

**Technical Summary
Survey of Denominational Leadership Attitudes
Presbyterian Church in America
Fall, 2004-Spring, 2005**

**Douglas R. Sizemore, Ph.D.
Consulting Statistician**

June, 2005

Technical Summary
Survey of Denominational Leadership Attitudes
Presbyterian Church in America

Background and Introduction

Some time ago the Administrative Committee (AC) of the Presbyterian Church in America (PCA) appointed a Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) to examine the state of the denomination and its several agencies, make a fresh delineation of the denomination's mission and the implementation of that mission for the future through a long range strategic plan. Chaired by Frank Brock, former president of Covenant College, the SPC soon realized a need to assess the current attitudes of the leadership of the denomination to better understand the sentiment of the leadership at that time.

As a response to the perceived need to know more concerning PCA leadership attitudes a Survey Task Force (STF) was created from members of the SPC, to develop, conduct, and analyze a survey of the ordained and unordained leadership of the PCA. The main goal of the survey was to identify the current attitudes of the leadership toward the denomination and use this knowledge as part of the input to the design of the long range strategic plan.

In August, 2004, Frank Brock asked the author to provide statistical support for the survey effort. This support consisted of the definition of an appropriate sample frame to ensure, as much as possible, a statistically valid and representative sample of the ordained and unordained leadership of the PCA.

Initial Constraints

Survey design and development had severe constraints from the beginning. The entire budget for the project totaled \$25,000.00. In addition, the survey analysis and results were needed by late January for presentation to the SPC and for later review by the General Assembly of the PCA in June. Finally, there was a substantial limit on the number of individuals that could help directly with the survey process. These limits of money, time, and personnel quickly defined the usable survey models available.

Survey Approach

Given the above constraints the implementation of a standard “household” type survey with the listing of the denominational leaders and then the actual interviewing of a sample of these individuals was dismissed early in the survey design. The method that seemed to utilize the available resources best was a Web based survey where sampled participants would complete the survey questionnaire by accessing the World Wide Web (WWW). The firm, Team Resources and their President, James Wert, were contracted to provide the Web link as well as design the survey instrument to be distributed by means of the Web.

Definition of the Sampling Frame and Sample Design

The mandate to the author was to identify a sampling method that would, within the resources available, ensure a representative and valid sample for the survey. A strong temptation would be to simply select a simple random sample (SRS) of churches from the denomination, identify the leaders in each church, inform them of the survey web site and request their participation in the survey. However, the PCA is a more complex organization than would be represented by this approach. Using this approach would

have risked the generation of a sample of denominational leaders that would not have represented the denomination as accurately as possible.

Again, keeping the limited resources in mind, the author identified a sampling frame that would ensure, as much as possible, a representative sample of the PCA leadership. This sample was a stratified, clustered sample where the strata were the PCA presbyteries and the clusters were the churches within each presbytery. Although more complex, this approach to sampling ensured the selection of a representative sample of the leaders within the denomination.

Once the type of sample design had been identified the number of leaders to sample had to be determined. Ms. Diane Hitzfeld, a consultant with the denomination, provided key information that eased the task of developing the sampling frame and defining the probabilities of church and leader selection. The participants in the survey were to be contacted by email. Administratively there was a need for considerable work to secure the email addresses of the survey participants. Each participant would be emailed the invitation to participate in the survey and be informed of the web site address to use to complete the questionnaire. There was also considerable follow-up attempts to encourage individual leaders to participate. The volume of this work limited the number of individual leaders that could be included in the sample. The work of identifying churches and individual leaders fell to Ms. Hitzfeld, who performed these tasks most professionally.

To estimate the sample size required for a desired response rate had to be identified. Typically, previous response rates are used to estimate the new response rate for a new survey. The PCA had never conducted a formal sample survey in its history.

Thus, there was no prior response rates to guide the setting of the current response rate.

With no history of sample survey within the denomination the decision was made to use a 65 percent (65%) response rate for the survey. The decision to use this value came from two sources. First, Ms. Hitzfeld provided the author with the PCA Fact Sheet for 2003 (the fact sheet is published by the PCA annually and this was the most current sheet we had at our disposal). Second, the response rate for the clergy survey of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (PCUSA) was also obtained. Both sources had a response rate of 65%. Although the author suspected the actual response rate would be much lower than the proposed 65%, to obtain a standard error of a proportion of approximately 0.01, 2000 completed questionnaires would be needed. For a rate of return of, say, 25 percent (25%) this means we would need a total of $2000/0.25$ or 8000 participants in the initial sample. As of 2003 there were 18380 ordained leaders in the PCA. A return rate of 65% requires $2000/0.65$ or 3077 participants in the initial sample. Due to the overwhelming task of tracking an initial sample of 8000 leaders, the 65% return rate was used with a targeted initial sample of 3000 leaders.

Once the response rate and initial sample size were determined, the sampling frame was constructed based on the PCA Fact Sheet from 2003 as referenced above. In 2003 there were 64 presbyteries in the denomination. These were used as strata in the sampling frame and sample design. The churches located within each presbytery were used as clusters. An average number of leaders per church per presbytery was found to be 11.01. This was raised to 12 from informal discussion with task force

members. The summary calculations for the sampling frame and sample design by presbytery are given in Tables I and II on the next two pages.

Once the decision was made to select $n = 3000$ leaders from the 64 presbyteries, these participants had to be associated with specific churches as the primary sampling unit (PSU) or cluster was the local church. Thus, for each presbytery, a random sample of churches and not individuals were selected to participate in the survey. All ordained leaders and a church driven selection of unordained lay leaders were then selected from each participating church. Thus, the sample is random to the church level and partially non-random in the selection of the unordained lay leaders from each church. This is the best that could be done as the enumeration of all ordained and unordained leaders within churches would have quickly exceeded the survey budget.

With a sample size of $n = 3000$ and an average number of leader estimates of 12 the number of churches to randomly select from each presbytery was calculated as follows:

$$\text{Proportion of churches within presbytery } X_i = \frac{\text{\# of churches within presbytery } X_i}{\text{Total \# of churches in the PCA}}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{\# of surveys for presbytery } X_i &= \\ \text{Initial sample size, } n_s = 3000 &\times \\ \text{Proportion of churches within presbytery } X_i & \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{\# churches to randomly select for presb. } X_i &= \\ \frac{\text{\# of surveys for presbytery } X_i}{\text{adjusted avg \# of leaders per church in PCA} = 12} & \end{aligned}$$

The above calculations were completed for each of the 64 presbyteries (Tables I and II).

Table I
PCA Leadership Attitude Survey
Fall 2004
Definitions: Sampling Frame

Presbytery	Communicant Members	Non-Communicant Members	Total Membership	Number of Elders	Number of Deacons	Total No. of Officers	Total No. of Ministers	Total No. of Leaders	No. of Churches In Presbytery
Ascension	2279	519	2798	74	66	140	38	178	18
Blue Ridge	3258	1049	4307	69	76	145	34	179	15
Calvary	6554	1697	8251	213	196	409	87	496	41
Central Carolina	6412	2321	8733	164	168	332	78	410	40
Central Florida	7396	1772	9168	151	133	284	80	364	26
Central Georgia	6396	1204	7600	193	188	381	83	464	38
Chesapeake	8287	2589	10876	189	187	376	65	441	29
Covenant	7035	1744	8779	212	206	418	79	497	48
Eastern Canada	206	139	345	7	6	13	15	28	9
Eastern Carolina	2641	733	3374	69	72	141	44	185	21
Evangel	11982	3173	15155	291	334	625	122	747	43
Fellowship	3523	681	4204	108	81	189	23	212	13
Grace	3689	477	4166	190	156	346	44	390	37
Great Lakes	2065	527	2592	64	43	107	32	139	15
Gulf Coast	4144	734	4878	141	130	271	57	328	30
Heartland	1547	668	2215	51	46	97	34	131	15
Heritage	3512	939	4451	86	88	174	41	215	22
Illiana	1098	195	1293	23	35	58	22	80	12
Iowa	833	241	1074	14	21	35	11	46	7
James River	4714	1049	5763	106	138	244	50	294	23
Korean Capital	3923	419	4342	31	112	143	58	201	26
Korean Central	2515	558	3073	32	227	259	65	324	24
Korean Eastern	2665	222	2887	30	332	362	43	405	30
Korean Northwest	691	92	783	7	84	91	30	121	16
Korean Southeastern	1399	123	1522	16	414	430	37	467	21
Korean Southern	204	60	264	5	1	6	26	32	15
Korean Southwest	3282	294	3576	19	1052	1071	62	1133	27
Louisiana	897	145	1042	28	30	58	16	74	10
Metro NY	2125	374	2499	60	80	140	63	203	32
Mississippi Valley	8923	1828	10751	293	324	617	90	707	49
Missouri	4926	794	5720	102	128	230	84	314	23
Nashville	6794	2223	9017	111	123	234	49	283	16
New Jersey	796	254	1050	31	32	63	23	86	11
New River	637	95	732	37	29	66	14	80	12
New York State	1276	349	1625	42	48	90	20	110	10
North Florida	3510	1173	4683	72	69	141	27	168	15
North Georgia	11918	3281	15199	398	290	688	143	831	56
North Texas	7600	2385	9985	119	155	274	75	349	30
Northern California	1787	441	2228	55	27	82	45	127	23
Northern Illinois	6008	845	6853	128	128	256	59	315	34
Northern New England	389	126	515	17	10	27	11	38	9
Ohio Valley	2643	616	3259	99	90	189	51	240	24
Pacific	1041	284	1325	32	31	63	36	99	15
Pacific Northwest	2787	762	3549	71	70	141	64	205	29
Palmetto	9478	2923	12401	259	296	555	89	644	45
Philadelphia	7506	2027	9533	173	212	385	130	515	31
Piedmont Triad	1695	422	2117	55	64	119	19	138	10
Pittsburgh	2910	823	3733	115	106	221	35	256	22
Potomac	4874	1734	6608	131	133	264	56	320	31
Rocky Mountain	3185	1225	4410	66	53	119	62	181	21
Siouxlands	1429	245	1674	49	49	98	24	122	16
South Coast	1758	158	1916	38	39	77	40	117	13
South Texas	4152	1263	5415	110	102	212	62	274	34
Southeast Alabama	5371	1204	6575	184	174	358	48	406	33
Southeast Louisiana	1109	226	1335	31	38	69	15	84	10
Southern Florida	18078	2712	20790	172	192	364	98	462	40
Southern New England	1111	204	1315	31	24	55	30	85	15
Southwest	2254	463	2717	52	68	120	38	158	18
Southwest Florida	4497	897	5394	129	135	264	60	324	31
Susquehanna Valley	3763	980	4743	89	93	182	55	237	19
Tennessee Valley	8392	1740	10132	227	279	506	93	599	33
Warrior	1683	184	1867	92	94	186	22	208	29
Western Carolina	4267	704	4971	139	102	241	70	311	29
Westminster	2357	491	2848	80	89	169	34	203	23
Totals (Sums):	256176	60819	316995	6472	8598	15070	3310	18380	1562

Table II
PCA Leadership Attitude Survey
Fall 2004
Sample Design: Calculations

Presbytery	Proportion of Total Membership	Proportion of Total No. of Officers	Proportion of Total No. of Leaders	Proportion of Total No. of Churches	Average # of Officers Per Presbytery	Average # of Leaders Per Church	# of Surveys for Presbytery	# of Churches to select	Ratio of # of Churches Selected to # of Churches in Presbytery
Ascension	0.00882664	0.00929	0.009684	0.011524	7.7777778	9.8888889	35	3	0.16666667
Blue Ridge	0.01358697	0.009622	0.009739	0.009603	9.6666667	11.9333333	29	2	0.13333333
Calvary	0.0260288	0.02714	0.026986	0.026248	9.97560976	12.097561	79	7	0.170731707
Central Carolina	0.02754933	0.022031	0.022307	0.025608	8.3	10.25	77	6	0.15
Central Florida	0.02892159	0.018845	0.019804	0.016645	10.9230769	14	50	4	0.153846154
Central Georgia	0.02397514	0.025282	0.025245	0.024328	10.0263158	12.2105263	73	6	0.157894737
Chesapeake	0.03430969	0.02495	0.023993	0.018566	12.9655172	15.2068966	56	5	0.172413793
Covenant	0.02769444	0.027737	0.02704	0.03073	8.70833333	10.3541667	92	8	0.16666667
Eastern Canada	0.00108835	0.000863	0.001523	0.005762	1.44444444	3.11111111	17	1	0.111111111
Eastern Carolina	0.0106437	0.009356	0.010065	0.013444	6.71428571	8.80952381	40	3	0.142857143
Evangel	0.04780833	0.041473	0.040642	0.027529	14.5348837	17.372093	83	7	0.162790698
Fellowship	0.01326204	0.012541	0.011534	0.008323	14.5384615	16.3076923	25	2	0.153846154
Grace	0.01314216	0.02296	0.021219	0.023668	9.35135135	10.5405405	71	6	0.162162162
Great Lakes	0.00817679	0.0071	0.007563	0.009603	7.13333333	9.26666667	29	2	0.133333333
Gulf Coast	0.01538826	0.017983	0.017845	0.019206	9.03333333	10.9333333	58	5	0.16666667
Heartland	0.00698749	0.006437	0.007127	0.009603	6.46666667	8.73333333	29	2	0.133333333
Heritage	0.01404123	0.011546	0.011697	0.014085	7.90909091	9.77272727	42	4	0.181818182
Illiana	0.00407893	0.003849	0.004353	0.007682	4.83333333	6.66666667	23	2	0.16666667
Iowa	0.00338807	0.002322	0.002503	0.004481	5	6.57142857	13	1	0.142857143
James River	0.0181801	0.016191	0.015996	0.014725	10.6086957	12.7826087	44	4	0.173913043
Korean Capital	0.01369738	0.009489	0.010936	0.016645	5.5	7.73076923	50	4	0.153846154
Korean Central	0.00969416	0.017186	0.017628	0.015365	10.7916667	13.5	46	4	0.16666667
Korean Eastern	0.0091074	0.024021	0.022035	0.019206	12.0666667	13.5	58	5	0.16666667
Korean Northwest	0.00247007	0.006038	0.006583	0.010243	5.6875	7.5625	31	3	0.1875
Korean Southeastern	0.00480134	0.028534	0.025408	0.013444	20.4761905	22.2380952	40	3	0.142857143
Korean Southern	0.00083282	0.000398	0.001741	0.009603	0.4	2.13333333	29	2	0.133333333
Korean Southwest	0.01128094	0.071068	0.061643	0.017286	39.6666667	41.962963	52	4	0.148148148
Louisiana	0.00328712	0.003849	0.004026	0.006402	5.8	7.4	19	2	0.2
Metro NY	0.00788341	0.00929	0.011045	0.020487	4.375	6.34375	61	5	0.15625
Mississippi Valley	0.03391536	0.040942	0.038466	0.03137	12.5918367	14.4285714	94	8	0.163265306
Missouri	0.01804445	0.015262	0.017084	0.014725	10	13.6521739	44	4	0.173913043
Nashville	0.02844524	0.015528	0.015397	0.010243	14.625	17.6875	31	3	0.1875
New Jersey	0.00331236	0.00418	0.004679	0.007042	5.72727273	7.81818182	21	2	0.181818182
New River	0.00230918	0.00438	0.004353	0.007682	5.5	6.66666667	23	2	0.16666667
New York State	0.00512626	0.005972	0.005985	0.006402	9	11	19	2	0.2
North Florida	0.0147731	0.009356	0.00914	0.009603	9.4	11.2	29	2	0.133333333
North Georgia	0.04794713	0.045654	0.045212	0.035851	12.2857143	14.8392857	108	9	0.160714286
North Texas	0.03149892	0.018182	0.018988	0.019206	9.13333333	11.6333333	58	5	0.16666667
Northern California	0.0070285	0.005441	0.00691	0.014725	3.56521739	5.52173913	44	4	0.173913043
Northern Illinois	0.02161864	0.016987	0.017138	0.021767	7.52941176	9.26470588	65	5	0.147058824
Northern New England	0.00162463	0.001792	0.002067	0.005762	3	4.22222222	17	1	0.111111111
Ohio Valley	0.01028092	0.012541	0.013058	0.015365	7.875	10	46	4	0.16666667
Pacific	0.00417988	0.00418	0.005386	0.009603	4.2	6.6	29	2	0.133333333
Pacific Northwest	0.01119576	0.009356	0.011153	0.018566	4.86206897	7.06896552	56	5	0.172413793
Palmetto	0.03912049	0.036828	0.035038	0.028809	12.3333333	14.3111111	86	7	0.155555556
Philadelphia	0.03007303	0.025547	0.02802	0.019846	12.4193548	16.6129032	60	5	0.161290323
Piedmont Triad	0.00667834	0.007896	0.007508	0.006402	11.9	13.8	19	2	0.2
Pittsburgh	0.01177621	0.014665	0.013928	0.014085	10.0454545	11.6363636	42	4	0.181818182
Potomac	0.02084575	0.017518	0.01741	0.019846	8.51612903	10.3225806	60	5	0.161290323
Rocky Mountain	0.01391189	0.007896	0.009848	0.013444	5.66666667	8.61904762	40	3	0.142857143
Siouxlands	0.00528084	0.006503	0.006638	0.010243	6.125	7.625	31	3	0.1875
South Coast	0.00604426	0.005109	0.006366	0.008323	5.92307692	9	25	2	0.153846154
South Texas	0.01708229	0.014068	0.014908	0.021767	6.23529412	8.05882353	65	5	0.147058824
Southeast Alabama	0.02074165	0.023756	0.022089	0.021127	10.8484848	12.3030303	63	5	0.151515152
Southeast Louisiana	0.00421142	0.004579	0.00457	0.006402	6.9	8.4	19	2	0.2
Southern Florida	0.06558463	0.024154	0.025136	0.025608	9.1	11.55	77	6	0.15
Southern New England	0.00414833	0.00365	0.004625	0.009603	3.66666667	5.66666667	29	2	0.133333333
Southwest	0.00857111	0.007963	0.008596	0.011524	6.66666667	8.77777778	35	3	0.16666667
Southwest Florida	0.01701604	0.017518	0.017628	0.019846	8.51612903	10.4516129	60	5	0.161290323
Susquehanna Valley	0.01496238	0.012077	0.012894	0.012164	9.57894737	12.4736842	36	3	0.157894737
Tennessee Valley	0.03196265	0.033577	0.03259	0.021127	15.3333333	18.1515152	63	5	0.151515152
Warrior	0.00588968	0.012342	0.011317	0.018566	6.4137931	7.17241379	56	5	0.172413793
Western Carolina	0.01568164	0.015992	0.016921	0.018566	8.31034483	10.7241379	56	5	0.172413793
Westminster	0.00898437	0.011214	0.011045	0.014725	7.34782609	8.82608696	44	4	0.173913043
Totals (Sums):	1	1	1	1	8.93462851	11.0197908	3001	251	0.160605056
					8.41323693	10.3383737			
					Average	Average			
					Median	Median			

To illustrate we can take Ascension Presbytery as our example. The calculations corresponding to the above formulas are as follows:

$$\frac{18 (\# \text{ ch. in Ascension Pres.})}{\text{Total Ch. PCA} = 1562} = \text{prop. ch. in presb.} = 0.011524$$

$$\# \text{ surveys in presb.} = n_s \Rightarrow 3000 \times \text{prop. ch. in presb.} = 0.011524$$

$$\# \text{ surveys in presb.} = 35$$

$$\# \text{ of ch. to randomly select for presb.} = \frac{\# \text{ surveys presb.} = 35}{\text{Adj. avg. \# leaders per church} = 12}$$

$$\# \text{ of ch. to randomly select for presb.} = 3$$

These calculations, computed for each of the 64 presbyteries, provided for the random selection of 251 churches representing 3001 ordained leaders in the initial sample. Thus, the initial sampling fraction of ordained leaders was 0.1633 and the sampling fraction for churches was 0.1607.

Using the number of churches to be sampled for each presbytery and a denominational list of churches provided by Ms. Diane Hitzfeld, these churches were randomly selected from the total list of churches for each presbytery. This process was accomplished using the pseudo-random number generator in a statistical software product called MINITAB.

Administration of the Survey

Once the sample of churches was identified, the leaders for each church needed to be identified. For each church in the sample, all ordained leadership and a church-defined selection of unordained lay leadership were identified as participants in the sample. As each survey participant would be contacted via email and complete the survey over the World Wide Web, each participant's email address was identified.

An email was then sent to each leader participating in the survey. The email message informed each participant of the goals of the survey and how to access the

survey by means of the World Wide Web. Each participant was to locate the survey web site online and complete the survey. Survey responses were captured electronically and collected by Team Resources, Inc. Participants were allowed to complete the survey in a first time window ending in late December, 2004, trying to avoid the holiday season. In this time window $n = 802$ surveys were completed. The survey completion window was then extended until the end of January and the sample size increased to $n = 873$.

Substitution and Linking

The securing of email addresses from the leader participants proved to be somewhat troublesome. The actual coverage of email addresses was strong but a number of leaders proved to not have a valid email address. To maximize the survey sample size this problem was addressed by implementing a carefully constructed subject substitution procedure. Although not normally implemented in large national household surveys, the procedure was necessary here to ensure as large a sample as possible. The procedure involved the random selection of a “replacement church” for a presbytery when a selected church was unavailable for participation in the survey. There were numerous reasons for a church not participating in the survey. Some churches outright refused while others were not meeting anymore. Some churches had little or no computer networking and/or email capability to complete the survey. Ms. Hitzfeld and the author conducted three administrations of the substitution procedure within the total time window of the survey. Each administration represented a smaller group of randomly selected substitute churches. The effect of substitution is the alteration of the initial probabilities of church selection within presbyteries. However, in this case this did not represent a large percentage of the churches and the presbyteries and ensured the capture of as large a sample as was possible. The tradeoffs of sample size and design limitations we were addressing here should be obvious.

The reader will recall that the number of churches finally selected to the sample for a given presbytery was determined by three formuli. In the Ascension Presbytery given above 3 churches were sampled from a total of 18 churches in the presbytery. Due to their size some presbyteries wound up with only 1 church being selected from the total number of churches. Only one church selected within a presbytery presents a statistical problem in the calculation of variances, standard deviations, and standard errors for means and other point estimators that we wanted to calculate. An easy illustration is to consider the formula for the simple sample standard deviation. The formula for the sample standard deviation is

$$s = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2}{n-1}}$$

and the substitution of $n = 1$ results in s being undefined as follows.

$$s = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \bar{X})^2}{1-1=0}} \text{ thus } s \text{ is undefined for presbyteries with 1 church}$$

To address this problem those presbyteries with only one church were “linked” with geographically similar presbyteries to increase the number of churches in the linked presbyteries above 1. Table III on the following page summarizes the sample by presbytery. Those presbyteries linked to other presbyteries are displayed in red. The Presbytery Link column gives which presbytery is linked to which other presbytery. The linking of these smaller presbyteries allowed for the calculation of summary statistics that reflect the presbyteries (strata), the churches (clusters), and a weighting for non-response of participants (see non-response section below).

Table III
PCA Leadership Attitude Survey
Fall 2004
Calculation of Non-Response Weights
Final Sample

Presbytery Number	Number of Participants Initial Sample, N	Presbytery Number	Number of Participants, Actual Sample, n	Prebytery Links	Sampling Fraction	Weight: Inverse of Sampling Fraction
1	19	1	4		0.210526	4.75
2	26	2	14		0.538462	1.857143
3	33	3	7		0.212121	4.714286
4	39	4	10	11 Linked to 4	0.25641	3.9
5	53	5	21	37 Linked to 5	0.396226	2.52381
6	89	6	23		0.258427	3.869565
7	46	7	10		0.217391	4.6
8	52	8	16		0.307692	3.25
12	200	12	53		0.265	3.773585
14	59	14	20		0.338983	2.95
15	69	15	16		0.231884	4.3125
16	111	16	30	55 Linked to 16	0.27027	3.7
17	52	17	19		0.365385	2.736842
18	13	18	5		0.384615	2.6
20	22	20	9	19 Linked to 20	0.409091	2.444444
21	95	21	37	35 Linked to 21	0.389474	2.567568
31	78	31	25		0.320513	3.12
32	66	32	20		0.30303	3.3
33	63	33	16		0.253968	3.9375
34	20	34	3		0.15	6.666667
38	379	38	146		0.385224	2.59589
39	136	39	42		0.308824	3.238095
40	8	40	4		0.5	2
41	30	41	15		0.5	2
43	121	43	40		0.330579	3.025
45	73	45	29	10 Linked to 45	0.39726	2.517241
46	64	46	8	13 Linked to 46	0.125	8
47	132	47	31		0.234848	4.258065
48	37	48	9		0.243243	4.111111
49	9	49	3		0.333333	3
50	63	50	29		0.460317	2.172414
52	24	52	8		0.333333	3
53	38	53	9	44 Linked to 53	0.236842	4.222222
54	51	54	14		0.27451	3.642857
56	24	56	6	29 Linked to 56	0.25	4
57	52	57	9		0.173077	5.777778
58	12	58	4	36+42 Linked to 58	0.333333	3
59	27	59	8		0.296296	3.375
60	77	60	16		0.207792	4.8125
61	31	61	13		0.419355	2.384615
62	85	62	36		0.423529	2.361111
63	34	63	12		0.352941	2.833333
64	23	64	12		0.521739	1.916667
65	32	65	12		0.375	2.666667
Totals:	2767		873			

Weighting for Non-Response

Adjusting the survey for those who chose not to respond (for whatever reasons) is important in obtaining as reliable and realistic estimates for the survey responses. In the present survey the weight for non-response is the inverse of the sampling fraction for a given presbytery. Thus, if the sampling fraction for presbytery X was 0.25 the non-response sampling weight would be 4. These weights are given in the last column of Table III. Linking presbyteries with only one church with other presbyteries and the calculation of non-response sampling weights are two relatively effective low cost techniques to allow the calculation of properly weighted summary statistics for the survey responses.

Demographics, Non-Coverage, and Bias

To aid the reader in the interpretation of the survey findings the documenting of the sample demographic variables, the description of non-coverage, those leaders missed by the survey and thus not represented, and the addressing of sample bias are very important. Each element is discussed below. Each frequency summary does not necessarily total to the final sample size of $n = 873$ due to item non-response.

A set of demographic variables was included in the survey instrument to assess the makeup of the sample once it was complete and to determine its similarity to the population of leaders within the PCA. The variables included were gender, age, leadership role, church size (number of members in the local church of the individual leaders), ethnicity, and geographic setting. For gender, 691 respondents or 80.63 percent of the final sample were male and 166 or 19.37 percent were female. Age broke out as

follows:

Age Bracket	Frequency	Percent
20-29	44	5.13
30-39	160	18.67
40-49	268	31.27
50-59	242	28.24
60-69	107	12.49
70 and up	36	4.20

Thus, the “typical” leader was in their forties and fifties and the sample, as was expected, is predominately male. Leadership roles broke out as follows:

Leadership Role	Frequency	Percent
Teaching Elder (TE)	111	13.00
Ruling Elder (RE)	303	35.48
Deacon	151	17.68
Deaconess	6	0.70
Active Church Member	283	33.14

Leadership role appears to have good representation for each category with the exception of Deaconess. The selection of a female who is also a deaconess is a function of each church’s selection strategy for local church lay leaders. When the sampling frame and design were constructed, some concern was voiced to include church size as part of the design. However, by stratifying on presbytery and clustering on churches with a random sampling of churches within presbytery there was little doubt that the church size distribution in the sample would be reasonably close to that of the population of PCA churches. The composition of the final sample was comparable to the population as reported by Ms. Hitzfeld in 2004:

Hitzfeld Report, 2004 (All churches)		Survey Sample, n = 873	
Size of Church	Percent	n	Percent
1-200	75	399	45.70
201-400	16	224	25.66
401-1000	6	129	14.78
1001 +	3	121	13.86

Prior to the administration of the survey there were strong fears the small churches would dominate the sample and bias the results. In actuality there was strong representation from the small churches but a stronger representation of the large churches at the 401-1000 and 1001+ levels. At least two explanations of the elevated responses from the larger churches can be put forward here. First, the level of resources these churches possess to participate in the survey (with relative ease) and, second, their intrinsic interest in the survey given their stakeholder status in the denomination and for their local members act as motivators in responding to the survey.

The stratified and clustered nature of the sample design directly addressed the question of representation by ethnicity. However, this proved difficult and especially so with the Korean churches. This was also addressed in the substitution efforts describe above to make sure Korean churches were represented. This proved unsuccessful due mostly to unit non-response with churches claiming they were not familiar enough with the denomination to complete the survey. The ethnic distribution of the sample is as follows:

Ethnic Group	Frequency	Percent
Afro American	13	1.52
Caucasian	819	95.90
Hispanic	6	0.70
Korean	1	0.12
Other	15	1.76

The reader should keep in mind that the frequency of responses given above are for individual leaders and not churches.

Finally, the survey asked for the geographic setting of the leader's church. Geographic setting broke out as follows:

Geographic Setting	Frequency	Percent
Inner City	25	2.92
Urban	141	16.45
Suburban	478	55.78
Small Town	171	19.95
Rural	27	3.15
Other	15	1.75

The above distribution by geographic setting shows a predominately suburban response with a moderate mix of urban and small town leaders.

Survey non-coverage refers to that portion of the target population that is not reflected in the sampling frame. In the construction of the sampling frame every effort available (within cost constraints) was made to include churches that were thought to be at risk for participation in the survey. However, as mentioned above, the Hispanic, Korean, and Afro-American subpopulations are under represented in the sample even after repeated attempts to solicit responses from these ethnic groupings. The reader needs to keep this lack of representation in mind when examining and interpreting the survey analysis.

Sometime during the administration of the survey the membership of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) completed the survey. The author was unaware of this as it pertained to the final data set. The final data set included the data from the sample design as defined above as well as the membership of the SPC. The effect of this on the descriptive data analysis currently provided on the PCA web site is a positive bias in the response to the survey items. Fortunately, the number of responses is relatively small so the bias is relatively small as well. Any future PCA sponsored surveys need to gain increased sensitivity to the development of and consistent use of the probability sample as originally designed. To not do this is to invite valid criticism that the sample was not a valid probability sample and likely biased.

Data Analysis

The author thought it wise to provide basic descriptive analyses for the data set from the defined sample design. The analyses reported in the **Results** section below represent the final probability sample of 873 PCA leaders. The sample excludes the responses from the 14 SPC members not selected for inclusion in the sample. In addition, the results and analysis currently posted to the PCA web site fail to report supporting descriptive statistical indices such as standard errors and confidence intervals when a sample mean for an item is reported or subtotal or total counts are occasionally missing when a proportion or percent for an item is reported. These counts may have been furnished since the writing of this report.

The analyses consisted of (1) the table of item descriptions, (2) the frequency tables for each survey item, (3) the descriptive statistical summaries for each survey item for the stratified, clustered sample design, and (4) the descriptive statistical summaries for each survey item for the data treated as a simple random sample (SRS). When reviewing the descriptive statistical summaries for the survey items, the reader should note the systematically lower values for the standard errors for the items in the SRS design analysis when compared to those same values for the stratified, clustered design analysis. This difference is due to the stratified, cluster design reflecting the increase in variation due to the complex sample design. The estimates given for the stratified, clustered design are the more accurate values. These estimates give the best balance between randomization (probability sample) and representation of the population in the sample. The reader should also be aware that the separate survey analysis posted to the PCA web site also addresses certain subclasses, cross-classes, and pooled item subsets that provide additional analyses that may be of interest and importance.

Results

Table IV consists of the verbal descriptions for each of the survey items:

Table IV
PCA Leadership Attitude Survey
Fall, 2004
Survey Variable Names and Labels

variable name	variable label
g1_q1	The PCA is/is not improving in planting healthy churches
g1_q2	Training and developing church leaders
g1_q3	Achieving denomination-wide goals and standards
g1_q4	Having a positive influence on our culture
g1_q5	Getting stronger, healthier as a denomination overall
g1_q6	PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY for ministries
g1_q7	Sunday School curriculum development
g1_q8	Seminary Training
g1_q9	College Education
g1_q10	Changes to Book of Church Order
g1_q11	Provision of health insurance for pastors & denom. staff
g1_q12	Provision of retirement plans for pastors & denom. staff
g1_q13	Ruling Elder Training
g1_q14	Amendments to Westminster Standards
g1_q15	Church Discipline
g1_q16	Taking stands on cultural issues
g1_q17	Evangelism Training
g1_q18	Church renewal training
g1_q19	Discipleship training
g1_q20	Mercy ministries/relief work
g1_q21	Training and sending of missionaries
g1_q22	Supporting indigenous missionaries
g1_q23	Raising and distributing funds through a foundation
g1_q24	Developing educational materials for children
g1_q25	Training new pastors
g1_q26	Examining and credentialing pastors
g1_q27	Resolving disagreements between churches
g1_q28	Offering fellowship/discipleship ops on college campuses
g1_q29	Other Objective
g1_q30	Other Objective
g2_q1	I have understanding of work of the Admin. Committee
g2_q2	The AC has understanding of org. purpose and role
g2_q3	The AC helps the work of the local church
g2_q4	The AC communicates with local churches and leaders
g2_q5	The AC is a steward of its financial resources
g2_q6	The AC is effective in getting local church to contribute to PCA causes
g2_q7	The work of the AC is critical to the health of the denom.
g2_q8	My church should give more to the CEP
g2_q9	I have a good understanding of work of CEP
g2_q10	The CEP has understanding of org. purpose and role
g2_q11	The CEP helps the work of the local church
g2_q12	The CEP communicates with local churches and leaders
g2_q13	The CEP is a steward of its financial resources
g2_q14	The CEP is effective in getting local church to contribute to PCA causes
g2_q15	The work of the CEP is critical to the health of the denom.
g2_q16	My church should give more to the CEP
g2_q17	I have a good understanding of the work of Covenant College
g2_q18	CC has understanding of organization, purpose and role
g2_q19	CC helps the work of the local church
g2_q20	CC communicates with local churches and leaders
g2_q21	CC is a steward of its financial resources
g2_q22	CC is effective in getting local ch. to contribute resources to PCA causes
g2_q23	The work of CC is critical to the health of the denom.
g2_q24	My church should give more to CC
g2_q25	I have a good understanding of the work of Covenant Seminary
g2_q26	CS has understanding of organization, purpose, and role
g2_q27	CS helps the work of the local church
g2_q28	CS communicates with local churches and leaders
g2_q29	CS is a steward of its financial resources
g2_q30	CS is effective in getting local ch. to contribute resources to PCA causes
g2_q31	The work of CS is critical to the health of the denom.
g2_q32	My church should give more to CS

variable name variable label

g2_q33 I have a good understanding of the work of Mission to North America (MNA)
g2_q34 MNA has understanding of organization, purpose, and role
g2_q35 MNA helps the work of the local church
g2_q36 MNA communicates with local churches and leaders
g2_q37 MNA is a steward of its financial resources
g2_q38 MNA is effective in getting local ch. to contrib. resources to PCA causes
g2_q39 The work of the MNA is critical to the health of the denom.
g2_q40 My church should give more to MNA
g2_q41 I have a good understanding of the work of Mission to the World (MTW)
g2_q42 MTW has understanding of organization, purpose, and role
g2_q43 MTW helps the work of the local church
g2_q44 MTW communicates with local churches and leaders
g2_q45 MTW is a steward of its financial resources
g2_q46 MTW is effective in getting local ch. to contrib.. resources to PCA causes
g2_q47 The work of the MTW is critical to the health of the denom.
g2_q48 My church should give more to MNA
g2_q49 I have a good understanding of the work of PCA Foundation (PCAF)
g2_q50 PCAF has understanding of organization, purpose, and role
g2_q51 MTW helps the work of the local church
g2_q52 PCAF communicates with local churches and leaders
g2_q53 PCAF is a steward of its financial resources
g2_q54 PCAF is effective in getting local ch. to contribute resources to PCA
g2_q55 The work of the PCAF is critical to the health of the denom.
g2_q56 My church should give more to PCAF
g2_q57 I have a good understanding of the work of PCA Retirement & Benefits
g2_q58 PCA R & B has understanding of organization, purpose, and role
g2_q59 PCA R & B helps the work of the local church
g2_q60 PCA R & B communicates with local churches and leaders
g2_q61 PCA R & B is a steward of its financial resources
g2_q62 PCA R & B is effective in getting local ch. to contribute resources to PCA
g2_q63 The work of the PCA R & B is critical to the health of the denom.
g2_q64 My church should give more to PCA R & B
g2_q65 I have a good understanding of the work of Reformed Univ. Ministries (RUM)
g2_q66 RUM has understanding of organization, purpose, and role
g2_q67 RUM helps the work of the local church
g2_q68 RUM communicates with local churches and leaders
g2_q69 RUM is a steward of its financial resources
g2_q70 RUM is effective in getting local ch. to contrib.. resources to PCA causes
g2_q71 The work of RUM is critical to the health of the denom.
g2_q72 My church should give more to RUM
g2_q73 I have a good understanding of the work of Ridge Haven Center (RHCC)
g2_q74 RHCC has understanding of organization, purpose, and role
g2_q75 RHCC helps the work of the local church
g2_q76 RHCC communicates with local churches and leaders
g2_q77 RHCC is a steward of its financial resources
g2_q78 RHCC is effective in getting local ch.to contrib. resources to PCA causes
g2_q79 The work of RHCC is critical to the health of the denom.
g2_q80 My church should give more to RHCC
g2_q81 Communication vehicles effectiveness - mailings and letters
g2_q82 emails
g2_q83 byFaith magazine
g2_q84 Web sites provided by PCA and/or committees & agencies
g2_q85 Reports made by committees/agencies at GA
g2_q86 Reports made by committees/agencies at presbytery
g2_q87 Conferences sponsored by denom. organizations
g2_q88 DVDs/CDs/Videos
g2_q89 Direct contact/dialogue, phone, face-to-face
g2_q90 Other
g3_q1 Frequency attending GA over past five years
g3_q2 Frequency attending meetings of local presbytery
g3_q3 Level of agreement local church is better as member of PCA
g3_q4 I understand the values/standards PCA stands for
g3_q5 I agree with the values/standards PCA stands for
g3_q6 My church should do more to support PCA initiatives and causes
g3_q7 The PCA is getting more liberal compared to my church
g3_q8 The PCA is getting more conservative compared to my church
g3_q9 Growth to 2-3 million from current 300,000 a good thing
g3_q10 PCA support important part of my church's planning/programs

variable name variable label

g3_q11 Support my church gives to the PCA is a high priority here
g3_q12 I plan on continuing to be an active member within the PCA
g4_q1 Local church decision maker for PCA funds: Pastor/Senior Pastor
g4_q2 Local church decision maker for PCA funds: Clerk of Session
g4_q3 Local church decision maker for PCA funds: Session as a whole
g4_q4 Local church decision maker for PCA funds: Chair of the Diaconate
g4_q5 Local church decision maker for PCA funds: Business/Office Administrator
g4_q6 Local church decision maker for PCA funds: Other committee chairperson
g4_q7 Local church decision maker for PCA funds: Other church staff member
g4_q8 Local church decision maker for PCA funds: Don't Know
g4_q9 Level of familiarity with PCA 'Partnership Shares' program
g4_q10 Every church should contribute something to the cost of the PCA
g4_q11 PCA's committees/agencies are good stewards of their funds
g4_q12 Current PCA fund raising methods are effective
g4_q13 Churches within PCA should have more denom. influence financially
g4_q14 Giving to PCA causes should be complete voluntary
g4_q15 Mandatory church 'dues' would be a good thing to belong to the PCA
g4_q16 'Partnership Shares' is an effective method for raising PCA Funds
g4_q17 Teaching elders have explained 'Partnership Shares' to leaders
g4_q18 Churches in the PCA give 5% of operating budgets to PCA organizations
g4_q19 How appropriate is the 5% level in Item 18 above?
g5_q1 Attended General Assembly (GA) within past three years
g5_q2 Served on a Committee of Commissioners at GA within past 3 years
g5_q3 Importance - positive reasons for attending GA: Interact with friends
g5_q4 Opportunity to learn best practices, interact with 'thought leaders'
g5_q5 Opportunity to learn about resources available to me and my church
g5_q6 Opportunity to worship/pray together in denom.-wide assembly
g5_q7 Opportunity to involve family so we feel more connected to PCA
g5_q8 Opportunity to hear of progress/issues concerning PCA agencies
g5_q9 Debate/development of PCA positions on theological issues
g5_q10 Debate/development of PCA positions on cultural issues
g5_q11 Debate/development of PCA positions important to function of church
g5_q12 Debate/development of PCA judicial proceedings from lower courts
g5_q13 Opportunity to review/hold presbyteries accountable
g5_q14 Opportunity to review/hold committees/agencies accountable
g5_q15 Other
g5_q16 Barriers to attending the PCA General Assembly (GA): Total Cost
g5_q17 Barriers to atd. the PCA General Assembly (GA):Length of time GA requires
g5_q18 Barriers to attending the PCA GA: Time off from work during work week
g5_q19 Barriers atd. PCA GA: my lack of ability to contribute/knowledge of issues
g5_q20 Barriers attending PCA GA: my lack of familiarity with procedures
g5_q21 Barriers atd.PCA GA: personal disinterest in PCA level mtgs and ministries
g5_q22 Barriers attnd'g PCA GA: Other
g6_q1 The debate/discussion at GA is productive and necessary
g6_q2 Process of debate at GA balances the majority and minority views
g6_q3 Presentation by committee/agency heads are productive/necessary
g6_q4 Presentations/rec. from committee chairs productive/necessary
g6_q5 Presentations/reports by leaders of other denom.s are valuable
g6_q6 An appropriate balance between work and worship in the GA agenda
g6_q7 Number of days spent at GA is about right
g6_q8 GA should continue to meet annually
g6_q9 Diversity of views of those speaking at GA appropriate & balanced
g6_q10 Commissioners attend GA good reflection of PCA view as a whole
g6_q11 My time spent at GA is worthwhile
g6_q12 How often do you encourage fellow church leaders to attend GA?
g6_q13 Impression of total size of GA in terms of number of commissioners
Gender71 What is your gender?
Age72 What is your age?
Ethnicity73 What is your race/ethnicity?
LeaderRole74 Which of the choices below best describes your role in your church?
NumGA75 How many General Assemblies have you attended?
GeoSetting76 Which description best reflects your church's demographic setting?

variable name variable label

(The following items represent items that required statistical imputation to get proper estimates. They are repeated here for identification within the report.)

ig1_q29 Other Objective (imputed)
 ig1_q30 Other Objective (imputed)
 ig2_q17 I have a good understanding of the work of Covenant College (imputed)
 ig2_q18 CC has understanding of organization, purpose and role (imputed)
 ig2_q19 CC helps the work of the local church (imputed)
 ig2_q20 CC communicates with local churches and leaders (imputed)
 ig2_q21 CC is a steward of its financial resources (imputed)
 ig2_q22 CC is effective to get local ch. to contribute resources to PCA (imputed)
 ig2_q23 The work of CC is critical to the health of the denom. (imputed)
 ig2_q24 My church should give more to CC (imputed)
 ig2_q81 Communication vehicles effectiveness - mailings and letters (imputed)
 ig2_q82 emails (imputed)
 ig2_q83 byFaith magazine (imputed)
 ig2_q84 Web sites provided by PCA and/or committees & agencies (imputed)
 ig2_q85 Reports made by committees/agencies at GA (imputed)
 ig2_q87 Conferences sponsored by denom. organizations(imputed)
 ig2_q88 DVDs/CDs/Videos (imputed)
 ig2_q89 Direct contact/dialogue, phone, face-to-face (imputed)
 ig2_q90 Other (imputed)
 ig4_q1 Local ch. decision maker for PCA funds: Pastor/Senior Pastor (imputed)
 ig4_q2 Local ch. decision maker for PCA funds: Clerk of Session(imputed)
 ig4_q3 Local ch. decision maker for PCA funds: Session as a whole(imputed)
 ig4_q4 Local ch. decision maker for PCA funds: Chair of the Diaconate (imputed)
 ig4_q5 Local ch. decision maker for PCA funds: Bus./Office Adminis'r(imputed)
 ig4_q6 Local ch. decision maker for PCA funds: Other comm. chairperson (imputed)
 ig4_q7 Local ch. decision maker for PCA funds: Other ch. staff member (imputed)
 ig4_q8 Local church decision maker for PCA funds: Don't Know (imputed)
 ig5_q4 Opportunity to l'rn best practices, engage w/ 'thought leaders' (imputed)
 ig5_q15 Other (imputed)
 ig5_q16 Barriers to attending the PCA General Assembly (GA): Total Cost (imputed)
 ig5_q17 Barriers to attdng the PCA GA: Length of time GA requires (imputed)
 ig5_q19 Barriers atdng PCA GA: lack of ability to contribute to issues(imputed)
 ig5_q20 Barriers attending PCA GA: lack of familiarity with procedures (imputed)
 ig5_q21 Barriers atd'g PCA GA: disinterest in PCA level mtgs/ministries (imputed)
 ig5_q22 Barriers attnd'g PCA GA: Other (imputed)

Table V provides the frequencies and percentage responses for each survey item.

Table V
 PCA Leadership Attitude Survey
 Presbyterian Church In America (PCA)
 Fall, 2004
 Summary Analysis of Item Frequencies and Percentages

-> tabulation of churchsize

Four levels of church size by number of communicant members	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
0-200	399	45.70	45.70
201-400	224	25.66	71.36
401-1000	129	14.78	86.14
>1000	121	13.86	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g1_q1

The PCA is/is not improving in planting healthy churches	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Worse	11	1.26	1.26
Bit Worse	50	5.73	6.99
Same	309	35.40	42.38
Bit Better	339	38.83	81.21
Better	123	14.09	95.30
.	41	4.70	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g1_q2

Training and developing church leaders	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Worse	12	1.37	1.37
Bit Worse	88	10.08	11.45
Same	350	40.09	51.55
Bit Better	294	33.68	85.22
Better	91	10.42	95.65
.	38	4.35	100.00
Total	873	100.0	

-> tabulation of g1_q3

Achieving denomination n-wide goals and standards	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Worse	5	0.57	0.57
Bit Worse	70	8.02	8.59
Same	468	53.61	62.20
Bit Better	227	26.00	88.20
Better	39	4.47	92.67
.	64	7.33	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g1_q4

Having a positive influence on our culture	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Worse	24	2.75	2.75
Bit Worse	93	10.65	13.40
Same	290	33.22	46.62
Bit Better	328	37.57	84.19
Better	102	11.68	95.88
.	36	4.12	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g1_q5

Getting stronger, healthier as a denomination overall	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Worse	11	1.26	1.26
Bit Worse	80	9.16	10.42
Same	294	33.68	44.10
Bit Better	352	40.32	84.42
Better	94	10.77	95.19
.	42	4.81	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g1_q6

PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY for ministries	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Gen Assembly	184	21.08	21.08
Presbytery	501	57.39	78.47
Local Church	115	13.17	91.64
Outside Denom	3	0.34	91.98
.	19	2.18	94.16
.a	51	5.84	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g1_q7

Sunday School curriculum development	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Gen Assembly	386	44.22	44.22
Presbytery	86	9.85	54.07
Local Church	334	38.26	92.33
Outside Denom	17	1.95	94.27
.	20	2.29	96.56
.a	30	3.44	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g1_q8

Seminary Training	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Gen Assembly	621	71.13	71.13
Presbytery	146	16.72	87.86
Local Church	21	2.41	90.26
Outside Denom	25	2.86	93.13
.	22	2.52	95.65
.a	38	4.35	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g1_q9

College Education	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Gen Assembly	504	57.73	57.73
Presbytery	90	10.31	68.04
Local Church	50	5.73	73.77
Outside Denom	109	12.49	86.25
.	25	2.86	89.12
.a	95	10.88	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g1_q10

Changes to Book of Church Order	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Gen Assembly	711	81.44	81.44
Presbytery	94	10.77	92.21
Local Church	23	2.63	94.85
.	20	2.29	97.14
.a	25	2.86	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g1_q11

Provision of health insurance for pastors & denom. staff	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Gen Assembly	496	56.82	56.82
Presbytery	129	14.78	71.59
Local Church	145	16.61	88.20
Outside Denom	29	3.32	91.52
.	23	2.63	94.16
.a	51	5.84	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g1_q12

Provision of retirement plans for pastors & denom. staff	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Gen Assembly	566	64.83	64.83
Presbytery	112	12.83	77.66
Local Church	115	13.17	90.84
Outside Denom	18	2.06	92.90
.	22	2.52	95.42
.a	40	4.58	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g1_q13

Ruling Elder Training	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Gen Assembly	49	5.61	5.61
Presbytery	279	31.96	37.57
Local Church	514	58.88	96.45
Outside Denom	2	0.23	96.68
.	19	2.18	98.85
.a	10	1.15	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g1_q14

Amendments to Westminster Standards	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Gen Assembly	721	82.59	82.59
Presbytery	71	8.13	90.72
Local Church	15	1.72	92.44
Outside Denom	5	0.57	93.01
.	22	2.52	95.53
.a	39	4.47	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g1_q15

Church Discipline	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Gen Assembly	31	3.55	3.55
Presbytery	120	13.75	17.30
Local Church	689	78.92	96.22
.	20	2.29	98.51
.a	13	1.49	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g1_q16

Taking stands on cultural issues	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Gen Assembly	443	50.74	50.74
Presbytery	93	10.65	61.40
Local Church	278	31.84	93.24
Outside Denom	17	1.95	95.19
.	24	2.75	97.94
.a	18	2.06	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g1_q17

Evangelism Training	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Gen Assembly	56	6.41	6.41
Presbytery	113	12.94	19.36
Local Church	666	76.29	95.65
Outside Denom	2	0.23	95.88
.	22	2.52	98.40
.a	14	1.60	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g1_q18

Church renewal training	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Gen Assembly	139	15.92	15.92
Presbytery	391	44.79	60.71
Local Church	219	25.09	85.80
Outside Denom	5	0.57	86.37
.	26	2.98	89.35
.a	93	10.65	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g1_q19

Discipleship training	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Gen Assembly	15	1.72	1.72
Presbytery	54	6.19	7.90
Local Church	769	88.09	95.99
Outside Denom	1	0.11	96.11
.	24	2.75	98.85
.a	10	1.15	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g1_q20

Mercy ministries/re lief work	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Gen Assembly	60	6.87	6.87
Presbytery	115	13.17	20.05
Local Church	659	75.49	95.53
Outside Denom	2	0.23	95.76
.	24	2.75	98.51
.a	13	1.49	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g1_q21

Training and sending of missionaries	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Gen Assembly	385	44.10	44.10
Presbytery	192	21.99	66.09
Local Church	242	27.72	93.81
Outside Denom	7	0.80	94.62
.	26	2.98	97.59
.a	21	2.41	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g1_q22

Supporting indigenous missionaries	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Gen Assembly	214	24.51	24.51
Presbytery	129	14.78	39.29
Local Church	453	51.89	91.18
Outside Denom	4	0.46	91.64
.	31	3.55	95.19
.a	42	4.81	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g1_q23

Raising and distributing funds through a foundation	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Gen Assembly	439	50.29	50.29
Presbytery	161	18.44	68.73
Local Church	93	10.65	79.38
Outside Denom	25	2.86	82.25
.	29	3.32	85.57
.a	126	14.43	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g1_q24

Developing educational materials for children	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Gen Assembly	544	62.31	62.31
Presbytery	97	11.11	73.42
Local Church	131	15.01	88.43
Outside Denom	32	3.67	92.10
.	31	3.55	95.65
.a	38	4.35	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g1_q25

Training new pastors	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Gen Assembly	344	39.40	39.40
Presbytery	394	45.13	84.54
Local Church	66	7.56	92.10
Outside Denom	15	1.72	93.81
.	25	2.86	96.68
.a	29	3.32	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g1_q26

Examining and credentialing pastors	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Gen Assembly	122	13.97	13.97
Presbytery	705	80.76	94.73
Local Church	7	0.80	95.53
.	24	2.75	98.28
.a	15	1.72	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g1_q27

Resolving disagreements between churches	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Gen Assembly	86	9.85	9.85
Presbytery	738	84.54	94.39
Local Church	9	1.03	95.42
Outside Denom	2	0.23	95.65
.	26	2.98	98.63
.a	12	1.37	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g1_q28

Offering fellowship/di scipleship ops on college campuses	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Gen Assembly	205	23.48	23.48
Presbytery	340	38.95	62.43
Local Church	264	30.24	92.67
Outside Denom	13	1.49	94.16
.	25	2.86	97.02
.a	26	2.98	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g1_q29

Other Objective	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Gen Assembly	13	1.49	1.49
Presbytery	5	0.57	2.06
Local Church	12	1.37	3.44
Outside Denom	2	0.23	3.67
.	818	93.70	97.37
.a	23	2.63	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g1_q30

Other Objective	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Gen Assembly	6	0.69	0.69
Presbytery	2	0.23	0.92
Local Church	2	0.23	1.15
Outside Denom	1	0.11	1.26
.	841	96.33	97.59
.a	21	2.41	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q1

I have understanding of work of the Admin. Committee	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	150	17.18	17.18
Disagree	213	24.40	41.58
Neutral	290	33.22	74.80
Agree	160	18.33	93.13
Strg Agree	27	3.09	96.22
.	33	3.78	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q2

The AC has understanding of org. purpose and role	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	2	0.23	0.23
Disagree	23	2.63	2.86
Neutral	601	68.84	71.71
Agree	167	19.13	90.84
Strg Agree	40	4.58	95.42
.	40	4.58	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q3

The AC helps the work of the local church	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	30	3.44	3.44
Disagree	81	9.28	12.71
Neutral	561	64.26	76.98
Agree	137	15.69	92.67
Strg Agree	22	2.52	95.19
.	42	4.81	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q4

The AC communicates with local churches and leaders	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	29	3.32	3.32
Disagree	143	16.38	19.70
Neutral	540	61.86	81.56
Agree	105	12.03	93.59
Strg Agree	11	1.26	94.85
.	45	5.15	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q5

The AC is a steward of its financial resources	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	8	0.92	0.92
Disagree	21	2.41	3.32
Neutral	644	73.77	77.09
Agree	131	15.01	92.10
Strg Agree	24	2.75	94.85
.	45	5.15	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q6

The AC is effective in getting local church to contribute to denomin. causes	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	30	3.44	3.44
Disagree	141	16.15	19.59
Neutral	549	62.89	82.47
Agree	102	11.68	94.16
Strg Agree	6	0.69	94.85
.	45	5.15	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q7

The work of the AC is critical to the health of the denom.	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	7	0.80	0.80
Disagree	22	2.52	3.32
Neutral	531	60.82	64.15
Agree	199	22.79	86.94
Strg Agree	73	8.36	95.30
.	41	4.70	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q8

My church should give more to the CEP	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	29	3.32	3.32
Disagree	93	10.65	13.97
Neutral	620	71.02	84.99
Agree	72	8.25	93.24
Strg Agree	18	2.06	95.30
.	41	4.70	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q9

I have a good understanding of work of CEP	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	52	5.96	5.96
Disagree	148	16.95	22.91
Neutral	229	26.23	49.14
Agree	350	40.09	89.23
Strg Agree	58	6.64	95.88
.	36	4.12	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q10

The CEP has understanding of org. purpose and role	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Disagree	29	3.32	3.32
Neutral	430	49.26	52.58
Agree	311	35.62	88.20
Strg Agree	57	6.53	94.73
.	46	5.27	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q11

The CEP helps the work of the local church	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	15	1.72	1.72
Disagree	71	8.13	9.85
Neutral	300	34.36	44.22
Agree	381	43.64	87.86
Strg Agree	61	6.99	94.85
.	45	5.15	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q12

The CEP communicates with local churches and leaders	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	19	2.18	2.18
Disagree	119	13.63	15.81
Neutral	452	51.78	67.58
Agree	207	23.71	91.29
Strg Agree	31	3.55	94.85
.	45	5.15	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q13

The CEP is a steward of its financial resources	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	3	0.34	0.34
Disagree	22	2.52	2.86
Neutral	618	70.79	73.65
Agree	164	18.79	92.44
Strg Agree	20	2.29	94.73
.	46	5.27	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q14

The CEP is effective in getting local church to contribute to denomin. causes	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	25	2.86	2.86
Disagree	144	16.49	19.36
Neutral	557	63.80	83.16
Agree	97	11.11	94.27
Strg Agree	6	0.69	94.96
.	44	5.04	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q15

The work of the CEP is critical to the health of the denom.	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	7	0.80	0.80
Disagree	31	3.55	4.35
Neutral	300	34.36	38.72
Agree	327	37.46	76.17
Strg Agree	162	18.56	94.73
.	46	5.27	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q16

My church should give more to the CEP	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	18	2.06	2.06
Disagree	96	11.00	13.06
Neutral	598	68.50	81.56
Agree	99	11.34	92.90
Strg Agree	16	1.83	94.73
.	46	5.27	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q17

I have a good understanding of the work of Covenant College	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	33	3.78	3.78
Disagree	80	9.16	12.94
Neutral	209	23.94	36.88
Agree	412	47.19	84.08
Strg Agree	99	11.34	95.42
.	40	4.58	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q18

CC has understanding of organization, purpose and role	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	3	0.34	0.34
Disagree	14	1.60	1.95
Neutral	372	42.61	44.56
Agree	357	40.89	85.45
Strg Agree	82	9.39	94.85
.	45	5.15	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q19

CC helps the work of the local church	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	49	5.61	5.61
Disagree	184	21.08	26.69
Neutral	431	49.37	76.06
Agree	147	16.84	92.90
Strg Agree	19	2.18	95.07
.	43	4.93	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q20

CC communicates with local churches and leaders	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	33	3.78	3.78
Disagree	189	21.65	25.43
Neutral	429	49.14	74.57
Agree	164	18.79	93.36
Strg Agree	13	1.49	94.85
.	45	5.15	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q21

CC is a steward of its financial resources	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	7	0.80	0.80
Disagree	18	2.06	2.86
Neutral	588	67.35	70.22
Agree	186	21.31	91.52
Strg Agree	28	3.21	94.73
.	46	5.27	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q22

CC is effective in getting local church to contribute resources to denom. causes	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	38	4.35	4.35
Disagree	178	20.39	24.74
Neutral	477	54.64	79.38
Agree	122	13.97	93.36
Strg Agree	12	1.37	94.73
.	46	5.27	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q23

The work of CC is critical to the health of the denom.	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	29	3.32	3.32
Disagree	78	8.93	12.26
Neutral	324	37.11	49.37
Agree	281	32.19	81.56
Strg Agree	116	13.29	94.85
.	45	5.15	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q24

My church should give more to CC	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	35	4.01	4.01
Disagree	115	13.17	17.18
Neutral	531	60.82	78.01
Agree	120	13.75	91.75
Strg Agree	26	2.98	94.73
.	46	5.27	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q25

I have a good understanding of the work of Covenant Seminary	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	45	5.15	5.15
Disagree	70	8.02	13.17
Neutral	204	23.37	36.54
Agree	389	44.56	81.10
Strg Agree	124	14.20	95.30
.	41	4.70	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q26

CS has understanding of organization, purpose, and role	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	1	0.11	0.11
Disagree	10	1.15	1.26
Neutral	352	40.32	41.58
Agree	327	37.46	79.04
Strg Agree	138	15.81	94.85
.	45	5.15	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q27

CS helps the work of the local church	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	17	1.95	1.95
Disagree	89	10.19	12.14
Neutral	378	43.30	55.44
Agree	257	29.44	84.88
Strg Agree	89	10.19	95.07
.	43	4.93	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q28

CS communicates with local churches and leaders	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	21	2.41	2.41
Disagree	124	14.20	16.61
Neutral	454	52.00	68.61
Agree	191	21.88	90.49
Strg Agree	39	4.47	94.96
.	44	5.04	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q29

CS is a steward of its financial resources	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	2	0.23	0.23
Disagree	11	1.26	1.49
Neutral	591	67.70	69.19
Agree	163	18.67	87.86
Strg Agree	54	6.19	94.04
.	52	5.96	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q30

CS is effective in getting local church to contribute resources to denom. causes	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	27	3.09	3.09
Disagree	144	16.49	19.59
Neutral	521	59.68	79.27
Agree	113	12.94	92.21
Strg Agree	20	2.29	94.50
.	48	5.50	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q31

The work of CS is critical to the health of the denom.	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	6	0.69	0.69
Disagree	23	2.63	3.32
Neutral	264	30.24	33.56
Agree	267	30.58	64.15
Strg Agree	268	30.70	94.85
.	45	5.15	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q32

My church should give more to CS	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	24	2.75	2.75
Disagree	65	7.45	10.19
Neutral	537	61.51	71.71
Agree	154	17.64	89.35
Strg Agree	48	5.50	94.85
.	45	5.15	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q33

I have a good understanding of the work of Mission to North America (MNA)	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	21	2.41	2.41
Disagree	81	9.28	11.68
Neutral	158	18.10	29.78
Agree	461	52.81	82.59
Strg Agree	108	12.37	94.96
.	44	5.04	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q34

MNA has understanding of organization, purpose, and role	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	6	0.69	0.69
Disagree	29	3.32	4.01
Neutral	284	32.53	36.54
Agree	413	47.31	83.85
Strg Agree	96	11.00	94.85
.	45	5.15	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q35

MNA helps the work of the local church	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	27	3.09	3.09
Disagree	106	12.14	15.23
Neutral	348	39.86	55.10
Agree	293	33.56	88.66
Strg Agree	55	6.30	94.96
.	44	5.04	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q36

MNA communicates with local churches and leaders	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	14	1.60	1.60
Disagree	117	13.40	15.01
Neutral	337	38.60	53.61
Agree	321	36.77	90.38
Strg Agree	40	4.58	94.96
.	44	5.04	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q37

MNA is a steward of its financial resources	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	13	1.49	1.49
Disagree	30	3.44	4.93
Neutral	526	60.25	65.18
Agree	219	25.09	90.26
Strg Agree	40	4.58	94.85
.	45	5.15	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q38

MNA is effective in getting local church to contribute resources to denom. causes	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	19	2.18	2.18
Disagree	113	12.94	15.12
Neutral	395	45.25	60.37
Agree	265	30.36	90.72
Strg Agree	33	3.78	94.50
.	48	5.50	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q39

The work of the MNA is critical to the health of the denom.	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	9	1.03	1.03
Disagree	18	2.06	3.09
Neutral	197	22.57	25.66
Agree	354	40.55	66.21
Strg Agree	250	28.64	94.85
.	45	5.15	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q40

My church should give more to MNA	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	27	3.09	3.09
Disagree	61	6.99	10.08
Neutral	471	53.95	64.03
Agree	218	24.97	89.00
Strg Agree	50	5.73	94.73
.	46	5.27	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q41

I have a good understanding of the work of Mission to the World (MTW)	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	12	1.37	1.37
Disagree	46	5.27	6.64
Neutral	119	13.63	20.27
Agree	484	55.44	75.72
Strg Agree	173	19.82	95.53
.	39	4.47	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q42

MTW has understanding of organization, purpose, and role	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	2	0.23	0.23
Disagree	12	1.37	1.60
Neutral	203	23.25	24.86
Agree	445	50.97	75.83
Strg Agree	172	19.70	95.53
.	39	4.47	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q43

MTW helps the work of the local church	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	12	1.37	1.37
Disagree	75	8.59	9.97
Neutral	282	32.30	42.27
Agree	372	42.61	84.88
Strg Agree	90	10.31	95.19
.	42	4.81	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q44

MTW communicates with local churches and leaders	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	8	0.92	0.92
Disagree	69	7.90	8.82
Neutral	257	29.44	38.26
Agree	419	48.00	86.25
Strg Agree	80	9.16	95.42
.	40	4.58	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q45

MTW is a steward of its financial resources	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	14	1.60	1.60
Disagree	30	3.44	5.04
Neutral	430	49.26	54.30
Agree	272	31.16	85.45
Strg Agree	87	9.97	95.42
.	40	4.58	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q46

MTW is effective in getting local church to contribute resources to denom. causes	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	8	0.92	0.92
Disagree	65	7.45	8.36
Neutral	294	33.68	42.04
Agree	377	43.18	85.22
Strg Agree	88	10.08	95.30
.	41	4.70	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q47

The work of the MTW is critical to the health of the denom.	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	2	0.23	0.23
Disagree	17	1.95	2.18
Neutral	144	16.49	18.67
Agree	361	41.35	60.02
Strg Agree	308	35.28	95.30
.	41	4.70	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q48

My church should give more to MNA	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	15	1.72	1.72
Disagree	64	7.33	9.05
Neutral	425	48.68	57.73
Agree	248	28.41	86.14
Strg Agree	83	9.51	95.65
.	38	4.35	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q49

I have a good understanding of the work of PCA Foundation (PCAF)	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	131	15.01	15.01
Disagree	202	23.14	38.14
Neutral	339	38.83	76.98
Agree	130	14.89	91.87
Strg Agree	24	2.75	94.62
.	47	5.38	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q50

PCAF has understanding of organization, purpose, and role	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	3	0.34	0.34
Disagree	17	1.95	2.29
Neutral	643	73.65	75.95
Agree	121	13.86	89.81
Strg Agree	30	3.44	93.24
.	59	6.76	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q51

MTW helps the work of the local church	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	31	3.55	3.55
Disagree	106	12.14	15.69
Neutral	605	69.30	84.99
Agree	65	7.45	92.44
Strg Agree	9	1.03	93.47
.	57	6.53	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q52

PCAF communicates with local churches and leaders	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	39	4.47	4.47
Disagree	144	16.49	20.96
Neutral	549	62.89	83.85
Agree	74	8.48	92.33
Strg Agree	9	1.03	93.36
.	58	6.64	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q53

PCAF is a steward of its financial resources	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	6	0.69	0.69
Disagree	17	1.95	2.63
Neutral	694	79.50	82.13
Agree	79	9.05	91.18
Strg Agree	20	2.29	93.47
.	57	6.53	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q54

PCAF is effective in getting local church to contribute resources to denom. cause	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	37	4.24	4.24
Disagree	136	15.58	19.82
Neutral	608	69.64	89.46
Agree	30	3.44	92.90
Strg Agree	6	0.69	93.59
.	56	6.41	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q55

The work of the PCAF is critical to the health of the denom.	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	16	1.83	1.83
Disagree	50	5.73	7.56
Neutral	624	71.48	79.04
Agree	98	11.23	90.26
Strg Agree	27	3.09	93.36
.	58	6.64	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q56

My church should give more to PCAF	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	33	3.78	3.78
Disagree	83	9.51	13.29
Neutral	654	74.91	88.20
Agree	34	3.89	92.10
Strg Agree	8	0.92	93.01
.	61	6.99	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q57

I have a good understanding of the work of PCA Retirement & Benefits	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	86	9.85	9.85
Disagree	150	17.18	27.03
Neutral	331	37.92	64.95
Agree	223	25.54	90.49
Strg Agree	38	4.35	94.85
.	45	5.15	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q58

PCA R & B has understanding of organization, purpose, and role	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	2	0.23	0.23
Disagree	16	1.83	2.06
Neutral	554	63.46	65.52
Agree	206	23.60	89.12
Strg Agree	43	4.93	94.04
.	52	5.96	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q59

PCA R & B helps the work of the local church	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	20	2.29	2.29
Disagree	74	8.48	10.77
Neutral	518	59.34	70.10
Agree	173	19.82	89.92
Strg Agree	33	3.78	93.70
.	55	6.30	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q60

PCA R & B communicates with local churches and leaders	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	31	3.55	3.55
Disagree	128	14.66	18.21
Neutral	531	60.82	79.04
Agree	114	13.06	92.10
Strg Agree	12	1.37	93.47
.	57	6.53	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q61

PCA R & B is a steward of its financial resources	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	3	0.34	0.34
Disagree	21	2.41	2.75
Neutral	656	75.14	77.89
Agree	118	13.52	91.41
Strg Agree	21	2.41	93.81
.	54	6.19	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q62

PCA R & B is effective in getting local church to contribute resources to denom.	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	22	2.52	2.52
Disagree	118	13.52	16.04
Neutral	595	68.16	84.19
Agree	72	8.25	92.44
Strg Agree	9	1.03	93.47
.	57	6.53	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q63

The work of the PCA R & B is critical to the health of the denom.	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	6	0.69	0.69
Disagree	35	4.01	4.70
Neutral	459	52.58	57.27
Agree	246	28.18	85.45
Strg Agree	73	8.36	93.81
.	54	6.19	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q64

My church should give more to PCA R & B	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	19	2.18	2.18
Disagree	61	6.99	9.16
Neutral	643	73.65	82.82
Agree	79	9.05	91.87
Strg Agree	14	1.60	93.47
.	57	6.53	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q65

I have a good understanding of the work of Reformed University Ministries (RUM)	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	37	4.24	4.24
Disagree	76	8.71	12.94
Neutral	181	20.73	33.68
Agree	371	42.50	76.17
Strg Agree	169	19.36	95.53
.	39	4.47	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q66

RUM has understanding of organization, purpose, and role	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	1	0.11	0.11
Disagree	10	1.15	1.26
Neutral	340	38.95	40.21
Agree	339	38.83	79.04
Strg Agree	141	16.15	95.19
.	42	4.81	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q67

RUM helps the work of the local church	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	17	1.95	1.95
Disagree	100	11.45	13.40
Neutral	362	41.47	54.87
Agree	247	28.29	83.16
Strg Agree	105	12.03	95.19
.	42	4.81	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q68

RUM communicates with local churches and leaders	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	21	2.41	2.41
Disagree	109	12.49	14.89
Neutral	384	43.99	58.88
Agree	251	28.75	87.63
Strg Agree	64	7.33	94.96
.	44	5.04	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q69

RUM is a steward of its financial resources	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	3	0.34	0.34
Disagree	17	1.95	2.29
Neutral	546	62.54	64.83
Agree	194	22.22	87.06
Strg Agree	68	7.79	94.85
.	45	5.15	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q70

RUM is effective in getting local church to contribute resources to denom. causes	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	18	2.06	2.06
Disagree	109	12.49	14.55
Neutral	435	49.83	64.38
Agree	205	23.48	87.86
Strg Agree	62	7.10	94.96
.	44	5.04	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q71

The work of RUM is critical to the health of the denom.	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	9	1.03	1.03
Disagree	28	3.21	4.24
Neutral	284	32.53	36.77
Agree	301	34.48	71.25
Strg Agree	209	23.94	95.19
.	42	4.81	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q72

My church should give more to RUM	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	17	1.95	1.95
Disagree	51	5.84	7.79
Neutral	495	56.70	64.49
Agree	184	21.08	85.57
Strg Agree	80	9.16	94.73
.	46	5.27	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q73

I have a good understanding of the work of Ridge Haven Center (RHCC)	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	95	10.88	10.88
Disagree	157	17.98	28.87
Neutral	313	35.85	64.72
Agree	213	24.40	89.12
Strg Agree	49	5.61	94.73
.	46	5.27	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q74

RHCC has understanding of organization, purpose, and role	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	3	0.34	0.34
Disagree	19	2.18	2.52
Neutral	595	68.16	70.68
Agree	168	19.24	89.92
Strg Agree	38	4.35	94.27
.	50	5.73	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q75

RHCC helps the work of the local church	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	58	6.64	6.64
Disagree	115	13.17	19.82
Neutral	509	58.30	78.12
Agree	123	14.09	92.21
Strg Agree	15	1.72	93.93
.	53	6.07	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q76

RHCC communicates with local churches and leaders	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	49	5.61	5.61
Disagree	143	16.38	21.99
Neutral	531	60.82	82.82
Agree	88	10.08	92.90
Strg Agree	7	0.80	93.70
.	55	6.30	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q77

RHCC is a steward of its financial resources	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	3	0.34	0.34
Disagree	21	2.41	2.75
Neutral	686	78.58	81.33
Agree	95	10.88	92.21
Strg Agree	17	1.95	94.16
.	51	5.84	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q78

RHCC is effective in getting local church to contribute resources to denom. cause	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	59	6.76	6.76
Disagree	144	16.49	23.25
Neutral	570	65.29	88.55
Agree	44	5.04	93.59
Strg Agree	7	0.80	94.39
.	49	5.61	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q79

The work of RHCC is critical to the health of the denom.	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	49	5.61	5.61
Disagree	105	12.03	17.64
Neutral	537	61.51	79.15
Agree	112	12.83	91.98
Strg Agree	21	2.41	94.39
.	49	5.61	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q80

My church should give more to RHCC	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	63	7.22	7.22
Disagree	112	12.83	20.05
Neutral	600	68.73	88.77
Agree	35	4.01	92.78
Strg Agree	10	1.15	93.93
.	53	6.07	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q81

Communiatin vehicles effectiveness - mailings and letters	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Ineffective	70	8.02	8.02
Smwhat Effective	224	25.66	33.68
Mod. Effective	162	18.56	52.23
Effective	139	15.92	68.16
Very Effective	14	1.60	69.76
.	44	5.04	74.80
.a	220	25.20	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q82

emails	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Ineffective	82	9.39	9.39
Smwhat Effective	170	19.47	28.87
Mod. Effective	133	15.23	44.10
Effective	163	18.67	62.77
Very Effective	26	2.98	65.75
.	45	5.15	70.90
.a	254	29.10	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q83

byFaith magazine	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Ineffective	58	6.64	6.64
Smwhat Effective	110	12.60	19.24
Mod. Effective	130	14.89	34.14
Effective	163	18.67	52.81
Very Effective	33	3.78	56.59
.	45	5.15	61.74
.a	334	38.26	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q84

Web sites provided by PCA and/or committees & agencies	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Ineffective	36	4.12	4.12
Smwhat Effective	150	17.18	21.31
Mod. Effective	150	17.18	38.49
Effective	207	23.71	62.20
Very Effective	50	5.73	67.93
.	46	5.27	73.20
.a	234	26.80	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q85

Reports made by committees/agenc ies at GA	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Ineffective	113	12.94	12.94
Smwhat Effective	164	18.79	31.73
Mod. Effective	111	12.71	44.44
Effective	99	11.34	55.78
Very Effective	9	1.03	56.82
.	45	5.15	61.97
.a	332	38.03	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q86

Reports made by committees/agencies at presbytery	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Ineffective	94	10.77	10.77
Smwhat Effective	154	17.64	28.41
Mod. Effective	134	15.35	43.76
Effective	113	12.94	56.70
Very Effective	14	1.60	58.30
.	47	5.38	63.69
.a	317	36.31	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q87

Conferences sponsored by denom. organizations	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Ineffective	56	6.41	6.41
Smwhat Effective	161	18.44	24.86
Mod. Effective	136	15.58	40.44
Effective	100	11.45	51.89
Very Effective	35	4.01	55.90
.	47	5.38	61.28
.a	338	38.72	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q88

DVDs/CDs/Videos	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Ineffective	61	6.99	6.99
Smwhat Effective	138	15.81	22.79
Mod. Effective	112	12.83	35.62
Effective	73	8.36	43.99
Very Effective	19	2.18	46.16
.	47	5.38	51.55
.a	423	48.45	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q89

Direct contact/dialogue , phone, face-to-face	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Ineffective	49	5.61	5.61
Smwhat Effective	69	7.90	13.52
Mod. Effective	89	10.19	23.71
Effective	157	17.98	41.70
Very Effective	108	12.37	54.07
.	51	5.84	59.91
.a	350	40.09	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g2_q90

Other	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Ineffective	2	0.23	0.23
Smwhat Effective	3	0.34	0.57
Mod. Effective	4	0.46	1.03
Effective	5	0.57	1.60
Very Effective	4	0.46	2.06
.	745	85.34	87.40
.a	110	12.60	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g3_q1

Frequency attending GA over past five years	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Never	646	74.00	74.00
Once	85	9.74	83.73
2 or 3 Times	70	8.02	91.75
4 Times	23	2.63	94.39
All 5 Times	27	3.09	97.48
.	22	2.52	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g3_q2

Frequency attending meetings of local presbytery	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Never	462	52.92	52.92
Occasionally	200	22.91	75.83
Half the Time	35	4.01	79.84
Frequently	43	4.93	84.77
Neary 100%	117	13.40	98.17
.	16	1.83	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g3_q3

Level of agreement local church is better as member of PCA	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	4	0.46	0.46
Disagree	18	2.06	2.52
Neutral	70	8.02	10.54
Agree	392	44.90	55.44
Strg Agree	374	42.84	98.28
.	15	1.72	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g3_q4

I understand the values/standards PCA stands for	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	1	0.11	0.11
Disagree	2	0.23	0.34
Neutral	30	3.44	3.78
Agree	421	48.22	52.00
Strg Agree	402	46.05	98.05
.	17	1.95	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g3_q5

I agree with the values/standards PCA stands for	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	2	0.23	0.23
Disagree	10	1.15	1.37
Neutral	40	4.58	5.96
Agree	380	43.53	49.48
Strg Agree	422	48.34	97.82
.	19	2.18	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g3_q6

My church should do more to support PCA initiatives and causes	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	8	0.92	0.92
Disagree	50	5.73	6.64
Neutral	417	47.77	54.41
Agree	295	33.79	88.20
Strg Agree	84	9.62	97.82
.	19	2.18	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g3_q7

The PCA is getting more liberal compared to my church	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	120	13.75	13.75
Disagree	356	40.78	54.52
Neutral	255	29.21	83.73
Agree	92	10.54	94.27
Strg Agree	30	3.44	97.71
.	20	2.29	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g3_q8

The PCA is getting more conservative compared to my church	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	80	9.16	9.16
Disagree	344	39.40	48.57
Neutral	365	41.81	90.38
Agree	55	6.30	96.68
Strg Agree	8	0.92	97.59
.	21	2.41	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g3_q9

Growth to 2-3 million from current 300,000 a good thing	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	11	1.26	1.26
Disagree	43	4.93	6.19
Neutral	229	26.23	32.42
Agree	353	40.44	72.85
Strg Agree	217	24.86	97.71
.	20	2.29	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g3_q10

PCA support important part of my church's planning/prog rams	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	37	4.24	4.24
Disagree	156	17.87	22.11
Neutral	348	39.86	61.97
Agree	271	31.04	93.01
Strg Agree	40	4.58	97.59
.	21	2.41	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g3_q11

Support my church gives to the PCA is a high priority here	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	24	2.75	2.75
Disagree	151	17.30	20.05
Neutral	327	37.46	57.50
Agree	316	36.20	93.70
Strg Agree	37	4.24	97.94
.	18	2.06	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g3_q12

I plan on continuing to be an active member within the PCA	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	3	0.34	0.34
Disagree	13	1.49	1.83
Neutral	36	4.12	5.96
Agree	305	34.94	40.89
Strg Agree	498	57.04	97.94
.	18	2.06	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g4_q1

Local church decision maker for PCA funds: Pastor/Senior Pastor	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Pastor/Sr. Pastor	254	29.10	29.10
.	619	70.90	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g4_q2

Local church decision maker for PCA funds: Clerk of Session	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Clerk of Session	28	3.21	3.21
.	845	96.79	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g4_q3

Local church decision maker for PCA funds: Session as a whole	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Session as a whole	669	76.63	76.63
.	204	23.37	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g4_q4

Local church decision maker for PCA funds: Chair of the Diaconate	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Chair of Diaconate	39	4.47	4.47
.	834	95.53	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g4_q5

Local church decision maker for PCA funds: Business/Office Administrator	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Bus./Office Admin'r	19	2.18	2.18
.	854	97.82	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g4_q6

Local church decision maker for PCA funds: Other committee chairperson	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Other comm. Chair	69	7.90	7.90
.	804	92.10	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g4_q7

Local church decision maker for PCA funds: Other church staff member	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Ch. staff member	17	1.95	1.95
.	856	98.05	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g4_q8

Local church decision maker for PCA funds:	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Don't Know			
Don't Know	85	9.74	9.74
.	788	90.26	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g4_q9

Level of familiarity with PCA 'Partnership Shares' program	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Not Familiar	512	58.65	58.65
Some Familiar	132	15.12	73.77
Mod. Familiar	74	8.48	82.25
Familiar	86	9.85	92.10
Very Familiar	61	6.99	99.08
.	8	0.92	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g4_q10

Every church should contribute something to the cost of the PCA	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	4	0.46	0.46
Disagree	19	2.18	2.63
Neutral	65	7.45	10.08
Agree	544	62.31	72.39
Strg Agree	229	26.23	98.63
.	12	1.37	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g4_q11

PCA's committees/ag encies are good stewards of their funds	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	6	0.69	0.69
Disagree	20	2.29	2.98
Neutral	510	58.42	61.40
Agree	283	32.42	93.81
Strg Agree	43	4.93	98.74
.	11	1.26	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g4_q12

Current PCA fund raising methods are effective	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	11	1.26	1.26
Disagree	107	12.26	13.52
Neutral	650	74.46	87.97
Agree	91	10.42	98.40
Strg Agree	3	0.34	98.74
.	11	1.26	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g4_q13

Churches within PCA should have more denom. influence financially	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	82	9.39	9.39
Disagree	290	33.22	42.61
Neutral	239	27.38	69.99
Agree	222	25.43	95.42
Strg Agree	23	2.63	98.05
.	17	1.95	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g4_q14

Giving to PCA causes should be complete voluntary	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	17	1.95	1.95
Disagree	167	19.13	21.08
Neutral	247	28.29	49.37
Agree	362	41.47	90.84
Strg Agree	62	7.10	97.94
.	18	2.06	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g4_q15

Mandatory church 'dues' would be a good thing to belong to the PCA	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	132	15.12	15.12
Disagree	262	30.01	45.13
Neutral	279	31.96	77.09
Agree	170	19.47	96.56
Strg Agree	12	1.37	97.94
.	18	2.06	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g4_q16

'Partnership Shares' is an effective method for raising PCA Funds	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	19	2.18	2.18
Disagree	98	11.23	13.40
Neutral	369	42.27	55.67
Agree	348	39.86	95.53
Strg Agree	25	2.86	98.40
.	14	1.60	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g4_q17

Teaching elders have explained 'Partnership Shares' to leaders	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	137	15.69	15.69
Disagree	280	32.07	47.77
Neutral	323	37.00	84.77
Agree	109	12.49	97.25
Strg Agree	11	1.26	98.51
.	13	1.49	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g4_q18

Churches in the PCA give 5% of operating budgets to PCA organizations	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Too Low	197	22.57	22.57
Some Too Low	291	33.33	55.90
About Right	317	36.31	92.21
Some Too High	14	1.60	93.81
Too High	2	0.23	94.04
.	52	5.96	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g4_q19

How appropriate is the 5% level in Item 18 above?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Too Low	106	12.14	12.14
Some Too Low	179	20.50	32.65
About Right	427	48.91	81.56
Some Too High	92	10.54	92.10
Too High	17	1.95	94.04
.	52	5.96	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g5_q1

Attended General Assembly (GA) within past three years	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Yes	167	19.13	19.13
No	687	78.69	97.82
.	19	2.18	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g5_q2

Served on a Committee of Comissioner s at GA within past 3 years	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Yes	53	6.07	6.07
No	801	91.75	97.82
.	19	2.18	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g5_q3

Importance - positive reasons for attending GA: Interact with friends	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Not Important	92	10.54	10.54
Some Important	176	20.16	30.70
Mod. Important	160	18.33	49.03
Very Important	195	22.34	71.36
Critically Important	44	5.04	76.40
.	22	2.52	78.92
.a	184	21.08	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g5_q4

Opportunity to learn best practices, interact with 'thought leaders'	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Not Important	46	5.27	5.27
Some Important	139	15.92	21.19
Mod. Important	183	20.96	42.15
Very Important	261	29.90	72.05
Critically Important	53	6.07	78.12
.	22	2.52	80.64
.a	169	19.36	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g5_q5

Opportunity to learn about resources available to me and my church	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Not Important	53	6.07	6.07
Some Important	159	18.21	24.28
Mod. Important	218	24.97	49.26
Very Important	244	27.95	77.21
Critically Important	39	4.47	81.67
.	22	2.52	84.19
.a	138	15.81	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g5_q6

Opportunity to worship/pray together in denom.-wide assembly	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Not Important	19	2.18	2.18
Some Important	93	10.65	12.83
Mod. Important	132	15.12	27.95
Very Important	292	33.45	61.40
Critically Important	189	21.65	83.05
.	24	2.75	85.80
.a	124	14.20	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g5_q7

Opportunity to involve family so we feel more connected to PCA	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Not Important	196	22.45	22.45
Some Important	171	19.59	42.04
Mod. Important	156	17.87	59.91
Very Important	119	13.63	73.54
Critically Important	18	2.06	75.60
.	26	2.98	78.58
.a	187	21.42	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g5_q8

Opportunity to hear of progress/issues concerning PCA agencies	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Not Important	29	3.32	3.32
Some Important	145	16.61	19.93
Mod. Important	223	25.54	45.48
Very Important	249	28.52	74.00
Critically Important	63	7.22	81.21
.	21	2.41	83.62
.a	143	16.38	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g5_q9

Debate/development of PCA positions on theological issues	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Not Important	12	1.37	1.37
Some Important	77	8.82	10.19
Mod. Important	124	14.20	24.40
Very Important	293	33.56	57.96
Critically Important	225	25.77	83.73
.	26	2.98	86.71
.a	116	13.29	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g5_q10

Debate/development of PCA positions on cultural issues	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Not Important	19	2.18	2.18
Some Important	96	11.00	13.17
Mod. Important	131	15.01	28.18
Very Important	284	32.53	60.71
Critically Important	202	23.14	83.85
.	24	2.75	86.60
.a	117	13.40	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g5_q11

Debate/development of PCA positions important to function of church	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Not Important	22	2.52	2.52
Some Important	118	13.52	16.04
Mod. Important	151	17.30	33.33
Very Important	247	28.29	61.63
Critically Important	169	19.36	80.99
.	21	2.41	83.39
.a	145	16.61	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g5_q12

Debate/development of PCA judicial proceedings from lower courts	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Not Important	35	4.01	4.01
Some Important	138	15.81	19.82
Mod. Important	137	15.69	35.51
Very Important	254	29.10	64.60
Critically Important	146	16.72	81.33
.	23	2.63	83.96
.a	140	16.04	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g5_q13

Opportunity to review/hold presbyteries accountable	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Not Important	55	6.30	6.30
Some Important	128	14.66	20.96
Mod. Important	143	16.38	37.34
Very Important	246	28.18	65.52
Critically Important	135	15.46	80.99
.	26	2.98	83.96
.a	140	16.04	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g5_q14

Opportunity to review/hold committees/agencies accountable	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Not Important	47	5.38	5.38
Some Important	115	13.17	18.56
Mod. Important	144	16.49	35.05
Very Important	254	29.10	64.15
Critically Important	145	16.61	80.76
.	25	2.86	83.62
.a	143	16.38	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g5_q15

Other	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Some Important	2	0.23	0.23
Mod. Important	3	0.34	0.57
Very Important	7	0.80	1.37
Critically Important	9	1.03	2.41
.	769	88.09	90.49
.a	83	9.51	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g5_q16

Barriers to attending the PCA General Assembly (GA): Total Cost	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Not a Barrier	130	14.89	14.89
Swhat a Barrier	193	22.11	37.00
Mod. Barrier	152	17.41	54.41
Signif. Barrier	123	14.09	68.50
Very Sig. Barrier	62	7.10	75.60
.	22	2.52	78.12
.a	191	21.88	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g5_q17

Barriers to attending the PCA General Assembly (GA): Length of time GA requires	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Not a Barrier	218	24.97	24.97
Swhat a Barrier	168	19.24	44.22
Mod. Barrier	145	16.61	60.82
Signif. Barrier	86	9.85	70.68
Very Sig. Barrier	21	2.41	73.08
.	21	2.41	75.49
.a	214	24.51	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g5_q18

Barriers to attending the PCA GA: Time off from work during work week	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Not a Barrier	213	24.40	24.40
Swhat a Barrier	157	17.98	42.38
Mod. Barrier	108	12.37	54.75
Signif. Barrier	145	16.61	71.36
Very Sig. Barrier	77	8.82	80.18
.	24	2.75	82.93
.a	149	17.07	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g5_q19

Barriers attending PCA GA: my lack of ability to contribute/knowledge of issues	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Not a Barrier	247	28.29	28.29
Swhat a Barrier	152	17.41	45.70
Mod. Barrier	147	16.84	62.54
Signif. Barrier	102	11.68	74.23
Very Sig. Barrier	32	3.67	77.89
.	24	2.75	80.64
.a	169	19.36	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g5_q20

Barriers attending PCA GA: my lack of familiarity with procedures	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Not a Barrier	280	32.07	32.07
Swhat a Barrier	167	19.13	51.20
Mod. Barrier	116	13.29	64.49
Signif. Barrier	80	9.16	73.65
Very Sig. Barrier	29	3.32	76.98
.	21	2.41	79.38
.a	180	20.62	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g5_q21

Barriers attnd'g PCA GA: personal disinterest in PCA level mtgs and ministries	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Not a Barrier	407	46.62	46.62
Swhat a Barrier	156	17.87	64.49
Mod. Barrier	68	7.79	72.28
Signif. Barrier	50	5.73	78.01
Very Sig. Barrier	22	2.52	80.53
.	31	3.55	84.08
.a	139	15.92	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g5_q22

Barriers attnd'g PCA GA: Other	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Not a Barrier	5	0.57	0.57
Swhat a Barrier	1	0.11	0.69
Mod. Barrier	1	0.11	0.80
Signif. Barrier	11	1.26	2.06
Very Sig. Barrier	23	2.63	4.70
.	751	86.03	90.72
.a	81	9.28	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g6_q1

The debate/discus sion at GA is productive and necessary	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	4	0.46	0.46
Disagree	19	2.18	2.63
Neutral	23	2.63	5.27
Agree	86	9.85	15.12
Strg Agree	34	3.89	19.01
.	707	80.99	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g6_q2

Process of debate at GA balances the majority and minority views	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	7	0.80	0.80
Disagree	16	1.83	2.63
Neutral	29	3.32	5.96
Agree	98	11.23	17.18
Strg Agree	16	1.83	19.01
.	707	80.99	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g6_q3

Presentation by committee/age ncy heads are productive/ne cessary	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	5	0.57	0.57
Disagree	13	1.49	2.06
Neutral	36	4.12	6.19
Agree	92	10.54	16.72
Strg Agree	20	2.29	19.01
.	707	80.99	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g6_q4

Presentations /rec. from committee chairs productive/ne cessary	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	2	0.23	0.23
Disagree	6	0.69	0.92
Neutral	36	4.12	5.04
Agree	97	11.11	16.15
Strg Agree	25	2.86	19.01
.	707	80.99	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g6_q5

Presentations /reports by leaders of other denom.s are valuable	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	11	1.26	1.26
Disagree	28	3.21	4.47
Neutral	61	6.99	11.45
Agree	61	6.99	18.44
Strg Agree	5	0.57	19.01
.	707	80.99	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g6_q6

An appropriate balance between work and worship in the GA agenda	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	4	0.46	0.46
Disagree	18	2.06	2.52
Neutral	29	3.32	5.84
Agree	104	11.91	17.75
Strg Agree	10	1.15	18.90
.	708	81.10	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g6_q7

Number of days spent at GA is about right	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	3	0.34	0.34
Disagree	12	1.37	1.72
Neutral	34	3.89	5.61
Agree	108	12.37	17.98
Strg Agree	8	0.92	18.90
.	708	81.10	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g6_q8

GA should continue to meet annually	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	5	0.57	0.57
Disagree	14	1.60	2.18
Neutral	21	2.41	4.58
Agree	74	8.48	13.06
Strg Agree	52	5.96	19.01
.	707	80.99	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g6_q9

Diversity of views of those speaking at GA appropriate & balanced	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	6	0.69	0.69
Disagree	21	2.41	3.09
Neutral	35	4.01	7.10
Agree	91	10.42	17.53
Strg Agree	12	1.37	18.90
.	708	81.10	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g6_q10

Commissioners attend GA good reflection of PCA view as a whole	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	5	0.57	0.57
Disagree	25	2.86	3.44
Neutral	41	4.70	8.13
Agree	84	9.62	17.75
Strg Agree	11	1.26	19.01
.	707	80.99	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g6_q11

My time spent at GA is worthwhile	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Strg Disagree	2	0.23	0.23
Disagree	8	0.92	1.15
Neutral	18	2.06	3.21
Agree	100	11.45	14.66
Strg Agree	36	4.12	18.79
.	709	81.21	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g6_q12

How often do you encourage fellow church leaders to attend GA?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Never	17	1.95	1.95
Rarely	13	1.49	3.44
Occasionally	56	6.41	9.85
Frequently	61	6.99	16.84
Very Frequently	19	2.18	19.01
.	707	80.99	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of g6_q13

Impression of total size of GA in terms of number of commissioners	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Never	5	0.57	0.57
Rarely	17	1.95	2.52
Occasionally	89	10.19	12.71
Frequently	18	2.06	14.78
Very Frequently	11	1.26	16.04
.	708	81.10	97.14
.a	25	2.86	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of Gender71

What is your gender?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
male	691	79.15	79.15
female	166	19.01	98.17
.	16	1.83	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of Age72

What is your age?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
20-29	44	5.04	5.04
30-39	160	18.33	23.37
40-49	268	30.70	54.07
50-59	242	27.72	81.79
60-69	107	12.26	94.04
70 and up	36	4.12	98.17
.	16	1.83	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of Ethnicity73

What is your race/ethnicit y?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Caucasian	819	93.81	93.81
Afro American	13	1.49	95.30
Hispanic	6	0.69	95.99
Korean	1	0.11	96.11
Other	15	1.72	97.82
.	19	2.18	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of LeaderRole74

Which of the choices below best describes your role in your church?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Teaching Elder	111	12.71	12.71
Ruling Elder	303	34.71	47.42
Deacon	151	17.30	64.72
Deaconess	6	0.69	65.41
Active Church Member	283	32.42	97.82
.	19	2.18	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of NumGA75

How many General Assemblies have you attended?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
None	606	69.42	69.42
One	91	10.42	79.84
Two or three	53	6.07	85.91
More than three	106	12.14	98.05
.	17	1.95	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

-> tabulation of GeoSetting76

Which description best reflects your church's demographic setting?	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Inner City	25	2.86	2.86
Urban	141	16.15	19.01
Suburban	478	54.75	73.77
Small Town	171	19.59	93.36
Rural	27	3.09	96.45
Other	15	1.72	98.17
.	16	1.83	100.00
Total	873	100.00	

The reader will note the “.a” coding designation for some of the survey items. This code was implemented for those items where there was a code of “0” given for an “I don’t know” category designation. The inclusion of these values for an item, results in the calculation of an erroneous value for the item mean and its supporting descriptive statistics.

Table VI provides the summary descriptive statistics for the stratified, clustered sample design.

Table VI
PCA Leadership Attitude Survey
Presbyterian Church In America (PCA)
Spring, 2005

Summary Analysis of Survey Adjusted Item Means with Supporting Statistics

pweight:	pweight	Number of obs(*) =	873
Strata:	presbynbr	Number of strata =	44
PSU:	churchnbr	Number of PSUs =	141
		Population size =	2767

Mean	Estimate	Std. Err.	[95% Conf. Interval]		Deff
g1_q1	3.623503	.0438121	3.536548	3.710458	2.198134
g1_q2	3.440742	.0476333	3.346203	3.53528	2.535925
g1_q3	3.27515	.0277014	3.220163	3.330137	1.239013
g1_q4	3.45385	.0425796	3.369341	3.538359	1.730211
g1_q5	3.523458	.0443866	3.435363	3.611553	2.246166
g1_q6	1.921747	.0365138	1.849258	1.994236	2.829303
g1_q7	1.993155	.0517412	1.890449	2.09586	2.293264
g1_q8	1.338175	.0291768	1.280252	1.396098	1.445866
g1_q9	1.682013	.0427537	1.597101	1.766926	1.14232
g1_q10	1.171858	.0160584	1.139983	1.203734	1.055998
g1_q11	1.641068	.0350458	1.571483	1.710652	1.209305
g1_q12	1.498537	.0307747	1.437449	1.559624	1.14337
g1_q13	2.560784	.0293326	2.502559	2.619009	1.96057
g1_q14	1.145757	.0150092	1.11596	1.175554	.909675
g1_q15	2.775543	.0248169	2.726281	2.824804	2.059688
g1_q16	1.849832	.0326958	1.784931	1.914733	.9657257
g1_q17	2.730558	.0256521	2.679639	2.781478	1.623464
g1_q18	2.124872	.0329856	2.059378	2.190366	1.702016
g1_q19	2.900956	.0154628	2.870262	2.931649	1.566104
g1_q20	2.729289	.0191195	2.691332	2.767246	.8992124
g1_q21	1.839198	.0507193	1.738507	1.939888	2.757368
g1_q22	2.307728	.0462932	2.215812	2.399644	2.238047
g1_q23	1.585603	.0429889	1.500223	1.670982	1.896671
g1_q24	1.568147	.0624966	1.444041	1.692253	3.892947
g1_q25	1.698234	.0355188	1.627729	1.768738	2.15682
g1_q26	1.865263	.0135923	1.838282	1.892243	1.153986
g1_q27	1.908739	.0123218	1.88428	1.933198	1.097594
g1_q28	2.094324	.0318611	2.031072	2.157577	1.32099
g1_q29	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)				
g1_q30	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)				
g2_q1	2.646538	.0456824	2.555871	2.737205	1.509362
g2_q2	3.262925	.0271952	3.208943	3.316907	1.698126
g2_q3	3.043498	.0328394	2.978312	3.108684	1.742245
g2_q4	2.910548	.026942	2.857069	2.964028	1.265932
g2_q5	3.175962	.0242906	3.127745	3.224178	1.571094
g2_q6	2.88466	.0258491	2.83335	2.93597	1.21717
g2_q7	3.379992	.0319967	3.316479	3.443505	1.623871
g2_q8	2.944875	.0256413	2.893978	2.995773	1.263005
g2_q9	3.253843	.0614309	3.131903	3.375782	3.021935
g2_q10	3.479602	.0372376	3.405686	3.553518	2.534676
g2_q11	3.486016	.0501463	3.386477	3.585556	3.11713
g2_q12	3.130868	.0413609	3.048767	3.212968	2.351173
g2_q13	3.218537	.0253318	3.168254	3.26882	1.809851
g2_q14	2.891748	.0252566	2.841614	2.941882	1.248551
g2_q15	3.742431	.0503388	3.642509	3.842352	2.941002
g2_q16	3.012957	.0286456	2.956096	3.069819	1.682154
g2_q17	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)				

Mean	Estimate	Std. Err.	[95% Conf. Interval]		Deff
g2_q18	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)				
g2_q19	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)				
g2_q20	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)				
g2_q21	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)				
g2_q22	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)				
g2_q23	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)				
g2_q24	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)				
g2_q25	3.565094	.053931	3.458041	3.672146	2.360688
g2_q26	3.703641	.0345686	3.635023	3.77226	1.768694
g2_q27	3.363119	.0417476	3.280251	3.445988	1.85337
g2_q28	3.126418	.0344508	3.058034	3.194803	1.508028
g2_q29	3.317104	.0313177	3.254939	3.37927	2.048569
g2_q30	2.936794	.0323108	2.872658	3.00093	1.612066
g2_q31	3.918493	.0429932	3.833152	4.003834	1.909286
g2_q32	3.167425	.0329458	3.102028	3.232822	1.521563
g2_q33	3.683485	.0561624	3.572004	3.794967	3.189351
g2_q34	3.694196	.0382963	3.618178	3.770213	2.20317
g2_q35	3.296523	.0445108	3.20817	3.384877	2.084801
g2_q36	3.315285	.0419433	3.232028	3.398542	2.095359
g2_q37	3.302321	.0337331	3.235361	3.36928	1.945061
g2_q38	3.218827	.0436258	3.13223	3.305423	2.344883
g2_q39	3.99656	.0508624	3.895599	4.097521	2.986289
g2_q40	3.261999	.0441084	3.174445	3.349553	2.490818
g2_q41	3.923643	.0465942	3.831167	4.01612	2.685674
g2_q42	3.937351	.0416075	3.854771	4.01993	2.80977
g2_q43	3.549417	.0439331	3.462222	3.636612	2.20395
g2_q44	3.598736	.0493732	3.500744	3.696728	3.091871
g2_q45	3.477185	.0438805	3.390095	3.564276	2.499427
g2_q46	3.570355	.0616756	3.447946	3.692764	4.698709
g2_q47	4.159419	.0446038	4.070893	4.247945	2.682209
g2_q48	3.401297	.0484988	3.30504	3.497554	2.806594
g2_q49	2.657635	.0383014	2.581607	2.733662	1.166742
g2_q50	3.183525	.0235332	3.136812	3.230238	1.573163
g2_q51	2.884646	.0285026	2.828069	2.941223	1.648202
g2_q52	2.832322	.0254775	2.781749	2.882894	1.119802
g2_q53	3.10845	.0181153	3.072491	3.144409	1.14854
g2_q54	2.784359	.0263683	2.732018	2.8367	1.515793
g2_q55	3.087649	.0218906	3.044197	3.131102	1.006081
g2_q56	2.876825	.0222215	2.832716	2.920934	1.20843
g2_q57	2.97186	.0384668	2.895503	3.048216	1.18679
g2_q58	3.326218	.0201484	3.286223	3.366212	.88311
g2_q59	3.148975	.026438	3.096496	3.201455	1.07248
g2_q60	2.931622	.0270605	2.877907	2.985337	1.222749
g2_q61	3.159214	.0199044	3.119704	3.198724	1.280929
g2_q62	2.904285	.0226709	2.859283	2.949286	1.127757
g2_q63	3.424724	.0237104	3.377659	3.471789	.8135546
g2_q64	3.01807	.0219366	2.974526	3.061614	1.18471
g2_q65	3.675543	.0620216	3.552431	3.798655	3.032206
g2_q66	3.734218	.0456529	3.643598	3.824838	3.076175
g2_q67	3.379092	.0522362	3.275404	3.48278	2.646529
g2_q68	3.265295	.0482178	3.169584	3.361007	2.549465
g2_q69	3.371308	.0386051	3.294677	3.447938	2.691248
g2_q70	3.211206	.0539252	3.104166	3.318247	3.379891
g2_q71	3.808022	.0579902	3.692913	3.923132	3.531375
g2_q72	3.315949	.0399678	3.236613	3.395284	2.048863
g2_q73	2.959006	.0551898	2.849455	3.068557	2.209866
g2_q74	3.27608	.0311101	3.214345	3.337815	2.199487
g2_q75	2.915249	.0418877	2.832102	2.998395	2.220493
g2_q76	2.841578	.0329359	2.776201	2.906956	1.678065
g2_q77	3.133923	.0230687	3.088132	3.179714	1.880215
g2_q78	2.764351	.0314059	2.702011	2.826691	1.619479

Mean	Estimate	Std. Err.	[95% Conf. Interval]	Deff
g2_q79	2.957809	.0372998	2.883769 3.031848	1.927864
g2_q80	2.796473	.0302786	2.73637 2.856575	1.548889
g2_q81	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)			
g2_q82	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)			
g2_q83	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)			
g2_q84	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)			
g2_q85	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)			
g2_q86	2.602442	.0579728	2.487336 2.717548	1.369932
g2_q87	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)			
g2_q88	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)			
g2_q89	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)			
g2_q90	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)			
g3_q1	1.469241	.0393865	1.39106 1.547423	1.413245
g3_q2	2.040183	.0590456	1.922978 2.157387	1.453617
g3_q3	4.297606	.0296836	4.238684 4.356527	1.372547
g3_q4	4.42653	.0209131	4.385018 4.468042	1.116196
g3_q5	4.424172	.0227203	4.379067 4.469278	1.036224
g3_q6	3.476248	.0339924	3.408773 3.543722	1.583142
g3_q7	2.483611	.0600803	2.364352 2.602869	3.251947
g3_q8	2.505294	.0443018	2.417355 2.593232	2.693824
g3_q9	3.851341	.0373646	3.777173 3.925509	1.470336
g3_q10	3.145644	.0476709	3.051019 3.24027	2.344798
g3_q11	3.206528	.0380131	3.131072 3.281983	1.598184
g3_q12	4.498311	.0247709	4.449141 4.54748	1.136529
g4_q1	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)			
g4_q2	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)			
g4_q3	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)			
g4_q4	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)			
g4_q5	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)			
g4_q6	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)			
g4_q7	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)			
g4_q8	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)			
g4_q9	1.904939	.0662355	1.77348 2.036398	2.256737
g4_q10	4.124562	.0248724	4.075197 4.173927	1.168649
g4_q11	3.393931	.0324706	3.329486 3.458376	2.139434
g4_q12	2.958106	.0232968	2.911868 3.004344	1.622094
g4_q13	2.777971	.0582856	2.66229 2.893651	2.803816
g4_q14	3.341608	.0439961	3.254288 3.428928	1.894044
g4_q15	2.610081	.0366961	2.537249 2.682913	1.122774
g4_q16	3.299978	.0386686	3.223231 3.376724	2.005037
g4_q17	2.506639	.047593	2.412181 2.601098	2.172141
g4_q18	2.180501	.0442055	2.092765 2.268237	2.325846
g4_q19	2.67886	.0456743	2.588209 2.76951	2.06832
g5_q1	1.80388	.0182408	1.767677 1.840083	1.800215
g5_q2	1.937258	.0100894	1.917233 1.957282	1.476593
g5_q3	2.88898	.0542623	2.781241 2.996719	1.436837
g5_q4	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)			
g5_q5	3.101201	.0495492	3.00282 3.199583	1.62866
g5_q6	3.759335	.0445564	3.67088 3.847791	1.294188
g5_q7	2.394403	.0546473	2.285852 2.502953	1.439632
g5_q8	3.247	.0435124	3.160617 3.333384	1.319521
g5_q9	3.8898	.0409335	3.808548 3.971053	1.170806
g5_q10	3.781067	.0450836	3.691577 3.870558	1.28134
g5_q11	3.619094	.0469321	3.525935 3.712253	1.233067
g5_q12	3.486611	.0431078	3.401043 3.572179	.9832652
g5_q13	3.408365	.0503816	3.308358 3.508372	1.267855
g5_q14	3.476023	.0508634	3.37506 3.576986	1.354216
g5_q15	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)			
g5_q16	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)			
g5_q17	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)			

Mean	Estimate	Std. Err.	[95% Conf. Interval]		Deff
g5_q18	2.603328	.0566406	2.490882	2.715773	1.184809
g5_q19	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)				
g5_q20	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)				
g5_q21	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)				
g5_q22	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)				
g6_q1	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)				
g6_q2	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)				
g6_q3	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)				
g6_q4	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)				
g6_q5	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)				
g6_q6	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)				
g6_q7	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)				
g6_q8	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)				
g6_q9	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)				
g6_q10	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)				
g6_q11	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)				
g6_q12	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)				
g6_q13	(stratum with 1 PSU detected)				
Gender71	.1848468	.022649	.1398947	.2297988	2.914212
Age72	3.3912	.051119	3.289743	3.492657	1.533436
Ethni~73	1.109355	.0221245	1.065444	1.153265	1.243099
Leade~74	3.035288	.0936712	2.849376	3.221199	3.416453
NumGA75	1.602638	.048416	1.506546	1.698731	1.810071
GeoSe~76	3.084012	.0594966	2.965928	3.202096	3.775041
ig1_q29	1.410012	.2102472	.9927297	1.827295	.7658004
ig1_q30	1.47197	.0321126	1.408235	1.535705	1.248335
ig2_q17	3.551117	.0513581	3.449185	3.653048	2.480357
ig2_q18	3.598868	.0294995	3.54032	3.657417	1.548828
ig2_q19	2.875652	.0338183	2.808532	2.942772	1.409553
ig2_q20	2.915225	.0313196	2.853064	2.977386	1.334335
ig2_q21	3.253067	.0260512	3.201362	3.304771	1.666572
ig2_q22	2.846126	.0378415	2.771021	2.921231	2.166945
ig2_q23	3.462701	.0462656	3.370877	3.554525	2.019742
ig2_q24	2.99688	.0326915	2.931996	3.061764	1.58454
ig2_q81	2.653573	.0372214	2.579689	2.727457	1.488432
ig2_q82	2.769115	.0326113	2.704382	2.833848	.9820449
ig2_q83	2.950017	.0408327	2.868965	3.031069	1.708236
ig2_q84	3.088645	.0378106	3.013592	3.163699	1.4068
ig2_q85	2.420258	.0375137	2.345794	2.494722	1.416506
ig2_q87	2.707889	.0380626	2.632336	2.783443	1.477594
ig2_q88	2.5992	.0299415	2.539766	2.658633	1.140232
ig2_q89	3.402176	.0332993	3.336078	3.468275	.9581838
ig2_q90	3.949893	.1254772	3.700822	4.198963	1.633862
ig4_q1	1	0	1	1	.
ig4_q2	1	0	1	1	.
ig4_q3	1	0	1	1	.
ig4_q4	1	0	1	1	.
ig4_q5	1	0	1	1	.
ig4_q6	1	0	1	1	.
ig4_q7	1	0	1	1	.
ig4_q8	1	0	1	1	.
ig5_q4	3.185575	.0424898	3.101244	3.269905	1.668707
ig5_q15	4.231904	.109056	4.015458	4.44835	1.140266
ig5_q16	2.681262	.0447306	2.592484	2.77004	1.425846
ig5_q17	2.2895	.0404184	2.209281	2.369719	1.380905
ig5_q19	2.300932	.0549646	2.191842	2.410021	2.173925
ig5_q20	2.127956	.053616	2.021543	2.234369	2.216663
ig5_q21	1.743033	.0467708	1.650206	1.83586	1.949991
ig5_q22	4.019599	.0918479	3.837306	4.201892	1.226362

Items with the “(stratum with 1 PSU detected)” designation are items where there was only one church present in at least one stratum (presbytery) of the sample. This typically

occurred when the number of responses to the item was very low. Small sample sizes like this typically do not provide reliable means and their associated statistical indices.

Table VII provides the summary descriptive statistics for the sample taken as an SRS.

Table VII
PCA Leadership Attitude Survey
Presbyterian Church In America (PCA)
Fall, 2004
Summary Analysis of Unadjusted (SRS) Item Means with Supporting Statistics

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	[95% Conf. Interval]	
presbynbr	873	34.26804	.6140437	33.06287	35.47322
pweight	873	3.16953	.0312001	3.108294	3.230766
churchnbr	873	129.6678	2.254947	125.2421	134.0936
prncode	873	18.27148	.4455029	17.39709	19.14586
churchsize	873	1.967927	.0364445	1.896397	2.039456

participan	873	21.94273	1.227819	19.5329	24.35255
g1_q1	832	3.616587	.0296713	3.558347	3.674826
g1_q2	835	3.435928	.0302044	3.376642	3.495214
g1_q3	809	3.278121	.0250574	3.228936	3.327306
g1_q4	837	3.467145	.0325715	3.403213	3.531076

g1_q5	831	3.527076	.0300093	3.468173	3.585979
g1_q6	803	1.921544	.0218	1.878752	1.964336
g1_q7	823	1.978129	.0341208	1.911155	2.045103
g1_q8	813	1.323493	.0236718	1.277028	1.369958
g1_q9	753	1.686587	.0402207	1.607629	1.765545

g1_q10	828	1.169082	.0153968	1.138861	1.199303
g1_q11	799	1.633292	.0319178	1.570639	1.695944
g1_q12	811	1.488286	.028688	1.431974	1.544598
g1_q13	844	2.555687	.0208864	2.514692	2.596683
g1_q14	812	1.142857	.0155595	1.112316	1.173399

g1_q15	840	2.783333	.0170371	2.749893	2.816774
g1_q16	831	1.842359	.0333764	1.776846	1.907871
g1_q17	837	2.733572	.0199891	2.694338	2.772807
g1_q18	754	2.119363	.0254333	2.069435	2.169292
g1_q19	839	2.901073	.0123242	2.876883	2.925263

g1_q20	836	2.721292	.0204546	2.681143	2.76144
g1_q21	826	1.843826	.0305225	1.783915	1.903737
g1_q22	800	2.30875	.0308093	2.248273	2.369227
g1_q23	718	1.587744	.031474	1.525952	1.649536
g1_q24	804	1.56592	.0317668	1.503565	1.628276

g1_q25	819	1.697192	.0242788	1.649536	1.744848
g1_q26	834	1.86211	.0127617	1.837061	1.887159
g1_q27	835	1.912575	.0117788	1.889455	1.935695
g1_q28	822	2.103406	.0275497	2.04933	2.157482
g1_q29	32	2.09375	.1816112	1.723352	2.464148

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	[95% Conf. Interval]	
g1_q30	11	1.818182	.3252463	1.093488	2.542876
g2_q1	840	2.644048	.0371866	2.571058	2.717037
g2_q2	833	3.264106	.0208018	3.223275	3.304936
g2_q3	831	3.048135	.024796	2.999465	3.096805
g2_q4	828	2.910628	.024211	2.863106	2.95815
g2_q5	828	3.171498	.019322	3.133572	3.209424
g2_q6	828	2.894928	.0234907	2.848819	2.941036
g2_q7	832	3.371394	.0248293	3.322659	3.42013
g2_q8	832	2.948317	.0225244	2.904106	2.992529
g2_q9	837	3.255675	.0355291	3.185938	3.325412
g2_q10	827	3.478839	.0235354	3.432643	3.525035
g2_q11	828	3.485507	.0286185	3.429334	3.541681
g2_q12	828	3.135266	.0273136	3.081654	3.188878
g2_q13	827	3.212817	.0187653	3.175984	3.249651
g2_q14	829	2.897467	.0227827	2.852748	2.942186
g2_q15	827	3.732769	.0293874	3.675086	3.790452
g2_q16	827	2.998791	.0220126	2.955584	3.041998
g2_q17	833	3.557023	.0331484	3.491958	3.622087
g2_q18	828	3.605072	.0244055	3.557169	3.652976
g2_q19	830	2.883133	.0293239	2.825575	2.94069
g2_q20	828	2.921498	.0278706	2.866792	2.976203
g2_q21	827	3.25393	.0206282	3.21344	3.29442
g2_q22	827	2.869407	.0266704	2.817058	2.921757
g2_q23	828	3.455314	.0334756	3.389607	3.521021
g2_q24	827	2.984281	.0264748	2.932315	3.036246
g2_q25	832	3.573317	.0352998	3.50403	3.642605
g2_q26	828	3.713768	.0262312	3.662281	3.765256
g2_q27	830	3.375904	.0307997	3.315449	3.436358
g2_q28	829	3.124246	.0281053	3.06908	3.179412
g2_q29	821	3.311815	.0217398	3.269143	3.354487
g2_q30	825	2.945455	.0255146	2.895373	2.995536
g2_q31	828	3.927536	.0313653	3.865971	3.989101
g2_q32	828	3.165459	.0265952	3.113257	3.217661
g2_q33	829	3.668275	.0316542	3.606143	3.730407
g2_q34	828	3.681159	.0260822	3.629964	3.732354
g2_q35	829	3.293124	.0309089	3.232455	3.353793
g2_q36	829	3.308806	.0289415	3.251998	3.365613
g2_q37	828	3.293478	.0238555	3.246654	3.340303
g2_q38	825	3.218182	.0283593	3.162517	3.273847
g2_q39	828	3.987923	.0295981	3.929826	4.046019
g2_q40	827	3.245466	.0280423	3.190423	3.300508
g2_q41	834	3.911271	.0288301	3.854683	3.967859
g2_q42	834	3.926859	.0250672	3.877656	3.976061
g2_q43	831	3.545126	.0296915	3.486847	3.603406
g2_q44	833	3.593037	.0280948	3.537892	3.648182
g2_q45	833	3.465786	.0275302	3.41175	3.519823
g2_q46	832	3.567308	.0284148	3.511534	3.623081
g2_q47	832	4.149038	.0274119	4.095234	4.202843
g2_q48	835	3.383234	.0288934	3.326521	3.439946
g2_q49	826	2.653753	.0353794	2.584309	2.723197
g2_q50	814	3.194103	.019017	3.156775	3.231431
g2_q51	816	2.895833	.0220091	2.852632	2.939035
g2_q52	815	2.840491	.0242232	2.792944	2.888038
g2_q53	816	3.110294	.0169058	3.07711	3.143478
g2_q54	817	2.79437	.0213349	2.752492	2.836247

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	[95% Conf. Interval]	
g2_q55	815	3.08589	.0217553	3.043186	3.128593
g2_q56	812	2.878079	.0202084	2.838412	2.917746
g2_q57	828	2.972222	.0356108	2.902324	3.04212
g2_q58	821	3.331303	.0215238	3.289055	3.373552
g2_q59	818	3.152812	.025656	3.102452	3.203171
g2_q60	816	2.936275	.0248503	2.887496	2.985053
g2_q61	819	3.162393	.0178476	3.127361	3.197426
g2_q62	816	2.911765	.0215081	2.869547	2.953983
g2_q63	819	3.421245	.0259652	3.370279	3.472212
g2_q64	816	3.009804	.0202208	2.970113	3.049495
g2_q65	834	3.670264	.0359192	3.599761	3.740767
g2_q66	831	3.732852	.0261234	3.681576	3.784128
g2_q67	831	3.388688	.0320717	3.325737	3.45164
g2_q68	829	3.27503	.0304703	3.215222	3.334838
g2_q69	828	3.370773	.0235935	3.324463	3.417083
g2_q70	829	3.221954	.0293964	3.164254	3.279654
g2_q71	831	3.809868	.0308389	3.749336	3.870399
g2_q72	827	3.31318	.0281651	3.257897	3.368464
g2_q73	827	2.956469	.0371829	2.883485	3.029453
g2_q74	823	3.2661	.0208014	3.225269	3.30693
g2_q75	820	2.904878	.0278951	2.850124	2.959632
g2_q76	818	2.830073	.0254064	2.780204	2.879943
g2_q77	822	3.124088	.0164826	3.091735	3.156441
g2_q78	824	2.752427	.0243319	2.704667	2.800187
g2_q79	824	2.940534	.0269922	2.887552	2.993516
g2_q80	820	2.776829	.0243489	2.729036	2.824623
g2_q81	609	2.676519	.041421	2.595173	2.757864
g2_q82	574	2.792683	.0474438	2.699498	2.885868
g2_q83	494	3.006073	.0511419	2.90559	3.106556
g2_q84	593	3.143339	.0442959	3.056343	3.230335
g2_q85	496	2.449597	.0494652	2.352409	2.546784
g2_q86	509	2.605108	.0489524	2.508934	2.701282
g2_q87	488	2.788934	.0503823	2.689941	2.887928
g2_q88	403	2.630273	.0541997	2.523723	2.736823
g2_q89	472	3.436441	.0586262	3.321239	3.551642
g2_q90	18	3.333333	.3131121	2.672724	3.993942
g3_q1	851	1.472385	.0335479	1.406539	1.538232
g3_q2	857	2.011669	.0484479	1.916578	2.106759
g3_q3	858	4.298368	.0254328	4.24845	4.348286
g3_q4	856	4.426402	.0200209	4.387106	4.465698
g3_q5	854	4.416862	.0225857	4.372532	4.461192
g3_q6	854	3.464871	.0269338	3.412007	3.517735
g3_q7	853	2.479484	.0335265	2.41368	2.545288
g3_q8	852	2.491784	.0270607	2.43867	2.544898
g3_q9	853	3.846424	.030966	3.785646	3.907203
g3_q10	852	3.142019	.0314646	3.080262	3.203776
g3_q11	855	3.223392	.0302541	3.164011	3.282773
g3_q12	855	4.499415	.0233982	4.453491	4.54534
g4_q1	254	1	0	1	1
g4_q2	28	1	0	1	1
g4_q3	669	1	0	1	1
g4_q4	39	1	0	1	1
g4_q5	19	1	0	1	1
g4_q6	69	1	0	1	1
g4_q7	17	1	0	1	1

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	[95% Conf. Interval]	
g4_q8	85	1	0	1	1
g4_q9	865	1.904046	.0443656	1.816969	1.991123
g4_q10	861	4.132404	.0229766	4.087307	4.177501
g4_q11	862	3.390951	.0222446	3.347291	3.434611
g4_q12	862	2.962877	.0184563	2.926653	2.999102
g4_q13	856	2.78271	.0349029	2.714205	2.851216
g4_q14	855	3.333333	.0320493	3.270429	3.396238
g4_q15	855	2.611696	.0346979	2.543593	2.679799
g4_q16	859	3.305006	.0271203	3.251776	3.358236
g4_q17	860	2.50814	.0323465	2.444652	2.571627
g4_q18	821	2.187576	.0288185	2.131009	2.244143
g4_q19	821	2.677223	.0317223	2.614956	2.739489
g5_q1	854	1.80445	.0135801	1.777795	1.831104
g5_q2	854	1.937939	.0082608	1.921725	1.954153
g5_q3	667	2.884558	.0451638	2.795877	2.973238
g5_q4	682	3.199413	.0406877	3.119525	3.279302
g5_q5	713	3.079944	.0388557	3.003658	3.156229
g5_q6	725	3.743448	.039435	3.666028	3.820869
g5_q7	660	2.381818	.0453316	2.292806	2.47083
g5_q8	709	3.242595	.0378799	3.168225	3.316966
g5_q9	731	3.878249	.0375935	3.804445	3.952053
g5_q10	732	3.756831	.0397321	3.678828	3.834833
g5_q11	707	3.598303	.0418909	3.516057	3.680548
g5_q12	710	3.476056	.0435583	3.390538	3.561575
g5_q13	707	3.393211	.0453089	3.304254	3.482167
g5_q14	705	3.475177	.0443862	3.388032	3.562322
g5_q15	21	4.095238	.2171763	3.642216	4.54826
g5_q16	660	2.687879	.0484197	2.592803	2.782954
g5_q17	638	2.253918	.0458637	2.163856	2.343981
g5_q18	700	2.594286	.0524639	2.49128	2.697291
g5_q19	680	2.294118	.0472582	2.201328	2.386907
g5_q20	672	2.123512	.0463032	2.032595	2.214428
g5_q21	703	1.753912	.0410208	1.673374	1.83445
g5_q22	41	4.121951	.2100962	3.697331	4.546571
g6_q1	166	3.76506	.0763912	3.61423	3.91589
g6_q2	166	3.60241	.0729494	3.458375	3.746444
g6_q3	166	3.656627	.0697954	3.518819	3.794434
g6_q4	166	3.825301	.0597957	3.707238	3.943365
g6_q5	166	3.126506	.0740877	2.980224	3.272788
g6_q6	165	3.593939	.0665355	3.462563	3.725316
g6_q7	165	3.642424	.0595322	3.524876	3.759973
g6_q8	166	3.927711	.0795048	3.770733	4.084689
g6_q9	165	3.49697	.0727581	3.353306	3.640633
g6_q10	166	3.427711	.0721628	3.285229	3.570192
g6_q11	164	3.97561	.0623444	3.852503	4.098716
g6_q12	166	3.313253	.0858161	3.143814	3.482692
g6_q13	140	3.092857	.0708895	2.952696	3.233018
Gender71	857	.1936989	.0135075	.1671872	.2202107
Age72	857	3.368728	.0406714	3.288901	3.448556
Ethnicity73	854	1.103044	.0194977	1.064775	1.141314
LeaderRole74	854	3.055035	.050834	2.955261	3.154809
NumGA75	856	1.601636	.0359742	1.531027	1.672244
GeoSetting76	857	3.092182	.0297143	3.033861	3.150503
ig1_q29	863	1.285773	.2815318	.7332054	1.838342
ig1_q30	863	1.461929	.0285265	1.405939	1.517918

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Err.	[95% Conf. Interval]	
ig2_q17	844	3.557492	.0327671	3.493178	3.621807
ig2_q18	844	3.604616	.0240114	3.557487	3.651745
ig2_q19	844	2.883406	.028873	2.826734	2.940077
ig2_q20	844	2.920839	.0274799	2.866902	2.974777
ig2_q21	844	3.256243	.0203046	3.216389	3.296096
ig2_q22	844	2.867063	.0262555	2.815529	2.918597
ig2_q23	844	3.456324	.0328773	3.391793	3.520855
ig2_q24	844	2.985663	.0260985	2.934437	3.036888
ig2_q81	838	2.653705	.030603	2.593637	2.713773
ig2_q82	838	2.781123	.0330566	2.716239	2.846007
ig2_q83	838	2.953693	.0312655	2.892325	3.015061
ig2_q84	838	3.10172	.0319601	3.038989	3.164452
ig2_q85	838	2.418739	.0310576	2.357779	2.479699
ig2_q87	838	2.72173	.0311095	2.660668	2.782792
ig2_q88	838	2.615456	.0276971	2.561092	2.66982
ig2_q89	838	3.421335	.0337129	3.355163	3.487507
ig2_q90	838	3.980026	.0987323	3.786234	4.173818
ig4_q1	866	1	0	1	1
ig4_q2	866	1	0	1	1
ig4_q3	866	1	0	1	1
ig4_q4	866	1	0	1	1
ig4_q5	866	1	0	1	1
ig4_q6	866	1	0	1	1
ig4_q7	866	1	0	1	1
ig4_q8	866	1	0	1	1
ig5_q4	859	3.180573	.032778	3.116239	3.244908
ig5_q15	859	4.22844	.1025745	4.027114	4.429766
ig5_q16	859	2.683705	.0373095	2.610476	2.756934
ig5_q17	859	2.287763	.0346601	2.219734	2.355791
ig5_q19	859	2.314586	.0375464	2.240893	2.38828
ig5_q20	859	2.138269	.0363328	2.066957	2.209581
ig5_q21	859	1.756494	.0338302	1.690094	1.822894
ig5_q22	859	4.019647	.08363	3.855504	4.18379

The above tables represent only the basic analyses for the survey. As the purpose of the present report is to document the technical aspects of the survey for the SPC and the PCA, the reader is referred to the posted analysis on the PCA web site completed by other Survey Task Force members. The author will, as time allows, develop more complex analyses of the survey data. In addition, for the interested church leader or member the author is available to conduct more complex analyses as time allows. The author can be reached at 706-419-1535 or 706-820-0504 or by email at sizemore@covenant.edu or dsizemore4@comcast.net. Serious requests for survey data analysis will be honored in as timely a fashion as possible on a first come first served basis. There is no cost for this service unless the request, in the opinion of the author,

constitutes a major analysis effort representing a considerable amount of time and professional engagement.

Summary Comments

For the time, dollars, and personnel available to conduct, analyze, and report the survey, a considerable wealth of information concerning the leadership of the Presbyterian Church in America was generated. The author encourages the PCA to work to establish a mechanism whereby this as well as other research projects can be defined and executed so the denomination has a more objective picture of what is happening within as well as to its several agencies and constituencies. The author applauds the vision of Dr Frank Brock and the SPC for engaging the present survey. May it serve as a modest template for future study and research of the Presbyterian Church in America.