



Diocese of Carlisle

CLERGY SURVEY 2006

Summary Report – January 2007

Prepared by

Ginny Murphy



Contents

	Page
1 Introduction & Methodology.....	1
2 Respondent Profile.....	2
3 Communication	5
4 Ministry Support & Diocesan Vision	6
5 Training and Development	9
6 Spirituality and Growth	11
7 Workload and Quality of Life	13
8 Housing	16

1 Introduction & Methodology

In Spring 2006, the Diocese of Carlisle decided to undertake a survey of all serving clergy in order to obtain their views on a wide range of topics and to understand the issues facing them in their ministry. An initial series of meetings took place between Derek Hurton (Diocesan Secretary), Ginny Murphy (ELM Research) and Eleanor Hancock (Curate with expertise in HR management) to determine what could realistically be achieved given the resources available.

Subsequently, a group of clergy from all parts of the Diocese was convened to agree the content and structure of the questionnaire and to advise on methodology. This group comprised the following:

Bryan Rothwell
Eleanor Hancock
James Richards
John Woolcock
Martin Jayne
Peter Tiplady
Ginny Murphy

Advice was also sought from Molly Dow (Diocesan Spirituality Adviser) and Amiel Osmaston (Ministry Development Officer) on those sections of the questionnaire relevant to their expertise.

The group strongly recommended that the survey should take the form of a tick-box postal survey without the requirement for text answers and that it should be anonymous in order to encourage openness. It was therefore agreed to conduct a postal survey with responses sent to a PO Box rather than the Diocese. It was further agreed that no analysis would be presented that might lead to identification of individual respondents.

Questionnaires were despatched to 194 clergy in November 2006 with a covering letter from Bishop Graham Dow and a pre-paid envelope addressed to the PO Box. The closing date was initially set for early December but later extended until the end of Christmas to maximise responses.

It should be noted that not all respondents answered all questions and a small number of responses to some questions could not be analysed as they did not follow the coding structure on the form. Therefore, results presented throughout this report are for those who provided a valid response to the particular question. Approximately 1 in 10 respondents added comments at the end of the form. In order to preserve anonymity these have not been quoted individually but, where relevant, have been summarised at the end of the section to which they refer. Some comments were specifically about the survey itself and these have been noted and will be taken into account for future surveys.

2 Respondent Profile

The overall response rate was 74% which is excellent for an anonymous survey of this nature.

2.1 Age & Gender

Just over a third of respondents were aged 45-54 with a similar proportion aged 55-64. A further 16% were aged 35-44, 5% were 25 – 34 and 5% over 65. Just under three quarters (73%) of respondents were male and a quarter (27%) female. The response rate was higher among females (84%) than males (69%).

2.2 Length of Service

There is a wide range of time clergy have served in the Diocese with 12% having served up to 1 year and 4% having served for over 25 years. Respondents were also asked about the time they had been in their current post and again there was a wide range of responses. None had been in post for more than 25 years. Table 1 summarises the responses for time in the Diocese and time in current post.

Table 1

<i>Time spent in Carlisle Diocese & Current Post (% of all valid responses)</i>		
Time	Diocese	Current Post
Up to 1 year	12.1	19.3
Over 1 year & up to 3 years	22.7	26.4
Over 3 years & up to 5 years	12.1	19.3
Over 5 years & up to 10 years	22.0	25.7
Over 10 years & up to 25 years	27.7	9.3
Over 25 years	3.5	---

2.3 Tenure

A third of respondents said they were freehold with a similar proportion in other stipendiary posts. One in six respondents were curates and just over one in ten were NSMs with the latter group split fairly evenly between those with other significant employment and those with little or none. Table 2 shows the breakdown of responses by tenure together with the response rate. It is clear from response rates that some respondents have classified themselves differently from the classification held at the Diocese (particularly in the case of curates) and so these figures should only be used as a general guide.

Table 2

<i>Nature of Tenure</i>			
Tenure	% of valid responses	No of responses	Response rate
Freehold	33.3	47	75.8
Other stipendiary	32.6	46	78.0
Salaried	2.1	3	60.0
House for Duty	5.0	7	87.5
NSM with significant employment	6.4	16	43.2
NSM with little/no employment	5.7		
Curate in training	14.9	21	95.5

Note: Response rate for NSMs is for all NSMs

2.4 Full Time / Part Time

Three quarters of respondents said their post was full time and the remainder part time.

2.5 Benefice Type

The highest proportion of respondents (37.4%) was in multiple parish/multiple clergy benefices, followed by multiple parish/single clergy (23.7%) and single parish/multiple clergy (22.3%). The remainder were split between single parish/single clergy and not in parish based roles. Table 3 shows the responses by benefice type.

Table 3

Responses by Benefice Type (% of valid responses)	
Not parish based	7.9
Single parish, single clergy	8.6
Single parish, multiple clergy	22.3
Multiple parish, single clergy	23.7
Multiple parish, multiple clergy	37.4

2.6 Deanery

The highest proportions of respondents were from the Kendal and Carlisle Deaneries and the lowest from Furness. Response rates were highest in Barrow (89%) and Kendal (86%) Deaneries and lowest in Furness (50%) and Derwent (57%). Table 4 shows the responses by deanery but in view of the desire to preserve anonymity, results will not be further analysed at deanery level.

Table 4

Responses by Deanery			
Deanery	% of valid responses	No of responses	Response rate
Appleby	5.7	8	72.7
Barrow	5.7	8	88.9
Brampton	6.4	9	69.2
Calder	10.7	15	78.9
Carlisle	15.7	22	75.9
Derwent	5.7	8	57.1
Furness	3.6	5	50.0
Kendal	17.9	25	86.2
Penrith	5.7	8	61.5
Solway	10.0	14	77.8
Windermere	7.9	11	64.7
Not deanery based	5.0	7	63.6

2.7 Size of Ministry Team

Respondents were asked to give the number of people of different types in their ministry team, including themselves. The majority of respondents were in ministry teams containing one or two full time clergy and no part time clergy. Four out of ten had one or more retired clergy and a similar proportion had one or more NSMs. Two thirds had one or more Readers, one in six had CLMs, one in ten had House for Duty clergy and one in eight had others. Table 5 shows the numbers in the ministry team.

Table 5

Number in Ministry Team (% of valid responses)								
Number	Full time Clergy	Part time Clergy	Retired Clergy	NSMs	Readers	CLMs	House for Duty	Others
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
None	16.2	86.8	55.9	55.1	33.8	83.1	89.7	88.3
One	36.0	11.0	21.3	24.3	27.9	6.6	10.3	8.8
Two	27.9	1.5	8.1	19.1	21.3	5.9	---	1.5
Three	19.1	0.7	5.9	1.5	5.9	2.2	---	---
Four	0.7	---	4.4	---	6.6	1.5	---	---
Five	---	---	2.2	---	3.7	---	---	1.5
Six	---	---	2.2	---	0.7	0.7	---	---

Note: Respondents were asked to include themselves in these figures but 13 who stated they were in full time parish ministry themselves, went on to say there were no full time clergy in their ministry team.

3 Communication

Respondents were first asked whether they agreed they were able to obtain the information they needed from a variety of sources. In general, most agreed to some extent that they could obtain the information they needed, although 18% disagreed in the case of the Resources Centre and 13% in the case of Rose Castle. Table 6 shows respondent agreement for each source, together with a mean score.

Table 6

To what extent do you agree you can get the information you need? (% of valid responses)					
Source	Strongly Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean Score
Church House	46.4	47.8	5.8	---	3.41
Rose Castle	30.9	55.9	11.0	2.2	3.15
Resources Centre	24.6	57.1	15.9	2.4	3.04
Diocesan Registrar	44.1	48.8	5.5	1.6	3.35
Archdeacon	55.9	42.6	0.7	0.7	3.54

NB: Higher score means stronger agreement with statement (mid point 2.5).

Respondents were then asked how useful they found various sources of information they receive. The sources with the highest proportion rating them very useful were informal networks (32.8%) followed by the Chapter (28.8%) and the Bishop's Letter (23.6%). The sources with the highest proportion rating them as not at all useful were the diocesan newspaper - The Way (15.1%), Deanery Synod (14.8%) and the electronic diocesan mailing (12.1%). When looked at as a mean score, informal networks and the Bishop's letter come out top while The Way and the diocesan website come out bottom with slightly more rating them not useful than useful. Table 7 shows the ratings for each source.

Table 7

How would you rate the usefulness of the following sources of information? (% of valid responses, mean of those who provided a rating)						
Source	Very Useful	Fairly Useful	Not Very Useful	Not at all Useful	Don't Receive/ Have Access to	Mean Score
Clergy mailing	12.2	68.3	17.3	2.2	---	2.91
Bishop's letter	23.6	55.7	13.6	7.1	---	2.96
Diocesan website	3.6	41.6	40.1	7.3	7.3	2.45
Diocesan news	5.1	48.9	35.8	9.5	0.7	2.50
Electronic diocesan mailing	13.6	36.4	20.0	12.1	17.9	2.63
Chapter	28.8	41.0	20.1	7.2	2.9	2.94
Diocesan Synod	8.1	40.7	23.0	8.1	20.0	2.61
Deanery Synod	14.1	41.5	27.4	14.8	2.2	2.56
The Way	5.8	42.4	34.5	15.1	2.2	2.40
Informal networks	32.8	52.6	10.2	1.5	2.9	3.20

NB: Higher score means higher rating of usefulness (mid point 2.5).

Percentages include those who do not receive/have access to the specified form of communication. Mean rating is of those who provided a usefulness rating.

4 Ministry Support & Diocesan Vision

This section of the survey looked at the help and support clergy receive from various sources as well as asking about the Diocesan Vision. Firstly, respondents were asked the extent to which they agreed that various people or groups were supportive of them in their ministry. The strongest scores for support were for training incumbents, Churchwardens and other members of the ministry team. The worst score (but still on the positive side of the mid point) was for Church House with a quarter of respondents disagreeing that it was supportive. Table 8 shows the ratings together with a mean score for each source of support.

Table 8

To what extent do you agree the following are supportive of you? (% of valid responses)					
	Strongly Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean Score
Bishop	39.9	46.4	9.4	4.3	3.22
Archdeacon	42.6	45.6	10.3	1.5	3.29
Rural Dean	38.8	43.4	14.7	3.1	3.18
Training Incumbent	67.9	21.4	7.1	3.6	3.54
Team Rector (or equiv)	57.1	28.6	9.5	4.8	3.38
Ministry team	52.2	41.7	5.2	0.9	3.45
Churchwardens	55.8	38.8	5.4	---	3.50
PCC	38.3	50.8	9.4	1.6	3.26
Colleagues	42.9	51.6	4.0	1.6	3.36
Church House	17.2	57.8	21.1	3.9	2.88

NB: Higher score means stronger agreement with statement (mid point 2.5).

Respondents were then asked the extent to which they felt the same people or groups gave them the help they needed. The mean scores were generally slightly worse on this and once again, training incumbents and Churchwardens scored best and Church House worst. A fifth of respondents said their PCC did not provide the help needed. Table 9 shows the ratings and mean score for each source of help.

Table 9

To what extent do you agree you receive the help you need from the following? (% of valid responses)					
	Strongly Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean Score
Bishop	37.8	43.0	12.6	6.7	3.12
Archdeacon	40.3	46.3	11.2	2.2	3.25
Rural Dean	34.7	45.2	13.7	6.5	3.08
Training Incumbent	62.1	24.1	3.4	10.3	3.38
Team Rector (or equiv)	45.2	35.7	11.9	7.1	3.19
Ministry team	45.2	41.7	10.4	2.6	3.30
Churchwardens	44.5	45.3	9.4	0.8	3.34
PCC	26.6	52.3	20.3	0.8	3.05
Colleagues	36.9	53.3	9.0	0.8	3.26
Church House	18.3	55.7	21.4	4.6	2.88

NB: Higher score means stronger agreement with statement (mid point 2.5).

Finally, respondents were asked to what extent they felt their style of ministry was affirmed by the same people or groups. The best mean scores here were again for training incumbents, Churchwardens and Ministry Team with the worst for Rural Deans and the Bishop (both were still well above the mid point). Table 10 shows the ratings and mean score for each person/group.

Table 10

To what extent do you agree your style of ministry is affirmed by the following? (% of valid responses)					
	Strongly Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean Score
Bishop	38.4	37.7	14.5	9.4	3.05
Archdeacon	33.1	54.9	9.0	3.0	3.18
Rural Dean	29.8	49.6	12.4	8.3	3.01
Training Incumbent	62.1	24.1	10.3	3.4	3.45
Team Rector (or equiv)	50.0	34.1	11.4	4.5	3.30
Ministry Team	43.0	47.4	9.6	---	3.33
Churchwardens	45.0	45.0	9.3	0.8	3.34
PCC	34.4	50.0	14.8	0.8	3.18
Colleagues	35.9	53.8	9.4	0.9	3.25

NB: Higher score means stronger agreement with statement (mid point 2.5).

The questionnaire then moved on to look specifically at the Diocesan Vision – From Survival to Revival. Firstly respondents were asked whether they understood and supported the Vision and whether they knew their role and responsibilities in implementing it.

Almost every respondent agreed that they understood the Diocesan Vision (97.9%) and the vast majority agreed that they support it (90.6%) and understand their roles and responsibilities (84.8%) in implementing it. However, in the case of the latter, the degree of agreement is slightly weaker with more tending to agree than strongly agree. Table 11 shows agreement with the statements and the mean score.

Table 11

Agreement with statements about the Diocesan Vision (% of valid responses)					
	Strongly Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean Score
I understand the Diocesan Vision	61.9	36.0	1.4	0.7	3.59
I support the Diocesan Vision	55.1	35.5	6.5	2.9	3.41
I know my role & responsibilities in implementing the Diocesan Vision	36.2	48.6	13.0	2.2	3.19

NB: Higher score means stronger agreement with statement (mid point 2.5).

The survey then moved on to ask whether respondents felt they had the support and resources needed to implement the various strands of the Diocesan Vision. In terms of support, for all strands the balance was in agreement that they had the support they needed. However, a significant proportion disagreed and this was particularly true in the case of the Young People and Mission strands where 44% and 43% respectively disagreed. Table 12 shows to what extent respondents agree they have the required support.

Table 12

To what extent do you agree you have the support you need to implement the Diocesan Vision? (% of valid responses)					
	Strongly Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean Score
Worship	16.5	57.9	21.8	3.8	2.87
Ministry	21.6	55.2	19.4	3.7	2.95
Mission	16.5	48.1	30.8	4.5	2.77
Discipleship	16.0	55.0	25.2	3.8	2.83
Young People	11.3	45.1	37.6	6.0	2.62
Giving	16.4	53.7	25.4	4.5	2.82

NB: Higher score means stronger agreement with statement (mid point 2.5).

In terms of resources, the majority were in agreement that they had the necessary resources for Worship, Ministry, Discipleship and Giving, although the proportions disagreeing were higher than for support. In case of Mission and Young People, the majority disagreed that they had the necessary resources. This was particularly the case for Young People where 18% strongly disagreed and 57% disagreed. Table 13 shows to what extent respondents agree they have the required resources.

Table 13

To what extent do you agree you have the resources you need to implement the Diocesan Vision? (% of valid responses)					
	Strongly Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean Score
Worship	11.1	54.1	26.7	8.1	2.68
Ministry	10.3	54.4	28.7	6.6	2.68
Mission	8.1	41.5	40.7	9.6	2.48
Discipleship	9.7	45.5	38.8	6.0	2.59
Young People	3.7	22.1	56.6	17.6	2.12
Giving	8.9	47.4	34.8	8.9	2.56

NB: Higher score means stronger agreement with statement (mid point 2.5).

Comments: Eighteen respondents made comments relevant to this section of the survey. Seven people expressed varying degrees of concern about non-evangelical clergy being marginalised and under-valued. Other comments displayed opposing views – from being extremely happy in the Diocese to being deeply unhappy, from there being too much central direction to welcoming the central lead given eg through Survival to Revival. Other comments concerned the need for those with responsibility of oversight to be freed up to carry out the task and the need for difficult decisions to be made in order to be mission-shaped.

5 Training and Development

This section asked respondents to consider the skills they have and the opportunities to develop these further.

Four fifths of respondents believe their practical skills are adequate or excellent with 17% saying they need a little improvement. One respondent said they need a lot of improvement.

Three quarters of respondents believe their knowledge/wisdom skills are adequate or excellent with 23% saying they need a little or lot of improvement.

Four fifths of respondents believe their personal qualities/attitudes are adequate or excellent with 15% saying they need a little improvement and one respondent saying they need a lot of improvement.

Table 14

How would you rate your skills/knowledge against those required? (% of valid responses)				
	Excellent	Adequate	Need a little improvement	Need a lot of improvement
Practical skills	21.0	60.9	17.4	0.7
Knowledge/wisdom	13.9	63.5	19.7	2.9
Personal qualities/attitudes	21.7	62.3	15.2	0.7

Anecdotal evidence suggests that a concern for clergy was an increasing tendency for them to be asked to undertake tasks for which they are not skilled. Over half of respondents (57%) said this happened occasionally and 13% said it happened regularly. In the absence of any benchmark, it is difficult to assess how significant an issue this is. Table 16 shows the responses.

Table 15

How often are you asked to undertake tasks which you do not have the skills for? (% of valid responses)	
Regularly	12.9
Occasionally	56.8
Hardly ever	25.2
Never	5.0

Respondents were then asked about the opportunities to develop their skills. Around half said they tended to agree they had sufficient opportunity and a quarter tended to disagree. Table 16 shows the level of agreement.

To what extent do you agree you have sufficient opportunity to develop the skills/knowledge you need? (% of valid responses)				
	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree
Practical skills	17.3	54.1	24.8	3.8
Knowledge/wisdom	10.5	53.4	30.1	6.0
Personal qualities/attitudes	13.5	51.9	30.1	4.5

Respondents were also asked about the number of days they had spent in the past year on various forms of personal learning/development. The mean number of days

for those undertaking each form is shown in Table 17, together with the % of respondents who had undertaken the stated learning activity.

Table 17

Days spent on learning/development in past year		
	% who have undertaken	Mean days
Short courses (up to 1 day)	71.9	2.9
Other courses (over 1 day)	51.6	6.2
Conferences	64.1	2.7
Desk based learning	54.9	14.1
Experiential learning	27.3	17.6
Other	15.0	7.2

Note: Some respondents answered 365 for experiential learning; these responses have not been included in the mean analysis.

Finally in this section respondents were asked whether they had participated in the new ministerial review process. Just over a third (37%) said they had and of these, 14% said they had found it very useful, 53% fairly useful, 29% not very useful and 4% not at all useful.

6 Spirituality and Growth

The first question in this section of the survey asked respondents to what extent they agreed that their spiritual life was effectively nurtured by a variety of activities. Bible study and private prayer received the strongest agreement ratings followed by daily office. Table 18 shows the levels of agreement with each option together with the mean score for those who provided a rating.

Table 18

To what extent do you agree your spiritual life is effectively nurtured by the following (% of valid responses, mean of those who provided rating)						
	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Not applicable	Mean score
Rule of life	24.6	41.8	14.9	2.2	16.4	3.06
Bible study	41.0	54.0	5.0	---	---	3.36
Spiritual reading	28.5	56.2	13.1	0.7	1.5	3.14
Quiet days	20.0	45.9	20.0	4.4	9.6	2.90
Retreats	28.6	30.8	17.3	5.3	18.0	3.01
Daily office	38.2	33.1	19.1	5.1	4.4	3.09
Private prayer	55.1	41.3	3.6	---	---	3.51
Teaching/preaching from others	26.8	45.7	21.7	2.2	3.6	3.01
Teaching/preaching to others	32.4	54.0	12.2	0.7	0.7	3.19
Ministry from others	23.4	57.7	13.1	2.2	3.6	3.06
Spiritual direction	17.2	34.3	20.1	4.5	23.9	2.84
Undertaking training	14.1	45.9	25.2	5.2	9.6	2.76

NB: Higher score means stronger agreement with statement. Mid point of scale is 2.5.

Percentages include those who answered "not applicable". Mean score is of those who rated their agreement.

Respondents were then asked how they felt their spiritual life had changed over the past year and how satisfied they were with it at the moment. Only a small proportion (8%, 11 respondents) said their spirituality had become less strong while 46% said it had stayed the same and the same proportion said it had become stronger. Almost two thirds (63%) said they were fairly satisfied with their spiritual life at the moment but a third (33%) of respondents said they were fairly dissatisfied. Table 19 shows the responses for these questions.

Table 19

Spiritual life (% of valid responses)			
	Stronger	Same	Less strong
Change in spiritual life over past year	46.0	46.0	7.9

	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Fairly dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Mean score
Satisfaction with spiritual life at moment	2.9	62.8	32.8	1.5	2.67

NB: Higher score means stronger satisfaction. Mid point of scale is 2.5.

Female respondents were slightly more likely than males to say their spiritual life had become stronger (53% v 42%) in the past year but were less likely to be satisfied with it at the moment (58% v 68%).

The next two questions considered various aspects of parish ministry (those not in parish ministry were asked to skip to the next section). Firstly respondents were asked to consider how various aspects of ministry had changed over the past year. It was recognised that this would not be an accurate measure, particularly for those who minister in several parishes, but it was intended to provide a baseline to gauge growth on some of the less tangible aspects of ministry. Table 20 shows how respondents felt their parishes were performing.

Table 20

Change in aspects of ministry (% of valid responses)						
	Increased		About the same	Decreased		Mean score
	a lot	a little		a little	a lot	
Attendance at services	6.3	32.3	37.8	22.0	1.6	3.20
Attendance at courses/groups	10.0	30.0	42.5	15.0	2.5	3.30
Financial health	6.3	22.0	38.6	20.5	12.6	2.89
Spiritual health	4.0	46.0	46.8	2.4	0.8	3.50
Interaction with young people	13.5	32.5	41.3	8.7	4.0	3.43
Interaction with adults	7.9	42.9	45.2	3.2	0.8	3.54
Lay involvement	17.3	47.2	30.7	3.1	1.6	3.76

NB: Higher score means greater degree of increase (mid point 3).

Respondents were then asked to rate their congregation(s) against the seven marks of a healthy church on a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 is poor and 10 is ideal. Again, it is recognised that this is difficult where clergy minister in several parishes but it does provide a valuable benchmark. The best mean scores were for operating as a community and making room for all. The worst mean scores were for facing the cost of growth/change and seeking to find out what God wants. Only a very small number of respondents gave their parishes the very lowest or highest ratings, the majority scoring them in the mid-range. Table 21 shows the mean score for each of the healthy church marks (in this case a higher the mean score means a better is).

Table 21

Health Churches Rating (mean of valid scores)	
Energised by faith	5.60
Outward-looking focus	5.27
Seeks to find out what God wants	5.11
Faces the cost of growth and change	5.03
Operates as a community	6.11
Makes room for all	6.08
Does a few things and does them well	5.96

NB: Higher score means better rating out of 10.

7 Workload and Quality of Life

This section of the questionnaire explored the workload of respondents, financial pressures and overall quality of life. Firstly, respondents were asked to state on average how many hours a week they spent on ministry duties. Some respondents found it hard to provide a figure because of the varied nature of the role but most were able to provide an average. This showed that overall, clergy spend 51 hours a week on ministry. When this is split by full time and part time it shows that full time clergy spend an average of 59 hours a week on ministry duties while part time clergy spend an average of 22.5 hours. Those working full time in single parish, single clergy benefices tend to work slightly more hours than average (66 hrs v 59).

Clergy were then asked to estimate, on average, what proportion of their time is spent on various aspects of ministry. The highest proportion of time is spent on sermon/service preparation (12.5%), pastoral care/visiting (10.7%), leading services (9.8%) and meetings/committees (9.8%). The proportions are slightly different when analysed by benefice type. Unsurprisingly, those who are not parish based, spend a higher proportion of time on duties such as administration (20% v 10%) and other ministry duties (13% v 6%) and less on parish-related activities. Those in single parish, single clergy benefices spend more time on pastoral care/visiting than in other benefices but less on leading services. Table 22 shows the breakdown for various benefice types with the average hours worked shown at the bottom.

Table 22

Time spent on ministry duties (% of valid responses)						
Ministry Duty	Not parish based	Single parish, single clergy	Single parish, multiple clergy	Multiple parish, single clergy	Multiple parish, multiple clergy	Total
Sermon/service preparation	7.4	11.5	16.2	10.7	12.7	12.5
Pastoral care/visiting	8.1	15.3	9.5	10.8	10.9	10.7
Leading services	5.9	7.8	10.1	9.3	11.3	9.8
Meetings/committees	15.2	5.8	7.7	9.6	10.8	9.8
Administration	19.7	7.5	8.6	9.6	8.3	9.6
Personal devotions/prayer	4.8	7.8	8.3	7.6	8.4	7.8
Other ministry duties	12.6	3.5	5.1	---	6.2	6.4
Study/theological reflection	6.4	5.5	6.4	5.9	6.1	6.1
Other Deanery/Diocesan roles	8.0	6.0	4.9	5.3	4.6	5.2
Occasional offices	0.3	5.6	5.4	4.8	4.7	4.6
Teaching/leading groups/classes	4.3	4.7	4.9	4.7	3.9	4.4
Mission/outreach	6.7	4.2	4.9	2.9	3.2	3.9
Development/support of lay ministry	4.7	3.2	2.9	3.6	3.1	3.3
School assemblies	0.5	3.7	2.5	4.0	2.7	2.8
School Governor duties	0.9	1.7	2.3	3.1	2.3	2.3
Chaplaincy	1.8	0.0	1.9	2.3	2.8	2.2
Other non-parochial ministry	0.5	6.5	1.6	2.6	1.4	2.0
Financial matters/fund raising	1.8	2.0	1.8	2.4	1.9	2.0
Number of respondents	10	10	31	29	50	130
<i>Hours Worked - all clergy</i>	<i>50.9</i>	<i>66.0</i>	<i>48.6</i>	<i>56.0</i>	<i>47.4</i>	<i>51.3</i>
<i>Hours Worked - full time clergy</i>	<i>59.4</i>	<i>66.0</i>	<i>56.4</i>	<i>61.1</i>	<i>57.9</i>	<i>59.2</i>
<i>Hours Worked - part time clergy</i>	<i>16.8</i>	<i>---</i>	<i>16.0</i>	<i>24.1</i>	<i>25.3</i>	<i>22.5</i>

Respondents were then asked to describe their view of the balance between their ministry and home life. This question was phrased to provide a comparison with a Quality of Life survey recently conducted for the whole population in Cumbria. A third of clergy (34%) said they spent far too much time working and not enough at home/leisure, just over a third (38%) said they spent a little too much time working while 28% said the balance was about right. This contrasts quite sharply with the general working population amongst whom 23% said they spent far too much time working, 27% a bit too much time, with 50% happy with the balance.

Table 23

Quality of Life (% of valid responses)		
	Clergy	All People*
Too much time working and not enough at home/leisure	34.0	23.0
A bit too much time working and not enough at home/leisure	37.6	26.6
Happy with how time is divided between work and home/leisure	28.4	50.0

* Source: Quality of Life Survey conducted for Cumbria County Council in Aug/Sept 2006

Comments: Half a dozen comments were received about workload, mostly about the pressure caused by working too many hours and the impact on the ability to minister effectively.

The questionnaire then moved on to question the respondent's financial situation. The survey working group felt that although financial issues were an import factor in clergy morale, this survey was not the best mechanism to explore them in detail and so the questions were very general in nature. They revealed that 39% of clergy rely on financial support from a partner/spouse's income with a further 17% sometimes benefiting from this source of income. In terms of other sources that respondents rely on, 17% do so on Child Tax credits, 13% on personal savings and 11% on other State benefits. Table 24 shows the level of reliance on various financial sources.

Table 24

Reliance on financial sources (% of valid responses)				
	Rely on	Sometimes benefit from	Rarely benefit from	Never benefit from
Partner/spouse's income	42.4	18.2	6.1	33.3
Personal savings	14.7	36.4	25.6	23.3
Other family or friends	5.6	22.2	21.4	50.8
Parish	1.6	10.2	18.8	69.5
Charitable sources	3.2	12.0	20.0	64.8
Child Tax Credits	18.8	16.4	2.3	62.5
Other State Benefits	12.8	10.4	4.0	72.8
Other sources	18.7	2.7	1.3	77.3

Respondents were also asked about their ministry expenses. Around 40% said they usually claimed their expenses in full while 44% said they mostly did, 13% said they did in part and 4% not at all. In terms of whether expenses claimed are paid by the parish, 92% said they were usually paid in full, 4% mostly paid in full, 3% paid in part and 2% not paid at all. One respondent commented that they subsidised their parish financially.

The survey then moved to assess the respondent's future intentions by asking where they saw themselves being in 3 years' time. Four out of ten thought they would be in the same parish as currently, 14% thought they would be in a different parish but still

in Carlisle Diocese, while 8% were due to retire. Excluding those who preferred not to answer the question, 53% thought they would be in the same parish, 17% in a different parish in Carlisle Diocese and 10% were due to retire. Two respondents said they didn't think they would be in any form of ministry.

Taken together, these findings show that 23.7% of clergy envisage they will not be in ministry in Carlisle Diocese in 3 years' time (10% due to retirement and a further 14% for other reasons). If these findings are typical of all clergy in the Diocese and were followed through, the Diocese would lose 46 clergy over the next 3 years. Table 25 shows the responses with and without the 'prefer not to say' category.

Table 25

Where do you see yourself in 3 years' time? (% of valid responses)		
	% of all	% excl 'prefer not to say'
Due to retire within 3 years	8.1	9.6
Parish ministry in same parish as now	44.1	52.6
Parish ministry in different parish, still in Carlisle Diocese	14.0	16.7
Parish ministry in different Diocese	6.6	7.9
Same non-parish ministry role as now	3.7	4.4
Non-parish ministry role in this Diocese	2.2	2.6
Non-parish ministry role in different Diocese	3.7	4.4
Not in any form of ministry	1.5	1.8
No opinion/prefer not to say	16.2	---

8 Housing

The final section of the survey asked about housing. Once again, the working group felt the survey was not the appropriate vehicle to explore this topic in detail and so questions were limited to a rating of satisfaction for those in Diocesan property and intentions for housing provision on retirement.

Three quarters of respondents living in Diocesan property were very or fairly satisfied with contact with Church House on property issues, 17% were not very satisfied and 7% were not at all satisfied. Satisfaction with the speed and quality of repairs/maintenance and work arising from inspection was lower and in particular, 39% were unhappy with the speed of ongoing repairs and 43% were unhappy with the speed of work arising from inspection. Table 26 shows the responses for satisfaction.

Table 26

Satisfaction with housing (% of all valid responses)					
	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Not very satisfied	Not at all satisfied	Mean score
Contact with Church	30.8	45.8	16.8	6.5	3.01
Speed of ongoing repairs & maintenance	13.9	47.5	19.8	18.8	2.56
Standard of ongoing repairs & maintenance	18.6	52.0	15.7	13.7	2.75
Speed of work arising from inspection	9.3	47.4	25.8	17.5	2.48
Standard of work arising from inspection	18.9	52.6	16.8	11.6	2.79

NB: Higher score means higher level of satisfaction. Mid point of scale is 2.5.

Comments: A small number of respondents provided specific examples of problems concerning their property and the apparent lack of resources to provide adequate housing.

Respondents were then asked about their housing provision for when they retire. A third of clergy (33%) own a property which they are buying on a mortgage and 22% own a property which is already paid for. Table 27 shows the responses for the various types of housing provision.

Table 27

Housing provision for retirement (% of all valid responses)	
	%
Expect to rent a property	5.4
Expect to rely on Church or State	20.8
Own a property which is fully paid for	22.3
Buying on a mortgage	33.1
Intend to purchase before retirement	18.5