined division of labor, a highly specialized personnel, and a distinct hierarchy of authority with little voice for the worker. In this kind of management theory the idea of control presented little difficulty. A basic operative tenet of this approach is that, if material rewards are closely related to work efforts, the worker will respond to the organization's needs and accept its values by performing with maximum effort.

A final example of early organizational theorists interested in the process of control is provided by the "human relations" school. The basic propositions of this approach were established by the Hawthorne studies conducted by Elton Mayo and his associates (cf. Krupp, 1961). At root, this school represented a reaction against the tradition of scientific management discussed above. Thus, two of its more important propositions were the following: first, the amount of work carried out by a worker (and hence the organization's level of efficiency and rationality) is not determined by a worker's physical capacity, but by his social capacity; second, non-economic rewards play a central role in determining the worker's motivation and happiness. The human relations approach, therefore, emphasized the emotional,
unplanned, non-rational element in organizational behaviour. With respect to our immediate interest in the concept of control, it can be said that the human relations advocates avoided explicit references to social power or control, partly because these terms carried connotations that were inconsistent with the ideal of the harmonious conflict--free organization" (cf. Tannenbaum, 1968:7). Nevertheless, as Tannenbaum goes on to observe:

... much of the human relations research was concerned implicitly with enhancing the control exercised by management, for example, through devising more effective techniques of supervision and through reducing "resistances" on the part of workers to managerial policies. Thus, some advocates of human relations were committed, implicitly at least, to enhancing control within organizations while denying its importance—a contradiction that may have contributed to the charge that human relations was manipulative (1968:7).

Following the lead provided by the early theorists, the concept of control has also been emphasized by many contemporary students of organization. Etzioni (1961), for example, has made considerable use of it in his theory of "compliance." Compliance refers both to a relation in which an actor conforms to a directive supported by another actor's power and to the orientation of the subordinated actor to the power applied. This definition of compliance provides the analytic base for his classification of organizations. This classification is done in three steps: first, one differentiates three kinds of power; second, one specifies three kinds of involvement; finally, one indicates the associations between kinds of power and kinds of involvement. These associations—
which constitute compliance relationships—then serve as an analytic scheme for a classification of organizations. According to Etzioni, the three kinds of power are: coercive, remunerative, normative. Involvement is distinguished as: alienative, calculative, and moral. There are, therefore, nine possible types of compliance.

In the context of the present study, Etzioni's differentiation of power is of more immediate concern. As Tannenbaum (1968:5) has noted, many authors have dealt with the question of organizational control while using different terms. Etzioni is an excellent example of this. He distinguished power from control by defining power as the ability to exercise control: power is an actor's ability to induce or influence another actor to carry out his directives or any other norms he supports (1969:60). Coercive power rests on the application, or the threat of application, of physical sanctions; remunerative power is based on control over material resources and rewards; normative power "rests on the allocation and manipulation of mass media, allocation of esteem and prestige symbols, administration of ritual, and influence over the distribution of 'acceptance' and 'positive response'" (1969:61). For Etzioni, therefore, control is seen primarily in terms of power relationships and it is exercised and maintained through coercive, remunerative, and normative means.

The concept of control used in the present study follows the notion developed by Arnold S. Tannenbaum. In Tannenbaum's formulation (1968:5), control refers to "any
process in which a person or group of persons or organization of persons determines, that is, intentionally affects, the behaviour of another person, group or organization." In keeping with this definition, Tannenbaum has developed for his research studies a descriptive technique which he calls the "control graph." This scheme characterizes the control structure of an organization in terms of two axes, one horizontal, the other vertical (1968:32-33). The horizontal axis is based upon a universal characteristic of formal organizations: the system of hierarchically defined ranks and is used to represent the various hierarchical levels, from low to high, in the organization. The vertical axis, on the other hand, is an indicator of the amount of control which exists in the organization. It represents the total amount of control exercised by all levels of the organization over its policies and actions.

Depending on how much control is exercised by each of the hierarchical groups, it is possible that curves of varying shape might be generated from these axes. Numerous possibilities are illustrated by Tannenbaum's use of four simple prototypes: the democratic, autocratic or oligarchic, laissez-faire or anarchic, and polyarchic organizations. In the democratic organization, the control curve increases as one goes down the hierarchy. Here, it is usually the lower level groups such as the rank and file that have more power. A

\[2\text{See } (\text{Tannenbaum and Kahn, 1957:127-140}) \text{ for a more detailed discussion of the control graph.}\]
descending curve exemplifies the autocratic or oligarchic organization. In other words, control decreases as one goes down the hierarchy. If a curve remains low for all hierarchical levels, then no one exercises much control—a situation which aptly describes the laissez-faire or anarchic organization. Finally, the polyarchic organization generates a curve which remains high at all hierarchical levels; in such an organization, all groups have important influence.

The above typology is important because it helps to illustrate Tannenbaum's emphasis on two distinct aspects of organizational control: the distribution of control, i.e., who or what hierarchically defined groups exercise control over the affairs of the organization, and the amount of control, i.e., how much control is exercised within the organization, from all sources. The shape of the curve thus represents the distribution of control; the average height of the curve, the amount. It is precisely because both these dimensions may vary independently of each other that they must be distinguished. Tannenbaum (1968:55) further maintains that organizations may have the same general distribution of control, even though they vary sharply in the total amount of control they exercise. Likewise, while organizations may be equal in the amount of control they exercise, they might differ markedly in the way this control is distributed. Indeed, such variations have been found among organizations to which the control graph has been applied. Therefore, it is in terms
of these two dimensions that the hypotheses of our study will be formulated. Before, formulating them, however, we will next consider the second major variable of the present study—organizational effectiveness.

Organizational Effectiveness

According to Barnard (cf. March, 1965:1171-1172), effectiveness refers to the attainment of the objectives of the organization. Katz and Kahn (1966:170) see organizational effectiveness as a term which has been subject to numerous and conflicting uses. In attempting to resolve such conflicts, they distinguish several components of effectiveness: efficiency, defined as the ratio of energetic output to energetic input, and potential versus actual efficiency. In the end, they explain organizational effectiveness as the maximization of return to the organization by all means available.

Probably the most detailed treatment of organizational effectiveness is that undertaken by James Price (1968). The purpose of Price's monograph is to "present the core of what the behavioral sciences now know about the effectiveness of organizations: what we really know, what we nearly know, what we think we know, and what we claim we know" (1968:1). At the outset of his review of the literature, Price defines effectiveness much like Barnard—as the degree of an organization's goal achievement. In the ideal order of course, a standardized measure of effectiveness should be developed and applied to all
types of organizations. As is clear from Price’s study, however, no such standardized measure exists; organizational studies dealing explicitly with effectiveness have had to make use of many diverse measures, e.g., productivity, morale, conformity, adaptiveness, and institutionalization. The adequacy of these measures, consequently, clearly depends upon the way in which effectiveness is defined and the nature of the organizations to be analyzed.

In the present study, which is a study of religious orders, it is difficult to measure effectiveness directly in terms of goal attainment. The reason for this is that the goals of religious orders are generally vague and diffuse, if they are defined at all. In using the concept of effectiveness in this study, therefore, we will measure it empirically in terms of variables other than goal attainment while maintaining its theoretical relationship to goal attainment itself. This is why Price is a valuable reference. His insistence on the fact that there is no universal measure of effectiveness and his willingness to use a variety of variables to measure it indicates that the organizational theorist is presently permitted a good deal of latitude in establishing his own criteria of effectiveness.

Our choice of measures for this study will follow the treatment of effectiveness presented by Georgopoulos and Tannenbaum (1957). As has already been noted, the study of organizational effectiveness must contend with
the question of organizational means and ends. Assuming that the organizational system maintains itself, Georgopoulos and Tannenbaum list the most general and important common objectives or organizations as three:

(a) a high output in the sense of achieving the end results for which the organization is designed, whether quantitatively or qualitatively;
(b) ability to absorb and assimilate relevant endogenous and exogenous changes, or the ability of the organization to keep up with the times without jeopardizing its integrity;
(c) the preservation of organizational resources of human and material facilities.

Organizational effectiveness can be studied by gearing all criterion variables to these general aspects of organization.

Organizational effectiveness, therefore, is defined "as the extent to which an organization as a social system, given certain resources and means, fulfills its objectives without incapacitating its means and resources and without placing undue strain upon its members" (Georgopoulos and Tannenbaum: 535-536). The following general criteria are subsumed in this conception of effectiveness:

(1) organizational productivity;

(2) organizational flexibility in the form of successful adjustment to internal organizational changes and successful adaptation to externally induced change;
(3) absence of intraorganizational strain, or tension, and of conflict between organizational subgroups.

It is further assumed that these criteria relate to the means-end (or goal-attainment) dimension of organizations and that they are universally applicable to all organizations. The first relates to the movement of the organization toward its goals (locomotion); the others relate to the requirements of organizational survival in the face of external and internal variability and to the dimension of preservation (or incapacitation) of organizational means.

In this study we will make use of two of Georgopoulos' and Tannenbaum's three general criteria of effectiveness. We will exclude the use of organizational productivity as a criterion of effectiveness because, as Etzioni (1961:77) points out, "productivity in a religious order may be feasible but it is not effective." We will, however, measure effectiveness according to the two other criteria:

-adjustment to internal and external changes,
-and the absence of intraorganizational strain.³

³It is under this concept of preservation of resources that such variables as turnover, absenteeism, morale, and satisfaction could be viewed as criteria of effectiveness.
Religious Orders

A brief review of the social research literature on religious orders is appropriate at this point. Unfortunately, little can be said about the sociology of religious orders, since these groups have received little systematic study. E. K. Francis' (1950:437-449) theoretical analysis of the nature of religious orders as social groups was one of the first attempts to study these groups sociologically. Francis' major effort was to construct a typology of religious orders which would provide some conceptual clarity about the organization of these groups and which in turn could be useful in empirical research. Francis' typology rests on the basic distinction between the community of religiosi (e.g. Benedictine monks) and the religious order (e.g. the Jesuits); these two types are then compared to Toennies' Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft types of social organization. While providing some insights into the origin and development of religious orders within Catholicism, Francis' approach remains historical and theoretical and is of limited value to the sociologist until subjected to empirical analysis. In the end, the sociological implications of Francis' typology are only implied and not substantiated.

A second sociological concern with religious orders can be highlighted by Fichter's (1961) study - Religion as an Occupation. An underlying aim of Fichter's monograph was to bring together the findings of a large number of exploratory
studies (most of them derived from master's theses in sociology done at the University of Notre Dame and the Catholic University of America) together with data collected by church administrators and to place them within the framework of the sociology of occupations. While Fichter's analysis provided a much sharper understanding of religious professionals in the Church, the focus explicitly centered on the individual religious professional or on all religious professionals. Little attention, therefore, was given to specific religious orders as units of analysis, and religious professionals were considered as a single occupational category.

Interest in religious orders as such can be well illustrated by Murphy's studies of religious orders of women. Murphy's investigations focused on attitudes toward change in religious life in specific groups of religious women. In the first of two articles (1964:91-98) Murphy centers on the relationships between the individual member and organizational change in religious communities and views these relationships in terms of a two-fold typology quite different from Francis' earlier effort. According to Murphy, religious relationships fall into one of two types: the "individually oriented" member and the "collectivity oriented" member. Individual-oriented members are more oriented toward change than the collectivity-oriented members. Concomitantly, those who were change-oriented also tended
to reject the lineal orientation (i.e. dependence on higher authority figures in making decisions). Finally, the change-oriented group showed a greater tendency to perceive more members of their own religious group, those of other religious orders, and lay people as being favorable to change than did the non-change group. Murphy's second article also focused on change in women's religious orders (1966:157-169), and in particular, on three associations each of which represented distinctively different orientations: rule-oriented, task-oriented, and profession-oriented. One of the principle findings of her second article was that differences in decision-making seem to bear out the hypothesis that the differences in the original orientation of the three communities tended to result in differences of organizational structure and communication.

The interest in reactions of religious orders to change was continued by Neal (1970) in the first nationwide survey of religious women. In a prior study of Boston clergy, Neal had demonstrated that patterns of belief were significantly related to priests' overall willingness to accept change. In her sisters' survey, Neal again discovered that religious beliefs as held by the members play significant roles in the process of structural change in religious communities. Her research examined the responses of religious orders of women in the United States to the second Vatican Council's Decree on Renewal; in Neal's
analysis, it is Vatican II that constituted the greatest single pressure to change the structures of Catholic religious orders. The aim of the research was to "account for the difference in response of individuals across all orders as well as for the difference between orders in the general pattern of their response as related to their religious beliefs." First and foremost among her hypotheses was that religious belief is a major determinant of (1) receptiveness to change and of (2) the occurrence of change itself. This hypothesis was strongly supported by the data from the sisters' survey, as well as the impact exerted by beliefs on other critical areas affecting the social organization of religious orders.

The last study to concern us is Gannon's analysis (1972) of the internal social organization of Catholic priests in the United States. The basic aim of this study was to investigate the dual organizational classification of clergy into diocesan and religious priests and to assess how far this scheme (or a more refined classification distinguishing between various communities of religious priests) could be helpful in accounting for differences in attitudes and lifestyle within the priestly profession. A number of variables were selected for analysis. It was hypothesized that priests' affiliation with either the diocesan or religious clergy would have consequences primarily for their occupational specialization and job satis-
faction, goal-orientation and membership stability, expressive relationships and experience of conflict, and finally, for their basic religious beliefs and theological perspectives. These consequences were grouped according to Parson's fourfold functional scheme of adaptation, goal-attainment, integration, and pattern-maintenance. On a more general level it was anticipated that the major differences between diocesan and religious clergy would occur in those areas most closely related to the adaptive (e.g. occupational specialization) and to the integrative function (e.g. patterns of priestly friendship). Moreover, few differences were expected between diocesan and religious priests in their theological perspectives and beliefs (the latency function). Finally, in comparing specific subgroups of religious priests, it was anticipated that significant differences would exist between those groups with a higher degree of specialized division of labor, in contrast to groups whose members are occupied in primarily routine tasks (e.g. generalized pastoral activities). The data used in the analysis taken from the National Priesthood Survey conducted by NORC amply confirmed both these general and more specific hypotheses.

For the present study, we have assumed the perspectives of Neal's and Gannon's researches which stress the centrality of the religious order as a unit of analysis. The Fichter and Murphy studies offer some useful background, while Francis' typology provides some helpful material for choosing the
particular orders to be investigated.

Integration and Hypotheses

Before closing this first section of our study and turning our attention to the methodological problems and analysis of the data, a brief integration of the foregoing analysis might be helpful. Robert Merton (1959:XIII) distinguishes three principal components in the formulation of a sociological problem. First is the originating question, a statement of what one wants to know. Second is the rationale, stating why one wants to have the particular question answered. Third is the specifying question that points toward possible answers to the originating question in terms consistent with the rationale of the problem. Following these distinctions, the originating question of the present study can be stated as follows: does the control structure of an organization ultimately determine its effectiveness? The rationale, the "why" of our investigation can be found in the preceding pages. Organizational writers have paid considerable attention to the process of control in organizations. At the same time, Georgopoulos and Tannenbaum (1957:534) maintain that "organizational effectiveness is one of the most complex and least tackled problems in the study of social organizations." The relationship, however, between control and effectiveness has not been an interest in many organizational studies. Consequently, research into
the relationship between these two variables offers a fertile field for investigation. Our specifying question may be simply put: how does the control structure of a religious order ultimately affect the effectiveness of that religious order? This is the question which the remainder of our investigation will address.

In seeking an answer to this question, we will be interested in testing two major hypotheses. These may be stated briefly. In line with Tannenbaum's finding that organizational democracy and effectiveness are closely related, we will expect that (1) the more democratic a religious order is, the more effective it will be. The second major hypothesis deals with the relationship between the total amount of control in a religious order and the order's effectiveness. This hypothesis reads: (2) the more control that exists in a religious order--i.e. the more persons or groups there are who can share in determining individual or group action within that religious order--the more likely it is to be effective; correlatively, the less control, the less effective. The testing of these hypotheses and the interpretation of our findings will be the central concern of this paper. With this in mind, we now turn to a discussion of the methodology of the study.

These hypotheses are not contradictory. In the comparison of organizations, it is quite possible for one organization to be (1) more democratic and to possess (2) more control than other organizations. Furthermore, both of these factors can lead to increased organizational effectiveness. For a discussion of this point, see Tannenbaum (1968:12-14).
II. Data and Research Techniques

The data for this study were drawn from a mailed questionnaire sent to a national sample of U.S. Catholic priests. The questionnaire was designed by the National Opinion Research Center under contract with the United States Catholic Conference (i.e., The American hierarchy). While the NORC sample included both diocesan and religious priests, the present study focuses on only four specific groups of religious priests: the Benedictines, Franciscans, Jesuits, and Vincentians. These groups were chosen to represent distinct organizational types of Catholic clergy: the monastic groups based more or less on a familial-communal model (Benedictines); the evangelical-mendicant which, at least historically, have displayed many characteristics of an organized social movement (Franciscans); the clerical religious order which represents the more rationalized, formal organization model (Jesuits); and the priest-society which most closely resembles the voluntary association (Vincentians). Given the different organizational principles embodied in these groups, it was expected that each would display distinctively different control structures.

The Sample

One of the major advantages of the NORC survey
lies in the size and national representativeness of its sample. According to Gannon (1972:50-56), the basic NORC sample consisted of 7500 priests. This total number included 4500 diocesan drawn from 85 American dioceses and 3000 religious priests drawn from 91 religious orders. The sample was planned and executed according to a two-stage, stratified design. In the first stage, the 98 religious orders in the United States were broken down into 253 sampling units and stratified according to size and geographical region. Of the original sampling units, 91 orders were selected for study. Stratified according to size, the breakdown of the 91 orders was as follows:

29 extra-small (1 to 20 religious priests)
17 small (21 to 50 religious priests)
22 medium (51 to 135 religious priests)
23 large (136 to more than 1000 religious priests)

The geographical region of the order was determined according to the place of residence of the major superior. The regional distribution of the sample was:

29 orders in the Northeast
24 orders in the North Central
17 orders in the West
18 orders in the South
3 orders in other countries (Canada and Japan)

At the second stage of sampling, individual priests were drawn at random from the membership of the selected
units. About twenty priests were drawn from each of the small religious orders, forty from the medium, sixty from the large; in the case of extra small orders, usually the questionnaire was sent to all the members. The sampling lists for order priests were obtained from the lists of all active priests submitted by each religious order that fell in the sample.5

The collection of the data was conducted by NORC during 1969-1970. The first wave of questionnaires was sent out in December, 1969, with subsequent follow-ups on this mailing in January, February and April 1970. A second mailing to the remainder of the sample went out in early February with subsequent follow-ups to this mailing in March and April. The final response rate was 77 per cent which meant a final sample comprising 5500 useable questionnaires. Thus, the sample represents 10 per cent of the total priest population in the United States. The four religious groups chosen for the present study constitute a sub-sample of seven hundred and sixteen (716) religious priests.6 The total N for each group is as follows: Benedictines - 203; Franciscans - 151; Jesuits - 309; Vincentians - 53.

Research Operations and Measures

The research strategy pursued in the following analysis

---

5 The sample procedures pertinent to the diocesan clergy are described in Gannon (1972:338-344).

6 For a more comprehensive understanding of the historical development of religious orders, see Francis (1950), Gannon and Traub (1969), Gannon (1972:30-50).
proceeded in three steps. First, each of the groups was measured and ranked on the variable of control. Second, each group was measured and ranked on the effectiveness variable. Third, the overall relationship between control and effectiveness was determined for all the groups under analysis. With respect to control, we were interested in both its distribution and total amount. This information was acquired by utilizing the control graph developed by Tannenbaum to which reference has already been made. Each respondent was asked:

In general, how much influence do you think the following individuals or groups have in determining policies, and actions in your province, abbey, or institute (cf. question 45A of the NORC priesthood study)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A very great deal</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>A Little</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Do Not Have</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Chapter</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Superior</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistants to Major Superior</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Superior</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Council</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Priests</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Construction of a control graph from the responses to this question is a relatively easy task. The horizontal axis
represents the distribution of control from General Chapter through Individual Priests. The vertical axis represents the levels or amounts of control found in the orders. The vertical axis was constructed on a five point scale from "None" to "A Very Great Deal." Since no respondents answered in the sixth category (i.e., "Do Not Have"), this category was eliminated from the scale. Finally, in order to facilitate construction of the control graph, the responses to the question were recoded so that a value of 5 was given to the response, "A very Great Deal", and a value of 1 was given to the response, "None"

The horizontal axis representing the distribution of control on the control graph constituted our index of democratic control and each of the four groups were ranked according to the average slopes of their respective curves. That religious order having the curve with the steepest average slope was considered the most democratic; second place was assigned to the religious order with the next steepest average slope, etc. These preceding computations were based on the mean scores of all respondents answering the control question.

In using this measure of control we have, in effect, assumed that as a group, members of an organization are able to provide reasonably valid and reliable data on the control structure within their own group. Regarding the legitimacy of this assumption, Tannenbaum (1968:24) points out that:

....the reliability of the measures, which are intended as organizational
indices, is a function of the number of respondents chosen from each of the organizations studied. Thus, although the reliability of scores based on an individual's responses may be low (in the sense that one person's responses per organization correlate poorly with those of other persons in the respective organizations), averaged responses may be quite stable. In most cases, reliability can be improved by increasing the number of informants. (This is analogous to increasing the reliability of a psychological test by increasing the number of items). The fact that individual respondents may be unsure of their answers and that they may be in error does not in itself vitiate the method, provided that respondents give better than chance answers, that the errors are random, and that a sufficient number of respondents are available. Experience with the method suggests that in most cases a minimum of twenty-five to fifty respondents per organizational unit are necessary.)

Since the respective N's of our samples far exceed the minimum suggested by Tannenbaum, we feel that we can safely assume the reliability and validity of the data used in this analysis.

The second major index employed in the present study measures the total amount of control exercised within each religious order from all sources. This index was constructed from the vertical axis of the control graph. This axis can be represented by calculating the average height of each control curve—a procedure which simply requires adding the amounts of control found in the six hierarchical levels of each order as reported by the respondents from each group.
Following Tannenbaum and Georgopoulos, our general theoretical criteria of effectiveness were set as adjustment to internal and external changes and the absence of intra-organizational strain. The concept of "absence of intra-organizational strain," it will be recalled, includes such characteristics as the rate of turnover, morale, and work satisfaction. In operational terms, therefore, effectiveness has been measured in terms of four specific variables: job satisfaction, adjustment to change, turnover, and morale.

Data on job satisfaction was provided by two questions from the NORC survey. The first question sought information about the utilization of individuals' skills. Respondents were asked: "to what extent do you feel you are utilizing your important skills and abilities in your present assignment?" (cf. question 11 of the NORC priesthood survey). The choice of responses ranged on a five point scale from 1, "Not At All," to 5, "A Great Deal." This seemed to be a fair indicator of job satisfaction inasmuch as a low score would certainly reflect some degree of frustration and dissatisfaction with one's present work. A high score, on the other hand, would indicate that an individual felt he was functioning on a level which he perceived as both intellectually and emotionally challenging.

The second question dealing with job satisfaction involves assessment of one's work based on seventeen short-phrase descriptions of such work scored on an integer scale
(1 - 52) with a high score indicating agreement with few unpleasant and many pleasant sounding descriptions. A full theoretical and empirical discussion of this job satisfaction measure is provided by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969). The index was constructed from question 20 of the NORC survey. Respondents were asked:

Think of your present work. What is it like most of the time? In the blank beside each word given below, write ...

Y for "Yes" if it describes your work
N for "No" if it does not describe your work
? if you cannot decide

Work on Present Assignment:

_Fascinating _Tiresome
_Routine _Healthful
_Satisfying _Challenging
_Boring _On your feet
_Good __Frustrating
_Creative _Simple
_Respected _Endless
_Pleasant _Gives sense of
_Useful Accomplishment

In calculating each person's job satisfaction score, a weight of three (3) was recorded for each of the pleasant sounding descriptions affirmed by the respondent; the rejection of
such a job description (i.e., a "No" response) was assigned a score of zero (0); an uncertain reply received a score of one (1). The following recodes held with respect to the unpleasant sounding descriptions: an affirmative response received a score of zero (0); a "No" response, a score of three (3); an "Uncertain" response, a score of one (1). An individual's overall score, therefore, consisted in the sum of the scores on each part of the index plus one (1). This results in a scale ranging from one to fifty-two (1 - 52).

Our second effectiveness measure, adjustment to change, was derived from two questions dealing with changes perceived within the religious group itself. Our aim was to discover the way in which priests reacted to changes that had occurred in their own communities and also to discover whether or not any real change had in fact taken place within that group. Consequently, respondents were asked to circle the code under the category which best fitted their present thinking on the following statements (cf. question 56 of the NORC survey):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Updating has created disorder and confusion which is harmful to our community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our pace of change has lacked a sense of realism and urgency. Adaptation has only been marginal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scores approaching disagreement on both of these statements would seem to indicate that (1) internal changes have been made with reasonable facility and (2) that reasonable adaptation has taken place with respect to the demands made by the contemporary church and society.

Our third measure of organizational effectiveness was organizational turnover. This was measured according to priests' present plans to remain in the clergy or resign from the priesthood (cf. question 75 of the NORC survey). Responses formed a five point scale ranging from "I have definitely decided to leave" to "I definitely will not leave."

The final effectiveness variable was overall happiness in the priesthood (general morale). In this context, two indicators were employed. Respondents were asked: "Taking all things together, how would you say things are these days--would you say you're very happy, pretty happy, or not too happy? Responses were marked on a three point scale from 1 "Not too happy: to 3 "Very happy", (cf. question 79 of the NORC survey). The second question was taken from Bradburn's "hydraulic model" relating to psychological well-being or happiness (1969). In Bradburn's model, it is assumed that psychological well-being results not so much from the total absence of negative feelings or the total presence of positive feelings but from a satisfactory "balance of payments" between positive and negative feelings. In effect there are three scales operative in relation to this
model: a positive affect scale measuring feelings of satisfaction and emotional reward; a negative affect scale recording feelings of frustration and dissatisfaction; an affect balance scale, which is the difference between the other two scales. The three scales are derived from items on question 81 of the NORC survey:

During the past few weeks, did you ever feel --

A. Particularly excited or interested in something?
B. So restless that you couldn't sit long in a chair?
C. Proud because someone complimented you on something you had done?
D. Very lonely or remote from other people?
E. Pleased about having accomplished something?
F. Bored?
G. On top of the world?
H. Depressed or very unhappy?
I. That things were going your way?
J. Upset because someone criticized you?

Response categories to each of these items were "Yes" and "No". The positive affect scale was defined as the number of pleasant emotional experiences out of five that one felt during the past few weeks; the range of scores is 0 - 5 with
a high score indicating many pleasant experiences. The five pleasant emotional experiences referred to in the above question are items A,C,E,G, and I. A response of "Yes" merits a recoded score of 1; a "No" response receives a score of 0. Similarly, the negative affect scale can be defined as the number of unpleasant emotional experiences out of five that one felt during the past few weeks; the range of scores is 0 - 5 with a high score indicating many unpleasant experiences. Unpleasant emotional experiences referred to are items B,D,F,H, and J and the scoring procedure is the same as for the pleasant responses. The overall "affect balance" scale, therefore, is defined as the difference between the number of pleasant emotional experiences out of five and the number of unpleasant ones out of five. The range of scores is -5 to +5, with a high score indicating few unpleasant and many pleasant experiences. This scale was constructed from all ten items mentioned previously and the overall formula is derived by subtracting the negative score from the positive affect score.

Statistical Techniques

Once having defined the indices and measures of effectiveness, it was necessary to determine a suitable procedure for ranking the four religious groups on these effectiveness measures. To clarify the difficulty involved in this kind of ranking, suppose one has a number of solutions to a problem, \( n \) say, which he wishes to rank, and a number of judges, say \( m \), who will each submit a ranking. The obvious way to arrive at a composite or consensus ranking...
is to abide by the choice of the majority of the judges. But how to determine this majority is precisely the problem at hand. It is certainly our problem in relation to the effectiveness measures. The fixed number, $m$, of judges becomes a fixed number of measures of effectiveness (namely 7). The fixed number, $n$, of solutions (or issues) becomes a fixed number of religious orders (namely 4). The problem to be solved, therefore, is which religious order ranks first, second, third, and fourth on all seven effectiveness measures combined. A solution to this problem can be found by following the method provided by Pomeranz and Weil (1970:251-254).

First, preference orderings are calculated for each single measure of effectiveness. In other words, each religious order is ranked in ascending order according to their mean scores on each measure of effectiveness. This results in a preference vector for each measure of effectiveness where the order of the entries in the vector indicates how they ranked on that specific measure. Testing for first place on an overall, composite effectiveness rank is accomplished by constructing a single preference matrix (first used by Garman and Kamien, 1968) for each measure of effectiveness, and then an overall matrix for all measures of effectiveness taken together. The entry in row $r$ and column $c$ of the matrix for a specific effectiveness measure is 1, if religious order $c$ is preferred to religious order $r$; otherwise the entry is 0. Construction of the overall preference matrix is achieved by taking the sum of the individual preference matrices. First
place on the rank order of effectiveness is assigned to a religious order if and only if there is a group whose row in the overall preference matrix has all of its entries less than \( m/2 \) (where \( m \) is the number of measures of effectiveness).

Once we have determined the rank order between groups on democratic control, total control, and effectiveness, then it is possible to test the relationship (a) between democratic control and effectiveness, and (b) between total control and effectiveness. In so doing, we are testing the basic hypotheses of our study. The primary statistical procedure used to test these relationships will be the Kendall Rank Correlation Coefficient (Tau).
III. RESULTS

Analysis of Data on Control

Before looking at the information provided by the overall control graph (Figure 5), let us consider a separate control graph of each religious group. The responses of the Benedictines to the question on control are represented by Figure 1. For the six hierarchical levels we see that the respective mean scores are: 2.49, 1.81, 2.87, 2.30, 2.37, 3.46. This means that individual priests, the assistants to the major superior, and the General Chapter, are the three groups perceived as exerting the most influence in the Benedictines, while the house council, local superior, and major superior are perceived as exerting the least influence. Interestingly enough, it is the individual priests whose influence is seen as greatest with a mean score of 3.46.

Figure 2, representing the Franciscans, presents a slightly different picture. Here the influence of each hierarchical group is viewed as increasing as one goes down the hierarchy. Thus, the mean scores from General Chapter through individual priests are 1.70, 1.74, 2.70, 2.93, 3.13, 3.49. Again, individual priests are seen as having the most influence; but in the Franciscans, those appearing to have the second and third highest influence are the house council
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*Control curve of the Franciscan Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Chapter</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Superior</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. to Major Superior</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Superior</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Council</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiv. Priest</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and local superior. The three groups at the top of the hierarchy--General Chapter, major superior, assistants to major superior--appear to have the least amount of influence in making policy decisions. The control curve presented in Figure 2, therefore, represents the democratic structure referred to by Tannenbaum (1968:32): a rising curve, with the lower hierarchical levels possessing more power than the higher levels.

The Jesuit control structure is outlined in Figure 3. The different hierarchical levels have corresponding mean scores of 2.03, 1.55, 2.47, 2.53, 3.35, 3.35. Except for one obvious deviation (i.e. from General Chapter to major superior), the curve rises steadily through the hierarchical structure, but levels off at the two lowest points (i.e. both the house council and individual priests, each of which has an identical mean score of 3.35). Control over decision making, therefore, is seen as heavily concentrated in these two groups. The next level of influence is seen as exerted by the local superior and, as with the Franciscans, it is the higher hierarchical levels which are perceived to have the least amount of influence (assistants to major superior, General Chapter, and major superior).

Figure 4 illustrates the control structure of the Vincentian priests. Except for the slight drop in influence from assistants to the major superior, the Vincentian curve rises steadily with control increasing as one goes down the
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hierarchy. Therefore, control is seen again as concentrated at the lower hierarchical levels. Individual priests with a mean score of 3.24 and the house council with a mean score of 3.06 have the greatest amount of say in decision and policy making. They are followed by the assistants to major superior and the local superior. The least amount of influence appears to be exercised by the major superior and General Chapter, with mean scores of 1.68 and 1.62 respectively.

Plotting all of the preceding information on one graph facilitates interpretation of the rank orders of each group on democratic control and total control. As can be seen in Figure 5, certain basic similarities and differences exist regarding the way in which control is perceived as distributed in the four groups. Looking at the General Chapter, for example, it becomes clear that this body is seen as exerting most influence among the Benedictines but least among the Vincentians. Likewise, the influence of major superiors is predominant in the Benedictines. For all groups, however, major superiors are seen to have less influence than their assistants. What, then, can be inferred about the overall control structure of these groups? More specifically, how do these groups rank on democratic control and on the total amount of control available and exercised in the group?

The rank order on democratic control was determined by computing the average slope of each of the curves presented in Figure 5. This is accomplished by employing the formula

---

7A procedure which, according to Tannenbaum (1968:62), requires a crude but nevertheless workable assumption of equal scale intervals along both the horizontal and vertical axes.
\[ Y_6 - Y_1 \] for each curve. \( Y_6 \) and \( Y_1 \) are equal to the last and first points plotted. Using this procedure, the control curve for the Benedictines has an average slope of 0.97; the Franciscans have an average slope of 1.79; the Jesuits, 1.32; the Vincentians, 1.62 (cf. Table 1).

The rank order on total control was determined by computing the average height for each curve of Figure 5. By simply adding the amount of control exercised by each hierarchical level for each religious group and taking the average, we arrive at the rank order on total control (cf. Table 2).

The following conclusions emerge from the preceding analysis:

1. The Franciscans and Jesuits are consistent in their ranking on democratic control and total control.
2. The Franciscans, with the highest amount of control, are also the most democratic in their distribution of control.
3. The Benedictines, with the second highest rank on amount of control, rank lowest on level of democratic control.
4. For both the Vincentians and Benedictines, the rank orders of each group on level of democratic control and total amount of control are inversely related; that is, whereas the Vincentians rank higher on democratic control but lower on amount of
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Table 1. Rank Order on Democratic Control.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Groups</th>
<th>Level of Democratic Control*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franciscans</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincentians</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesuits</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedictines</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on the average slope of each control curve

Table 2. Rank Order on Total Control.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Groups</th>
<th>Level of Total Control*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Franciscans</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedictines</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesuits</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincentians</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on the average height of each control curve
control, the Benedictines score lower on democratic control but higher on total control.

Analysis of Data on Effectiveness

The second set of variables to concern us in this study dealt with organizational effectiveness. Table 3 represents the mean scores of all respondents on the measures of effectiveness. Looking at the first variable, utilization of skills, the mean scores (ranging from 4.09 - 4.47 on a five point scale) reflect that most respondents feel that they are utilizing their skills anywhere from "fairly much" to "a great deal". Jesuits and especially the Vincentians, however, score notably higher on skill utilization (or job challenge) than the other two groups.

Row 2 presents the mean scores on Smith's Job Satisfaction Index. Since the index was based on an integer scale of 1 - 52, the scores listed in Table 3 can be described as moderately high. It seems reasonable to conclude, therefore, that the most respondents are reasonably satisfied with the work they are doing. At the same time, some groups have more satisfied members than others: Jesuits with a mean score of 38.89, for example, rank highest on job satisfaction, whereas Franciscans (mean = 37.02) rank lowest.

The third and fourth items in Table 3 deal with the question of organizational change. In particular, item three measured the respondent's evaluation of change within
Table 3. Mean Scores on Measures of Effectiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness Measures</th>
<th>OSB</th>
<th>OSF</th>
<th>SJ</th>
<th>CM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skill Utilization</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>37.64</td>
<td>37.02</td>
<td>38.89</td>
<td>38.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change (Updating)</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change (Adaptation)</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Plans</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.571</td>
<td>4.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Happiness</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Well-Being</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*OSB = Benedictines, OSF = Franciscans, SJ = Jesuits, CM = Vincentians

his own religious group. Responses ranged from a mean score of 2.96 to 3.60 on a five point scale. The Jesuits, with the mean score of 2.96 reported least certainty about how "updating" has affected their communities. At best, their reactions were ambivalent. The remaining three groups, however, generally disagree with the statement that "updating" has been harmful to community living. The Vincentians reveal the strongest negative feelings in this respect.

Item four focused on the perceived sense of realism and urgency with which change (or adaptation) has occurred within each religious group. The mean scores on this variable
ranged from 2.99 to 3.35 on a five point scale. As can be seen in Table 3, change seems to have been most problematic for the Franciscans, whose mean score of 2.99 is the lowest of the four groups. The Vincentians ranked highest (mean = 3.35) on this item, - a response which when interpreted in the light of their general disagreement that change had created confusion within their group (cf. item 3 in Table 3) seems to indicate that of all the groups, the Vincentians have adapted more successfully to the need for change.

The fifth item in Table 3 concerns organizational turnover. These scores give some indication about the plans of American religious priests with respect to leaving or remaining in the priesthood. The higher the score (on a scale of 1 - 5) registered on this item, the stronger the respondent's intention not to resign from the ministry. Since all of the groups scored over 4.4, there seems little danger that organizational turnover in the sense of "departure rate" will be high in any group. The responses also indicate that the average priest's attitude toward his future in the priesthood is strongly positive. It should be observed, however, that the Benedictines are slightly more positive than the other groups.

Finally, items six and seven are measures of morale. Item six treats priests' overall happiness in their vocation. The mean scores on this item range from 2.15 to 2.24 indicating that the average respondent falls somewhere between the level of "pretty happy" to "very happy" in his present
vocation. The Franciscans, however, scored slightly higher on this question than did the other three groups. Our second measure of morale (item 7) was derived from Bradburn's scale of "psychological well-being;" the scale itself ranged from a score of -5 to +5, with a negative score signifying many unpleasant and few pleasant experiences and a positive score signifying many pleasant and few unpleasant experiences. Each of the four groups scored on the positive side of the scale, and as in the case of overall happiness, the Franciscans scored the highest of the four groups.

It will be recalled that effectiveness has been operationally defined in terms of four specific variables: job satisfaction, adjustment to change, turnover, and morale. With this in mind, the following conclusions emerge from the preceding analysis of these variables:

1. The Vincentians and Jesuits appear to be most satisfied with the job they are doing. Vincentians rank first on the "utilization of skills" index followed by the Jesuits. On the Smith Job Satisfaction index, the Jesuits rank first followed by the Vincentians.

2. Change appears to have been least problematic for the Vincentians; this is evidenced by the fact that they scored highest on both questions relating to change.
3. Of all the groups, the Benedictines report the highest level of commitment to remain in the priesthood.

4. Overall morale, however, is highest among Franciscans. The consistency of their responses in this area is demonstrated by their first place rankings on both the overall happiness index and on the index of psychological well-being.

The Relationship of Control and Effectiveness

Having considered each measure of effectiveness separately, the next step of our analysis was to derive a combined ranking for each of the four groups on all effectiveness measures. The procedure used in computing this rank order was outlined in the preceding section of the study. Thus, to provide a standard way of labeling the rows and columns of all the matrices used, rows and (columns) are arbitrarily labeled in the order determined by the first effectiveness measure (i.e., OSB, OSF, SJ, CM). As the preference vector of each measure of effectiveness becomes known, its corresponding, individual preference matrix is generated and added to the overall preference matrix. After matrices have been generated for all measures and summed to form the overall matrix, each row of the overall matrix is scanned for an entry greater than \( m/2 \) (3.5). If such an entry is found,
the religious group represented by that row cannot be awarded first place on this effectiveness ranking, since there is some other group which ranks higher on at least half of the measures of effectiveness. However, if a given row has all its entries less than \( m/2 \), then it will be awarded first place on the effectiveness ranking. Tables 4 to 6 summarize the overall effectiveness rankings for all the groups by providing the following information: an ascending preference order (developed in a preference vector) for each measure of effectiveness over the religious groups (Table 4); preference matrices for each measure of effectiveness (Table 5); an overall preference matrix which is based on the sum of the individual preference matrices (Table 6).

Table 4 provides information of how each religious group ranked on each measure of effectiveness. If we look at the skill utilization measure, for example, the Benedictines rank lowest and the Vincentians score highest. On the job satisfaction index, the Franciscans score the lowest and the Jesuits the highest.

Table 5 lists the individual preference matrices for each measure of effectiveness. A 1 in row \( r \) and column \( c \) indicates that for this measure of effectiveness, the religious group represented in column \( c \) is preferred to that in row \( r \). Observation of the skill utilization matrix, for example, tells us that the Franciscans rank above the Benedictines, the Jesuits rank above both the Benedictines and the
and the Franciscans, the Vincentians rank above the Benedictines, the Franciscans, and the Jesuits.

Table 4. (Ascending) preference order for each measure of effectiveness over the religious orders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness Measures</th>
<th>Preference Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skill Utilization</td>
<td>OSB, OSF, SJ, CM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>OSF, OSB, CM, SJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change (Updating)</td>
<td>SJ, OSB, OSF, CM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change (Adaptation)</td>
<td>OSF, OSB, SJ, CM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Plans</td>
<td>OSF, SJ, CM, OSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Happiness</td>
<td>CM, OSB, SJ, OSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Well-Being</td>
<td>OSB, CM, SJ, OSF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We now inspect the overall matrix (Table 6) in order to discover whether or not there is a row all of whose entries are less than $m/2$. In this analysis, $m/2$ is equal to 3.5. We see that such a row does exist. Every entry in the row representing the Vincentians has a value less than 3.5. The Vincentians, therefore, are awarded first place on the ranking of effectiveness.

By a procedure of elimination and reduction (a variation on the method of Pomeranz and Weil suggested by VandeVelde, 1972), we arrive at the second place ranking. Once the Vincentians' first place ranking was determined, they were
Table 5. Preference matrices for each measure of effectiveness.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness Measures</th>
<th>Preference Matrices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill Utilization</td>
<td>OSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>OSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change (Updating)</td>
<td>OSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change (Adaptation)</td>
<td>OSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Plans</td>
<td>OSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Happiness</td>
<td>OSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Well-Being</td>
<td>OSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A 1 in row r and column c indicates that for this measure of effectiveness, the religious group represented in column c is preferred to that in row r.*
Table 6. Overall preference matrix which is derived by taking the sum of the individual preference matrices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OSB</th>
<th>OSF</th>
<th>SJ</th>
<th>CM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Reduced Overall Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OSB</th>
<th>OSF</th>
<th>SJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
removed from further consideration by deleting the row and the column which represented them. This leaves us with a reduced matrix (Table 7). If we look at the reduced matrix, we see that there is now another row of those remaining, all of whose entries are less than 3.5, namely the Jesuits. Jesuits, consequently, are ranked second on overall effectiveness. By proceeding according to this reduction method, we conclude that the Franciscans merit third place and Benedictines fourth on effectiveness. For comparative purposes, these effectiveness rankings are presented in Table 8 together with the rank orders of the four groups on distribution of control and total control.

Table 8. Rankings of the religious orders on democratic control, total control, and effectiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Orders</th>
<th>Democratic Control</th>
<th>Total Control</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How do these two sets of variables correlate? At the outset of the study, we had hypothesized that effectiveness would be directly related to democratic control; consequently,
more democratic religious groups would also be more effective. Calculating the relationship between democratic control and effectiveness results in a \textit{Tau} value of .33. This suggests a moderately strong relationship between the two variables and provides some evidence for sustaining this hypothesis.

Our second hypothesis anticipated a positive relationship between total control and effectiveness. However, the data revealed a strong negative correlation between these two variables (\textit{Tau} = -.66)—a finding that reverses the hypothesized relationship. Thus, rather than asserting that "the more control the more effective the group", the data indicate that the less control exercised within the group, the higher its effectiveness.

The above findings thus reveal similarities to and differences from Tannenbaum's conclusions regarding control and effectiveness in voluntary groups. Like voluntary organizations, normative organizations like that structuring the clergy reflect the values of their cultural milieu. As Tannenbaum (1968:56) points out, in a culture where democratic values are extolled, a large proportion of rank-and-file members seek to have active influence in the decision-making processes of the organizations to which they belong. In contrast to some existing stereotypes of religious authority structures, the present data demonstrate that in all four religious organizations the members do in fact think they exercise significant influence in the organization's control
structure, even though the perceived influence varies between the groups under analysis. Convergence between the larger cultural values and the more specific control practices of organizations contribute to their effectiveness. For normative organizations, however, there are limits to the impact of values from the surrounding culture. Whereas voluntary group members apparently tend to associate democratic control with an increase in the total volume of control exercised within the organization—an equation which would account for the positive relationship of each variable to effectiveness—the clergy review these two factors as quite distinct phenomena. Not only do the data reveal a zero correlation between the distribution (e.g. democratic) and total amount of control, but the larger the amount of control perceived to exist within a group, the lower its reported level of effectiveness. Some tentative reasons for this phenomenon will be offered in the concluding section of the study.
IV. Discussion

One of the more interesting findings of the present study relates to the distribution of control. Surprisingly, each of the four groups seems to fit the democratic model—having a curve that is high for the rank and file (i.e., individual priests) and relatively low for the higher echelon individuals or groups of individuals. For the four orders studied, therefore, it is the lower levels in the hierarchical structure who perceive themselves as exerting the most influence in making policy decisions.

This finding raises the question of what factors determine the distribution of control in religious orders. The traditional view of religious orders usually conceives them as strongly hierarchical (even monarchical) organizations in which rules, regulations, and policies are imposed from above. Evidence from the present study, however, severely challenges this long accepted understanding.

On the other hand, there is clear evidence from the constitutions of all these orders that superiors do possess the largest amount of juridical authority in each specific group. How does one explain, then, the autonomy and democracy which appear endemic to these contemporary religious orders? Before addressing this question, we should briefly but more carefully compare our findings.
with the formal constitution and "rule" of these four orders. Specifically, how is the control process formally understood, as it is written down?

In writing on the Benedictines, Knowles points out that the Benedictine rule knows of no confederation of monks beyond the individual abbey (1930:46). Each individual abbey is an autonomous entity and, consequently, one cannot speak of a Benedictine "order" in the same way as one speaks of a Jesuit "order" with provinces, provincials, and a superior general. It is clear from the Benedictine rule that the abbot is the keystone of the monastery; it is he who issues directives and commands and it is to him that the monks owe absolute obedience. Knowles also points out, however, that the rule strongly encourages development of a mos majorum; such customs often take the place of direct commands of the abbot (p.42). Therefore, while the Benedictine rule gives wide power to the abbot, at the same time it emphasizes the necessity of cooperation between the abbot and the monks. In the third chapter of the rule, for example, which treats of the important calling in of the monks to give counsel, it is clear that this counsel involves not only seeking advice but often permission to act in a certain way.

The organization of the Franciscans, on the other hand, is quite different from the Benedictines'. Brady (1953:173-179) describes the Franciscan hierarchical structure in terms of the roles fulfilled by the minister general,
the minister provincial, and the chapter. According to the Franciscan rule, the minster general is the head of the order. In his hands rests the ultimate power and authority. With the growth of the order came a demand for the demarcation of provinces, and the office of minister provincial was instituted for the closer government of the friars in the various provinces or parts of the world. The minister provincial thus assumed the duties of the minister general for the friars subject to them. Finally, the chapter of the order, which is made up of the minster general and the minister provincials, possesses both a consultative and a legislative authority. Their decisions and regulations are communicated to individual provinces by means of provincial chapters. It is evident, therefore, that according to Franciscan rule and tradition, a definite hierarchical chain of command exists. Nevertheless, the role of the Franciscan superior must be seen in its complete context. The name minister epitomizes the whole concept of the Franciscan superior; his main duty lies primarily not in ruling and commanding but in serving the needs of the friars.

The ultimate source of authority in the hierarchical structure of the Jesuit order is the superior general. According to the constitutions of the Society of Jesus (cf. Canss, 1970:317), the general "may command in virtue of obedience all the members in regard to everything conducive to the end which the Society seeks. And although he communicates his authority to other superiors, he may approve
or revoke what they did and regulate everything according to what seems good to him." After the general, authority flows first to his four general assistants, then to provincial superiors, and finally to superiors of local houses. The exercise of authority, which once followed strongly patriarchal patterns, now operates in a dominantly bureaucratic manner; i.e., by a rational-legal chain of command.

Unlike the Franciscans and the Jesuits, the Vincentians are not a religious order in the strict sense of the term. Vincentians take simple vows without any solemnity or formal consecration; these vows are not accepted by the superior either in the name of the Church or in the name of the Congregation. Simple vows taken under such conditions are not the vows of religious. In other respects, however, the Vincentians are much like the Jesuits. According to Coste (1934:474), the Rules of the Vincentians are largely based on the Rules of the Society of Jesus; in many instances even the phraseology of the original has been reproduced. Supreme authority resides in the General Assembly. The superior general is elected for life and he is aided by four assistants elected by the General Assembly and by a Secretary General and Procurator General chosen by himself. Authority passes to the local level through individual house superiors and their assistants.

This brief review of the formal, juridical systems
of the four religious orders suggests that the distribution of authority as perceived by the respondents and reported in the present data departs from the formal system described in each order's official statements. While some autonomy at the lower levels is provided by the constitutions of all groups, it remains true that a definite hierarchical chain of command formally exists. How then can one explain the findings of the present study (and we caution that these findings are derived from perceived responses and based upon analytical and not contextual properties)?

Hoxie's (1923) investigation of business unions emphasized that, where "bread and butter" goals are concerned such as the pursuit of higher wages, internal discipline and autocratic control is stressed. Howe and Widick (1949) make the further suggestion that unions whose interests focus on broader social functions and problems (e.g. political action, the general welfare of the community) tend to be more democratically controlled. As has already been mentioned, the goals of religious orders are diffuse and rarely clearly defined. But it is also probably correct to say that the scope of their interests is broad and more likely includes such concerns as the promotion of individual and community welfare. With this in mind, a tentative and partial interpretation of the existence of democratic control structures in religious orders is that such groups are primarily directed not toward "bread and butter goals" but rather toward "broader social and individual orientations."
It is also likely that the present control structures observable in religious orders are related to the size of these organizations. Downs (1966) defines any organization as "large" in which the "highest ranking members know less than half of all the other members." By this definition, the four religious orders under investigation are large. Relating to size, Downs (P. 143) speaks of three basic principles of organizational control, the second of which is called the Law of Diminishing Control: the larger any organization becomes, the weaker is the control over its actions exercised by those at the top. This second principle is pertinent here. In general, religious orders dramatically increased in membership after the Second World War. According to Downs' principle, such an increase would be accompanied by a loss of control at the top. The lower levels of hierarchical control reported in the preceding analysis appear to provide independent support of Downs' law of diminishing control. Thus, one apparent result of the gradual evolution of religious orders over the last one or two decades has been a shift in control from autocratic and oligarchic forms to democratic forms. At the same time, one can reasonably hypothesize that this evolution reached its climax with Vatican II.

The reality of Vatican II merits further comment. Another of Downs' principles is the Law of Counter Control: the greater the effort made by a sovereign or top-level official to control the behavior of subordinate officials,
the greater the efforts made by those subordinates to evade or counteract such control (p. 147). Furthermore, agreement among subordinates tends to reduce the control their joint superior is able to exercise over them (p. 148). Neal (1970) has shown the effect which Vatican II exercised on the belief perspectives of religious professionals. It can also be suggested that Vatican II created an environment which enabled such Downsian principles, at least in modified form, to become operative in religious orders. This interpretation is easily applicable to the Law of Counter Control, according to which members of religious orders felt free enough to question, if not actively to counteract, policies formulated and imposed from above. Moreover, with its emphasis on the need for renewal in all religious orders, Vatican II tended to facilitate growth of a new cohesiveness and homogeneity among large sections of the rank and file clergy. Insofar as such cohesion has developed, one can talk about "agreement among subordinates" and "reduction of control over them." Both these factors would certainly be conducive to building democratic control structures of the type found in this study.

Vatican II's own statements lend support to this suggestion. In the words of the decree on the appropriate renewal of religious life: (1966:469):

The manner of living, praying and working should be suitably adapted to the physical and psychological conditions of
today's religious and also, to the extent required by the nature of each community, to the needs of the apostolate, the requirements of a given culture, the social and economic circumstances everywhere.

The decree goes on to point out that the way in which religious orders are governed should also be reexamined in the light of these same standards. With this strong emphasis on the need for renewal, it is not unlikely that restructuring of machinery has actually occurred in the manner indicated by this study, specifically, in the control structures of religious organizations. These structures tend to have become more democratic and appear to be more effective than prior to Vatican II.

In attempting to explain the observed relationship between less control and greater effectiveness, the nature of the organization is of critical concern. The organizations studied in the present investigation are normative organizations. This means that members' participation in the organization can be characterized in Etzioniian terminology as motivated by "moral involvement." This is a positive motivation and suggests intense commitment. Under such conditions, the need for a great volume of control is considerably less than what might be required for organizational effectiveness in other types of organizations. Given this normative character, in fact, an excessive volume of control might well have an alienating effect.

Members belong to and function within such organizations not because of coercion or remuneration, but
rather because their identification with the organization is so strong that they have internalized its values, norms, and interests. Given this identification, a large amount of total control could be superfluous, even alienating, since such control can be interpreted as a questioning of the members' sense of responsibility and commitment to the organization. Nor is it surprising that initiative in setting and formulating policy can be a type of "grass roots" experience in this kind of organization. The data analyzed in the present study illustrate that members feel they are working in democratically controlled organizations. We might conclude, therefore, that normative organizations (e.g. the four orders of this study) characterized by a democratic control structure, require less exercise of control from other levels of the organization to maintain effectiveness. Thus, because these organizations are both normative and democratic and consequently assume strong and positive membership commitment, less control is required over the members to maintain effectiveness. Further, since individual members exercise the most control and are primarily responsible for many policy implementations, less control is required from other organizational levels to insure conformity and sustain effectiveness.

**Conclusions**

While the NORC data enable us to draw these tentative conclusions, we must also point out certain limitations regarding the design of the present study which caution
against facile over-generalization. With respect to control, it is possible that religious members' perception of the way control is distributed is quite different from the de facto situation. The control structures of the four religious orders have been inferred rather than deduced from the data. The measures utilized were the perceived responses of individuals; these measures were based upon analytical (i.e., member responses) and not contextual properties (i.e., characteristics of the whole unit) of organizations. Use of more objective measures would be desirable in any further research. Regarding effectiveness, this has been measured by the four variable index described. This overall effectiveness index, however, needs further refinement. A determination of the goals of religious orders and a subsequent analysis of the context of religious authority in specific orders would also be of great benefit. Again, such analysis should be part of any further research on organizational control in clergy groups.
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