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Abstract

The astonishing growth of lay ecclesial ministry in the Roman Catholic Church began in the 1960's with the advent of the Second Vatican Council and with the emergence of a variety of specialized ministries one such ministry was to youth. The focus of this query was on the emergence of the profession of lay ecclesial youth ministry. The growth of the professional field of lay ecclesial ministry in the Roman Catholic Church can be seen in the writings of bishops, theologians, authors, national ministerial associations, and researchers as they address four major areas of concern. Those areas include (1) the ministerial roles and responsibilities of the lay ecclesial minister, (2) the formation and preparation of lay ecclesial ministers, (3) the effectiveness of lay ecclesial ministers, and (4) the formal relationship between the lay ecclesial minister and the church.

Various elements have impacted the ability of the profession to move to a more established and stable place as a field and within the church. These elements include the lack of consistency in both youth ministry position titles and responsibilities, the lack of standardization in employment benefits and salaries, as well as ministry formation programs, all present the field with critical challenges as it attempts to develop professionally. Lay ecclesial youth ministers, in this study, clearly believe that the advancement of two areas: professional activities (such as a national association or a professional journal) and professional credentials (such as national certification) are essential for the future development of the field. An increased understanding of the current state of lay ecclesial youth ministry will assist the field in movement towards
resolution of the many issues which presently both enhance and challenge, the emergence of lay ecclesial youth ministry as a profession within the Roman Catholic Church.
Chapter One: Introduction

In this age of politics and propaganda, many cries of concern for the young of our society are heard, such as “leave no child behind,” or “it takes a village.” And yet, in the midst of the rhetoric, there is a genuine concern by many for those growing through childhood into adulthood. One such group, which will serve as the focus of this work, is professional lay ministers who work with young people in the Roman Catholic Church. This group’s concern comes from the knowledge that the world in which young people of the twenty-first century are living in is very different from that of the past. The world in which twentieth century adults grew up no longer exist for today’s adolescent (Miller, 1999).

At one time in our history, neighborhoods and schools were considered safer places than they are the present time; the media saw their role as protecting the young instead of “targeting” them. Years ago, most families had the same structure, with two parents living in the same home and extended family members actively participating in the children’s development. However, as our society embarks on a new millennium, the support structures that were once taken for granted in young people’s lives (school, family, church, neighborhood) no longer can be assumed to be present.

The change in the social structures supporting young people has been noted by both researchers, psychologists and youth workers (Benson, 1997; Elkind, 1984). Peter Benson (1997), president of the Search Institute and prominent researcher of the current generation of young people, explained the impact of the changing infrastructure and complex world surrounding young people:
For the first time in the history of this country, young people are less healthy and less prepared to take their places in society than their parents. And it is happening at a time when our society is more complex, more challenging, and more competitive than ever before. (p. 4)

Even though the world in which young people are living today is different, many in our society do not believe that the young people themselves are very different. Furthermore, many believe that it is the responsibility the adult community to assist young people into healthy adulthood has not changed. The National Commission on Children concurred in their 1991 Report:

We see no reason to believe that young people today are less talented, resourceful, or caring than young people in the past. But the world around them is very different. The options all adolescents face are more diverse, the demands upon them are greater, and in many cases their sources of support are more limited. For their sake, and for ours, we must ensure that every young person enters adulthood confident, hopeful, and able to achieve his or her potential. (National Commission on Children, as cited in East & Roberto, 1994, p. 1)

Recent research completed by the Search Institute has identified two important groups of factors that promote healthy adolescent development and minimize at-risk behaviors by adolescents (Benson, 1997). These factors are referred to as assets; one set of which is external to the adolescent, in that these assets are present in the family and community surrounding adolescents. “These external assets, taken together, form a kind of temporary scaffold around a child in order to support and encourage while the growing child is developing an internal system of supports that will see him or her safely into adulthood” (East & Roberto, 1994, p. 5). The second set of factors is comprised of internal qualities that the adolescent possesses, such as values, social competence, and religious faith.
It Takes a Village

Most assuredly, rhetoric is not our best chance for helping adolescents move positively to adulthood; but rather through the building of partnerships among all the systems that surround them. How does our nation, our society, participate in and ensure the healthy development of its young? One recommended strategy is by working together to build a “scaffold” of support around the young (East & Roberto, 1994). So, if it does indeed take a whole village to provide such a support system, then who are the individuals and institutions that make up that village? Is it parents, teachers, youth workers, lawmakers, and ministers? Or maybe, the village is comprised of families, schools, community organizations, government agencies, and churches? How do we mobilize the village, or better yet, the network of the systems that surround and support young people so they are working together to address the task of helping all young people to indeed reach their potential?

The first step in mobilizing the village is to ensure that each institution contributing to the task of helping young people grow into healthy adulthood is aware of the human and financial resources it can commit to the task. This awareness includes the understanding that each partner in this network (or village) has the responsibility of developing and evaluating its resources so that it can approach the task with intentionality and effectiveness (Strommen & Hardel, 2000). The evidence of this action can be seen in educational institutions, as they struggle with the issues of teacher and student accountability; in families, who make tough decisions about childcare; and, in the media...
as they attempt to regulate themselves regarding the violent content of the music, television, and video games they produce.

**Religious Institutions as Part of the Village.** “Search Institute’s studies show that youth involvement with religious organizations has a powerful positive effect on adolescent development, promoting various assets young people need and offering protections from behavioral risks” (Scales, Blyth, Conway, Donahue, Griffin-Wiesner, & Roehlkepartain, 1995, p. 4). Changes in society present the Roman Catholic Church and other religious institutions with a new set of challenges and issues as they engage in pastoral ministry with young people and their families (National Conference of Catholic Bishops [NCCB], 1997).

Religious institutions and churches dealing with the impact that the changing world is having on their own institutions are similar to educational institutions that are challenged to constantly grow and adapt to meet the needs of those they serve for the greater good of society. This has been the case in the growth and development within the Roman Catholic Church, which has been undergoing changes in leadership structures and personnel since 1962, when the second Vatican Council was convened. How has ministerial leadership in the Roman Catholic Church changed since the second Vatican Council? Leadership and ministerial roles in church parishes across the United States, once filled by priests and religious women, are now increasingly being filled by lay men and women (Murnion & DeLambo, 1999). The number of lay ecclesial ministers serving in 63% of the Roman Catholic parishes across the United States is currently over 29,000 (Murnion & DeLambo, 1999).
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The growth of lay persons serving in formal ministerial leadership roles in the Roman Catholic Church is relatively recent in the church’s history (Fox, 1986, 1998; Heft, 1998). This growth is due to a variety of factors, including, but not limited to, the increasing shortage of priests, a greater understanding of baptism as a ministerial sacrament, and the movement in the U.S. culture toward second and third careers (Rademacher, 1992). Lay ecclesial ministers serve as youth ministers, directors of religious education, hospital chaplains, pastoral associates, or directors of music and liturgy (Fox, 1998). This is not an exhaustive list; however, it demonstrates the diversity of ministerial roles that are contained within the field of lay ecclesial ministry. The diversity of ministerial roles dictates the need to research each specialized role, in order to increase the overall understanding of the field.

The field of lay ecclesial ministry, and more specifically youth ministry, is faced with unique challenges because it is still in the process of formalizing itself and establishing its place in the church’s structure (Fox, 1998). In many ways, the growth of lay ministry has outpaced the church’s ability to establish policies and structures that are needed to respond adequately to this growth (National Association of Church Personnel Administrators [NACPA], 1994; National Conference of Catholic Bishops [NCCB], 2000). The need for additional research and clarification of the role of the lay ecclesial minister is supported by the conclusion of the recent study on that population by the National Parish Life Center (Mumion & DeLambo, 1999):

It appears that the practice of pastoral ministry that led to engaging more and more lay people in parish ministry outstrips the theology and church policy regarding lay ministry. This is to be expected. In fact, it is beneficial
that the practice has a chance to develop before it is codified too tightly. Nonetheless, the need to continue theological reflection, ministerial clarification, and church policy development is evident if we are to make the most of the gifts to the church represented by these parish ministers and provide the kind of support for them and their pastors to foster appropriate and effective collaboration. (p. 107)

Every emerging profession must answer certain questions and make decisions that will guide the direction and growth of that field. Lay ecclesial ministry has issues similar to the field of adult education, which has struggled with the issue of professionalization, as well as finding its place within the broader field of education (Merriam & Brockett, 1997). Furthermore, adult education as a profession has had to deal with distinguishing who is considered a professional adult educator and how they are prepared for their profession which are also issues for lay ecclesial ministry.

Is lay ecclesial youth ministry a true profession in the workforce of the Roman Catholic Church? According to Merriam and Brockett (1997), the presence of three elements assist in identifying a profession. Those elements include a distinct body of knowledge for the field, programs of graduate study for persons in the field and national associations for members of the profession. An examination of lay ecclesial (youth) ministry should include the evaluation of the current state of development of these elements within it.

Since, the middle of the twentieth century lay persons have been ministering to youth in the Roman Catholic Church, yet many questions exist about who they are, what they do and what is their formal relationship with the Church. Therefore, an accurate understanding and assessment of the emerging profession of the lay ecclesial youth
minister in the Roman Catholic Church is an essential step in the development of the current workforce serving its young people.

Statement of Research Problem

The hierarchy of the church has begun to explore the issue of who falls within the classification of lay ecclesial minister. In the midst of this exploration, some have a concern regarding the exclusion that may come with saying who is and who is not a lay ecclesial minister, because of the call to service by all who are baptized (NCCB, 2000). However, the central issue is not exclusion, but rather clarification.

Clarifying the role of the lay ecclesial minister, and more specifically, the lay ecclesial youth minister, is a challenging but necessary process in the development of this emergent church ministry. This research attempts to respond to this challenge by studying the following questions. First, who is the lay ecclesial youth minister? A complete demographic description is needed of the lay ecclesial youth minister, both personally and by ministerial setting, as well as by the job responsibilities and populations which they serve. Next, how have these ministers been formed and educated for professional ministry? An understanding of the current processes guiding the education and formation of these ministers is necessary in order to increase effectiveness (NCCB, 2000). Finally, how is the current relationship between the minister and the institution (church) defined and qualified? The policies and structures that define the formal relationship between the church and the lay ecclesial youth minister need to be better clarified.

Many of these questions regarding the lay ecclesial (youth) minister have been identified by the United States Catholic Bishops (NCCB, 2000); it is now time to find
answers to those questions and take action. A greater understanding of this emerging field of professional ministry will assist the field in further self-definition, as well as providing opportunities for lay ecclesial youth ministers to take the next step toward increased professionalization and effectiveness. Movement toward greater professionalization and effectiveness of lay ecclesial youth ministers will no doubt facilitate a fuller participation of the Roman Catholic Church in their contribution to the system(s) assisting young people as they navigate adolescence in the twenty-first century.

Religious institutions can have a positive impact on society, especially, if they seek to partner with both non-profit and for-profit agencies in addressing societal issues and concerns. The recent and drastic growth of a new type of minister in the workforce of the Roman Catholic Church should be evaluated beyond the Bishops reflection towards a more scientific clarification of this new minister within the workforce. Due to the similarities between the issues facing adult education and lay ecclesial ministry, the School of Human Resource Education and Workforce Development is in a unique position to contribute to the building body of knowledge of this profession.

Research Objectives

The following research objectives were utilized in addressing the established research problem:

1. Describe the lay ecclesial youth minister in terms of the following selected personal variables:
   A. Highest educational level completed,
   B. Age,
C. Gender,

D. Ethnic group,

E. Number of years in youth ministry,

F. Vocational status in the church,

G. Youth ministry employment status,

H. Whether or not they attended Catholic school,

I. Past participant in Catholic youth activities as an adolescent,

J. Past participant in Catholic parish religious education,

K. Religious background,

L. Annual youth ministry salary, and

M. Participation in Catholic youth leadership activities as an adolescent.

2. Describe the ministerial setting of the lay ecclesial parish youth minister in the following areas:

   A. Size of parish in terms of number of registered families,

   B. Number of potential youth in grades 6-12,

   C. Number of participating youth in Catholic youth ministry programs,

   D. Size of parish lay ministry staff,

   E. Total annual youth ministry budget, and

   F. Title of the youth minister’s supervisor.

3. Describe the elements present in the formal relationship between the lay ecclesial youth minister and parish including the following:

   A. Employment contract,
B. Paid health care benefits,
C. Paid vacation,
D. Paid annual retreat,
E. Written job description,
F. Participation in parish staff meetings,
G. Secretarial support,
H. Retirement plan,
I. Life insurance,
J. Annual performance review, and
K. Paid continuing education benefits.

4. Describe the occurrence of selected ministerial job functions and activities of the lay ecclesial parish youth minister in the following areas:
   A. Primary activities (as defined by frequency of occurrence) of the lay ecclesial youth minister,
   B. Primary population of youth that are served, and
   C. Additional areas of ministry responsibility beyond ministry to adolescents.

5. Determine the intentions of the lay ecclesial youth minister regarding their future work in a formal ministry position in the church.

6. Describe the influence of selected factors in a lay ecclesial youth minister’s decision to enter youth ministry in the church.

7. Determine the influential factors in a lay ecclesial youth minister’s decision to exit formal ministry in the future.
8. Describe the training and ministry formation of the lay ecclesial youth minister by identifying the following characteristics of their formation experience:

A. Program curriculum,
B. Supervised practice of ministry,
C. Assessment activities,
D. Established entrance requirements.
E. Graduation or commissioning ceremony (upon program completion).
F. Mentoring, and
G. Retreat experience.

9. Determine the importance of the formalization of the role lay ecclesial minister in the church and the professionalization of the field, as perceived by the lay ecclesial youth minister, specifically in the following areas:

A. Professional organizations (local and national).
B. Professional resources and journals.
C. Professional certification (diocesan personnel and parish personnel),
D. Annual professional conference,
E. Youth ministry resource web site,
F. Participation in national committees,
G. Recognized, transferable credential, and
H. Programs for spiritual development.

10. Determine self-perceived competency in selected knowledge and skill areas of ministry.
11. Determine the effect of youth ministry employment status on the opinions of lay ecclesiastical ministers with regard to professionalism.

12. Determine if a model exists that significantly increases the researcher's ability to accurately explain the paid versus volunteer youth ministry employment status of the lay ecclesiastical parish youth minister from the selected ministerial setting variables and selected personal characteristic variables.

13. Explain the variance in the perception of the professionalization and formalization of the field, utilizing youth ministry employment status, years of youth ministry experience, completion of ministry formation, and highest education level as the predictor variables.

Operational Definitions

The following operational definitions will be utilized in this study:

1) Parish: A local church institution within a geographic diocese.

2) Archdiocese or Diocese: A geographical grouping of local church parishes governed by an archbishop or archbishop.

3) Lay Ecclesiastical Minister in the Roman Catholic Church: A baptized Catholic lay person (non-ordained) serving in a formal ministerial role(s) within the Roman Catholic Church who has been given responsibility for a specific area of church ministry. This person must be recognized for this ministry by Church leadership, either by the local bishop, an ordained pastor or other persons of authority within the Church. The position of responsibility that they hold can be either as a volunteer or paid (full-time or part-time) staff member.
4) Lay Ecclesial Youth Minister in the Catholic Church: A baptized Catholic lay person (non-ordained) serving in a formal ministerial role in the Roman Catholic Church who has been given responsibility for ministering to adolescents and their families. This person must be recognized for that ministry by church leadership, either by the local bishop, an ordained pastor, or other persons of authority within the Church. The position of responsibility they hold can be either as a volunteer or paid (full-time or part-time) staff member.

5) Ministry Formation Program: An education program with the purpose of preparing lay ecclesial ministers with the knowledge and skills necessary to formally engage in ministry on behalf of the Church.

Limitation of the Study

The limitation of this study is the inability to obtain an accurate frame of the population in order to draw a random sample. An accurate frame of the target population, which consists of all lay ecclesial youth ministers in the United States in the Roman Catholic Church, is difficult to establish. Many factors contribute to the inability to establish an accurate frame of this population. These factors include the lack of a common credentialing process for the profession, the autonomous nature of each diocese (which results in different structures for coordinating and supporting parish youth ministry), the absence of a national association of lay ecclesial parish youth ministers, and the inconsistent reporting of lay ecclesial ministers in the Kenedy Directory (the official annual report of the status, statistics, and personnel of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States). The limitation of this study may have a potential impact on the external
population validity of the study and, consequently, the generalization of the study’s findings.
Chapter Two: Review of Literature

Since the 1960s, with the ecclesial event of Vatican II and the social upheavals in society, a ministry "explosion" has occurred (O'Meara, 1983). The expansion of the understanding of ministry has impacted all parts of the world and all religious faiths, especially the Roman Catholic Church in the United States. Thomas O'Meara describes this expansion:

The expansion of the ministry is not, then a random or annoying occurrence but an aspect of a new church which is, for the first time in many centuries, worldwide. Size, expansion, and potential point out the limitations of the past and the possibilities of the future. What a strange coincidence that as the needs of the church and society pointed to a wider ministry, there have emerged so many thousands of people intent upon ministry. Men and women, sisters, brothers, priests, teachers, and activists prepared themselves at professional and graduate schools for a specific ministry. (p. 9)

The growth of the professional field of lay ecclesial ministry in the church can be seen in the writings of bishops, theologians, authors, national ministerial associations, and researchers as they address four major areas of concern. Those areas include (1) the ministerial roles and characteristics of the lay ecclesial minister, (2) the formation and preparation of lay ecclesial ministers, (3) the effectiveness of lay ecclesial ministers, and (4) the formal relationship between the lay ecclesial minister and the church. This review of literature will address these four major areas specifically within the context of their connection to the lay ecclesial youth minister.

In order to understand the current state of lay ecclesial youth ministry, it is important to appreciate the historical context from which it has emerged. In light of that, this review will provide a brief history of the development of ministry in the church, a
history of the development of the field of Catholic youth ministry, as well as the research that has been accomplished to date in the field.

A Historical Perspective

A Brief Overview of the Historical Development of Ministry. O'Meara (1983) presents an idiosyncratic periodization of the metamorphosis of ministry throughout the church history in six distinct periods, each with its own unique contribution to the understanding of the current state of ministry in the life of the church. The development of Christian ministry is described by O'Meara as a process not always characterized by the current expansion experienced in today’s church.

The process of history of Christian ministry, however, because it is human and historical, has limits. For the past thousand years or more it seems to have been a process of reduction, not expansion. Up until 1962, cultural and ecclesial epochs seem to present less and less of the ministry. (p. 98)

The first period, referred to as “From House Church to Basilica, from Minister to Bishop,” is noted for two important movements in the structure of ministry. First, the need for organization and leadership became evident in the first century following Pentecost. As the church grew in size, the movement from gathering in homes to large buildings was inevitable, and this growth actually led to the diminution of ministry (O'Meara, 1983). By the end of the first century, there was movement toward an emphasis on the ministry of leadership. “Such a reduction to and centralization of ministry in leadership—what we might call its episcopalization—extends through two centuries” (O'Meara, p. 98). Two ministries became central, that of bishop (episkopos) and priest (presbyteros), in light of the role of Eucharist in the life of the church and the need for a public presider when the church gathered.

16
The second period of ministry, referred to as “Monastery as Minister,” is highlighted by the change in the role of the bishop from coordinator of ministries to one more closely resembling an abbot of the monastery, or a spiritual leader. The Christian life was seen during this time not as public activity, but as inner spiritual life because of the monastic influence. The importance of celibacy in monastic life influenced the present day understanding of the celibate priesthood. “The rubrics, clothes, and institutions which appear to be eternally ecclesial and deeply Christian are monastic and Romanesque” (O’Meara, p.109).

The third period of ministry is referred to as “Ministry as Hierarchy.” “During the twelfth century the context of ministry as well as the igneous core of Christian society moved from the monastic to the clerical, from contemplative community to individual priesthood defined by the real presence in the Eucharist” (O’Meara, 1983, p.109). The social classes of the feudal system influenced the hierarchal structure of the church and the solidification of the three orders of ecclesial ministry: deacon, priest and bishop.

The fourth period of ministry, referred to as the “Reformation of Ministry,” is noted for the challenge by reformers such as Luther and Calvin to remember the priesthood of all the baptized. This was a challenge to return to the New Testament understanding of ministry, “...a world of ordinary people expecting charisms, and willing to serve their community and change the world” (O’Meara, 1983, p.116). The fifth period in the history of ministry, referred to as “Ministry and Baroque,” is highlighted by events such as the Council of Trent, the beginning of the Society of Jesuits, and renewed emphasis on the vowed life. “In the western church three families of men and women
lived out their baptism through vowed life: the monks, the friars, and the Jesuits who formed the model for the modern congregations. These are not purely chronological groupings but rather—as all live on through later centuries—three basic styles of vowed life” (O’Meara, 1983, p. 121).

The sixth period of the history of ministry is referred to as “The Romanticization of Ministry.” The struggle of how to minister in the modern world and still be faithful to the Gospel was evident as bishops and priests retreated to the edge of society. Ministry did experience expansion during this time, through the formation of many congregations of religious women who moved from the cloister out into the public ministries of education and health care.

The most important event by far to the expansion of ministry in the church was the Second Vatican Council, which literally opened the doors of ministry to the laity and reformed outdated structures which existed for centuries. In addition to the shift in the understanding and meaning of ministry, the church concurrently experienced an exodus of priests and religious women from ministry, during the sixties and seventies. “In the United States, an estimated 3,413 men resigned from the priesthood between 1966 and 1969 ... and by 1978 it was estimated that in the United States about ten thousand priests had left active ministry since 1966” (Dolan, 1985, p. 437). The total population of religious women in the United States reached 181,421 in 1966, but by 1980 the total population was reduced to 126,517 (Dolan). The seventies saw the entrance of full-time paid lay ministers as an accepted part of parish life.
A Brief History of the Field of Catholic Youth Ministry. Prior to the 1960s, the primary outreach to young people was by younger members of the clergy and religious sisters (Roberto, 1985). However, over the past three decades, a different type of minister to youth has begun to emerge, the lay ecclesial minister. Like other areas of church ministry, the field of Catholic youth ministry has been impacted by the sheer numbers of lay persons entering this emerging profession (Murnion & DeLambo, 1999). The consequences of this impact on the effectiveness of the church’s ministry to youth have yet to be identified. In order to have a clear understanding of the present state of the field of Catholic youth ministry, a look back to the beginnings of this emerging field is needed.

Ministry directed towards youth as a specific population in the Roman Catholic Church is less than 100 years old. Bishop Bernard Sheil known as the founder of the Catholic Youth Organization (CYO), with his initiation of the first organized activities for Catholic youth in 1930 (Weldgen, 1980). In the seventy years since organized ministry to Catholic youth began, it has been a constantly evolving movement and profession. In 1940, the field took an important step in structuring itself with the development of the National Council of Catholic Youth. The fifties and sixties were a time when Catholic youth work flourished and developed under a variety of names, finally settling on the popular title, CYO (Weldgen, 1980).

In the field’s first step toward professionalism, The American Journal of Catholic Youth Work (Barr, 1966) was created with the purpose of furthering the body of knowledge surrounding this new field. This journal ceased publication in the early
seventies. Additionally, a professional magazine for Catholic youth ministers emerged for a short time in 1994, entitled *Vision and Challenge*.

Another important step toward professionalism was the establishment of the Biennial National Conference of Catholic Youth Serving Agencies in 1957, which is still in existence today under a different name and sponsor. However, as structures within the national church began to change, so did structures supporting national Catholic youth work (Murphy, Guerin, Roberto, & Brown, 1980). The seventies were a time of setting forth a unifying vision of the field, and also brought an important name change, from CYO to youth ministry. One of the committees of the bishops of the United States, in conjunction with various national organizations and diocesan leaders, wrote and published *A Vision of Youth Ministry*, which for the first time provided the field with a comprehensive vision. The most recent statement by the U.S. Catholic bishops on youth ministry occurred in 1997 with the publishing of *Renewing the Vision*, an update of the 1976 *Vision* document.

The eighties were a time for initiating the role of the lay ecclesial youth minister in the church, as evidenced by two national symposiums focusing on the field. “Hope for a Decade,” a symposium held in 1980, identified a number of key issues that needed to be addressed and researched by the field. Those recommendations included the need for developing professional training programs for youth ministers, as well as the identification of competencies and curriculum for the field (Murphy, et al, 1980). Unfortunately, as good as some of the recommendations were, many never received action. A follow-up symposium, entitled “Faith Maturing: A Personal and Communal
Task” (Roberto, 1985) identified a significant challenge the facing the field’s progress by describing the challenge that youth ministers were having with role initiation:

There are [sic] a cluster of issues which surround the role of the professional or paraprofessional, salaried or volunteer Coordinator of Youth Ministry. Many of these issues can be grouped under the category of Role Initiation. The lay Coordinator of Youth Ministry is often hired to fill a task that has been carried out by clergy or religious or to fill a first-time position. The Coordinator has few guidelines to establish his or her role within the parish or school. The problem is compounded when the leaders who hired the Coordinator are uncertain about the specifics of the job description, uncertain about the type of contractual agreements they should offer a lay minister (salary, benefits, etc.), uncertain about the number of work-hours and their scheduling, and uncertain about who the Coordinator is accountable to and for what he or she is responsible. In short, the lack of clarity that surrounds the role of Coordinator creates a situation of potential misunderstanding and conflict ... The situation puts the Coordinator in the anomalous situation of being change-agents in the very institution and structure on which they depend for support, i.e. they become Role Initiators. It is a tragedy to lose competent Coordinators of Youth Ministry because the institution is not adequately prepared for their ministry. (pp. 14-15)

In 1982, the National Catholic Youth Organization Federation became the National Federation for Catholic Youth Ministry (NFCYM), which is still in existence today. The NFCYM, or “Federation,” as it is referred to by its members, has published a number of influential papers on different aspects in the field. One focused on the professional development of youth ministers and was published in 1991 with the title Competency-Based Standards for the Coordinator of Youth Ministry.

The professionalization of the field and those who serve in it has always been central to Catholic youth work. William Barr (1966) addressed the essence of the issue in the mid-sixties. Barr explains the unfolding of the field and the primary struggle it has had in becoming a profession:
During this process of maturation a profession must demonstrate some degree of effectiveness in attaining its objectives ... It is the thesis of this article that Catholic Youth Work has not yet matured professionally because it has placed high emphasis on aspiration and has not been appropriately concerned with the discovery of methods and means of achieving objectives ... To qualify as professional, helping efforts must be directed by a body of practice principles derived from valid scientific sources ... The salient task confronting Catholic Youth Work is the accumulation of a body of practiced principles. Scrutiny of CYO literature reveals a climate characterized by statements of aspiration and dedication, but one learns little of an instrumental nature. (pp. 16-18)

Research on the Field of Catholic Youth Ministry. A limited amount of research has been conducted specific to the field of Catholic youth ministry. A study of professional, salaried youth ministers was conducted in the late 1980s in nineteen dioceses across the United States. This study was the first to describe this emerging population of ministers in the United States Catholic Church (Fox, 1994a). The first national study of youth who participate in parish youth ministry programs was conducted in 1996 (Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate [CARA]), followed by a study of the role of the Diocesan Director of Youth Ministry in 1999 (Froehle & Gautier, 2000a). Catholic youth workers were studied as part of a larger study on religious youth workers by the Search Institute in 1995, in which ten percent of the sample self-identified as Catholic youth ministers (Scales et al., 1995). The most recent research conducted specifically on the parish youth minister was accomplished by St. Mary’s Press (2000).

The Ministerial Roles and Characteristics of the Lay Ecclesial Minister

Diversity and exclusivity are two of the issues that most drive the debate and discussion regarding the identity of the lay ecclesial minister. Even though the most common lay ecclesial ministry positions are held in the parish setting, lay ecclesial...
ministers also serve in diocesan and national ministerial positions. In addition, they work in ministry positions in church-related institutions, such as universities and hospitals.

**Toward a Definition of the Lay Ecclesial Minister.** The U.S. bishops have chosen the term ‘ecclesial minister’ to describe lay people who have been professionally prepared for ministry; no fuller definition exists” (Fox, 1998, p. 3). The generic title of “lay ecclesial minister” has been used to describe those serving in the variety of roles identified in the field of lay ministry, both those working in local church parishes and those serving in institutions such as hospitals and universities. At the current time, it is the best way to describe this new role that is still evolving in the church (NCCB, 2000). Breaking down the title, “lay” refers to persons who are members of the laity (persons who are not ordained), including vowed religious women (commonly called sisters or nuns), and men (commonly called brothers). According to the National Conference of Catholic Bishops’ Subcommittee on Lay Ministry (see NCCB, 2000), “the word ‘Ecclesial’ denotes not only that the ministry of these lay persons has a place within the church but also that it is to be submitted to the judgment and supervision of the hierarchy” (p. 6). The title of “minister” includes those who perform service on behalf of the church and its mission (NCCB, 2000). In the Roman Catholic Church, the title minister, for the majority of its history, was reserved for ordained clergy, which includes bishops, priests, and deacons.

The question of who belongs in the category of lay ecclesial ministers has been discussed and debated with little resolution (NCCB, 2000). Due to the diverse areas of specialized ministry within the field, resistance has been encountered in efforts to come to a concise definition to the generic term and role of “lay ecclesial minister” (Fox, 1998).
Instead of giving a definition, the report following the Lay Ministry Project sponsored by the United States Bishop’s Subcommittee on Lay Ministry (NCCB, 2000) provided a description of lay ecclesial ministers by listing eight characteristics that should be present to some degree in every lay ecclesial minister.

Those characteristics include being a fully initiated lay person responding to a call from the church, and willingness to share their gifts given by the Holy Spirit in a specific ministry. Additional characteristics include someone who has received formal preparation for ministry and performs that ministry intentionally, as well as someone who has been entrusted or installed to perform a particular ministry by church authority. The position held by the lay minister can be paid (full-time or part-time) or volunteer. The distinction being not whether a lay ecclesial youth minister is employed, but whether they have been given responsibility and authority from the institutional church to minister in a particular area.

Another challenge of understanding who is and who is not considered a lay ecclesial minister centers on the issues of exclusivity in ministry and what is considered “official” ministry. By baptism, all Catholics are called to service for the kingdom of God (NCCB, 2000). Since Vatican II, there has been an inclination to assume that all acts of service are considered ministry, such that the word “ministry” has become so stretched as to forfeit all meaning (Rademacher, 1992). In addition, the debate has focused on the issue of whether ministry is a state or a function.

Vocational Identity. Related to the issue of the lay ecclesial minister’s ministerial identity is the question of whether a minister has to be called by the community to
ministry, or empowered by church authority to ministry, or has discerned a call from God
to ministry on their own (Rademacher, 1992). Research demonstrates that lay ministers
describe among their reasons for being in ministry as having a vocation and call from God
(Fox, 1986; NCCB, 2000). Invitation by the pastor, volunteering in parish ministries, and
the influence of other lay people are some of the most common reasons given by lay
ecclesial ministers for entry into professional ministry (Fox).

According to the Bishop’s Subcommittee on Lay Ministry (NCCB, 2000), the
identity of a lay ecclesial minister is one of personal awareness and intentionality, as well
as recognition by official church authority to participate in the public ministry of the
church. In other words, it is essential that a lay ecclesial minister defines him or herself as
such, and be recognized to serve in that capacity by church authority, such as a local
pastor or bishop. This definition is reinforced by a sense of permanence of the
commitment to ministry. Forty percent of lay ecclesial ministers responded yes, when
asked whether their work in the church implies a permanent commitment (Fox, 1998).

Professional Identity. The final area of debate regarding the definition of the lay
ecclesial minister involves the use of the word “professional” as a primary descriptor. The
term professional lay minister has been used in the past to help make a distinction about
this new ministerial role. The working definition that the Bishops Subcommittee on Lay
Ministry (NCCB, 2000), begun in the Lay Ministry Project, was “professionally prepared
men and women, including vowed religious, who are in positions of service and
leadership in the church” (p. 8). However, some church leaders see problems with using
the term professional in relationship to pastoral work because of its secular connotations
(NCCB, 2000). One definition of the phrase “professional ministry” includes the distinction of ministers who, after serious call and extensive preparation, make a full-time commitment to the profession of public ministry in areas of service that are central and foundational to the life of the church (O’Meara, 1983).

**Gender and Ethnic Group.** The recent study by the National Pastoral Life Center focusing on Parish Lay Ministry (Murnion & DeLambo, 1999) reported that 82% of all lay ministers are female, which remains consistent with previous studies. A study conducted by St. Mary’s Press (2000), found that eighty percent of all parish youth ministers were female. This contradicts an earlier study that found the proportion of men serving as lay ecclesial ministers in the field of youth ministry is higher, at 41% (Fox, 1998).

Those serving in the role of Diocesan Directors of Youth Ministry consist of a higher percentage of males at 61% (Froehle & Gautier, 2000a). The Catholic Church has a higher percentage of female youth workers based upon findings from the interdenominational youth worker study, which reported that 59% of religious youth workers are female (Scales et al., 1995). The population of lay ecclesial ministers is predominantly Caucasian, with only 6.4% being Hispanic, African American, or Asian American (Murnion & DeLambo, 1999).

**Religious Background.** The average lay minister has attended Catholic schools for 8.2 years. Nearly 25% have not attended Catholic school at all (CARA, 1998). This can be contrasted with the general population of Catholics, in which 48% have attended Catholic school, and 72% report having attended religion classes (CARA, 1995).
Educational Background. Fifty-three percent of all lay ecclesial ministers serving in parishes have at least a master’s degree (Murnion & DeLambo, 1999). Thirty-seven percent of parish youth ministers have engaged in some graduate level study (St. Mary’s Press, 2000). Four in five Diocesan Directors of Youth Ministry have a master’s degree (CARA, 2000). Over 50% of full-time parish Directors of Religious Education (DREs) have a master’s degree, while only one-third of part-time DREs possess the same.

Age and Youth Ministry Experience. According to the information obtained by St. Mary’s Press (2000), lay ecclesial youth ministers have been in youth ministry 9.3 years (mean). Religious workers from various denominations have more than five years experience, on average (Scales et al., 1995). Forty-three percent of these ministers are under the age of forty (St. Mary’s Press). It appears that the mean age of youth ministers has increased since the Fox (1986) study of the population, which reported that two-thirds of youth ministers were under the age of 35, and the median age was 45. Youth ministry professionals serving in the role of Diocesan Director of Youth Ministry have a mean age of 43 years (Froehole & Gautier, 2000a).

Parish Ministerial Positions. The largest number of lay ecclesial ministers serves in parish roles and, as such, the focus of the majority of the research has centered upon them. Two national studies have been done on parish lay ministers by the National Pastoral Life Center, which have attempted to describe the parish lay minister’s identity and what they do in parish settings. The 1992 study by the National Pastoral Life Center was the first attempt to describe the extent to which the laity had been given leadership roles in parish ministry. A follow-up study conducted by that same organization in 1998
by Mumion and DeLambo (1999) reported that there has been a 35% increase in lay ministers since the first study (from 21,500 lay ministers to 29,145). The study also reported that 63% of parishes in the United States employ lay ministers, which is up from 54% in the 1992 study (Mumion & DeLambo).

The largest group of lay ecclesial parish ministers are religious educators, at 41%; general pastoral ministers are the next largest group, at 26%; and youth ministers are the third largest, at 11% (CARA, 1998). Sixty-five percent of lay ecclesial Catholic youth ministers have a paid youth ministry employment status, with 44% of those full-time and 55% part-time (St. Mary's Press, 2000). Parish religious educators are primarily full time (87%). Seventy-eight percent of all lay parish religious educators are lay, with 21% being religious (CARA). The primary title of religious educations is Director of Religious Education, commonly referred to as DRE.

The Parish Ministerial Setting. One way to define the size of a local parish is by the number of registered families, or households. The mean number of registered households in parishes in which youth ministers serve is 1,148; sixty-seven percent of those youth ministers coordinate both junior high and senior high youth ministry (St. Mary’s Press, 2000). The Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate (2000) has created four descriptive categories of parishes in the United States. The categories with information regarding percentage of lay staff and the percentage with a youth minister are as follows:

1. “Mega” Parishes have more than 1,200 families, with 3.8 lay staff members, and 66% have a youth minister.
2. "Corporate" Parishes have between 550 to 1,200 families, 2.4 lay staff members, and 49% have a youth minister.

3. "Community" Parishes have between 201 to 549 families, 1.5 lay staff members, and 41% have a youth minister.

4. "Family" Parishes have 200 or fewer families, 0.7 lay staff members, and 26% have a youth minister.

Primary Activities of Parish Youth Ministers. According to the St. Mary's (2000) study, the most common weekly programs occurring three or more times per month led by parish youth ministers are religious education classes (77%). The next most common programs or activities held at least three times a month are confirmation classes (53%) and youth group meetings (48%). The least commonly sponsored programs on a three times a month or more basis are Bible studies (10%) and prayer meetings (20%). Annually, parish youth ministers sponsor overnight retreats (82%) at least once a year, and take part in youth conferences and rallies (89%). An earlier study of parish youth ministers (Fox, 1994a) reported that religious education (41%) and community building/fellowship activities (37%) are the activities to which most time is given, with retreats ranking third. The same study reported that 94% of youth ministers had sole or shared responsibility for confirmation.

Primary Populations Served by Parish Youth Ministers. Sixty-eight percent of parish youth ministers are responsible for ministry with both junior high and high school youth, while 28% work only with high school youth. The average number of youth in grades 6 through 12 was reported as 285, with the median number of potential youth
being 200. On average, 88 youth participate in youth ministry programs sponsored by parishes, with a median participation of 45 (St. Mary’s Press, 2000).

The Formation and Preparation of Lay Ecclesial Ministers

The types of ministerial formation and preparation programs for lay ministry vary as much as the ministers who participate in them. Both the degree of formality and the program focus often depend upon the sponsoring institution. There have been five national studies, conducted by either the National Conference of Catholic Bishops or the Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate, on formation programs that prepare lay ecclesial ministers for parish ministry.

Lay Ministry Formation Programs. There has been a 50% increase in the number of ministry formation programs from 1986 (the first study) to 1999 (the fifth study). Currently, there are 295 programs, with an enrollment of 29,137 participants, which also demonstrates a significant increase from previous studies (CARA, 1999). The research has identified three different types of sponsors of lay ministry formation programs and two different categories of programs.

The most common ministry formation program sponsors are archdioceses and dioceses. Programs sponsored by dioceses are categorized as diocesan-based programs (n=189). The second largest sponsor of these programs includes Catholic universities, colleges, or seminaries, which are categorized in the research as academic-based programs (n=96). The third type of sponsor for lay ministry formation programs are independent Catholic organizations, which are categorized as diocesan-based programs because of the similarity of these programs to their diocesan counterparts. Diocesan-
based programs focus more on spiritual formation, while academic-based programs focus more on academic content. Both categories of programs place emphasis on supervised practicum/skill development (CARA, 1997, 1999).

Upon program completion, academic-based programs offer degrees ranging from associate to doctoral. The most common degree offered and obtained is a Master’s in Pastoral Studies or Pastoral Ministry. Seventy-eight percent of the diocesan-based programs offer certificates upon completion, usually in an area of specialized ministry such as youth ministry, catechetics, or liturgy (CARA, 1999). In addition, 36% of the diocesan-based programs have a commissioning ceremony upon successful completion of the program (CARA, 1997).

Lay Ministry Formation Program Students. Program participants are primarily female, outnumbering men by a ratio of two to one, with 60% between the ages of 40 and 60. Seventy-one percent of the participants are white, with Hispanics as the next largest group, at 23% (CARA, 1999). These lay ministry program participant characteristics are relatively consistent with past studies (CARA, 1997). Sixty-one percent of participants in degree programs are church career professionals, with 14% being full-time students. Most non-degree program participants were preparing for volunteer service in the church (CARA, 1997).

Effectiveness of the Lay Ecclesial Minister

Ministerial effectiveness is often difficult to determine (Nauss, 1994). Pastors, parish ministers, and parishioners report that “the lay parish ministers make a significant contribution to almost all aspects of parish life” (Murnion & DeLambo, 1999, p. 104). In response to the difficulty of assessing effectiveness, many of the national organizations
serving the field in specialized areas in lay ecclesial ministry have developed competency-based standards for specific ministerial roles. These standards define the knowledge and skills that a lay ecclesial minister in that specialized area and role need to possess in order to be effective. Benefits of the development of national competency-based standards for various roles of lay ecclesial ministers include the potential to influence curriculum, and assist in the movement toward standardization of lay ecclesial ministry formation. In addition, in theory, the development of national standards has a portability dimension that could benefit the lay ecclesial minister who moves from one diocese to another (NCCB, 2000).

Certification and Accreditation in the Field of Lay Ecclesial Ministry. One response to the concern of the formation and development of lay ministers has been the creation of the United States Catholic Conference Commission on Certification and Accreditation [USCC/CCA]. This commission has the function of overseeing the development of certification standards for individual ministers and accreditation standards for the institutions that train and prepare lay ministers (USCC/CCA, 1999). The USCC/CCA has been designated by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops to serve as the national accrediting agency for clinical pastoral and ministry formation programs, and as the approval agency for certification standards and procedures for specialized ministries. This agency has established standards for ministry formation programs, as well as procedures to review these programs. However, few programs, both diocesan and academic, have undergone the review and accreditation process.
The Development of National Competency-Based Standards. Certification standards for lay ecclesiial ministers serving in various areas of specialized ministry have been developed by the corresponding professional organizations for those ministry areas (NCCB, 2000). The development of standards for specific ministries began in 1971, with the National Association of Catholic Chaplains (NACC), which is the national professional organization for hospital chaplains. NACC provides national certification for members of its organization serving as hospital chaplains. Other organizations and areas of specialized ministry that have developed standards include:

- The National Federation for Catholic Youth Ministry (NFCYM), which developed standards for Coordinators of Youth Ministry in 1989.
- The Catholic Campus Ministry Association (CCMA), which developed standards and provides certification for Campus Ministers in a university setting, beginning in 1991.
- The National Conference for Catechetical Leaders (NCCL), which developed standards for Directors of Religious Education in 1996.
- The National Conference of Catholic of Airport Chaplains (NCCAC), which developed standards and provides certification for Airport Chaplains in 1997.
- The American Catholic Correctional Chaplains Association (ACCCA), which developed standards and provides certification for Prison Chaplains, beginning in 1979.
The initiative on the part of national lay ecclesial ministry associations to develop these standards is a movement toward self-definition and accountability that should be commended (NCCB, 2000). The development of these standards provide an opportunity to improve the effectiveness of ministers in their organizations and are a positive sign for the future of lay ecclesial ministry, according to the Catholic bishops of the United States (NCCB, 2000).

Three of the national organizations with approved standards (NFCYM, NCCL, and NALM) are currently working collaboratively to develop a core set of competency-based standards for lay ecclesial ministers (NCCB, 2000). These organizations, through the Common Competencies Project, are attempting to identify what is common to all these ministers. In addition to the development of core standards, each organization will revise the standards for their specialized areas of ministry. The goal is to have these core and specialized standards developed by 2003, in time for the periodic seven-year review of the current organizational standards by the USCC/CCA.

Currently, the utilization of competency-based standards in the church takes many forms. Individuals use these standards as they assess their current level of competence in light of the standards and develop self-directed learning plans. Local churches use the standards as they seek to hire, supervise, support, and evaluate professional lay ecclesial ministers serving in parishes. Dioceses and archdioceses use these standards to assist in the formation of lay ecclesial ministers in certification processes. Institutions of higher education, dioceses, and independent Catholic organizations who sponsor training
programs use the standards in developing curricula for programs of study for the lay ecclesial minister.

**Self-Assessed Ministry Competency.** The Fox (1986) study of professional salaried youth ministers identified (1) understanding of youth, (2) community building, (3) theology, (4) worship and prayer, and (5) enablement as the greatest areas of competence of that population. Justice, evangelization, counseling, and theology were identified as areas of least competence (Fox, 1994b). Each of the items above, in both lists, was checked by at least 50 percent of the respondents in that survey.

**The Formal Relationship Between The Lay Minister and The Church**

One area of lay ecclesial ministry that was studied by the Lay Ministry Project is financial and human resources connected with lay ministry (NCCB, 2000). The Lay Ministry Project concluded there is a need for standard human resource practices that will enhance lay ecclesial ministry, such as job descriptions, performance evaluations, staff meetings, portable benefits, just compensation, and grievance procedures. Those conclusions also express concern about the job security of lay ecclesial ministers and other parish personnel as parish leadership changes. The need for diocesan offices to establish procedures and policies to address this concern was suggested (NCCB, 2000). The good news is that work conditions are becoming more formalized and salaries have improved. Furthermore, diocesan offices are beginning to partner more with parishes in hiring activities and establishing personnel policies (Murnion & DeLambo, 1999).

**Characteristics of the Employment Relationship.** Forty-five percent of youth ministers report “that they receive formal supervision, defined as active, ongoing over-
sight and evaluation of ... [their] work” (Fox, 1994b). The pastor is identified by one-third of the respondents as the person who is most involved in the evaluation process. Many dioceses and parishes have established an employment “at will” policy in order to protect themselves from legal actions in cases of termination of employment relationships. The National Association of Church Personnel Administrators (NACPA) (1994) advocates for establishing employment relationships based on a “for cause” basis. They believe that this framework will best serve the church because of its consistency with church social teaching. Additionally, the improvement of personnel practices will support this type of employment relationship (NACPA, 1994).

Salaries of Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministers. The only national salary information that exists regarding full-time parish youth ministers’ salaries was reported by Diocesan Directors of Youth Ministry (Froehle & Gautier, 2000a), who reported that the average “recommended” salary is $25,691, the average “typical” salary is $21,181, the highest salary is $30,801, and the lowest salary is $15,234. Lay Diocesan Directors of Youth Ministry receive a mean salary of $34,337, with male directors making an average of $3,424 more per year than their female counterparts. A Diocesan Director of Religious Education earns, on average, $33,000, with the average parish DRE earning $28,000 per year (CARA, 1998).

Values to Guide the Relationship Between Lay Minister and the Church. NACPA (1994) cited four values that could guide the church’s relationship with those whom it employs: (1) humankind is fundamentally good, (2) persons are the greatest resource of the church, (3) church personnel systems should be comprehensive, and (4) those who
work for the church must be accountable (p. 3). In response to these values, NACPA has developed a number of resources to aid dioceses and parishes in establishing job descriptions, performance appraisals, and other personnel practices. It is important to note that, in cases where the lay ecclesial minister is serving in a volunteer capacity, the same values and policies should apply to ensure the mutual accountability of both parties (NACPA, 1994). The implementation of these values would be an important and fundamental step toward establishing formal structures to facilitate the ministerial relationship between the church and the lay ecclesial minister.
Target Population

The target population for this study was all lay ecclesial ministers serving in the field of Catholic youth ministry, which included both diocesan and parish personnel. The accessible population was registered participants of the National Conference on Catholic Youth Ministry (NCCYM) held November 30, 2000 to December 3, 2000 in Birmingham, AL. The primary audience of the conference, sponsored by the NFCYM, is parish and diocesan personnel serving in the field of Catholic youth ministry. The purpose of the conference is to provide for the continuing education and training needs of the professional field of Catholic youth ministry.

Framing the Target Population. An accurate frame of the target population of lay ecclesial youth ministers in the Roman Catholic Church in the United States is very difficult to obtain due to the lack of information about this population. The only prospect of getting an exact frame of this population would be to call every church parish in the United States. This option is neither feasible nor cost efficient. Furthermore, the effectiveness of such action would be impacted by the variety of positions, titles, and job descriptions currently included in the field of lay ecclesial youth ministry making it close to impossible to ensure consistency in the frame.

No national list of all lay ecclesial ministers in the United States exist. The annual report of statistics and personnel information for the United States Roman Catholic Church is The Official Catholic Directory (1999), published by P.J. Kenedy and Sons does not include a listing of lay ministers. However, the directory does provide an
accurate list of clergy, dioceses, parishes and other important statistical information about
the Roman Catholic Church, both in detail by diocese and in a summary format.
However, the total number of lay ecclesial ministers is not reported in the summary
(like Catholic clergy) which is one reason for the difficulty in establishing an accurate
frame of the target population. Additionally, the absence of a definition of the lay
ecclesial minister by the publishers of the directory results in limited and inconsistent
information on lay ecclesial ministers in the directory because who falls within the
category is solely defined by each reporting diocese.

One strategy used in a recent study (St. Mary’s Press, 2000) to identify the
members of the target population was to solicit diocesan offices throughout the country
to provide a list of their youth ministers. While such an action could be accomplished,
and such lists did exist, the question as to whether this would provide an accurate frame
of the target population still remained. The potential inaccuracy of framing the population
in this manner is rooted in the autonomous nature of each diocese and their varying
organizational structures. The high likelihood that each diocesan list had been obtained in
very different manners and did contain very different information was very high. For
example, one diocese might include both volunteers and professionals on the diocesan list
of youth ministers, whereas another might include just paid professionals. Additionally,
one diocese may include one minister per parish on the list, while another diocese may
include multiple contacts.

Lastly, the target population was difficult to frame because no national
association of parish youth ministers exists in the United States. However, a national
association for diocesan level personnel in Catholic youth ministry does exist, the National Federation for Catholic Youth Ministry (NFCYM). The NFCYM does, however, indirectly serve parish youth ministers through the sponsorship of biennial conferences for Catholic youth and for parish and diocesan youth ministry personnel.

Census Study of the Accessible Population

For the purpose of this study, a census study was conducted of the accessible population. The accessible population were conference participants at the biennial conference for Catholic youth ministers sponsored by the NFCYM in Birmingham, Alabama in November of 2000. One of the primary purposes of this study was to assess and describe the profession of the lay ecclesial youth minister. One distinction of a profession is sponsorship of professional conferences and associations (Merriam & Brockett, 1997). Therefore, it was probable that those attending the NFCYM, a professional conference for the field of Catholic youth ministry could provide important data about those engaged in the profession and activities within the field.

While there was no guarantee that conference attendees represented the entire population of Catholic youth ministers, it was likely they represented lay ecclesial youth ministers interested in professionalization and formalization of the field by the mere fact that they attended the only national professional conference that existed for the field of Catholic youth ministry. The probability that a representative sample of the target population gathered at the conference was high because the primary audience of the conference were lay ecclesial youth ministers. Past conference attendance records demonstrate that those gathered include lay youth ministers from diocesan, parish, and
school ministry settings both paid and volunteer. Conference attendance in 2000 was over 1700 participants; in 1998 it was over 1300; and, in 1996 it was 1000, which represents a steady increase in participants.

Inclusion Criteria for Acceptance Into the Study. The a’priori criteria for acceptance into the study included the definition of the accessible population and population frame as being registered participants at the 2000 National Conference for Catholic Youth Ministry. Additionally, all persons in the study must have the vocational status of being a lay minister in the Roman Catholic Church.

Instrumentation

Instrument Development. The survey instrument (see Appendix A) that was used to collect the data was designed by the researcher, using both original questions and questions taken from two surveys from recent related studies of the target population. One of the surveys used in the development of the instrument included the St. Mary’s Press Research Study (2000) on parish personnel in youth ministry. The other survey utilized in designing the instrument was used in a study done by the Center for Applied Research for the Apostolate (CARA) (Froehle & Gautier, 2000a) and sponsored by the NFCYM. It concerned diocesan personnel in youth ministry. The sponsors of both studies gave verbal permission for the use of items on the survey instrument in this research study.

Instrument Content. Section one of the survey instrument encompassed questions regarding demographic information. Section two of the survey dealt with professional ministry issues and attitudes. Items 20 through 26 included questions regarding the
influential factors for entrance and exiting service in the field, as well as future work intentions. Section three included questions assessing ministerial competence and were adapted from the national standards for the Coordinator of Youth Ministry. Section four of the survey instrument covers information on lay ministry education and formation of the respondents. Section five of the survey instrument dealt with information on the ministerial setting and role description. Section six was designated for those serving in a parish ministerial setting only and consisted of items related to descriptive information regarding ministry in that ministerial setting. Item 58 was adapted from the St. Mary’s Press (2000) study survey and assessed the primary activities of parish youth ministers.

**Content Validity of the Instrument.** The data collection instrument was tested for content validity by a panel of experts in the field of Catholic youth ministry. These experts consisted of diocesan and national youth ministry leaders with extensive experience in parish youth ministry and the field of Catholic youth ministry. The size of the original panel of experts was 20 persons from throughout the United States. The primary means of communication was email.

Thirteen (five national representatives and eight diocesan representatives) of the original 20 member panel responded to the request for evaluation and feedback on the instrument. Primary concerns of the panel involved the confusion that may occur due to the mixture of both diocesan and parish youth ministry personnel in the study and how subjects might respond to or interpret questions differently. The feedback resulted in moving certain items on the instrument to a “parish only” section to avoid this confusion.
The overall feedback regarding the instrument was very positive, and items were deemed appropriate by the panel of Catholic youth ministry experts.

**Field Test of the Instrument.** The survey instrument was field tested at a gathering of lay ecclesial youth ministers in the Diocese of Galveston-Houston. Twenty-three youth ministers participated in the field test. The youth ministers who participated in the field test were not planning to attend the NCCYM, which is why they were chosen for the field test.

Completion of the survey instrument took youth ministers in the field test an average of 20 minutes with a range of 15 minutes to 35 minutes. The ministers were asked to circle any questions on the instrument that were unclear in either concept or wording. Two questions were eliminated due to the input from the field test and several were re-written to incorporate input received.

**Data Collection**

The survey instrument was distributed to the accessible population during the registration process at the NCCYM, which took place in Birmingham, AL, November 30-December 3, 2000. The researcher was invited to speak during the opening session to explain the purpose and importance of the research, as well as to provide instructions for completing and returning the survey. Conference attendees were reminded through announcements each day to complete the survey. Door-prize drawings were held each day from the names of the attendees who completed the survey. The survey instruments were collected in boxes by the doors to the main conference room. A total of 869 surveys were collected from the 1717 conference participants resulting in a response rate of 51%.
Data Analysis

All analyses in this study were conducted using SPSS computer software. This study used an a priori alpha level of .05 for all analysis. Procedures for statistical analysis, as well as findings, have been explained by objective.

The first step in the data analysis was to eliminate from the data set any multiple survey responses. Additionally, those responding as either priest or deacon in the vocational status of the demographic information on the survey were eliminated because they did not qualify as lay ecclesial ministers in the Roman Catholic Church.

Objective one was to describe the lay ecclesial youth minister in terms of the following variables:

A. Highest educational level completed,
B. Age,
C. Gender,
D. Ethnic group,
E. Number of years in youth ministry,
F. Vocational status,
G. Youth ministry employment status according to number of work hours paid for per week for youth ministry activities,
H. Past Catholic school student,
I. Past participant in Catholic youth ministry activities as an adolescent,
J. Past participant in Catholic parish religious education,
K. Religious history regarding being a “cradle” Catholic or a Catholic convert,
L. Annual salary for youth ministry position, and

M. Participation in Catholic youth leadership programs as an adolescent.

The analysis of this objective was accomplished by calculating and reporting frequencies and percentages on each of the variables listed. The central tendency of the variables of age, number of years in ministry, annual youth ministry salary, and number of years in youth ministry variables were described by reporting the mean. All other variables were summarized by reporting the percentage of the categorical variable present in the sample.

Objective two was to describe the ministerial setting of the lay ecclesial youth minister in the following areas:

A. Number of parish in terms of registered families,

B. Number of potential youth in grades 6th-12th,

C. Number of participating youth in Catholic youth ministry programs,

D. Size of parish professional staff,

E. Total annual youth ministry budget,

F. Title of the supervisor of the youth minister, and

G. Title of youth ministry position.

The analysis of this objective was accomplished by calculating the mean for each variable except for the title of the supervisor and the title of the youth ministry position in which the percentage of the title present in the total sample was reported. To further describe the youth ministry employment status and youth ministry position title for parish youth ministers a cross-tab analysis of these two variables was presented.
Objective three was to describe the elements present in the formal relationship between the lay ecclesial youth minister and parish using the following variables:

A. Employment contract,
B. Paid health care benefits,
C. Paid vacation,
D. Paid annual retreat,
E. Written job description,
F. Participation in parish staff meetings,
G. Secretarial support,
H. Retirement plan,
I. Life insurance,
J. Annual performance review, and
K. Paid continuing education benefits.

The analysis of this objective was accomplished by calculating and reporting frequencies and percentages on each of the items listed.

Objective four was to describe the occurrence of selected ministerial job functions and activities of the lay ecclesial youth minister in the following areas:

A. Primary activities and responsibilities of the lay ecclesial youth minister,
B. Primary population of youth served, and
C. Additional areas of ministry responsibility beyond ministry to adolescents.

The analysis of this objective was accomplished by calculating frequencies and percentages on each of the items listed in this section of the survey. The primary activities
was assessed by asking respondents to indicate the frequency of the occurrence of 18 programs or activities included in parish youth ministry. The primary population served was assessed by asking respondents to indicate from a list of four categories which one best describes the youth population which they served; one of the four categories was “other” which allowed respondents to write in another description of the primary youth population served. Additional responsibilities of the lay ecclesial youth minister was assessed by asking respondents to check all of the areas of additional responsibility that apply to their work from a list of seven categories; one of the seven categories was “other” which allowed respondents to write in another description of the additional responsibilities.

Objective five was to determine intentions of the lay ecclesial youth minister regarding their future work in a formal ministry position in the church. The analysis of this objective was accomplished by computing frequencies and percentages the items which asked respondents to indicate from four options which one best describes their intent regarding the range of years in which they intend to work in the field and to choose from a list of possible reasons for which they might leave youth ministry work.

Objective six was to describe influential factors in a lay ecclesial youth minister’s decision to enter formal ministry in the church. The analysis of this objective was accomplished by calculating and reporting the mean on five items which provide possible reasons for engaging in youth ministry work. The influence of the items was rated with the following four point scale: (1) Not at all; (2) Only a little; (3) Somewhat; (4) Very much.
Objective seven was to determine influential factors in a lay ecclesial youth minister’s decision to exit formal ministry in the future. The analysis of this objective was accomplished by calculating and reporting frequencies and percentages on each of the seven items listed. The respondents were asked to pick the one item that would most likely influence their decision to leave youth ministry service; one of the options was an “other” category which allowed respondents to write in a response.

Objective eight was to describe the training and ministry formation of the lay ecclesial youth minister by identifying the inclusion various elements in ministry formation programs completed by lay youth minister. The elements evaluated included:

A. Curriculum within program,
B. Supervised practice of ministry,
C. Assessment activities,
D. Established entrance requirements,
E. Graduation or commissioning ceremony (upon program completion),
F. Mentoring, and
G. Retreat experience.

Respondents were first asked to indicate whether or not they had completed a ministry formation program. Those that had completed a ministry formation program where provided the list of elements and asked to check all items that were included in the ministry formation program in which they completed. The analysis of this objective was accomplished by running frequencies and percentages on each of the items within section four of the survey instrument.
Objective nine was to determine opinions of the lay ecclesial youth minister regarding the formalization of their role within the Church and the professionalization of the field, in the following areas:

A. Professional organizations (local and national),
B. Professional resources and journals,
C. Professional certification (diocesan personnel and parish personnel),
D. Professional conferences,
E. Youth ministry resource web site,
F. Participation in national committees, and
G. Recognized, transferable credential.

The respondents were asked to indicate their opinion about the importance of the professional development items using the following four point scale: (1) Not important; (2) Somewhat important; (3) Important; and (4) Very Important. The mean was calculated and reported for each item. To further summarize the data through identification of the main categories of perception regarding the professional development of the field of Catholic youth ministry, a factor analysis the items in section two of the survey was conducted.

This analysis was accomplished by using a principal component factor analysis with a varimax rotation method. The first step in the analysis was to create a correlation matrix in order to evaluate the appropriateness of inclusion of specific items in the analysis. The initial extraction was accomplished by using eigenvalues of 1.0 or more as the a’priori level for extracting components. An alpha reliability analysis was run on the
11 items to evaluate the correlation of the items. A Kaiser-Myer-Oklin (KMO) sampling adequacy test was used to determine if the sample size was adequate. Both a scree plot of the eigenvalues and the initial extraction of components were evaluated in order to determine the number of factors present within the data. A decision was made regarding the final number of factors based upon the criteria that both meaningful interpretation and simple structure were accomplished.

Objective ten was to determine self-perception of ministry competency of the lay ecclesial youth minister in specific knowledge and skill areas of ministry. Twenty-one competency items were assessed by the respondents using the following four-point scale: (1) No competency; (2) Limited competency; (3) Satisfactory competency; and, (4) Exceptional competency. The analysis of this objective was accomplished by calculating the means for each item.

To further summarize the data by identifying categories of ministerial competence, a factor analysis on ministerial competency items in section three of the survey was computed. A correlation matrix of all 18 items was examined for appropriateness of inclusion of items in the analysis. An alpha reliability analysis was accomplished on the 18 items to evaluate the correlation of the items. A Kaiser-Myer-Oklin (KMO) sampling adequacy test was used to determine if the sample size was adequate.

Eigenvalues of 1.0 or higher was the a’priori level for extracting components in the initial extraction. A principal component extraction was used with a varimax rotation method. A scree plot of the eigenvalues was evaluated along with the results of the initial
extraction in order to determine the number of factors present with both a meaningful interpretation and simple structure.

Objective eleven was to determine the effect of youth ministry employment status on the opinions of lay ecclesial ministers towards professional development of the field. The analysis of this objective was accomplished with an analysis of variance procedure with the opinions of the lay ecclesial youth minister regarding professional development of the field being the dependent variable. The independent variable was youth ministry employment status. The Tukey’s post hoc test was used to identify which groups were significantly different.

Objective twelve was to determine if a model exists which significantly increases the researcher’s ability to accurately explain whether the lay ecclesial parish youth minister has a paid youth ministry employment status or a volunteer youth ministry employment status from selected personal and ministerial variables. A discriminant analysis was used.

Two different discriminant analyses were conducted both with the dependent variable of a paid or volunteer youth ministry employment status. The first discriminant model utilized ministerial variables including the number of participating and potential youth, areas of additional ministry responsibility and number of families registered as the independent or predictor variables.

The independent variables utilized in the second analysis included the eighteen competency-indicator items used to measure self-assessed ministerial competence, the five dichotomous variables defining the highest education level completed by
respondents, and whether a ministry formation program had been completed or not. A stepwise entry method was used in both analyses due to the exploratory nature of the this objective.

Objective thirteen was to explain the variance in the perception of the professional development of the field utilizing youth ministry employment status defined as employed or volunteer, years of youth ministry experience and education level as the independent or predictor variables. The identified factors of perceptions regarding professionalization were used as the dependent variables in the multiple regression analysis. Assumptions of normality, linearity and homogeneity of variance were tested.
Chapter Four: Results

A total of 1717 surveys were distributed to each of the registered conference attendees during the registration process. Eight-hundred sixty-nine surveys were completed and returned by the end of the conference, resulting in an overall response rate of 51%. All those completing the survey which identified their name and diocese were registered conference participants. However, 69 of the surveys were rejected from data input because respondents did not indicate their name and diocese on the information cover sheet of the survey, thus eliminating the ability to cross reference the respondent with the conference registration list.

Data input was donated and completed by the Center for Applied Research for the Apostolate (CARA), a national Catholic research center. Upon completion of data input into SPSS, the data file was sent to the researcher by CARA.

Data Analysis

Data analysis began with a review of the data for data input errors. A frequency analysis was done on the response to the first question on the survey regarding vocational status. An a’priori condition for being included in the sample was having a vocational status as a lay person (including religious sisters and brothers) within the Roman Catholic Church. Respondents were asked to indicate whether their vocational status could best be described as lay, priest or deacon, or religious sister or brother.

All respondents who indicated that their vocational status was that of ordained clergy (priest or deacon) were eliminated from the data analysis because the target population of the study was lay persons (which includes religious brothers and sisters, but not priests or...
deacons) serving as ministers to youth. This analysis resulted in the elimination of 30 total of which 24 cases who had indicated their vocational status was either priest or deacon, and six cases in which there was missing data for that question. A sample size of 770 persons met the a’priori inclusion criteria of a being lay ecclesial youth minister in the Roman Catholic Church, as well as a registered NCCYM participants, and as such were included in the data analysis in this study.

Objective One

Objective one was to describe the lay ecclesial youth minister in terms of selected personal variables. This analysis was accomplished by calculating frequencies and percentages on each of the variables. Of the 770 persons in the sample with a lay vocational status, 2.9% were religious sisters or brothers. The sample was primarily female, at 77% (n=593), with only 23% (n=177) being male.

The majority of the sample reported being Caucasians (n=684, 89.8%) with Hispanic the second largest ethnic group (n=37, 4.9%) (see Table 1). The respondents which indicated that their ethnic group was something “other” than the four groups listed Native-American (n=3), mixed ethnic groups (n=5) and 12 who did not specify a response besides “other”.

Education Level of the Respondents. The majority of lay ecclesial youth ministers reported a bachelor’s degree as their highest education level completed (n=300, 41%) with the completion of a master’s degree being the next highest level of education completed (n=147, 20%). Those which responded, “other” to the question of education level included a variety of responses (see Appendix B).
Table 1

Ethnic Group of Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>89.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic-American</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other a</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Nine lay ecclesial youth ministers did not respond when asked to complete the question regarding their ethnic background.

*Those respondents who chose "other" included 3 who responded Native-American, 5 that stated mixed ethnic group and 12 who did not chose to specify.

Age and Youth Ministry Experience. A summary of the central tendencies and variance of the age of lay ecclesial youth ministers was reported in Table 3 and years of ministry experience was reported in Table 4. The mean age of all respondents was 40.1 years old, with a standard deviation of 9.6. The median age of lay ecclesial youth ministers is 45.

The mean number of years of youth ministry experience was 9.55, with a standard deviation of 7.67 and a range of 44 years (1 to 45). The median years of youth ministry experience of the respondents is seven years, and the mode is three years.
Table 2

**Highest Education Level Completed by Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Education Level Completed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Year Associate Degree</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other *</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Forty-five lay ecclesial youth ministers did not respond when asked to select the highest education level completed. For a complete listing see Appendix B.*

Table 3

**Age of Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>40.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>41.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>9.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. One lay ecclesial youth minister did not respond to the question on age.*
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Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Years of Youth Ministry Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Thirty-eight lay ecclesial youth ministers did not respond to the question on years of youth ministry experience.

Youth Ministry Employment Status. The most common employment status (according to number of work hours paid per week for youth ministry activities) of youth ministers in the sample was full-time paid parish staff (n=360, 49%), with parish volunteer (n=166, 22%), being the next most frequent. Table 5 provides a summary of the employment status of lay youth ministers. Full-time status was defined as being employed for 20 hours or more per week and part-time status was defined by being employed for 20 hours or less per week. Twenty-two respondents chose “other” as their youth ministry employment status; twenty chose not to specify their status and two wrote in the response “girl scout leader”.
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Table 5

Youth Ministry Employment Status for Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Youth Ministry Employment Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parish Staff: Paid Full-time</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Volunteer</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Staff: Part-time</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan Staff</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Minister</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Thirty-two lay youth ministers did not respond to the question on youth ministry employment status.

*All the respondents that responded “other” to youth ministry employment status did not chose to specify their status except for two respondents who stated their employment status to be girl scout leader.

Youth Ministry Position Titles. Respondents were asked to report the title of their youth ministry position. In conducting analysis of this objective, the researcher first coded the responses based upon familiarity with common titles and common wording of titles. A total of 18 titles were coded (see Table 6). Overall, the most common title for youth ministers was Coordinator of Youth Ministry (n=122, 25%). Appendix C provides a complete listing of the coded category of “other”.

Religious Background of Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministers. The respondents were asked to describe their religious background and history by indicating whether a series of
Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Youth Ministry Position Titles</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator of Youth Ministry or Youth Coordinator</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Youth Ministry or Youth Director</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Youth Minister</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Including advisor, leader, girl scout leader *</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan Director of Youth Ministry</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral Associate or Pastoral Assistant</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Religious Education (DRE)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director or Coordinator of Faith Formation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High Youth Minister or Coordinator</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRE/Youth Minister</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Director of Diocesan Youth Ministry</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth and Young Adult Minister or Director</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Minister or Director of Campus Ministry</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation Coordinator</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYO Director</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catechist</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant for Youth Ministry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>741</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Thirty-nine of the respondents did not indicate the title of their youth ministry position.

*Appendix C provides a listing of all responses in this category.
statements were true about them. The most frequently indicated religious background and history item reported was attending a Catholic school at the elementary level (n=430, 56%) and the least frequently indicated item was being a convert to Catholicism (n=87, 11%). For a summary of the percentages of religious background and history variables refer to Table 7.

Table 7

Religious Background of Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Background Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Catholic School student</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in religious education</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in youth ministry activities as a teenager</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Catholic School student</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Catholic School student</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in leadership programs sponsored by Catholic Church as a youth.</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convert to Catholicism</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The total is greater than 100% since respondents could select all that applied.

Youth Ministry Salary of Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministers. Respondents were asked to report the annual salary they receive for their youth ministry position. The mean salary for all lay youth ministry personnel is $22,777, with a median salary of $24,000. A
summary and comparison of the mean annual salary of youth ministers by youth ministry employment status can be found in Table 8.

Table 8

Mean Annual Salary of Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministers by Youth Ministry Employment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Youth Ministry Employment Status</th>
<th>Mean Annual Salary (dollars)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parish Volunteer</td>
<td>6068.42</td>
<td>13211.53</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Staff: Paid Full-time</td>
<td>25682.76</td>
<td>7151.97</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Staff: Part-time</td>
<td>9714.75</td>
<td>5111.48</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan Staff</td>
<td>30109.89</td>
<td>13338.09</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Minister</td>
<td>28375.00</td>
<td>9664.92</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other *</td>
<td>19121.90</td>
<td>14172.07</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22782.24</td>
<td>10643.87</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Due to missing data in both variables only 523 cases were included.

*Twenty respondents chose not to specify their status and two responded “girl scout leader”.

Objective Two

Objective two was to describe the ministerial setting of the parish youth minister on the variables of size of parish, number of potential as well as participating youth, amount of operating budget for youth ministry, and the title of the supervisor of the lay ecclesial youth minister. The data for this objective came from questions from the final section of the survey, which was designated for those serving in a church parish setting; except for the question regarding the youth minister’s supervisor, which included others beyond a parish ministerial setting such as those in a diocesan or school setting.
except for the question regarding the youth minister’s supervisor, which included others
beyond a parish ministerial setting such as those in a diocesan or school setting.

Supervisor of Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministers. The respondents were asked to give
the title of the person who supervises their ministry to youth. The responses were coded
by the researcher using common wording and knowledge of common titles, resulting in
eight different title categories. Table 9 provides a summary of the reported supervisor.
The most frequently reported title for the supervisor of lay ecclesial youth ministers was
the pastor or priest (n=447; 61.8%).

Table 9
Supervisor Titles as Reported by Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor Titles</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pastor or Priest</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Minister, Coordinator, or Director</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Religious Education (DRE) or Director of Faith Formation</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan Director</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral Associate, Assistant or Administrator</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal or Board of Education</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicar, Chancellor, or Secretariat Level Diocesan Personnel</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Forty-six lay ecclesial youth ministers did not respond to this question.
Parish Ministry Setting of Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministers. A description of the parish ministry setting of lay ecclesial youth ministers includes the variables of number of families, number of youth, number of participating youth and the annual operating budget for youth ministry. One common way to determine the size of a local parish congregation is by the number of registered households or families in a church parish. The mean number of registered families was 1621 ($n=566$) with a median number of 1300 families. The mean, median, mode, range, and standard deviation of registered families is reported in Table 10.

The mean number of potential youth reported was 461 ($n=505$) and the mean number of participating youth was 114 ($n=493$). A summary of the mean, median, mode, range, and standard deviation for both the potential and active youth (6th through 12th grades) in parishes is reported in Table 10.

The respondents were asked to report the total operating budget for parish youth ministry programs excluding salaries. The mean total operating budget was calculated to be $15,368 ($n=373$) with, a median budget of $9,000. A summary of the central tendency and variance for this variable is also reported in Table 10.

Objective Three

The purpose of objective three was to describe the formal relationship between the lay ecclesial youth minister and the church by indicating whether or not selected elements were a part of the formal relationship (see Table 11). In order to accomplish this objective, those with a full-time parish status ($n=360$) were utilized for the analysis since full-time employees are more likely to have many of the employment benefits.
which was reported to be present in the relationship by the largest number of respondents was “participation in parish staff meetings” \((n=332\ or\ 92\%)\). The variable least commonly present was a paid annual retreat \((n=169\ or\ 47\%)\).

Table 10

Summary of Parish Ministry Setting Descriptors as Reported by Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Number of registered families</th>
<th>Number of youth in 6-12 grades</th>
<th>Number of participating youth</th>
<th>Annual operating budget (in dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1621.32</td>
<td>461.47</td>
<td>114.09</td>
<td>15368.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>1300.00</td>
<td>302.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>9000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>2000.00</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>10000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1319.49</td>
<td>496.55</td>
<td>154.19</td>
<td>18605.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>9954.00</td>
<td>5982.00</td>
<td>1197.00</td>
<td>99749.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>9999.00</td>
<td>6000.00</td>
<td>1200.00</td>
<td>99999.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective Four

The fourth objective was to describe the occurrence of selected ministerial job functions and activities of the parish youth minister, including their primary job activities and responsibilities, the primary population they serve, and additional areas of ministry.
responsibility beyond youth ministry. The primary job activities were assessed by asking respondents to indicate the frequency of 18 selected youth ministry programs or activities occur in the parish setting. Frequency of activity or program occurrence was defined by weekly (4), monthly (3), annually (2) or not at all (1).

Table 11

Description of the Percentage of Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministers Who Reported that Selected Elements were Present in Their Formal Relationship with the Parish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element present in relationship</th>
<th>Frequency of “Yes” Responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in parish staff meetings</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid annual vacation</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid continuing education</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care benefits</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written job description</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement plan</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life insurance</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual performance review</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in parish council meetings</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial support</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid annual retreat</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=360; only full-time paid parish youth ministers’ responses were included in this analysis.
Parish program activities that occur most frequently on a weekly basis include youth group meetings (n=388, 62.1%), religious education classes (n=451, 74.9%), and confirmation classes (n=301, 50.8%). Parish program activities that occur most frequently on a monthly basis include youth-focused liturgies (n=199, 32.4%), local service programs (n=369, 58.9%), and youth prayer meetings (n=192, 31.7%). Parish program activities that occur most frequently on an annual basis include mission trips (n=329, 53.7%), participation in diocesan programs (n=434, 70.1%), out of town social trips (n=408, 67.5%), overnight retreats (n=491, 79.2%), day long retreats (n=445, 73.1%), youth leadership programs (n=392, 63.6%), and adult leadership programs (n=338, 55.5%). The activities which are most often not included are Bible study (n=239, 40.5%), parent-teen programs (n=239, 40.5%), parent education (n=318, 52.8%), and Eucharistic adoration (n=346, 57.3%). Table 12 provides a summary of the primary activities. Appendix G provides a summary of the primary activities by the mode of occurrence of the activity.

Primary Populations Served by Parish Youth Ministers. The primary population of youth served by lay ecclesial youth ministers is both junior high and high school youth (n= 469 or 64%), with high school only (n=175 or 24%) the next highest. Only three percent (n=23) of lay ecclesial youth ministers serve junior high youth only in their ministerial setting. Eight percent (n=62) responded to the question by writing in a different description of the primary population served. Appendix D provides a listing of the responses to the “other” category for primary population of youth served by lay ecclesial youth ministers.
Table 12

Frequency of Occurrence of Primary Programs Reported by Parish Lay Youth Ministers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs or Activities</th>
<th>Frequency of Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth group meetings</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious education classes</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation classes</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth-focused liturgies</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local service programs</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth prayer meetings</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission trips</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight retreats</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan programs</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of town social trips</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day long retreats</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth leadership programs</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult leadership programs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/teen programs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent education programs</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible study</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One on one counseling</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eucharistic adoration</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Additional Areas of Ministry Responsibility.** The most common areas of additional ministerial activities beyond youth ministry in which parish youth ministers are responsible was confirmation (n=381, 53.4%). The least common additional ministerial activity was parish-wide liturgical ministry or music ministry (n=78, 9.4%). Table 13 provides a summary of these areas of additional ministerial responsibility beyond youth ministry. Appendix E provides a complete listing of the “other” responses to additional areas of responsibility.

Table 13

**Ministerial Responsibilities That Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministers Have Beyond Youth Ministry Responsibilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area or population of additional responsibility</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young adult ministry</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other areas or groups *</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish-wide Religious Education</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry to elementary children</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish-wide liturgical or music ministry</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N=770; items do not total 100% because respondents could choose multiple items.

Objective Five

Objective five was to determine the intentions of lay ecclesial youth ministers regarding their future work in a formal ministry position in the church. This analysis was
accomplished asking lay youth ministers to indicate which category would best describe their future intentions from a list of four categories. The categories included less than one year, between one and five years, between five and ten years, and more than ten years. The most frequently reported intentions of lay youth ministers was to work for ten years or more in professional youth ministry (n=209, 36%). Table 14 provides a summary of the responses.

Table 14

**Future Intentions Reported by Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministers Regarding Their Plans to Work in a Formal Youth Ministry Position**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future plans to work in professional youth ministry</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than ten years from now</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between five and ten years</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between one and five years</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. One hundred and ninety-nine lay youth ministers did not respond to the question regarding future work intentions in the field of youth ministry.

**Objective Six**

Objective six was to describe influential factors in a lay ecclesial youth minister’s decision to enter youth ministry service in the church. The respondents were given a list of five items that may have influenced their decision to enter youth ministry and were asked to rate the influence of the item using a four-point anchored scale. The analysis of
this objective was accomplished by calculating the mean for each of the five items (see Table 15).

To aid in the interpretation of these responses, the researcher established a scale of interpretation as follows: 1.49 or less = "not at all influential"; 1.50-2.49 = "only a little influential"; 2.50-3.49 = "somewhat influential" and; 3.50-4.0 = "very much influential". The items which received the highest mean influential rating were "a personal call to ministry" with a mean rating of 3.51 (n=763) and "the needs of youth" with a mean rating of 3.54 (n=763).

Table 15

Description of the Perception of Influential Factors in Decision to Enter Youth Ministry Work by Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influential factor item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean *</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Classification b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs of youth</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>Very Much Influential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal call to ministry</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>Very Much Influential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request of parish leadership</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>Somewhat Influential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent of a young person</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>Only a Little Influential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation as a youth</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>Only a Little Influential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Seven youth ministers did not respond to the "needs of youth" item and to the "personal call to ministry" item; ten did not respond to the "request of parish leadership" item; twenty did not respond to the "parent of a young person" item; and seventeen did not respond to the "participation as a youth" item.

*Response scale: 1 = "not at all influential"; 2 = "only a little influential"; 3 = "somewhat influential" and; 4 = "very much influential".

*Interpretative scale: 1.49 or less = "not at all influential"; 1.50-2.49 = "only a little influential"; 2.50-3.49 = "somewhat influential" and; 3.50-4.0 = "very much influential".
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Objective Seven

Objective seven was to determine influential factors in a lay ecclesial youth minister's decision to exit formal ministry in the future. The analysis of this objective was accomplished by calculating frequencies and percentages on each of the items listed. Respondents were asked to select the most likely reason they would leave formal ministry from a list of eight reasons (see Table 16). “To engage in another form of ministry” (n=158, 22%) was the reason reported most frequently by respondents; the next most frequent was “other” (n=128, 18%) which was a combination of 128 responses Appendix F provides a complete list of these responses.

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for leaving</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Another form of ministry</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons *</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of time required</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate pay &amp; benefits</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of pastor support</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support by parents</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of appreciation by youth</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Forty-eight lay youth ministers did not indicate a response to this item. *Appendix F provides a complete listing of the “other” responses.
Objective Eight

The purpose of objective eight was to describe the training and ministry formation of the lay ecclesial youth minister by identifying the selected variables that were either included in or characteristic of the ministry formation experience in which they had completed. The analysis of this objective was accomplished by calculating the percentages of whether the element was present in the ministry formation program completed by lay ecclesial youth ministers.

Respondents were first asked if they had completed a formal ministry formation program. Thirty-five percent ($n=273$) responded that they had completed a formal ministry formation program. Those who responded yes were then asked to check off all elements that were part of the ministry formation program from the selected list of 13 elements. If they responded no they were asked to skip to the next question.

Courses in leadership skill development ($n=259, 94.8\%$) and courses in scripture ($n=252, 92.3\%$) were identified as the elements most frequently included in ministry formation programs. Courses in various cultural backgrounds ($n=141, 52\%$), the supervised practice of ministry ($n=128, 46.8\%$), and mentoring ($n=123, 45.1\%$) were reported as the least frequently included elements in ministry formation programs that have been completed by lay youth ministers. Table 17 provides a summary of the percentages of all the selected variables in ministry formation programs.

Objective Nine

Objective nine was to determine opinions of the lay youth ministers regarding the formalization of their ministerial role in the Church and the professionalization of the
Table 17

Number of Lay Ecclesial Ministers Who Reported that Selected Elements Were Included in Their Ministry Formation Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ministry Formation Program Element</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courses in leadership skills</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>94.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses in scripture</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses in theology</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses in adolescent development and culture</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses in comprehensive youth ministry</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment activities</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retreat experiences</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation or commissioning ceremony</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses in family perspective</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance requirements</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses in various cultural backgrounds</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervised practice of ministry</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Only 273 youth ministers have completed a ministry formation program and are included in this analysis.
field. This analysis was accomplished by calculating the mean and standard deviation for each of the professional development items (see Table 18). Respondents were asked to rate the importance of 11 different items having to do with practices, activities, and resources related to the professional development of a field using a four-point scale of responses from very important (4), important (3), somewhat important (2) not important at all (1). To aid in the interpretation of these responses, the researcher established a scale of interpretation as follows: 1.49 or less = “not at all important”; 1.50-2.49= “somewhat important”; 2.50-3.49 = “important” and; 3.50-4.0 = “very important”. All professional development items were rated either very important or important by respondents (see Table 18). Appendix H provides a summary of the percentage of the scaled responses to each professional development item.

To further summarize the information regarding the professional development items the researcher used factor analysis to determine if a set of constructs representing professional development of the field existed within the scale. A review of the correlation matrix revealed that “a website for youth ministry leaders” had the weakest correlations with all of the items, however, all correlations were significant at the .05 level or lower. The Kaiser-Meyer-Oklin Measure of sampling adequacy resulted in a statistic of .591, which means the sample size was sufficient for the analysis. A reliability analysis was conducted on the 11 items, resulting in a standardized alpha of .770.

The first step in the analysis was to determine the optimum number of factors to extracted. A scree plot displayed a sharp elbow pattern between 2 and 3 factors. The original analysis revealed three factors based upon an extraction using eigenvalues over
Table 18

Summary of Mean Response to the Importance of Professional Items To The Professional Development of the Field As Perceived By Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Item</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Classification b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual programs for youth ministers</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site for youth ministry leaders</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program of study for lay ministers</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National certification for diocesan leaders</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local organization for parish leaders</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferable credential for parish leaders</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional journal for field</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National certification for parish leaders</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in national committees</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National organization for parish leaders</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual conference for youth ministry leaders</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Missing responses to each item are noted in the Table.

*Scale explanation: 4 = Very important; 3 = Important; 2 = Somewhat important; 1 = Not important at all.

*Interpretative scale: 1.49 or less = "not at all important"; 1.50-2.49 = "somewhat important"; 2.50-3.49 = "important" and; 3.50-4.0 = "very important".
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After a series of factor runs using varimax rotation method and the principal component analysis extraction method, the most meaningful conclusion with the simplest structure was that two factors existed within the 11 items (see Table 19). The subscales explaining 43% of the total variance were labeled by the researcher as professional activity, with 8 items and professional credentials, with 3 items (see Table 19).

The first factor in the professional development analysis is "Professional Activity," which explained an additional 23% of the variance had factor loadings ranging from .642 to .402. The items include in the sub-scale were as follows: a local professional organization for parish leaders, a national professional organization for parish leaders, opportunities to participate in national committees, a professional journal for the field, an annual conference for youth ministry leaders, spiritual programs for youth ministry leaders, programs of study for preparing lay ministers and a web site for youth ministry leaders.

The second factor, "Professional Credential" explaining 20.9% of the variance included the following items: national certification for both diocesan and parish leaders, and transferable credential. The sub-scale had factor loadings ranging from .878 to .665.

The researcher, then, computed scale scores for both of the sub-scales of professional development. The sub-scale scores included the mean and standard deviation for both of the constructs. The first construct, "professional activity" had an overall mean score of 3.34 with a standard deviation of .40. The second construct of "professional credential" had a mean score of 3.26 with a standard deviation of .68.
Table 19

Factor Analysis of the Perception of Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministers Regarding the Importance of Selected Professional Development Items to the Field of Youth Ministry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Development Items</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local professional organization for parish leaders</td>
<td>.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National professional organization for parish leaders</td>
<td>.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to participate in national committees</td>
<td>.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Journal for field</td>
<td>.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual conference for youth ministry leaders</td>
<td>.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual programs for youth ministry leaders</td>
<td>.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program of Studies for preparing lay ministers</td>
<td>.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site for youth ministry leaders</td>
<td>.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Certification for parish leaders</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Certification for diocesan leaders</td>
<td>8.216E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferable credential for parish leaders</td>
<td>.278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bold items represent the acceptable factor loadings for the components. *Rotation converged in 3 iterations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 20 summarizes the two sub-scales using the interpretive scale established by the researcher.

Table 20

**Professional Development Factors within the Field of Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministry Sub-Scale Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Mean*</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Credential</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>1.00 - 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Activity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>1.38 - 4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Missing responses to each item are noted in the Table.

*Scale explanation: 4 = Very important; 3 = Important; 2 = Somewhat important; 1 = Not important at all.

*Interpretative scale: 1.49 or less = “not at all important”; 1.50-2.49 = “somewhat important”; 2.50-3.49 = “important” and; 3.50-4.0 = “very important”.

**Objective Ten**

Objective ten was to determine the perception of ministry competency of the lay ecclesial youth minister in specific knowledge and skill areas of ministry. The analysis of this objective was accomplished by calculating the mean and standard deviation of each of the 19 items related to ministerial competency.

The respondents assessed their ministerial competence using a four-point anchored scale: 1=No competency; 2=Limited competency; 3=Satisfactory competency; and, 4=Exceptional competency. To aid in interpretation of the responses the researcher established a scale of interpretation as follows: 1.49 or less = “no competency”; 1.50-2.49 = “limited competency”; 2.50-3.49 = “satisfactory competency” and; 3.50-4.0 = “exceptional competency”.
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A summary of the mean responses to each ministry competency item is presented in Table 21. The items which lay youth ministers reported the highest self-assessed competency were understanding ministerial calling/identity, with a mean of 3.33, understanding of gifts/limitations for ministry, with a mean of 3.33, and understanding the goals of youth ministry, with a mean of 3.34.

The items that lay ecclesial youth ministers reported to have the lowest level of competency were responding to needs of youth from different cultures, with a mean of 2.31, understanding the importance of cultural heritage in ministry with youth, with a mean of 2.68, and utilizing computer technology, with a mean of 2.70.

In order to further summarize the perceived ministry competency of lay youth ministers, a factor analysis of the 19 items related to ministry competency was accomplished. A review of the correlations matrix revealed that “utilizing computer technology” was not significantly correlated with all the items, so the determination was made that this item would be eliminated from the factor analysis.

A scree plot displayed a sharp turn at 3 factors or components. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of sampling adequacy resulted in a statistic of .883, which means the sample size was sufficient for the analysis. A reliability analysis was conducted on the 18 items, resulting in an alpha of .8789.

The original analysis revealed five factors based upon an extraction using eigenvalues over one. After a series of factors runs using varimax rotation method and the principal component analysis extraction method, the most meaningful conclusion was
Table 21

Self-assessed Ministerial Competence Reported by Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ministerial Competencies</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding goals of youth ministry</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of gifts/limitations for ministry</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of ministerial calling/identity</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocating for youth</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding/responding to needs of youth</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilizing leadership skills</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding adolescent development/culture</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding available resources</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of social justice teachings</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating comprehensive youth ministry</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding/utilizing teachings of church</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding/utilizing teachings of scripture</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing budget/finances of program</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding principles of adolescent catechesis</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining support/involvement of parents</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting/training volunteers</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilizing computer technology</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of importance of cultural heritage</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to needs of youth from different cultures</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Missing responses to each item are listed in the table.
that three factors existed within the 18 items. The rotated component matrix of the three
factor solution of self-assessed ministerial competency is presented in Table 22. The
three factors explained 50% of the total variance (see Table 23).

The researcher, then, computed scores for each of the sub-scales of ministerial
competency (see Table 24). The first factor in the ministerial competencies with ten
items having loadings at .40 and higher was labeled by the researcher as the knowledge
and skills needed to “coordinate and administer a comprehensive youth ministry
program.” This sub-scale included the following items: coordinating comprehensive
youth ministry, recruiting and training volunteers, utilizing leadership skills,
understanding the goals of youth ministry, gaining support and involvement of parents,
managing budget and finances of youth ministry program, advocating for youth,
understanding of ministerial calling and identity, and understanding of gifts and
limitations for ministry. The first sub-scale, “coordinating a comprehensive youth
ministry program”, had individual respondent means ranging from 1.70-4.00. The first
construct of “coordinating and administering comprehensive youth ministry” had a
mean score of 3.13 (n=761) with a standard deviation of .44 which placed it in the
“satisfactory competency” category.

The second factor with four items loading at .53 and higher was labeled by the
researcher as the knowledge areas needed for “Ministry in the Catholic Church”. This
sub-scale included the following items: understanding and utilizing teachings of
scripture, understanding and utilizing teachings of the Church, understanding principles
of adolescent catechesis, and understanding the social justice teachings of the Church.
Table 22

Factor Analysis of Self-Assessed Ministerial Competence of Lay Youth Ministers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ministerial Competency</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating comprehensive youth ministry</td>
<td>.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting/training volunteers</td>
<td>.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilizing leadership skills</td>
<td>.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding goals of youth ministry</td>
<td>.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining support/involvement of parents</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing budget/finances of program</td>
<td>.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding available resources</td>
<td>.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocating for youth</td>
<td>.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of ministerial calling/identity</td>
<td>.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of gifts/limitations for ministry</td>
<td>.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding/utilizing teachings of scripture</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding/utilizing teachings of church</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding principles of adolescent catechesis</td>
<td>.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of social justice teachings</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to youth needs from different cultures</td>
<td>-1.397E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of importance of cultural heritage</td>
<td>-6.376E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding adolescent development/culture</td>
<td>.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding/responding to needs of youth</td>
<td>.388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bold items represent acceptable factor loadings for each component.

*Rotation converged in 9 iterations.
Table 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>21.87</td>
<td>21.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>16.21</td>
<td>38.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>50.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second sub-scale, “Ministry in the Catholic Church”, had individual respondent means ranging from 1.25-4.00. The second construct, “ministry within the Catholic Church” had an overall mean score of 3.02 (n=759) with a standard deviation of .53 which placed it in the “satisfactory competency” category.

The third factor with 4 items with factor loadings of .59 or higher was labeled by the researcher as the knowledge and skills needed in “Ministry with Youth from Various Backgrounds.” This sub-scale included the following items: responding to youth needs from different cultures, understanding of the importance of cultural heritage, understanding adolescent development, and understanding and responding to the needs of youth. The third sub-scale, “Working with Youth from Various Backgrounds,” had individual respondent means ranging from 1.33-4.00. The third construct “ministry with youth from various backgrounds” had an overall mean score of 2.88 (n=760) with a standard deviation of .46 which placed it in the “satisfactory competency” category.
Table 24

**Description of the Sub-Scale Factors of Ministerial Competence of Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Coordinating and Administering Comprehensive Youth Ministry</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>Satisfactory Competency</td>
<td>1.70 - 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Ministry within the Catholic Church</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>Satisfactory Competency</td>
<td>1.25 - 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Ministry to Youth from Various Backgrounds</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>Satisfactory Competency</td>
<td>1.33 - 4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scale Explanation: 1=No competency; 2=Limited competency; 3=Satisfactory competency; and 4=Exceptional competency*

*Interpretive Scale: 1.49 or less = “no competency”; 1.50-2.49 = “limited competency”; 2.50-3.49 = “satisfactory competency” and; 3.50-4.0 = “exceptional competency”

**Objective Eleven**

Objective eleven was to determine the effect of youth ministry employment status on the opinions regarding professionalism of lay ecclesial ministers. The analysis of this objective was accomplished by comparing the two factors of professional development of the field, “professional activity” and “professional credential” by youth ministry employment status, the independent variable. The mean rating of the two factors of professional development compared by the four categories of youth ministry employment status is presented in Table 25.

Four of the six categories of youth ministry employment status were used for the comparison. Two categories of youth ministry employment status were eliminated from...
The Mean Rating of the Factors of Professional Development of the Field of Youth Ministry as Compared with the Different Youth Ministry Employment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Development Perception Constructs</th>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Activity</td>
<td>Parish Volunteer</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parish Paid Part-time</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parish Paid Full-time</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diocesan Staff</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Professional Credential                       | Parish Volunteer        | 166| 3.05 | .70 |
|                                               | Parish Paid Part-time   | 112| 3.21 | .70 |
|                                               | Parish Paid Full-time   | 356| 3.33 | .67 |
|                                               | Diocesan Staff          | 69 | 3.30 | .61 |
|                                               | Total                   | 703| 3.24 | .68 |

The analysis; the category of “other” was eliminated due to the variety of roles that were included in this category and the category of “campus minister” was eliminated from the analysis because it failed to meet the assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variance required for ANOVA. The assumption of normality required for an ANOVA was tested by examining both box plots and histograms of the youth ministry employment status items. All categories met the assumption of normality except that of “campus minister,” due to the low number of subjects in this category. The assumption for equality...
of variance was tested with the Levene's statistic, which resulted in a failure to reject the hypothesis of equal variances and the assumption of homogeneity of variance being met.

The results of the ANOVA for both dependent variables are shown in Table 26. The analysis involving the effect of youth ministry employment status on "professional activity" resulted in a significant difference in the group means, \( F(3,702) = 3.344, \ p = .019 \). The analysis involving the effect of youth ministry employment status on "professional credential" resulted in a significant mean difference in the groups, \( F(3,699) = 7.011, \ p \leq .001 \).

Table 26

**Effect of Employment Status on Opinions Regarding the Professional Development of the Field of Catholic Youth Ministry**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.608</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>3.344</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>112.505</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114.113</td>
<td>705</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Credential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>9.722</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.241</td>
<td>7.011</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>323.099</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>332.281</td>
<td>702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Tukey's post hoc multiple comparison test was calculated in order to find the groups within youth employment status that differ significantly on the two factors of professional development. The Tukey's post hoc test for the dependent variable of "professional activity" resulted in a significant difference in the means between the
“parish paid full-time” (M=3.37) status and “parish volunteer” (M=3.27) status. The Tukey’s post hoc test for the dependent variable of “professional credential” resulted in a significant difference in the means between the “parish volunteer” (M=3.05) status and both the “parish full-time” (M=3.33) status and the “diocesan staff” (M=3.30) status. The nature of these differences was such that volunteers perceived lower importance of the constructs of professional development in all comparisons.

**Objective Twelve**

Objective twelve was to determine if a model exists that significantly increases the researcher’s ability to accurately explain whether the lay parish youth minister has a paid youth ministry employment status or a volunteer youth ministry employment status from the selected personal and ministerial variables. Parish youth ministry employment status was the dependent variable.

The first step in the analysis was to transform youth ministry employment status into a dichotomous variable. This was done by combining the part-time and full-time paid employment status as one level of a new variable labeled employed and using the volunteer status as the other level of the variable representing not being employed or paid.

To accomplish this objective the researcher examined the data for the existence of two specific discriminant models accomplishing two different purposes. The first exploratory discriminant analysis searched for an explanatory model for whether a youth minister has a paid or volunteer parish youth ministry employment status based upon variables in the ministerial setting. The discriminating variables entered into this model
included potential number of youth, participating number of youth, number of registered families and additional areas of ministry responsibility.

The second exploratory discriminant model sought to create a model based upon personal characteristics of the youth minister, including the three factors of self-perceived ministerial competence, whether a ministry formation program had been completed, and the highest education level completed.

The first step in examining the discriminant model was to compare paid or volunteer employed status with each of the independent variables. For the interval level ministerial setting variables including the number of families registered, number of potential youth and participating youth, as well as the three sub-scales within the items of ministerial competency were compared using an ANOVA procedure. The results of the ANOVA procedure can be found in Table 27. Of the variables evaluated, all demonstrated a significant difference means of the two groups. Additionally, a chi-square test of independence was calculated on the categorical variables including whether or not ministry formation had been completed, highest education level completed, and other areas of ministry responsibility; all were found to be not significant and such independent, except for three of the areas of additional ministry responsibility. These variables, which include ministry to elementary children, parish wide religious education, and parish wide liturgical ministry were eliminated from the analysis. The independent variable of highest educational level was transformed into five dichotomous variables for the best entry into analysis. A stepwise entry method was used, due to the exploratory nature of this objective.
Only one variable entered the first discriminant model of employed status based upon ministerial setting variables, which was the additional responsibility of confirmation as part of the ministry of the lay ecclesial youth minister. The model produced an overall Table 27

Comparison of Ministerial Competency Means to Employed Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discriminating Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Potential Youth in 6-12 Grades</td>
<td>14.155</td>
<td>( p \leq .001 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Participating Youth in 6-12 Grades</td>
<td>7.138</td>
<td>( p = .008 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Registered Families</td>
<td>14.083</td>
<td>( p \leq .001 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1 of Ministerial Competence, “Coordinating a Comprehensive Youth Ministry Program”</td>
<td>107.297</td>
<td>( p \leq .001 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2 of Ministerial Competence, “Ministry Within the Catholic Church”</td>
<td>32.311</td>
<td>( p \leq .001 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3 of Ministerial Competence, “Ministry With Youth From Various Backgrounds”</td>
<td>7.034</td>
<td>( p = .008 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

canonical correlation of \( R = .316 \) and resulted in 71.4% of the cases being correctly classified (see Table 28). The two variables with the highest standardized canonical discriminant coefficients were responsibility for confirmation at \( .785 \) and total number of potential youth at \( .567 \). The Wilks’ Lambda statistic (\( .900 \)) was significant (\( p \leq .001 \)).

A total of four variables entered the second discriminant model of employed status based upon completion of ministry formation, factor one of ministerial competence which was “coordinating a comprehensive youth ministry program”, completion of a doctorate degree and completion of a bachelor’s degree. The variables were all significant, and produced an overall canonical correlation of \( R = .433 \) and resulted in 70.4% of the cases being correctly classified (see Table 29). The variable which had the
highest standardized canonical discriminant coefficients (above .500) was factor one of ministerial competence, "coordinating a comprehensive youth ministry program" (.763).

The Wilks' Lambda statistic (.813) was significant (p ≪ 0.001).

Table 28

Classification of Cases Based upon Ministerial Setting for Employed Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Group</th>
<th>Predicted Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paid</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 71.4% of original grouped cases correctly classified
b N=465

Table 29

Classification of Cases Based Personal Variables for Employed Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Group</th>
<th>Predicted Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paid</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 70.4% of the original grouped cases correctly classified.
* N=577.
Objective Thirteen

Objective thirteen was to determine if a model existed to explain a significant portion of the variance in the perception of the professional development of the field based upon knowledge of the variables of employment status, as defined by volunteer versus paid position (employed), years of youth ministry experience, and education level as the predictor variables. The analysis of this objective was accomplished by using multiple regression analysis. The 11 items measuring perception regarding the importance of professional development of the field contained two distinct constructs, professional activity and professional credential. Because of this, two separate regression analysis were calculated. A full model entry was used in the regression. The independent variables entered into both regression models were youth ministry employment status as defined by volunteer versus paid position (employed), years of youth ministry experience, and education level as the independent variables.

Collinearity of the independent variables was analyzed and found to be within acceptable limits. Partial plots of the residuals with the dependent variables were reviewed and found to exhibit a linear relationship. The independent variable, “highest education level completed,” was transformed into five different dichotomous variables.

The independent variable, “years of youth ministry experience” was tested for normality and found to be within the limits with the exception of one extreme outlier. The independent variable, “youth ministry employment status” was transformed into a dichotomous variable that denoted whether the lay ecclesial youth minister employment status was employed or paid, versus being a volunteer.
The first regression analysis, which involved regressing the independent variables against the dependent variable of importance of professional activity, was not significant, $F (8, 495) = .989, p = .443$. The failure to produce a significant model resulted in no need for further analysis on this dependent variable.

The second regression analysis, which involved regressing the independent variables against the dependent variable of importance of professional credential, resulted in a significant model, $F (8, 495) = 6.336, p \leq .001$, which explained almost ten percent of the variance in the independent variable (see Table 30). The regression model summary shows that all independent variables were entered into the model. The variables which entered the model included whether or not the lay ecclesial youth minister was employed, number of years of youth ministry experience, and completion of the following: an associate degree, a doctoral degree, a high school diploma, a master's degree, a bachelor's degree and a ministry formation program.

The regression model was further analyzed with a t-test analysis of each of the variables which entered the model in order to assess which variables contributed significantly to the model. According to the $t$ values found in Table 31, the variables that contributed significantly to the model were years of experience ($t=2.30, p=.021$), whether or not a doctorate degree was held ($t= -2.79, p=.005$), completion of a ministry formation program ($t= -2.83, p=.005$), and employed status ($t=3.30, p=.001$). The most significant variable contributing to the model was employed status with number of years of youth ministry experience being the next highest.
Table 30

Regression Model Summary for the Importance of the Factor of Professional Credential to Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.9865115</td>
<td>6.336</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Predictors: (Constant), Employed, Years, Associate Degree, Doctorate Degree, High School Diploma, Master's Degree, Ministry formation program, Bachelor's Degree

*Dependent Variable: Professional Credential

Table 31

Results of the T-Test for Regression Analysis of Professional Development Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>(Constant)</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.237</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>-.76</td>
<td>.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employed Status</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry Formation</td>
<td>-.283</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>-.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Completion</td>
<td>-1.190</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>-.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Years of youth ministry</td>
<td>1.501E-02</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>-.293</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>-.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>-.199</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>-.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>2.742E-02</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>2.231E-02</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dependent Variable: Professional Credential
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Chapter 5: Discussion and Recommendations

The astonishing growth of the lay ecclesial ministry in the Roman Catholic Church began in the 1960's with the advent of the Second Vatican Council and with the emergence of a variety of specialized ministries, one such ministry was to youth. The focus of this query was on development of the specialized ministry to youth and the emergence of profession of the lay ecclesial youth ministry. The challenge of studying the target population of lay ecclesial youth ministers lies in the difficulty of establishing an accurate frame of the population.

Therefore, a census study of lay ecclesial youth ministers attending the 2000 National Conference on Catholic Youth Ministry was conducted; an eight page survey instrument was distributed to the 1775 conference participants with 869 surveys being returned for a response rate of 51%. Utilizing both the a’priori criterion a of being a lay person in the Roman Catholic Church and a verified registered conference participant resulted in a useable sample of 770 lay ecclesial youth ministers.

The growth of the professional field of lay ecclesial ministry in the church can be seen in the writings of bishops, theologians, authors, national ministerial associations, and researchers as they address four major areas of concern. This discussion of the summary, conclusions and recommendations resulting from this study will be framed by the following four overriding questions:

1. How do we define the lay ecclesial youth minister? What do they do as ministers, who do they serve as ministers, why are they in ministry to youth and where do they engage in ministry to youth?
2. What are the needs and perceptions of lay ecclesial ministers regarding the professional development of the field? What are their future intentions and needs as lay ecclesial ministers?

3. How are lay ecclesial youth ministers prepared for effective service to youth in the Roman Catholic Church?

4. What are the current characteristics formal relationship between the lay ecclesial youth minister and the Church and what areas need further attention for growth to continue?

Defining the Lay Ecclesial Youth Minister

How do we define persons in the profession of lay ecclesial youth ministry? The identity factors of the lay ecclesial youth minister included in this research were employment status, paid or volunteer; the eight characteristics identified by the U. S. bishops; the title of youth ministry position; the ministry setting; whether they have completed a ministry formation program; the primary activities engaged in as a part of their role and the populations and areas of ministry for which they are responsible.

Lay ecclesial youth ministers have no clear identity. This conclusion is based upon the varied responses to the multiple identity factors regarding the lay ecclesial youth ministers which were found in this research. In an attempt to draw conclusions regarding the identify and definition of persons in this role and about the role itself, each of the identified factors will be discussed.

The Bishops’ Characteristics of Lay Ecclesial Ministers. The U.S. bishops (NCCB, 2000) stated that lay ecclesial ministers cannot be distinguished by their status,
but by a variety of personal characteristics, such as responding to a call or vocation to ministry and willingness to undertake a specific ministry of which the majority of are consistent with the lay ecclesial youth ministers in this study. For example, when asked to rate the influence of reasons for entering ministry, 88% of lay ecclesial youth ministers responded that “a personal call to ministry” was either very much (66%) or moderately (22%) influential in their decision; 92% responded that “the needs of youth (a specific ministry in the church)” was very much (64%) or moderately (27%) influential in their decision.

Being “entrusted or installed” to perform a particular ministry by church authority another characteristic of the Bishops’ which lay ecclesial ministers have due to the fact that 61% of lay youth ministers reported that their primary supervisor is a pastor or priest, which denotes that the ministry undertaken is done so with the authority of the church. Furthermore, 35% of lay ecclesial youth ministers report participating in a commissioning or graduation ceremony upon completion of a ministry formation program, which is another method in which church authority could be seen as installing persons for ministry.

The one characteristic identified by the Bishops’ which lay ecclesial youth ministers are notably lacking was the need for formal preparation for ministry based upon the actuality that only 35% of lay youth ministers have completed a ministry formation program. Recommendation One: The field needs to develop strategies to increase the completion of ministry formation programs by lay ecclesial youth ministers.
Finally, undertaking a particular ministry with a sense of permanence was one of the characteristics of a lay ecclesial minister. A majority of lay ecclesial youth ministers have a sense of permanence regarding their ministry. This conclusion is based upon the findings that 69% of lay youth ministers intend to continue working in youth ministry for at least five years, with 36% of those planning to continue for ten years or more. Additionally, the average years of experience of lay youth ministers is almost ten years.

Based upon the findings of this research the lay ecclesial youth ministers in this study can be characterized by using the Bishop’s characteristics with the exception of the characteristic of completion of a formal ministry formation program. This researcher would recommend that the eight characteristics of the U.S. Bishops be utilized as a starting place in identifying who is and who is not a lay ecclesial minister.

Youth Ministry Employment Status and Ministry Setting. Five distinct categories of lay ecclesial youth ministers exist within the field based upon this research. The defining elements of these categories are the variables of youth ministry employment status and ministry setting. Three of these categories are within the parish ministry setting and include those who are paid for full-time employment (49%), the volunteer youth minister status (22%) and, the part-time paid employment status (15%). The two other categories, based upon ministry setting are diocesan staff serving in a diocesan setting (9%) and campus ministers (1%) serving in a school setting.

However, if all lay ecclesial youth ministers who are in a paid (full-time or part-time) employment status, regardless of setting (parish, diocese, or school), are combined, then the percentage of total paid employed status would increase to almost 75% of the
population of lay ecclesial youth ministers. With such a majority of the population having this an employed status, then an conclusion drawn by this researcher is that an important aspect of categorizing those in the profession of lay ecclesial ministry is being employed.

**Youth Ministry Position Titles.** The titles used by lay ecclesial youth ministers are very diverse. This conclusion is based upon the finding of this research that at least 17 distinct titles exist within the field, which define different roles and positions, held by lay ecclesial youth ministers in parish, diocesan, and school settings. Furthermore, ten percent of the titles reported by the youth ministers were so diverse they could not be classified into a meaningful grouping.

Within the professional literature and resources in the field of Catholic youth ministry, the title of Coordinator of Youth Ministry is the most commonly used. The use of the title “Coordinator” defines most accurately the vision of ministry to youth that has been set forth by the field and by the bishops. Parish youth ministry personnel are challenged to coordinate activity and ministry for youth, not to be the sole provider or director of it.

Recommendation Two: Further study and discussion of titles of lay ecclesial youth ministers with the goal of establishing a commonly accepted and used set of titles within the field of Catholic youth ministry. This recommendation is based upon lack of commonly accepted and used titles of within lay ecclesial youth ministry positions is a potential barrier to communication and data collection about the field. In studying or assessing lay religious education personnel (CARA, 1998), the acceptance of the title
“Director of Religious Education” enables them to be quantified and qualified in a manner that the field of youth ministry currently does not have.

As bishops, researchers, diocesan personnel, or resource agencies discuss (and study) the lay ecclesial youth minister, what term do they use and how can they be sure they are addressing the same position with the same functions? The lack of a commonly accepted and used title is a potential communication barrier for those within the field, as well as those outside of it.

The discussion and study should include addressing the question of whether youth ministry positions be titled by function (coordinating versus directing), by population served (junior high, high school, or young adult), or by employment status (full-time, part-time, or volunteer)? A particular focus of this discussion and study should address the concern by some members of the field regarding the use of the title coordinator as opposed to director in defining the professional or primary parish youth ministry position. The use of the term coordinator by some seems to diminish the peer to peer professional standing of religious education and youth ministry personnel. This concern centers on the issue that in many parishes youth ministry personnel are considered peers with religious education personnel who have the title of Director of Religious Education. In some parish settings, there may actually be coordinators of different age levels of religious education with titles such as Coordinator of Elementary Catechesis or Coordinator of Adolescent Catechesis who work for or directly under the supervision of the Director of Religious Education. This research supports the fact that indeed this is an issue for the field to address and not just a concern by a limited number of persons. Coordinator of Youth
Ministry or Youth Coordinator is the most commonly used term, with 25% reporting using this title; Director of Youth Ministry or Youth Director follows closely, with 20% of the population researched using this title and 17% use the title of Parish Youth Minister.

**Primary Populations Served by Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministers and Additional Areas of Responsibility.** One identified area of consistency within the field is the primary population of youth who are served. The majority of lay ecclesial youth ministers are primarily responsible for ministry to both high school and junior high youth (64%). A smaller percentage are responsible for ministry with high school youth only (24%) and an even smaller percentage for junior high youth only (3%). These numbers are very consistent with a recent study of parish youth ministers (St. Mary’s Press, 2000).

However, an area of inconsistency include the additional areas and populations that fall within the responsibility of parish youth ministers which include young adult ministry (28%), parish-wide religious education (18%), parish-wide liturgical or musical ministry (10%), ministry to elementary age children (17%), and confirmation (50%). Furthermore, 27% of lay ecclesial youth ministers described their additional ministry responsibilities by specifying an “other” response to this question (see Appendix F).

The conclusion can be drawn that the common phenomenon, known as “ministry slashers” which refers to ministers who have multiple ministerial roles or ministry responsibilities such as Youth Minister/DRE, or Youth Minister/Young Adult Minister or DRE/Pastoral Minister does indeed exist. This phenomenon is a reality lay ecclesial youth ministers are experiencing based upon this research, which makes using functions or
populations served as a difficult and confusing manner in which to define or categorize the lay ecclesial youth ministers.

Recommendation Three: Further study of the populations and areas of responsibility of lay ecclesial youth ministers is needed. This study should include a comparison of these factors with youth ministry employment status, position title and parish ministry setting descriptors. Increased information may give additional insight into how the primary activities and functions differ among groups with different titles and status. This comparison could assist in further definition the lay ecclesial youth minister, based on the functions they perform and the populations they serve. Additionally, assessing the activities and functions not only by frequency but by priority would be beneficial information in this definition process.

The Development of the Profession of Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministry

What are the needs and perceptions of lay ecclesial youth ministers regarding the professional development of the field? A main purpose of this study was to assess the current state of the profession of the lay ecclesial youth minister in the Roman Catholic Church by assessing the field’s perception of the importance of a myriad of commonly understood professional issues. The issues studied were those which most professions have been concerned with, such as resource and scholarship development, professional associations, and training and credentialing persons for the profession (Merriam & Brockett, 1997). Two areas of importance regarding the professional development of the field of youth ministry have been identified by this research. They include “professional
activity” and “professional credential.” The issue lies in an attempt to draw some distinction regarding who is a member of the profession of lay ecclesial youth ministry.

**Professional Activity.** The development of professional activities for paid professional parish youth ministers is imperative to the growth of the professional aspects of the field. This conclusion is based upon the finding that a difference exists among the beliefs of volunteer youth ministers and paid full-time youth ministers regarding the need for “professional activities” in the development of the field. Recommendation Three: Both local and national ministerial organizations and associations need to be established in the field of lay ecclesial youth ministry so that lay ecclesial youth ministers can receive support from and contribute professionally to the field in which they work.

The professional activity most important to the development of the field is spiritual formation based upon the reality that the need for spiritual programs received the highest ranking in terms of importance (72% said it was very important). However, less than half of the youth ministers studied reported that their parish pays for them to participate in an annual retreat (47%), which is in direct contrast with the expressed need for such programs by members of the field. Recommendation Four: The increased sponsorship of and access to spiritual development programs for lay ecclesial youth ministers should be a priority for diocesan and national church leaders.

**Professional Credential.** There is a distinction between the needs and concerns of those who engage in ministry activity as a “profession,” versus those who engage in it as ministerial activity as a volunteer. The analysis of the difference in perceptions regarding importance of professional credentials to the future of the field by youth ministry
employment status exhibited an obvious but critical difference in the perception of parish
volunteers with those of full-time parish youth ministers and diocesan staff. This concern
resonates in the point that a large number, though not a majority, of youth ministry
personnel are volunteers (23%). In the name of inclusion of the needs of volunteer youth
ministers, sometimes the needs and priorities of those engaged in this activity as a
“profession” may actually be excluded or at least under-addressed.

Likewise, the regression analysis of this construct resulted in employed status
being the largest contributing factor towards predicting a lay ecclesial youth minister’s
response to the perception of importance regarding the need for a professional credential
for the field. Other variables that contributed include those with a doctorate degree, those
who have completed a ministry formation program, and the number of years experience,
which clearly reveals that those with credentials and more youth ministry experience have
a different perspective and need regarding a professional transferable credential. These
lay ecclesial minister perceive that the future development of the field of the field is linked
to this issue.

Recommendation Five: The establishment of a transferable credential for the field
of lay ecclesial youth ministry. The need for a recognized or transferable professional
credential is paramount for the future growth of the professional lay ecclesial youth
minister. Every professional field has some type of recognized credential establishing who
has authority to engage in the professional practice and who does not. Teachers, lawyers,
nurses, counselors—all provide examples of the benefits and rationale for such credentials
and a credentialing process. However, the greatest rationale lies in the majority of lay
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ecclesial youth ministers, who responded strongly to the need for a transferable credential and for national certification procedures.

The lay ecclesial ministers in this study seem to be crying out for professionalism and professional development of the field. While, the United States Bishops noted an expressed concern by some in the Church over the use of the word “professional” as a descriptor in the definition of lay ecclesial ministers and the overall professionalization of the field of lay ecclesial ministry (NCCB, 2000), the respondents of lay ecclesial youth ministers within this study do not seem to have those concerns.

Recommendation Six: The use of the word professional in the definition and possibly the title of the lay ecclesial youth ministers who have completed ministry formation and whose ministry has been recognized by Church authority. The word professional denotes training and preparation, as well as a certain level of effectiveness and accountability. Additionally, it can be applied to people in either paid or volunteer employment status, as long as members of either group are required to meet the same standards of professionalism. However, due to the large number of paid lay ecclesial youth ministers (75%), it is likely that the use of the descriptor “professional” could be associated with having a paid youth ministry employment status; but, that would not necessarily be a criterion for its use.

The profession of lay ecclesial ministry, and more specifically youth ministry, is a profession which has graduate programs of study, a body of developing knowledge, and a variety of national ministerial organizations which match the identified characteristics of a profession found within the literature. Certainly, there is need for improvement in
regarding the development of professional credentials, professional salaries, and professional ministry associations for parish youth ministers.

**Ministerial Formation and Effectiveness**

How are lay ecclesial youth ministers prepared for effective service to youth within the Roman Catholic Church? This is an important question since only 35%, or a little more than a third, of all youth ministers in the study have completed a formal ministry formation program designed to prepare them for the ministry they engage in on behalf of the church. Yet, all the youth ministers studied have a high level of self-assessed ministry competency. This results in another question: whether formal ministry formation is necessary or not; or what impact does ministry formation have on self-perceived ministerial competency? The relationship between self-perceived competence and elements of ministry formation programs was found to exist based upon the findings of this research.

A positive relationship appears to exist among some aspects of the self-assessed competency of lay ecclesial ministers and the elements within ministry formation programs that prepare these ministers. Eighty-two percent of ministry formation programs completed by lay ecclesial youth ministers in this study have courses in comprehensive youth ministry, with the same ministers assessing their understanding of the goals of youth ministry at 94% satisfactory competency or higher and coordinating comprehensive youth ministry at 81% satisfactory competency or higher. Ninety-two percent offer courses in theology, with youth ministers assessing their understanding and utilization of the teachings of the church at 83% satisfactory competency or higher.
Eight-nine percent of youth ministers assessed their ability to utilize leadership skills at 90% satisfactory competency or higher, with 95% of ministry formation programs offering courses in leadership skills. Additional areas of self-assessed strength include understanding gifts and limitations for ministry, with a self-assessed rating 92% satisfactory competency or higher and understanding of ministerial calling or identity, with a self-assessed rating of 89% satisfactory competency or higher.

In addition to seeing the positive relationship between content of ministry formation and self-assessed competency, a negative relationship can also be seen in the lack of courses being offered in various cultural backgrounds (52%), with self-assessed competency in responding to needs of youth from different cultures at 34% satisfactory competency or higher and understanding the importance of cultural heritage in ministry with youth at 61% satisfactory competency or higher. Only 60% of ministry formation programs offer courses in the family perspective, with only 65% of youth ministers rating their ability to gain the support and involvement of parents a rating of satisfactory competency or higher. Other areas of self-assessed competency that were rated the lowest include utilizing computer technology, rated at 59% satisfactory competency or higher, and recruiting and training volunteers, rated at 60% satisfactory competency or higher.

Recommendation Seven: Further research in the areas of both ministerial formation and ministerial competence should be undertaken by those research the field. This research should include longitudinal study of those serving in lay ministry in order to get a more accurate picture of the impact of the evolution of this ministry on the church
and on those that serve the church as lay ministers. Additional research on the
effectiveness of lay ecclesial youth ministers needs to be conducted, as well as on the
effectiveness of ministry formation programs for lay ecclesial youth ministers. The
research needs to move beyond looking at the competence of lay ministers from a self-
assessed viewpoint and move towards assessment of effectiveness of lay ministers from
those that they serve and those who supervise them, similar to what has been done with
ordained clergy (Nauss, 1994).

Completion of ministry formation seems to be an important variable in many areas
related to the lay ecclesial minister; future research should investigate this variable more
fully by moving from descriptive studies towards studies that evaluate the effectiveness of
the different models to see which ones produce more competent and long term ministers.
Research in this area may also assist in the consolidation of the many lay ecclesial
ministry formation programs by identifying the most effective and at a minimum could
assist in the ongoing development of accreditation standards and procedures.

While national competency-based standards exist for the lay ecclesial youth
minister in the form of certification standards, no such specific program standards exist
for youth ministry formation programs that prepare these ministers. The lack of such
accreditation standards not only prevents the articulation between ministry formation
programs, which are high in number (CARA, 1999) but also limits the ability for a
common outside source to impact the content and structure of the programs. One reason
that this is an important issue if the identified areas of concern regarding ministry
formation are to be improved. Recommendation Eight: Development of accreditation program standards for programs which prepare lay ecclesial youth ministers.

One area of concern regarding ministry formation is the lack consistent use of supervised practice of ministry as a core program element. This concern is well-founded since lay ecclesial youth ministers who have completed a ministry formation program reported that less than half of all ministry formation programs utilized both the supervised practice of ministry (47%) and mentoring (45%). The absence of supervised practice and support methods such as mentoring make the assessment of competence difficult.

Such a system of support and accountability is not only a key issue in increasing the effectiveness of lay ecclesial youth ministers, but in the perception of other helping professions, as most professional fields like medicine or education require some type of supervised practice. Recommendation Nine: Ministry formation programs should establish the element of supervised practice of ministry as an essential part the ministry formation experience of lay ecclesial youth ministers.

Finally, a factor analysis of the 15 ministerial competency items resulted in three categories of ministerial competence, which conviently align with national competency-based standards that have been written by diocesan level youth ministry personnel. The alignment of these categories with the major sections of the standards is the first assessment of the elements of the national standards with a large grouping of youth ministers. The analysis gives credence both to the content of the standards, as well as the accurate perceptions of the diocesan personnel who have written and approved such standards. Recommendation Ten: The further analysis of the national competency-based
standards in order to establish verifiable areas of competence within the field of Catholic youth ministry.

The Formal Relationship Between the Minister and the Church

What are the characteristics of the formal relationship between the lay ecclesial minister and the church? What areas need further attention for growth to continue? The shift from a pastoral staff primarily of clergy and religious women to a pastoral staff of lay persons has presented the Church with a variety of human resource management challenges (NCCB, 2000; NACPA, 1994). The literature on the field has named this these challenges as the process of role initiation of the lay ecclesial youth minister. Role initiation has been a major factor in the relationship between the lay youth minister and the church in which they serve (Roberto, 1985). The findings of this study demonstrate that some areas role initiation attempts have been successful, such as the finding that 92% of youth ministers participate in parish staff meetings which is a positive sign their role initiation as established members of the pastoral staff.

However, the field needs to continue the role initiation process in some areas of the formal relationship between the parish and the minister. This conclusion is based upon the occurrences of 24% do not have health care benefits, 40% do not have life insurance paid for by the parish, 28% do not have a retirement plan, and 45% do not have at least an annual performance review of their work. The lack of these elements as an established part of the relationship between the parish and the minister is a sign that some basic aspects of the employment relationship have not been attended to in the role initiation process.
Additionally, only 51% have secretarial support, which means lay youth ministers are spending a large amount of their time attending to administrative responsibilities instead of ministerial responsibilities. Finally, the fact that only 61% have an employment contract is disconcerting, when considering the issue of job stability and the “employment at will” practices of many church parishes (NACPA, 1994).

More information and study is needed regarding the salaries of lay ecclesial youth ministers. The lack of information can be noted in diocesan directors of youth ministry who reported the mean “typical” salary for full-time parish youth ministers as $21,181, with a mean “recommended” salary of $25,691 (Froehle & Gautier, 2000a) while the actual mean salary reported in this study for that group was $25,683. Diocesan directors appear to have underestimated the salaries of parish full-time ministers by approximately $4500, as well as underestimating their ability to influence salary levels, with the actual and recommended salaries being basically equal.

A determinant aspect to increasing the salary level of parish youth ministers would appear to be for diocesan directors to obtain more accurate information about salaries in their diocese and how they compare to national figures. Recommendation Eleven: The study of the salary and benefits of lay ecclesial youth ministers should occur annually both at national and diocesan levels.

Recommendation Twelve: The development of a planned strategy of advocacy regarding salary and benefits of lay ecclesial youth ministers at both the national and diocesan levels. A primary target of the advocacy should be directed towards pastors since they are the primary supervisors (61%) of parish youth ministers.
A key aspect of this advocacy should be for the salary guidelines for those serving in parish youth ministry. Other elements of this advocacy plan should include the importance of all lay ecclesial youth ministers having a job description, an employment contract, and the "typical" benefits that other professionals enjoy.

Addressing the Representativeness of the Sample

This study provides the largest sample to date of any study of lay ecclesial youth ministers. Nevertheless, the limitation of this study centered on the inability of the researcher to draw a random sample of the target population due to the overall difficulty of framing this population. However, it can be concluded that the sample within this study provides a good representation of the target population based upon the similarity of demographics of the sample with previous studies of the population, as well as the similarity of the sample to the demographics of the broader field of lay ecclesial ministry.

Demographic Comparison of Sample with Previous Studies. In comparing the demographics of this sample with recent studies done on this population and the population of lay ecclesial ministers, most key demographics such as gender (mostly female), age (averaging 45 years old), years of youth ministry experience (approximately 9 years), and employment status (71% paid part-time or full-time), are all similar or the same.

Comparison of Lay Youth Ministers to Broader Field of Lay Ecclesial Ministry. How do lay ecclesial youth ministers compare to the broader field of lay ecclesial ministry? This comparison is important for two reasons: first, the intent of this study was to arrive at a better understanding of the field of lay ecclesial ministry by researching the
specific fields within the broader field; and second, lay ecclesial youth ministers reported that the primary reason they would leave youth ministry would be to engage in another form of ministry (22%). Whereas lay youth ministers plan to engage in other forms of lay ministry, a primary concern of those in church leadership should be how such movement can be easily facilitated, thereby providing stability, consistency, and opportunity for the entire field. An understanding of how youth ministers compare to the broader field on various personal and ministerial characteristics is necessary in order to facilitate such movement. Furthermore, such comparison is as an important consideration in assessing the representativeness of this research sample with regards to the target population.

**Gender.** Lay ecclesial youth ministers very similar to the broader field since both are primarily female. Youth ministry has seen an increase in the number of female ministers, bringing it more in line with the field of lay ecclesial ministry. Youth ministers are primarily female (77%), which is slightly less than all lay ministers, of which 82% are female. The percentage of female youth ministers has increased since the Fox (1986) study in which 41% were reported to be male. However, the percentage of male diocesan staff remains higher at 33%, which is consistent with past studies although is not as high as the 61% of men serving in the specific role of Diocesan Director of Youth Ministry (Froehle & Gautier, 2000a).

**Education level.** Lay ecclesial youth ministers as a group have completed less formal education than the broader population of lay ecclesial ministers. The Murnion and DeLambo (1999) study of lay ecclesial ministers reported that 53% have at least a master’s degree, compared with 21% of lay youth ministers. Eighty percent of all lay
ecclesial ministers (Fox, 1998) have at least a college education, while 62% of youth ministers have at least a college education.

**Age.** The average age of youth ministers appears to be slightly lower than the broader field. The median age reported was 41, in comparison to the broader field, which reports a median age of 45. In past studies of youth ministers (Fox, 1986) two-thirds (66%) were under the age of 35, which remains consistent with the findings of this study.

**Religious background.** Thirty-eight percent of youth ministers in this study attended a Catholic high school, compared to one half reported in an earlier study (Fox, 1998). The same study reported that less than half of youth ministers attended a Catholic college, which is consistent with this study’s findings that only 28% have attended a Catholic college.

**Ethnic group.** Lay youth ministers are similar to the broader field in the area of race. Like lay ecclesial ministers, youth ministers are primarily Caucasian (90%) and the second largest group is Hispanics (5%). These figures are almost parallel with the broader field.

**The Future of Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministry**

The story of the emergence of the profession of lay ecclesial youth ministry within the Roman Catholic Church has been characterized by ongoing change in both ministerial roles and ministerial mission. A strong wind of change has been blowing through the church since the second Vatican council with the reaffirmation of the role of the laity in the official ministry of the church by the council (Rademacher, 1992). In his landmark book on lay ministry, William J. Rademacher (1992), described this wind as a storm:
“Great storms” blowing sometimes from inside of the church and sometimes from outside, have defined and then redefined the church’s ministries. The Holy Spirit, breathing where and when she wishes, sometimes through councils and sometimes through the ministers themselves, has shaped the churches ministries. Since Vatican II, the baptized people have become more aware that they are no longer passive objects waiting for their ministries to be shaped by ecclesial, historical, or cultural forces. While they learn from history, they know they are also called to make history (p. 83).

The continual change process has impacted the ability of the profession of lay ecclesial youth ministry to move to a more stable place as a field within the Church. The current issues and questions that face the field of lay ecclesial youth ministry have been adequately identified by those in the field and outside of it (NCCB, 2000). Nevertheless, the resolution of these issues appears to be unobtainable until agreement on notable parameters occurs. Agreement needs to occur by both those within the field and those in leadership within the Roman Catholic Church.

The parameters in need of recognized and established policies and practices include the adoption of a set of position titles, especially for parish ministry personnel; minimum employment and education standards for all types of lay ecclesial youth ministers; recommended and rendered standards regarding the salaries and benefits of lay ecclesial youth ministers; and, a transferable credential lay ecclesial youth ministers. If agreement on and utilization of such parameters is not established, the future growth and stability of the field will be hampered. However, in the short history of this field (less than forty years), great progress has been made and future progress rests in the willingness of practitioners and researchers alike to continue to ask the questions and implement the answers.
The Next Generation of Lay Ecclesial Ministers. Regardless of what the twenty-first century holds for the Church's ministry to youth; it is a certainty that a portion of the young people currently being served by Catholic youth ministry will inevitably be apart of the Church's ministerial leadership in the future as either a member of the clergy, a religious sister or brother, or as a lay ecclesial minister. One of the greatest gifts, the Church can give the youth who will in part make up the next generation of lay ecclesial ministers, is to increase the dialogue about and understanding of this emerging ministerial role. The benefits of this gift will experienced by today’s youth whose path towards ministry will be more illuminated and defined than those of the previous generations of lay ecclesial ministry upon whose shoulders they will stand.
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Appendix A: Survey Instrument

Research Study of Roman Catholic Youth Ministry Leaders
sponsored by the National Federation for Catholic Youth Ministry

Dear NCCYM Participant,

Welcome to Birmingham and the National Conference for Catholic Youth Ministry! Your participation in this, the largest gathering of Catholic youth ministry leaders, in the history of the National Federation for Catholic Youth Ministry (NFCYM,) is a sign of your deep commitment to the young people of our Church and ministry to them! Thank you for being here. In addition, to gaining insights and knowledge that will hopefully impact the quality of your ministry to youth, you have an opportunity to give something in return to the field of Catholic youth ministry by participating in important research on the field, that is taking place at this conference. By filling out the enclosed survey you will be contributing to the continuing body of knowledge being built about the field of Catholic Youth Ministry. Youth ministry is still a relatively new and developing field within our Church. By increasing the knowledge base about Catholic youth ministers, the NFCYM is assisting the field in taking another step in its development. Additionally, information gathered through this research will help the NFCYM better serve you by better understanding your needs and how those needs should be reflected in it’s strategic planning. To that end, the research and survey instrument have been designed to address the following:

► Describe you and your peers in the areas of ministerial background, setting and activities
► Assess your needs and attitudes regarding the professional development of the field
► Understand the formation process(es) being used to train persons for youth ministry in the Church
► Identification of common patterns among youth ministry leaders like you

The survey consisting of 59 questions was fielded tested with an average time of completion being 25 minutes. Please take the time to respond to this survey and make sure your parish (or other ministry setting) and your ministry is included in the building knowledge base regarding the field of Catholic youth ministry. All completed surveys can placed in the boxes labeled accordingly in the back of the main conference meeting room.

As a sign of our appreciation for your participation in this research and needs assessment of the field, a daily drawing will take place from among all who have completed the surveys. The winners of the daily drawings will be given various NFCYM and youth ministry resources.
Please note that all responses to the research are confidential. On the back side of this letter is a respondent information form that should be completed and returned at the time the survey is returned. This form will be separated from the survey upon receipt of it and will be used only to cross reference the names of those who completed a survey with the conference registration list so that the validity of the research can be maintained. Additionally, the respondent information forms will be used for the daily drawings. Please complete one survey only per registered conference participant.

Thank you for considering this request to participate in this research and for attending this conference. But most of all, thanks for all the work you do for our young people on behalf of the Church. May God continue to bless and guide you and your ministry to youth. Have a great conference!

In Christ,

Charlotte McCorquodale
Primary Research Investigator

Bob McCarty
Executive Director of the NFCYM

--------

Respondent Form #________

Survey Respondent Information Form

Name of Conference Participant Completing the Survey:_____________________

Name of Diocese listed on the Conference Registration Form:_________________

☐ Yes, I would like a copy of the summary of the findings of this research. Please email it to me at the following email address____________________

☐ Yes, I would like a copy of the summary of the findings of this research. Please mail it to me at the following address:

☐ No thanks, I am not interested in a copy of the summary of the findings of this research.

Thank you for taking time to complete this survey and participate in this important research about the field of Catholic Youth Ministry!

Please return the survey to the marked boxes.
Section One: Demographic Information

Directions: Please check one box that most accurately describes you.

1. What is your vocational status?
   □ Religious Sister or Brother
   □ Priest or Deacon
   □ Lay person

2. What group below best describes your ethnic group?
   □ Hispanic-American
   □ African-American
   □ Caucasian
   □ Asian-American
   □ Other (Please specify): ________________________

3. What is the highest level of education in which you have completed?
   □ High school diploma
   □ Two year associate degree
   □ Bachelor's degree
   □ Master's degree
   □ Doctoral degree
   □ Other (Specify): _____________________________

4. What is your gender? _____ Male _____ Female

5. What is your current age (in years)? __________

6. How many years have you worked in youth ministry? __________

7. Please check ALL of the below statements that accurately describe you religious background.
   □ I attended Catholic school as an elementary student.
   □ I attended as a high school student.
   □ I attended Catholic school as a college student.
   □ I participated in Catholic religious education as a young person.
   □ I participated in Catholic youth activities as a teenager.
   □ I participated in leadership programs as a teenager sponsored by the Catholic church.
   □ I am a convert to Catholicism.

8. What is the annual salary you receive for your youth ministry position? __________
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**Section Two: Professional Ministry Issues and Attitudes**

Directions: Please circle the number which accurately describes your opinion of the importance of the following items in the professional development of the field of youth ministry. Use the following scale to indicate your response 1=Not important; 2=Somewhat important; 3=Important; 4=Very Important.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Opportunities for parish ministers to participate in national committees which influence policy and resource development in the field.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. A professional journal for Catholic youth ministry published on a quarterly.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. A national professional organization for parish youth ministry leaders.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. A local professional organization for parish youth ministry leaders.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. National certification for parish youth ministry leaders.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. National certification for diocesan youth ministry leaders.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. A professional and transferable credential for youth ministry leaders.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Programs for the spiritual development of lay ministers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. University programs of study directed towards preparing lay youth ministers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. An annual professional conference for youth ministry leaders.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. A web site containing resources and facts targeted to youth ministry leaders.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Directions: Please circle the number which accurately describes your opinion of the following items. Use the following scale to indicate your response 1=Not at all; 2=Only a little; 3=Somewhat; 4=Very much.

How much did each of the following influence your decision to work in youth ministry?

20. Request of parish leadership
   1  2  3  4
21. Needs of youth
   1  2  3  4
22. My own participation in youth ministry as a young person.
   1  2  3  4
23. Experience of a personal call to ministry.
   1  2  3  4
24. Being a parent of a young person.
   1  2  3  4

Directions: Please check only ONE box below that reflects the most accurate answer.

25. Do you plan to be working in paid professional youth ministry?
   (Please check only one):
   □ More than ten years from now
   □ More than five years from now
   □ Between one year and five years from now
   □ Less than twelve months from now
   □ I do not work in a paid position

26. If you were to leave youth ministry what would be the most likely cause (please check only one):
   □ Inadequate pay & benefits
   □ Amount of time required to do the job
   □ Lack of support by pastor and parish leadership
   □ Lack of support by parents
   □ Lack of appreciation by youth
   □ Want to do another type of ministry
   □ Other(Please specify): ____________________________
Section Three: Self-Assessment Questions

Directions: Please circle the number which most accurately describes your perception of your competency in the items below.

Scale explanation: 1= No competency; 2= Limited competency; 3= Average competency; 4= Exceptional competency.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Understanding of the goals and components of youth ministry.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Creating and coordinating a comprehensive youth ministry.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Recruiting and training volunteers to work with youth.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Understanding and responding to the needs of youth.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Understanding of adolescent development and youth culture.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Gaining the support of and involving parents and families.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Managing the budget and finances of the youth program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Finding available youth ministry resources.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Understanding and explaining the teachings of scripture.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Understanding and explaining the teachings of the Church.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Understanding of my own gifts and limitations for ministry.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Understanding of my ministerial calling and identity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Three: Self-Assessment Questions (continued)

Scale explanation: 1= No competency; 2= Limited competency; 3= Average competency; 4= Exceptional competency.

39. Utilization of leadership skills. 1 2 3 4

40. Advocating for youth to parish and community leaders. 1 2 3 4

41. Utilization of computer technology in my ministry. 1 2 3 4

42. Understanding of principles and aims of adolescent catechesis. 1 2 3 4

43. Understanding the importance of cultural heritage in ministry with youth. 1 2 3 4

44. Responding to the needs of youth from different cultures. 1 2 3 4

Section Four: Education and Lay Ministry Formation Information

45. Have you completed a ministry formation program? _____ Yes _____ No; If no, please skip the next question.

46. Please check ALL items below that were included in the primary ministry formation program that you have completed.
   □ Established entrance requirements
   □ Supervised practice of ministry
   □ Assessment activities (ie. tests, papers, projects)
   □ A retreat experience
   □ Courses in scripture
   □ Courses in theology
   □ Courses in comprehensive youth ministry
   □ Courses in adolescent development and culture
   □ Courses in understanding ministry in the church
   □ Courses in leadership skills development
   □ Courses in the family perspective in ministry
   □ Courses in various cultural backgrounds
   □ Mentoring
   □ Graduation or commissioning ceremony
Section Five: Ministerial Setting and Role Description
Directions: Please check the ONE that best describes you or your ministry situation the best.

47. What group below best describes the population of youth you currently serve?
   □ Junior High Only
   □ High School Only
   □ Junior High & High School
   □ Other (Please Specify): _______________

48. Of the items below, which one best describes the status of your current youth ministry position?
   □ Parish Volunteer
   □ Parish Staff: Paid Full-time (21 hours or more a week)
   □ Parish Staff: Paid Part-time (20 hours or less a week)
   □ Diocesan Staff
   □ Campus Minister
   □ Other (Please specify): _______________

49. Please check all of the additional areas of ministry in which you responsible for besides youth ministry?
   □ Confirmation
   □ Religious education
   □ Liturgical or music ministry
   □ Young adult ministry
   □ Ministry to elementary age children
   □ None
   □ Other (Please Specify): _______________

50. Please give the title of the position of the person that supervises your position? _________________________________

51. What is the official title of your youth ministry position?
   ___________________________________________________________________________________________

   If you have a youth ministry position in a parish setting, please fill out the next two pages.
   If you do not, please stop here and return this form to the designated boxes in the back of the main conference room.
52. Please check all of the items below, which are in existence in your formal relationship with your parish:

☐ Employment contract
☐ Paid Health care benefits
☐ Participation in parish staff meetings
☐ Annual performance review
☐ Written job description
☐ Paid annual retreat
☐ Paid annual vacation
☐ Paid continuing education
☐ Secretarial support
☐ Retirement Plan
☐ Life Insurance

53. If all of the youth in grades 6th through 12th in your parish participated in the youth activities offered through your parish how many youth would you serve? ________

54. On the average, how many of the youth in grades 6th through 12th participate regularly activities at your parish? ________

55. How many families are registered in the parish you serve? ______________

56. How many full or part-time lay ministerial staff does your parish employ? _________

57. How much is your annual operational budget for parish youth ministry excluding all salaries? __________
Directions: Please indicate the occurrence of the following activities and programs in your parish youth ministry. Scale explanation: 1=Not included in our parish ministry to youth; 2=Periodically included (once or twice a year) in our parish ministry to youth; 3=A regular part of our parish ministry to youth (once a month); 4=An essential part of our parish ministry to youth (at least a weekly occurrence).

58. Parish Youth Ministry Activities Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. youth group meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. confirmation classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. mission trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. youth prayer meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. bible study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. diocesan programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. day long retreats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. adult leadership events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. parent education programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. religious education classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. youth liturgies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. local service programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. counseling youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. overnight retreats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. out of town trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. youth leadership events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. parent/teen events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Eucharistic adoration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for taking time to complete this survey and participate in this important research about the field of Catholic Youth Ministry! Please return this survey to the designated boxes in the back of the main session room.
Appendix B: Listing of “other” Responses to Highest Education Level Completed by Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministers

Note: Each item listed below was a response written in the space for specifying an “other” response to the question. The numbers in parenthesis following some of the responses indicate that the number of respondents who had given that response to question.

1. MASTER’S +30
2. CERTIFICATE IN YOUTH MINISTRY (5)
3. SOME COLLEGE (33)
4. EXECUTIVE SECRETARY DEGREE
5. ED SPECIALIST DEGREE (2)
6. REGISTERED NURSE (2)
7. JURIST DOCTORATE
8. CATECHETICAL CERTIFICATE PROGRAM
9. SOME GRADUATE WORK (2)
10. BUSINESS SCHOOL
11. YOUTH MINISTRY CERTIFICATION (2)
12. WORKING TOWARD MASTER IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION
13. CLERICAL & BUSINESS TRAINING
14. 5 YR BS IN PHARMACY
15. NATIONAL CERTIFICATE IN PROCESS (3)
Appendix C: Listing of "other" Responses to Youth Ministry Position Titles of Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministers

Note: Each item listed below was a response written in the space for specifying an "other" response to the question. The numbers in parenthesis following some of the responses indicate that the number of respondents who had given that response to question.

1. ASSISTANT YOUTH MINISTER (2)
2. CLUSTER YOUTH MINISTER
3. COORDINATOR OF LIFETEEN (4)
4. PROGRAM DIRECTOR
5. NATIONAL CONSULTANT/TRAINER
6. COORDINATOR OF THE FAITHWAYS PROGRAM
7. CHAIR-PARISH YOUTH MINISTRY BOARD CATECHESIS COMMITTEE HEAD
8. CORE TEAM MEMBER
9. CHAIR DIOCESAN CATHOLIC GIRL SCOUT COMMITTEE
10. YOUTH MINISTRY SPECIALIST
11. YOUTH MINISTRY LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBER
12. DIRECTOR OF HIGH SCHOOL FAITH DEVELOPMENT AND YOUNG ADULT MINISTRY
13. MUSIC DIRECTOR
14. THEATER DIRECTOR
15. PAROCHIAL VICAR/YOUTH MODERATOR
16. REGION II COORDINATOR
17. CCD DIRECTOR
18. CCD TEACHER
19. DIRECTOR OF THE LITTLE FOLLOWERS OF CHRIST
20. CHAIR OF YOUTH (VOLUNTEER) MINISTRY TEAM
21. COORDINATOR OF FAMILY AND YOUTH MINISTRY
22. DIRECTOR OF LIFE FOUNDATIONS
23. DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN & YOUTH MINISTRIES
24. EXEC DIRECTOR YOUTH & YOUNG ADULT MINISTRY & CYO
25. MASTER CATECHIST
26. CHILDREN AND YOUTH MINISTER
27. EASTERN DEANERY YOUTH MODERATOR
28. DIRECTOR FORMATION & TRAINING
29. DINNER COORDINATOR
30. DIRECTOR-TRI-COMMUNITY YOUTH MINISTRY
31. SPIRITUALITY COORDINATOR
32. DEANERY DIRECTOR OF YOUTH MINISTRY
33. CYO SPONSOR
34. YOUTH COMMISSION CHAIRMAN
35. COORDINATOR OF ORLEANS CO VICARIATE YOUTH MINISTRY
36. DIOCESAN GIRL SCOUT CHAIRPERSON
37. CATHOLIC COMMITTEE ON GIRL SCOUTS (7)
38. PROGRAM DIRECTOR CAMP FIRE
39. YOUTH NIGHT COORDINATOR
40. ADULT CHAIRPERSON OF YOUTH LITURGICAL MINISTRIES
41. REGION 5 COORDINATOR FOR TEC
42. YOUTH CHOIR DIRECTOR & CANTOR TRAINER
43. COORDINATOR OF PARISH YOUTH MINISTRY OUTREACH
44. DIRECTOR OF EVANGELIZATION & YOUTH MINISTER
45. COORDINATOR OF ELEMENTARY & MIDDLE SCHOOL CATECHESIS
46. TEACHER 11TH GRADE CONFIRMATION
47. SPOUSE OF YOUTH MINISTER
48. EX SECRETARY FOR OYM DIOCESE
49. DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICE CORP
50. DIRECTOR OF YOUTH MINISTRY AND LIFE TEEN CO-ORDINATOR
51. HISPANIC PASTORAL/YOUTH MINISTER
52. DIRECTOR OF CHILD & YOUTH MINISTRY
53. PROGRAM ASSISTANT/YOUTH MINISTRY INTERN
54. SUPPORT STAFF/ACTIVITIES COORDINATOR
55. FAMILY MINISTER (2)
56. PRINCIPAL OF SUNDAY SCHOOL SECRETARY OF YOUTH COUNCIL
57. DIOCESAN REGIONAL RESOURCE COORDINATOR
Appendix D: Response to “other” Category of Primary Population of Youth Served by Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministers

Note: Each item listed below was a response written in the space for specifying an “other” response to the question. The numbers in parenthesis following some of the responses indicate that the number of respondents who had given that response to question.

1. JUNIOR HIGH & SENIOR HIGH & ELEMENTARY CHILDREN (13)
2. MULTI-GENERATIONAL PARISH
3. JUNIOR HIGH & SENIOR HIGH & YOUNG ADULT (8)
4. 11-20 YEARS OLD
5. 5TH GRADE THRU 12TH GRADE
6. ELEMENTARY & JUNIOR HIGH (2)
7. PRESCHOOL-HIGH SCHOOL
8. HIGH SCHOOL & JUNIOR HIGH AND COLLEGE AGE (2)
9. JUNIOR HIGH-HIGH SCHOOL-YOUNG CHILDREN
10. MOSTLY HIGH SCHOOL BUT SEVERAL PARISH GROUPS
11. ALL AGE GROUPS (2)
12. 3RD THROUGH 6TH GRADERS
13. ELEMENTARY / JR HIGH/ HIGH SCHOOL / COLLEGE (2)
14. PARISH CYM'S NO YOUTH
15. ALL LEVELS OF GIRL SCOUTS
16. AGES 12 TO 21
17. ALL LEVELS KINDERGARTEN THROUGH ADULT EDUCATION
18. ELEMENTARY GRADES
19. 0-18 YEARS OF AGE
20. YOUNG ADULT
21. COORDINATORS OF BOTH JR & HI SCHOOL
22. COLLEGE
23. 4 YEAR OLDS THROUGH 10TH GRADE
24. CHILDREN & ADULTS TOO
25. CHRISTIAN EDUCATION MINISTER & YOUTH ADULT
26. 13-18 YEARS OLD
27. HIGH SCHOOL & COLLEGE
28. CURRENTLY SERVE YOUTH LEADERS
29. GRADES K-12
30. FAMILY
31. GRADES 4-6 & JUNIOR & HIGH & COLLEGE
32. PRE K THROUGH CONFIRMATION
33. GRADE 4 THROUGH HIGH SCHOOL
34. YOUTH & ADULT LEADERS
35. HIGH SCHOOL YOUTH & YOUNG ADULT (2)
36. PRE K THROUGH HIGH SCHOOL (2)
37. AGES 16-25
38. ALL 2ND TO 12TH GRADE
39. 8TH-12TH
40. CHILDREN MIDDLE SCHOOL SENIOR
41. YOUTH CHOIR CHILDREN'S CHOIR
Appendix E: Listing of “other” Responses to Additional Responsibilities That Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministers Have Beyond Youth Ministry Responsibilities

Note: Each item listed below was a response written in the space for specifying an “other” response to the question. The numbers in parenthesis following some of the responses indicate that the number of respondents who had given that response to question.

1. SACRAMENTAL PREP (EUCHARIST & RECONCILIATION)
2. SCOUTING (5)
3. TO ADULTS
4. HEALTH & WELLNESS
5. 8TH GRADE FAITH FORMATION
6. LECTOR LAY MINISTER PASTORAL COUNCIL
7. FAMILY MINISTRY (10)
8. RE 7-12 & FOREVER YOUNG (50+ AGE GROUP)
9. RCIA FOR CHILDREN RELIGIOUS ED
10. REACH (RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ACTION)
11. DEANERY YOUTH MINISTRY
12. CONNECTING TO PARISH COMMUNITY
13. EVANGELIZATION MUSIC
14. 7-12 RE
15. CUB SCOUTS-DEN LEADER
16. RCIA-ELEMENTARY (5)
17. PASTORAL COUNCIL (3)
18. FINANCE
19. RCIA/ADULT FORMATION (20)
20. SACRAMENTAL PREP FOR HS STUDENTS (10)
21. SCOUTING ATHLETIC MINISTRY (CYO) (6)
22. JUNIOR HIGH FAITH FORMATION
23. MUSIC
24. TEEN RCIA
25. DIOCESAN YOUTH MINISTRY
26. RE GRADE 7-11
27. GIRL SCOUT RELIGIOUS AWARDS (3)
28. RETREATS (6)
29. MIDDLE SCHOOL FACULTY
30. PEER MINISTRY TEAM GRADES 8-12
31. LEGION OF MARY, PRESIDENT
32. MUSIC MINISTRY
33. FOLK GROUP MUSIC & HOSPITALITY
34. ECCLESIAL COMMUNITIES
35. YOUTH LITURGY-MONTHLY
36. ADULT FORMATION
37. SACRAMENTS VACATION BIBLE SCHOOL
38. DIOCESAN CYM TRAINING (10)
39. ADULT TRAINING (15)
40. TEEN THEATER
41. GENERAL PARISH MINISTRY
42. CAMPUS MINISTRY-COMMUNITY SERVICE
43. NURSERY (BABY-SITTING) PROGRAM
44. HEALTH CARE MINISTRY RESPECT LIFE
45. SOCIAL ACTION MINISTRY
46. RELIGIOUS PROJECTS
47. PARISH ART & ENVIRONMENT
48. SOCIAL CONCERNS-JUSTICE ISSUES (15)
49. ADULT EDUCATION
50. MISSIONS (3)
51. EUCHARISTIC MINISTRY
52. COLLEGE MINISTRY (6)
53. SPECIAL RELIGIOUS ED
54. GS PROGRAM & BSA PROGRAM
55. VAN MAINTENANCE
56. ENHANCEMENT OF SPIRITUALITY
57. INFANT BAPTISMAL SMALL CHURCH
58. PARISH COORDINATOR FOR RENEW
59. YOUNG MARRIED COUPLES & FAMILIES
60. PARISH MANAGER
61. JAIL MINISTRY
62. BEREAVEMENT
63. PASTORAL CARE
64. PRE-CANA ROSARY CENACLE MUSIC
65. LEADERSHIP TRAINING
66. HEAD OF THEOLOGY DEPT-CATHOLIC SCHOOL
67. YOUTH LITURGY
68. NEWSLETTER MINISTRY CONGREGATION
69. CHRISTIAN INITIATION FOR TEENS
70. ALTAR SERVERS
71. RELIGIOUS EDUCATION (30)
72. PASTORAL MINISTER HISPANIC
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Appendix F: Listing of “other” Responses to the Most Likely Reason That Lay Ecclesial Youth Ministers Reported Would Influence a Decision to Leave Youth Ministry Service

Note: Each item listed below was a response written in the space for specifying an “other” response to the question. The numbers in parenthesis following some of the responses indicate that the number of respondents who had given that response to question.

1. IF I WERE ASKED TO LEAVE CHURCH
2. LACK OF SUPPORT BY DIOCESAN OFFICE (3)
3. GOD’S WILL
4. FAMILY COMMITMENTS AND DESIRE TO HAVE OR SPEND TIME WITH OWN CHILDREN (27)
5. GOD CALLS ME TO ANOTHER MINISTRY (5)
6. BURN OUT (5)
7. DO NOT PLAN TO STOP WORKING IN YOUTH (6)
8. LACK OF YOUTH INVOLVEMENT (2)
9. FAMILY MOVING OR JOB TRANSFER (8)
10. CURRENT ATMOSPHERE OF THE LIFE THE CHURCH (2)
11. CHILDREN GRADUATE
12. IF I FIND THAT I CAN NO LONGER FIND SUPPORT
13. VOCATION-ENTERING A RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY (2)
14. FIRST 4 ANSWERS ALL APPLY TO ME
15. ELECTED TO LEADERSHIP IN MY RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY
16. RECENT RETIREMENT
17. INADEQUATE PAY
18. PERMANENT DIACONATE ORDINATION
19. HEALTH OR ILLNESS (10)
20. I WANT TO TEACH
21. MARRIAGE & MOVING
22. PHYSICAL/MENTAL INABILITY
23. DESIRE TO MOVE ON TO NEW FIELD (2)
24. MOVE AWAY FROM PARISH
25. I WONT LEAVE UNLESS THERE ARE NO YOUTH
26. TIRED FROM WORKING FULL TIME
27. I VOLUNTEER (2)
28. PASTOR REQUEST
29. GOING INTO FULL TIME RETREAT WORK
30. IF I FELT I WERE NO LONGER EFFECTIVE (3)
31. THEATER
32. UNABLE TO FIND A BALANCE OF TIME (3)
33. STOP TO TAKE A BREAK
34. BISHOP ASKING ME TO STEP DOWN
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35. GENERAL STRESS CAUSED BY JOB
36. TIME TO MOVE ON
37. DRE
38. LACK OF IDENTIFICATION WITH THE YOUTH
39. FINISH COLLEGE
40. ENTER SEMINARY (2)
41. COMBINATION OF TIME AND PAY AND LACK OF SUPPORT
42. LACK OF ORGANIZATION & ACCOUNTABILITY
43. SHIFT TO OTHER AREA OF MINISTRY (2)
44. COLLEGE AND MY FULL-TIME JOB
45. CONTINUE MY EDUCATION (3)
46. REASSIGNMENT
47. THE TOP THREE ARE WHY ONE MIGHT LEAVE
48. SEXUAL ABUSE FROM PRIEST
49. CHURCH POLITICS (2)
50. FRUSTRATION WITH MANY ASPECTS OF THE CHURCH
51. DEATH (3)
52. NEW CHALLENGES
53. GOING TO DO VOLUNTEER WORK
54. LACK OF ENERGY TO KEEP UP WITH TEENS
55. I MAY DECIDE THAT VOLUNTEERING IS NOT FOR ME
56. I DON'T KNOW
Appendix G: Summary of Primary Activities of Parish Youth Ministers by Mode of Occurrence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Youth Ministry Program or Activity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mode of Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth group meetings</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious education classes</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation classes</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth-focused Eucharistic liturgies</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission trips</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local service programs</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Prayer Meetings</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One on one counseling with youth</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible study</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight retreats</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in diocesan programs</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of town social trips</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day long retreats</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth leadership programs</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult leadership programs</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/teen programs</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent education programs</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eucharistic adoration</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix H: Description of Importance of Professional Items To The Professional Development of the Field of Youth Ministry As Perceived By Lay Youth Ministers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Item</th>
<th>Very Imp. n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Important n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Somewhat n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Not Imp. n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National committees</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional journal for field</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National organization</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local organization</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National certification for parish leaders</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National certification for diocesan leaders</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferable credential</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual programs</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs of study</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual conference</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web site for youth ministry leaders</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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