

KEEPING CHURCH GOERS MOTIVATED:
CHURCH WORSHIP COMMUNICATION STUDY

by

ANNE R. TRELSTAD
B.A. University of Central Florida, 2009

A thesis proposal submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts
in the Nicholson School of Communication
in the College of Sciences
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Summer Term
2012

Major Professor: James Katt

© 2012 Anne Trelstad

ABSTRACT

At a time when mainline Protestant churches in America are concerned with stagnant or declining worship attendance (Duin, 2008) a better understanding of worshippers' motivations could help church leaders plan and create positive worship experiences (Katt & Trelstad, 2009). This study extends the scope of the previous research of Katt and Trelstad by employing a larger sample of purposively selected churches. It attempts to more clearly answer the following question more clearly: What types of incidents serve as motivator and de-motivator factors in the church worship service setting? A sample of 105 church members from thirty-eight churches participated in a survey, either in person or online. The results indicate that there are motivators and de-motivators for attendees of a church worship service which are specific to the context. This research could provide practical information for churches concerned about member motivation and further extend the scope of Herzberg's theory into another context.

This thesis is dedicated to my Lord and Savior Jesus, the Christ and to my father, Samuel Rice,
because both have inspired me to finish the course strong.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank several people for their tireless support. First and foremost, thank you, mom, for listening, proofreading, learning the discipline of communication with me, and giving me space when I needed it. A special thank you is given to my thesis committee chair, Dr. James Katt, for placing a goal before me as an undergraduate and giving me the breathing room to accomplish it. Thank you to Dr. Ann Miller and Dr. Kristin Davis for agreeing to be on my thesis committee and giving all the academic and moral support. To Jerry Sublette, who inspired me to shoot for a Master of Arts, thank you. I would be remiss if I did not thank Kirsten Seitz and my colleagues for the support in so many ways. I would like to say thank you to my pastor, Dr. Rev. Daniel Gilbert, and my church family at Peace Lutheran Church for giving me encouragement. To my Saturday Morning breakfast group, thanks for listening, praying, believing, and cheering; I love you all. To my best girlfriend, Laura Turco, thank you for always being there and helping in every way possible. Thank you to my brother, John Rice, for all the late night moral support. A deeply felt thank you goes to my two sons, Steven and John, for keeping me motivated throughout this endeavor. Lastly, to my boyfriend, Dave Bitler, who walks with me on this journey, I love you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	3
The Church: A Duality of the Spiritual and Business.....	3
Motivation Research in the Church.....	4
Motivation-Hygiene Theory.....	7
Motivation-hygiene theory in not- for – profit and non- profit contexts.....	11
Motivation-hygiene theory in church settings.....	13
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY.....	19
Participants.....	19
Procedure.....	20
Instrument.....	20
Codebook.....	21
Coding Procedure.....	25
Fleiss’ Kappa Inter-coder Reliability Test.....	26
Data Management.....	27
Risks and Benefits.....	28
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS.....	29
Primary Analyses.....	29
Post Hoc Analyses.....	32
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION.....	34
General Discussion.....	34
Limitations and Implications for Future Research.....	40
Conclusion.....	42
APPENDIX A: EXPLANATION OF RESEARCH.....	43
APPENDIX B: WORSHIP SERVICE CRITICAL INCIDENT SURVEY.....	45
APPENDIX C PERCENTAGES OF CHURCH A, CHURCH B, AND ALL OTHERS MOTIVATION – HYGIENE FACTORS.....	48
REFERENCES.....	50

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 Fleiss' k equation (Fleiss, 1971, p. 379)	26
Figure 2 Interpreting k values (Landis & Koch, 1977	27

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 <i>Established Motivation and Hygiene Factors (Herzberg, 1966, 1974)</i>	9
Table 2 <i>Church Worship Motivation – Hygiene Factors (Katt & Trelstad, 2009)</i>	16
Table 3 <i>Katt and Trelstad (2009) Factor names and percentage of responses</i>	17
Table 4 <i>Codebook Rationale</i>	22
Table 5 <i>Factor names, examples of incidents reported, and the percentage of responses</i>	29
Table 6 <i>Percentages of church A, church B, and all others motivation factors.</i>	49
Table 7 <i>Percentages of church A, church B, and all others hygiene factors.</i>	49

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Moving into the 21st century, communication scholars bringing new voices and perspectives should generate a greater authenticity to the discipline (Gordon, 2007). One of these perspectives is expanding communication studies to include the worship service context. Discussions and research of spirituality have been, in the past, allotted to religious leaders, few communication scholars and communication scholarship concerning the divine has been mostly relegated to religious journals. Since one of the foundations of a society is religious activity, communication theorists should not be afraid to depart from the historical place in rhetorical studies and the religious communication journals (Wrench, Corrigan, McCrosky, & Punyanunt-Carter, 2006; Gordon, 2007) to publish the human communication processes of the divine in wider selection of journals.

In many ways a church worship service, having elements of persuasive, informative, and inspirational messages, is similar to other communication environments. Yet the distinct atmosphere is created through combining the rituals, sermons, liturgy, and music, along with architecture, spatial arrangements and artifacts of the sanctuary (Johnson, Rudd, Neuendorf, & Jian, 2010). The people who come to a worship service do so voluntarily as opposed to a paid position (i.e. a job). The composition of these variables provides a fertile context to study. At a time when mainline Protestant churches in the United States are concerned with stagnant or declining worship attendance (Duin, 2008) a better understanding of communication elements that influence worshippers' motivations could help church leaders plan and create positive worship experiences (Katt & Trelstad, 2009).

Motivation-Hygiene theory, a well-tested organizational theory, contends that people's motivation stems from two sources: the desire to grow psychologically (motivators) and the desire to avoid unpleasantness (hygiene factors). Motivators should motivate people to greater commitment through action (i.e. job performance). Hygiene factors do not motivate, but instead serve as de-motivators when they are perceived negatively. The hygiene factors must be continually adjusted because they never are completely satisfied. The terms 'hygiene factor(s)' and 'de-motivator(s)' are used interchangeably in this study. The current study extends previous research that applied motivation-hygiene theory to a church worship service via a survey of a single congregation (Katt & Trelstad, 2009). Results of that study suggested the motivation-hygiene theory might be a useful lens through which to examine the motivation of church worshippers. The present study investigated a larger sample of worshippers from multiple churches.

Specifically, this research study aims to further investigate which incidents in church worship services are motivators or de-motivators for attendees. Studying the motivation of adult volunteers to remain active in and promote a non-profit organization, such as a church worship service, extends the scope of motivation-hygiene theory into new context.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

The Church: A Duality of the Spiritual and Business

There is a spiritual aspect and a business aspect that, when in combination, comprise the Church. (The capital “C” in the word church will denote the composition of both the spiritual and corporate aspects of the body of Christ. The lower case “c” will denote the local congregation and their business practices. It is difficult to examine one without the other for they are two sides of the same coin.) The Church looks at the business practices of the day to accomplish what has been the mission of the Church since Jesus gave it almost two thousand years ago. Jesus told his disciples to “Go into all the world and preach the Good News to everyone” (Mark 16:15, New Living Translation). Throughout the centuries the Church has used the business practices and media of the day to communicate the gospel for people to identify with the message and the organization (e.g. Finke & Iannacone, 1993; Underwood, 2002; Hoover, 2003; Sturgill, 2004; Baab, 2007; Scott, 2007; Johnson et al., 2010).

For instance, on October 31, 1517, Martin Luther, using a prominent form of communication of the time, nailed his 95 theses to the door of the Castle Church in Wittenberg. These theses or concerns addressed issues of purgatory, indulgences and other teachings of the Catholic Church. Later, Luther and others used the newest communication medium of the day to champion his cause, the printing press. His intent was to reform the church not to separate from it. However, the nailing of the 95 theses was an act that began the Reformation and, ultimately, changed the world (Bainton, 1950). Using Luther’s example, the church, as an organization, can be placed under examination to discover what can be changed for the betterment of the Church.

In other words, the Church is in the communication business (Strugill, 2004; Johnson et al, 2010).

Motivation Research in the Church

The bulk of research in the past twenty years about church member motivation has taken place within two major academic areas: church growth, increasing membership, (Kelly, 1978; McKinney & Hoge, 1983; Deci & Ryan, 1985; Iannaccone, 1992; Hadaway, Marler, & Chaves, 1993; Baard, 1994; Iannaccone, Olson, & Stark, 1995; Stoll & Petersen, 2008; Thomas & Olson, 2010) and personal enrichment, personal spiritual growth, (Paragament, Steele, & Tyler, 1979; Ryan, Rigby, & King, 1993; Maltby, Lewis, & Day, 1999; Clough, 2006; Covert & Johnson, 2009; Martos, Ke'zdy, & Horva'th-Szabo, 2011; Neyrinck, Vansteenkiste, Lens, Duriez, & Hutsebaut, 2006). There is one other area of research, divine inspiration or God's influence in the affairs of mankind by speaking directly with a person (Drapela, 1969; Horne, 1990; Baesler, 1997; Zulick, 2003; Gorsuch & Wong-McDonald, 2004; Starks & Robinson, 2007; Kaylor, 2011). Some of the theoretical perspectives connected with church growth, personal enrichment, and divine inspiration have included reactive approach motivation (e.g. McGregor, Nash, & Prentice, 2010); choice and decision motivation (e.g. Covert & Johnson, 2009); elaboration likelihood model (e.g. Joseph & Thompson, 2004); and intrinsic-extrinsic motivation (e.g. Byrd, Hageman, & Isle, 2007; Martos et al., 2011; Neyrinck et al., 2006).

The theoretical basis for a larger portion of the research has been Abraham Maslow's (1970) hierarchy of needs. He posited that human beings are motivated by unsatisfied needs, and that certain lower needs need to be satisfied before higher needs can be satisfied. Maslow used

the terms physiological, safety, belongingness and love, esteem, and self-actualization to represent needs that describe the pattern of human motivations (Maslow & Frager, 1987).

Physiological needs are the very basic needs such as air, water, food, sleep, sex, etc. When these are not satisfied we may feel sickness, irritation, pain, discomfort, etc. These feelings motivate us to alleviate them as soon as possible to establish homeostasis. Once they are alleviated, we may think about other things, hence the hierarchy. Safety needs are for establishing stability and consistency in a chaotic world: “security; stability; dependency; protection; freedom from fear, anxiety and chaos; need for structure, order, law, and limits; strength in the protector; and so on” (Maslow, 1970, p.18).

Love and belongingness are next on the ladder. Humans have a desire to belong to groups: clubs, work groups, religious groups, family, gangs, etc. We need to feel loved (non-sexual) by others, to be accepted by others. For instance, performers appreciate applause. We need to be needed. “Any good society must satisfy this need one way or another, if it is to survive” (Maslow, 1970, p.20). Esteem needs are similar to love and belongingness because self-esteem which results from competence or mastery of a task and the ensuing attention and recognition that comes from others.

Self-actualization is potential realized. “The individual is doing what he or she, individually, is fitted for...What humans can be, they must be. They must be true to their own nature” (Maslow, 1970, p. 22). People who have the other needs satisfied tend to maximize their potential. They, generally, seek knowledge, peace, esthetic experiences, self-fulfillment, oneness with God, etc. Communication scholars have often grouped these need levels of Maslow (1970) as intrinsic motivations (Paragament et al., 1979; Deci & Ryan, 1985; Iannacone, 1992;

Hadaway et al., 1993; Baard, 1994; Clough, 2006) which are equated with Herzberg's desire for growth..

Intrinsic motivation corresponds with longer involvement in endeavors, greater tenacity in completing tasks, and higher levels of satisfaction and creativity (Deci & Ryan, 1985) Intrinsic motivation for attending church has emerged as an independent predictor of satisfaction with life, purpose in life, and self-efficacy (Byrd et al., 2007). Intrinsically motivated church worship service attenders could be described as those enjoying in the overall worship service experience, looking forward to it each week, expecting to learn, and to be involved with other members of the congregation. On the other hand, extrinsic motivation entails those activities engaged in largely out of a desire to gain a reward or to avoid an ill consequence such as guilt, or damnation in the religious extreme (Deci & Ryan, 1985). The extrinsically motivated person may participate in church activities, such as attending Sunday service, primarily out of a sense of "should" due to an internalized rule, or because it might look bad if he or she did not attend (Baard, 1994).

Although several scholars (e.g. Deci & Ryan, 1985; Baard, 1994; Neyrinck et al., 2006; McGregor et al., 2010; Lavric & Flere 2011; Martos et al., 2011) have examined the intrinsic and extrinsic motivations together, they have not examined a content and process approach to congregational motivation. Content is rhetoric or work of the business, subjects one studies in school, or, in this case, a church worship service. In a worship service setting, the content can be viewed as the rhetoric said or sung. Whereas, process is the how, or way, the content is delivered. It can be thought of as the mechanics of the sermon, rituals, musical scores, and so on. A more holistic approach to motivation is Fredrick Herzberg's (1966) motivation-hygiene

theory because it covers content and process, as well as intrinsic and extrinsic motivations.

Organizations have utilized motivation-hygiene theory and the application has proven beneficial to increasing job satisfaction (e.g. Wren, 1972; Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Syptak, Marsland, & Ulmer, 1999; Steers, Mowday, & Shapiro, 2004; Lundberg, Gudmundson, & Andersson, 2008; Katt & Condly, 2009).

Motivation-Hygiene Theory

Motivation-hygiene theory (Herzberg, 1966) advances the position that people are 1) motivated by one set of concepts (motivation factors) and 2) de-motivated, by another separate set of concepts (hygiene factors). The factors can be understood as 'job content' and 'job context' factors: the motivation factors involve the work and its processes and hygiene factors are characteristics of the environment in which the work is done (Ruthankoon, 2003; Schermerhorn, 2003). Simply, the theory involves both between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and the content and process of the context.

The motivation factors are based in the desire to grow psychologically, while the hygiene factors are grounded in the desire to avoid pain or unpleasantness. The motivation factors are no surprise; motivators motivate. On the other hand, the hygiene factors are those entities which are, for the most part, unnoticed except when they affect the individual's well-being. For example, an air conditioner in a conference room is hardly noticed when functioning properly. However, it becomes the center of attention when it is not working properly on a hot July day. It becomes a de-motivator for people listening to the same plenary address and they will respond very differently to the speaker.

Herzberg argues that it is fallacious to assume any of these following three notions: 1) the motivation and hygiene factors are on a single continuum, or 2) motivation is a result of removing hygiene factors, or 3) de-motivation is a lack of motivators. Instead, contending the correct assumption for motivation-hygiene theory is that motivation and hygiene factors operate independently. Herzberg, his colleagues, and others have conducted over 200 organizational studies which have affirmed this notion which yielded the taxonomy of factors (Herzberg,1974). The organizational motivation factors that emerged from these studies are achievement, recognition for achievement, the work itself, responsibility, advancement, and personal growth. Administration, supervision, relations with co-workers, working conditions, physical environment, salary, and job security encompass the hygiene factors (Herzberg, 1966, 1974). These motivation-hygiene factors have remained stable throughout the various workplace studies that have been conducted in the past forty-five years (e.g. Beulens & Van den Breock, 2007; Eisenberg, Goodall, & Trethewey, 2007; Miller, 2006; Papa, Daniels, & Spiker, 2008; Shockley-Zalabak, 2006). Table 1 is the listing of the categories and understanding of the categorical definition.

Table 1 *Established Motivation and Hygiene Factors (Herzberg, 1966, 1974)*

<u>Motivators</u>	<u>Hygiene Factors</u>
<p><i>Achievement</i> Completion of a job, solution to a problem, seeing the results of one’s efforts. This category also allowed for incidents involving failure (the absence of achievement).</p>	<p><i>Company policy and administration</i> Events involving the “adequacy or inadequacy” (Herzberg, 1966, p. 197) or “harmfulness or beneficial effects” (p. 197) of the company’s organization and management.</p>
<p><i>Recognition for achievement</i> An act of notice, positive or negative, from anyone (supervisor, peer, or the general public).</p>	<p><i>Supervision</i> Events that center on the behavior of one’s supervisor.</p>
<p><i>Work itself</i> Events centered on the variety/routineness, difficulty/ease, or creativity/lack of creativity of respondent’s work.</p>	<p><i>Interpersonal relations</i> Reports of events in which there is specific reference to the characteristics of interaction between respondent and superiors, subordinates, or peers.</p>
<p><i>Responsibility</i> Events involving the status of respondent’s authority or responsibility.</p>	<p><i>Working conditions</i> Events involving the physical adequacy or inadequacy of the work environment, (including lighting, ventilation, tools, space, etc.)</p>
<p><i>Advancement</i> An actual change in a “person’s status or position in the company” (Herzberg, 1966, p. 195).</p>	<p><i>Salary</i> “Sequences of events in which compensation plays a role” (Herzberg, 1966, p. 195).</p>
<p><i>Growth</i> Situations that resulted in respondents learning new skills, acquiring a new outlook, or the opening of a “previously closed door” (Herzberg, 1966, p. 194).</p>	<p><i>Job security</i> Responses involving a specific reference to the presence or absence of job security.</p>

(Katt & Condly, 2009)

The motivation-hygiene factors emerged from a methodological technique for collecting data in which participants are asked to respond freely to open-ended questions that asked participants to recall incidents that caused them to feel particularly good or bad. This technique is called ‘critical incident’ (Flanagan, 1954). A characteristic of the technique is the incident reported represents a specific time when the respondent felt different than he or she usually felt (Flanagan, 1954). The reasoning behind using the critical incident is clarified by Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman (1959) who argue against providing participants a list of potential motivating or de-motivating factors to rate by some type of scale, noting this approach carries the assumption that the participants actually have an attitude about each item. In cases in which respondents either have no attitude or are unaware of their attitude with regard to a given item, they are compelled to “make up” attitudes in order to complete the instrument. In contrast, Herzberg’s (1966) critical incident approach asks each participant to recall an incident when “you felt exceptionally good or exceptionally bad about your present job” (p. 93) and continues with a series of follow-up questions about that incident. Inherent in the technique is that the incident reported represents a specific time when the respondent felt different than he or she usually felt.

Feelings are the subjective experiences of human thinking which include bodily sensations, moods, emotions, and metacognitive feelings (like ease of recall or fluency of perception) and impact evaluative judgment (attitude) (Ellsworth & Scherer, 2003). That is, “emotions reflect the person’s appraisal of a specific event which is in the focus of the person’s attention” (Schwartz, 2012, p.15), making recall of an event easier (Bower, 1981), and thereby tapping the attitude (Haddock et al., 1999). This line of reasoning is why Herzberg argued that

‘critical incident’ method increases “the likelihood that a feeling is being tapped” (p. 95), as opposed to an opinion or an interest. Categories are formed a posteriori, with similar responses grouped together, frequencies noted, and the resultant groups logically named. Sub-sequentially, the majority of researchers in motivation – hygiene theory have utilized the “critical incident” method (Chell, 2003; Bycio & Allen, 2004).

Motivation-hygiene theory in not- for – profit and non- profit contexts.

Although the motivation-hygiene theory research has been in business organizations with consistent categories (e.g. Wren, 1972; Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Syptak et al., 1999; Steers et al., 2004; Lundberg et al., 2008), they have revolved around the paid employee and job satisfaction. It is possible for other categories to emerge when the context has changed from the for-profit organization to not- for or non-profit environments (e.g. Freeman, 1978; Pietro, 1996; Gorman & Millette, 1997; Danielson, 1998; Jamison, 2003; Esmond & Dunlop, 2004; Fugar, 2007; Katt & Condly, 2009). The current study focuses on the subjects in a voluntary setting (church) for their satisfaction with and involvement within that setting.

Research has already shown that a distinction should be made between motivation factors in the workforce and motivation factors for volunteers (Degli Antoni, 2009). A volunteer, by definition, is a person who performs a service and does not receive monetary compensation (Online Etymology Dictionary, 2012). Likewise, a voluntary setting is an association or organization undertaken, done by, composed of, and / or functioning with the aid of volunteers who do so of one's own free will. Low “job” satisfaction for a volunteer is more likely to result in the loss of that volunteer because he or she is free to choose another use for his or her time. In this sense, when addressing motivation and hygiene factors for a volunteer setting becomes a

“make or break” proposition for volunteer-based organizations (Degli Antoni, 2009; Huck, Al, & Rathi, 2011). The voluntary attendance of church worship service setting is removed from the original for-profit business context. Therefore, a review of literature in not-for-profit and non-profit contexts is warranted to verify the applicability for a church worship service setting.

An early application of Herzberg’s theory to not-for-/non-profit context was performed by Walter Freeman (1978). He examined the motivation of 4-H paid volunteer leaders using Herzberg’s motivation – hygiene theory. The taxonomy Freeman developed for the 4-H administrators included recognition, personal growth, interpersonal relationships (other 4-H leaders, extension staff, and parents) for motivators; while the de-motivator factors included guidance and training, policy and administration, and interpersonal relationships (especially, leadership). Subsequently, Irma Jamison (2003) studied turnover and retention of volunteers in human service agencies, using Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene as her theoretical basis. The motivation factors she established were skill development, challenging task, personal growth, decision making, feedback and evaluation, recognition, and reward (p. 122). Hygiene factors emerged as training, orientation, communication, interpersonal relations, direct service, and equitable treatment (p. 122). Esmond and Dunlop (2004) applied a volunteer motivation inventory (VMI) (M^cEwin & Jacobsen-D’Arcy, 2002) based on Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene theory to fifteen different volunteer organizations in Western Australia. Their taxonomy specifically added religious, government and community to the inventory list.

This fluidity of taxonomies is further evidenced in post-secondary educational settings. For instance, Danielson (1998) examined motivation and hygiene factors among college students with regard to their overall college experience. She found a dichotomy between elements of

participants overall college experience that served as motivators (such as faculty/staff taking time with students, showing care for students) and those that served as de-motivators (such as unfair practices, class size, difficulty of assignments).

Similarly, Katt and Condly (2009) applied motivation-hygiene theory to motivation in the college classroom (as opposed to the overall college experience). They found that the incidents that served as motivators for students (i.e. professorial care, achievement, and recognition for achievement) were for the most part different from those incidents that served as de-motivators (i.e. poor classroom administration, unfair course policies, and personal failings). These previous examples help solidify the evidence towards the nature of motivation and hygiene factors could be context-dependent with specific and, sometimes, unique taxonomies.

Motivation-hygiene theory in church settings.

The current study focuses on attendees in a voluntary setting (church worship service) for their satisfaction with and involvement within that setting. In many ways a church worship service, having elements of persuasive, informative, and inspirational messages, is similar to other communication environments. Yet the distinct atmosphere is created through combining the verbal communication aspects of rituals, sermons, liturgy, and music, along with nonverbal communication components of architecture, spatial arrangements and artifacts of the sanctuary (Johnson, Rudd, Neuendorf, & Jian, 2010). Along with the fact that the people who come to a worship service do so voluntarily as opposed to a paid position (i.e. a job) makes the composition of these variables a fertile communication context.

Motivation –hygiene theory allows for a more holistic approach to a church worship service communication study because it covers content and process of the rhetoric, as well as, the

intrinsic and extrinsic motivation of the worshippers for experiential satisfaction. Therefore, it is relevant to this study to review investigations of motivation –hygiene theory that have taken place in church settings. Three studies are worth noting that have applied motivation-hygiene theory to church settings. Hal Pettegrew (1993) discussed the overall church experience using Herzberg’s (1966) motivation-hygiene theory as his theoretical undergirding. The categories that emerged were organization (structure), support, reward (recognition), trust, care (concern), warmth (friendliness), standards, purpose (cause), communication, and ownership (identity). Even at a glance, Pettigrew’s taxonomy depicts a few items reflecting the labels given by Herzberg.

A more recent not-for-profit and non-profit study examined clergy (Fugar, 2007). The researcher surveyed 117 full-time clergy of congregations to determine motivators and demotivators for performing a range of tasks associated with their jobs and overall satisfaction. From his findings, Fugar determined that the typical Herzberg factors list did not quite fit the context and he did not flex the terminology of the taxonomy. Instead, he opted to report that Herzberg’s motivation – hygiene theory may not be applicable. This might be in part due to the method he used to collect the data. Instead of using the critical incident method, he modified Wood’s (1973) Faculty Job Satisfaction/ Dissatisfaction scale eliminating the possibility of different contextual terms to emerge.

The only known study that applied the motivation-hygiene theory to member motivation in church worship services was conducted by Katt and Trelstad (2009). The church worship context was chosen because it is, generally, the first impression the potential regular attendee

receives of the church. Also, the worship service is the most attended event of the church, during the week, by the parishioners (Scott, 2009).

Katt and Trelstad (2009) used the established critical incident method to obtain the data to be analyzed. The authors admitted, however, that these results were preliminary at best. The study accessed only thirty-two members of a single Lutheran congregation. Table 2 provides brief descriptions of the reported motivation factors and hygiene factors. Table 3 displays the percentage reported of each factor. Even with the small sample size, the division between motivation and hygiene factors is clear in the data.

Table 2 Church Worship Motivation – Hygiene Factors (Katt & Trelstad, 2009)

<u>Motivators</u>	<u>Hygiene Factors</u>
<p><i>Spiritual</i> The events having to do with one's relationship with God which involved affective (inspirational messages), cognitive (helped to understand better), and behavioral (realization of changes needed in one's lifestyle).</p>	<p><i>Interpersonal Relationships</i> Events involving the conflict within congregation; disagreement among members; overhearing other member make disparaging remarks about sermon.</p>
<p><i>Music</i> The service included music that ascetically affected the person.</p>	<p><i>Doctrine</i> Events that conflict within congregation; disagreement among members; overhearing other member make disparaging remarks about sermon.</p>
<p><i>Youth Participation</i> Events centered on the youth of the church being involved in the worship experience i.e. Youth Sunday.</p>	<p><i>Quality of Presentation</i> Reports of events in which there is specific reference to the sound system and PowerPoint problems or supporting personnel not trained well; i.e. communion assistants not knowing where to go.</p>
<p><i>Stewardship</i> Events involving the opportunities to give more whether it is time, talent, or money.</p>	<p><i>Sermon Topic</i> Events involving the sermon topic was to political.</p>
<p><i>Pastoral Care</i> Pastor's words or actions (to respondent) after the service meaningful; i.e. Pastor's words after the baptism were touching</p>	<p><i>Familiarity</i> Difficulty in accepting change; wanting things to be the same.</p>
<p><i>Personal Participation</i> Situations that resulted in respondents and family members being involved in the worship service as opposed to setting in the audience.</p>	<p><i>Worship Style</i> Responses involving a specific reference to the presence or absence of a particular worship style; i.e. being offended by modern dramatization of nativity</p>

(Katt & Trelstad, 2009)

Table 3 Katt and Trelstad (2009) Factor names and percentage of responses

Factor	Positive “Motivator”	Negative “Hygiene Factor”
Spiritual	54.5%	
Affective (36.3%)		
Cognitive (9.1%)		
Behavioral (9.1%)		
Music	13.6%	
Youth Participation	13.6%	
Stewardship	9.1%	
Pastoral Care	4.6%	
Personal Participation	4.6%	
Interpersonal		30.8%
Doctrine		23.0%
Quality of Presentation		15.4%
Sermon Topic		15.4%
Familiarity		7.7%
Worship Style		7.7%

Katt and Trelstad (2009) called for larger studies, employing larger samples from multiple congregations in order to obtain a more clear indication of which incidents are motivators and de-motivators. A clearer indication could give a better understanding of the communication factors that motivate and de-motivate participants could ultimately help churches and other volunteer organizations better serve the needs of their members in order to more effectively pursue their organizational mission. Also, it would serve to further solidify the motivation-hygiene theory as a macro-level organizational theory. This study will attempt to

answer the following questions through extending the scope of the previous research of Katt and Trelstad:

RQ1: Does the dichotomy between motivators and hygiene factors that was reported in the previous research in a worship service context exist with a larger sample?

RQ2: What types of incidents serve as motivators and de-motivator factors in a church worship setting?

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

The study used survey research in which members of Lutheran congregations nationally were asked to respond to a series of questions in a self-administered, face-to-face or online, questionnaire. Then, the content of the responses were coded, analyzed, and the results reported. The Lutheran denomination was chosen for two reasons. Katt and Trelstad (2009) used a specific congregational affiliation. Replication in a different denomination could add confounding variables. Furthermore, multi-denominational data could create extenuating confusion with variables such as doctrine and worship style.

Participants

The governing bodies of forty-five Lutheran congregations nationally were approached for permission to survey church members via email, phone call, Facebook, and word-of-mouth. These churches were chosen through networks of known congregational leadership. There were five congregations from the mid-west, five from the east coast outside of Florida, and twenty-eight from Florida that agreed to participate after the initial contact via follow-up phone call. Most congregations gave few responses; no more than three. However, one congregation gave a fair amount of responses through the online survey link (N = 27) and another gave a fair amount of responses from a face-to-face survey (N = 26). The total number of respondents was 105 (48% male and 52% female). The average age was sixty-two years old. The average length affiliated with the participant's congregation was ten years and eight months.

Procedure

In line with the preferences of each of the congregations' leadership, questionnaires were administered either online (N=37) or face-to-face (N=1). Face-to-face surveys were administered in an agreed upon place during the specific, agreed upon, time. The "Explanation of Research" (see Appendix A) was distributed to the potential participants of the congregations emphasizing that participation was is voluntary, anonymous, and that one must be at least eighteen years of age. Participants were invited to direct any questions they have, including those about the overall results of the study (when available), to the PI. Participants responded to short prompts and answered close-ended questions.

For congregations whose leadership prefers to have the survey administered online, potential participants were emailed a link to the online survey site. Upon navigating to the site, participants encountered the "Explanation of Research" document. At the bottom of the page they were given the choice to proceed with the survey, or to decline to participate. Those who choose the latter were directed to a page where a message thanking them for their interest is displayed. Those who choose to proceed with the survey were directed to a series of web pages where they were asked to respond to prompted items (see Appendix A). Upon completion of the survey participants were directed to a page where they are thanked for their participation. Both face-to-face and online questionnaires took about fifteen minutes to complete.

Instrument

The survey consisted of two prompts and demographic questions; including sex, age, and length of congregational affiliation were given (see Appendix B). The first prompt was the following: "Think about a time in the past when you felt especially *good* about one of the

worship services you attended. Briefly describe that time and the event(s) that led to it.” In an effort to encourage participants to focus on a specific incident rather than their general, cumulative experience, participants were asked the following questions: How long did the feeling last? Did the way you felt affect your involvement at church? How seriously were your feelings about the worship service affected by what happened? The second free-response prompt was the following: “Think about a time in the past when you felt especially *bad* about one of the worship services you attended. Briefly describe that time and the event(s) that led to it.” Again, participants were also asked to indicate the duration of the feeling, if it affected their involvement in the church service, and the degree to which it affected their feelings toward the worship service.

Codebook

A codebook was developed and modified from the emerged categories reported in the Katt and Trelstad study (2009). The modification was a result of reviewing the initial categories and understandings of each category as defined by Herzberg (1966). Katt and Trelstad found no equivalent of the following Herzberg’s categories: achievement, recognition, advancement, work itself, and salary. Katt and Trelstad’s categories of worship style, sermon topic, music, and youth participation were not listed among the Herzberg categories. Table 4 presents the codebook rationale for the categories.

Table 4 Codebook Rationale

<i>Category</i>	<i>Herzberg's definition (1966, 1974)</i>	<i>Katt and Trelstad definition (2009)</i>	<i>Current Study</i>
<u>Work itself / none/ Overall Experience:</u>	Events centered on the variety/routineness, difficulty/ease, or creativity/lack of creativity of respondent's work.		After re-evaluation, <i>Overall Experience</i> contains the events centered on the variety/routineness, difficulty/ease, or creativity/lack of creativity of respondent's experience in combination which includes such things as the format of the service (e.g. style), youth participation, genre of music, etc.
<u>Responsibility/ Personal participation/ Personal participation:</u>	Events involving the status of respondent's authority or responsibility.	Individual or family members assisting with worship.	Remains consistent with Katt and Trelstad's (2009) name and definition.
<u>Growth / Spiritual / Spiritual:</u>	Situations that resulted in respondents learning new skills, acquiring a new outlook, or the opening of a "previously closed door" (Herzberg, 1966, p. 194).	"Spiritual" (having to do with one's relationship with God), fell into three sub-categories: 3a. <i>Affective</i> (influencing one's spiritual feelings), 3b. <i>Cognitive</i> (influencing one's spiritual understanding), 3c. <i>Behavioral</i> (influencing one's spiritual actions)	Remains consistent with Katt and Trelstad's (2009) name and definition.

<i>Category</i>	<i>Herzberg's definition (1966, 1974)</i>	<i>Katt and Trelstad definition (2009)</i>	<i>Current Study</i>
<u>Supervision / Pastoral Care / Pastoral Care:</u>	Events that center on the behavior of one's supervisor.	Words and actions (including personal beliefs) by the Pastor other than during the presentation of the order of service.	Remains consistent with Katt and Trelstad's (2009) name and definition.
<u>Company policy and administration / Doctrine/ Doctrine and Worship Service Management:</u>	Events involving the "adequacy or inadequacy" (Herzberg, 1966, p. 197) or "harmfulness or beneficial effects" (p. 197) of the company's organization and management.	Denominational Theological precepts.	<i>Company policy and administration</i> was separated into two categories (<i>Doctrine and Worship Service Management</i>) after reviewing the intent of Herzberg and keeping within the context. 5a. <u>Company policy/ Doctrine:</u> concerns the organizational aspects of a business. In this case, the denominational theological precepts and structure will have varying degrees of control in the local church. 5b. <u>Administration / Worship Service Management</u> in an organization consist of the implementations of the policy. However, in a worship service, involves the actual management of running the worship service, as opposed to an overall company implementation.

<i>Category</i>	<i>Herzberg's definition (1966, 1974)</i>	<i>Katt and Trelstad definition (2009)</i>	<i>Current Study</i>
<u>Interpersonal</u> <u>/Interpersonal/</u> <u>Interpersonal:</u>	Reports of events in which there is specific reference to the characteristics of interaction between respondent and superiors, subordinates, or peers.	Reports of events in which there is specific reference to the characteristics of interaction between respondent and other congregants.	Remains consistent with Katt and Trelstad's (2009) name and definition.
<u>Working conditions /</u> <u>Quality of presentation/</u> <u>Worship Service</u> <u>Conditions:</u>	Events involving the physical adequacy or inadequacy of the work environment including lighting, ventilation, tools, space, etc.	Events involving the physical adequacy or inadequacy of the work environment including lighting, ventilation, tools, space, system problems, poorly trained lay assistants, etc.	The same definition as Katt and Trelstad (2009). However, the name has been changed to be in keeping with Herzberg's operational definition.
<u>Job security /</u> <u>Familiarity/</u> <u>Familiarity:</u>	Responses involving a specific reference to the presence or absence of job security.	Responses involving a specific reference to the presence or absence of the affective comfort levels which could include things such as another pastor presiding, crying baby, or change in seating position, etc.	Remains consistent with Katt and Trelstad's (2009) name and definition.

Coding Procedure

After responses were gathered from participants, all of the handwritten responses were transcribed and entered into a database. Because the participants were asked to respond based on a single incident, each response was considered a single unit. Furthermore, each participant was asked to recall a time he or she felt particularly good about worship, and also to recall a time he or she felt particularly bad about worship, there were potentially two units of data from each participant, although some participants chose not to respond to both prompts. Responses that were not based on a specific incident (e.g. “the sermon”) or left blank were not analyzed. The usable responses were ninety-eight motivation incidents and eighty-seven hygiene incidents; equaling 185 total responses. Separate printouts of the positive and negative incident responses were produced for initial examination and coding. As groups of responses emerged that did not fit any the categories, they were set aside and reviewed for possible new factor establishment.

Coding was conducted by four coders; trained and working independently. They coded all the online responses, seventy- nine motivation responses and sixty- nine hygiene responses, to establish inter-coder reliability. Two of the coders coded the motivation responses while the other two coders coded the hygiene responses. The responses were swapped so that all four coders ended up coding all the online responses. Disagreements were resolved via discussion on each response individually. Then, to code the face-to-face responses, two coders coded the motivation responses and the other two coded the hygiene responses for a total of ninety-eight motivation responses and eighty-seven hygiene responses. Once all the responses, both online and face-to-face, were coded, results were reported descriptively, as a percentage of responses that fell into each category. A total of six responses out of 185 total combined responses were

categorized as “other” by the coders. These cases were each unique, so additional *posteriori* categories were not created. Data were analyzed according to frequency. Factors that occur primarily in reports of negative incidents are considered hygiene factors; those that occur primarily in reports of positive incidents are considered motivators.

Fleiss’ Kappa Inter-coder Reliability Test

Fleiss' (1971) kappa was utilized because there were four coders. Fleiss' kappa expands Scott's (1955) Pi by allowing for three or more coders (Fleiss & Cohen, 1973; Freelon, 2010). Fleiss' kappa specifically assumes that although there are a fixed number of raters (e.g., three) different items are rated by different individuals (Fleiss, 1971, p.378). For instance, Item 1 is rated by Raters A, B, and C; but Item 2 could be rated by Raters D, E, and F etc... Agreement can be thought of as follows, if a fixed number of people assign numerical ratings to a number of items then the kappa will give a measure for how consistent the ratings are (Freelon, 2010). The kappa, κ , formula is defined as:

$$\kappa = \frac{\bar{P} - \bar{P}_e}{1 - \bar{P}_e}$$

Figure 1 Fleiss' k equation (Fleiss, 1971, p. 379)

The factor $1 - \bar{P}_e$ gives the degree of agreement that is attainable above chance, and $\bar{P} - \bar{P}_e$ gives the degree of agreement actually achieved above chance. This is to say, if the raters are in complete agreement, then $\kappa = 1$. However, if there is no agreement among the raters, other than what would be expected by chance, then; $\kappa \leq 0$ (Fleiss, 1971). Landis and Koch (1977) gave the following for interpreting κ values.

κ	Interpretation
< 0	Poor agreement
0.01 – 0.20	Slight agreement
0.21 – 0.40	Fair agreement
0.41 – 0.60	Moderate agreement
0.61 – 0.80	Substantial agreement
0.81 – 1.00	Almost perfect agreement

Figure 2 Interpreting k values (Landis & Koch, 1977)

It is understood that the smaller number of categories, the higher the kappa. However, with all four coders coding the seventy- nine motivation and sixty- nine hygiene online responses, there is confidence in the reliability findings. In addition to the quantity of responses coded, the *enlisted* coders consisted of one non-student, who was not familiar with Lutheran doctrine and organizational structure; two undergraduate students, who were familiar with Lutheran doctrine and organizational structure; and one non-student, who was familiar with Lutheran doctrine and structure.

The calculations were set up in Excel, one for online motivation responses and another for online hygiene responses. Using twelve categories (0 -11) - zero being the response was such as "I didn't have a good or bad experience"; the rest of the categories were as defined by the codebook. The *kappa* for the online motivation responses was substantial agreement (0.73) and the *kappa* for online hygiene responses was almost perfect (0.83) utilizing the Landis and Koch (1977) table for interpreting kappa values (see Figure 2).

Data Management

Survey documents and data stored under lock in key in the office of the faculty advisor. Survey electronic documents gathered from Qualtrics secure survey tools downloaded and the online data destroyed. Access to the site was closed after thirty days. Data was analyzed using

descriptive statistics only. After analysis the downloaded data was stored on CD-ROM under lock and key in the office of the faculty advisor.

Risks and Benefits

Participation had the potential to bring back unpleasant memories for participant. In the course of the survey, participants were asked to recall a time they "felt especially bad about one of the worship services," so they were recalling an "unpleasant" memory. However, participants were advised, orally and in writing, that they did not have to answer any question that made them feel uncomfortable. Previous research of this type, using the same type of prompts, has not resulted in any reports of participants feeling uncomfortable while participating. Participants received no direct benefits from their participation.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

Primary Analyses

Table 5 lists the factor names, examples of incidents reported, and the percentage of responses (positive or negative) for each factor.

Table 5 *Factor names, examples of incidents reported, and the percentage of responses*

Category	Motivation Percentage	Example	Hygiene Percentage	Example
*Spiritual <i>Affective</i> (8.2%)	*37.8%	The sermon triggered an emotional release; "...unloading past "baggage" in your life... <i>It affected me very much</i> "	0.0%	
<i>Cognitive</i> (15.3%)		Helped the respondent to understand; "this sermon ... <i>made me realize</i> that I wanted for nothing..."	0.0%	
<i>Behavioral</i> (14.3%)		Inspired respondent to make life changes; "this sermon <i>challenged</i> us to ... <i>I did that ...</i> "	3.4%	
Overall Experience	23.5%	Heightened awareness from the combination of several elements in the service; "The <i>whole evening tied things together</i> from Scripture and made it <i>come alive in my life.</i> "	6.9%	

Category	Motivation Percentage	Example	Hygiene Percentage	Example
Personal Participation	7.1%	Family members assisting in worship; "My little granddaughter gets ... <i>My pride always shows ...of her to be doing this and being a little helper at the age of 4.</i> "	1.1%	
Pastoral Care	2.0%	Pastor's words or actions specifically to the respondent; "The assistant Pastor ... <i>visited with me ...</i> "	1.1%	
Doctrine	3.1%	Denominational theological or policy positions; 'Hearing a pastor with the conviction <i>stand against the Synod...</i> '	9.2%	'A position was presented, <i>part of synodical statement</i> , that I <i>cannot reconcile to my thinking.</i> '
Familiarity	14.3%	Presence or absence of the affective comfort levels "When I was growing up <i>I would always look forward... would sing the same song every year...</i> "	24.6%	"When <i>my pastor is gone...</i> the message doesn't reach me as well."
Interpersonal	9.2%	Interactions between members; "A <i>member</i> , who know my wife, <i>asked</i> about her progress."	26.4%	" <i>Being misunderstood after talking to a fellow member.</i> "

Category	Motivation Percentage	Example	Hygiene Percentage	Example
Worship Service Conditions	0.0%		16.1%	Physical adequacy or inadequacy of the worship service environment; "Contemporary service. <i>Done poorly, musically and technically.</i> "
Worship Service Management	3.1%		23.0%	Handling of worship service events; emergent events in service not handled well by the Pastor.

*The *Spiritual* category constitutes the three sub-categories shown

RQ1 asked if the dichotomy between motivators and hygiene factors that was found in the previous research of a church worship service context exists with a larger sample. In applying the data to this question; spiritual, overall experience and personal participation emerged as motivators, cited primarily as sources of positive affect. The factors interpersonal, worship service management, and worship service conditions emerged as hygiene factors, cited primarily as sources of negative affect. Familiarity emerged as more hygiene factor than motivator, cited as a source of almost seventy-five percent more negative than positive affect. Pastoral care was the only one that did not follow the motivation/hygiene dichotomy, cited almost equally as source of positive and negative affect. For this sample size, the data suggests that there is an overall dichotomy between motivators and hygiene factors in a church worship setting.

RQ2 asked what types of incidents serve as motivators and de-motivator factors in a church worship context. As indicated in Table 5, the reported incidents of a spiritual nature

constituted 47.9% [spiritual (23.9%) and overall experience (23.5%)] tended to produce positive feelings. The incidents reported relating to family participation in the worship service (personal participation) tended to be positive in nature rather than negative. However, the incidents reported having to do with one's relationship with other members (interpersonal) or with worship service conditions tended to produce negative feelings. The incidents reported having to do with the worship service management tended to serve as a hygiene factor. The factor, doctrine, tended to raise more negative feelings than positive. The incidents reported concerning what a worshipper is accustomed to (familiarity) tended to serve as a strong hygiene factor rather than a motivator. The incidents having to do with the pastor's words or actions towards an attendee (pastoral care) were reported with a 2.0% motivation factor and 1.1% hygiene factor.

Post Hoc Analyses

Although the primary reason for the other questions was to help the respondent focus on a specific event, the question, “Did the way you felt, as a result of the reported incident, affect your involvement at church?”, was an effort to confirm that the incidents reported did indeed affect worshipers’ involvement. A post hoc analysis of this data was conducted to determine the degree of being affected. The possible response categories included “did not affect my work in that class at all,” “affected it a little,” “affected it moderately,” and “affected it a lot.” Of those reporting positive incidents, 68.4% reported the feeling affecting their worship involvement “a lot” (48.0%) or “moderately” (20.4%). Of those reporting negative incidents, 63.3% reported the feeling affecting their worship involvement “a lot” (51.4%) or “moderately” (12.2%). These data suggest that reported feelings did have a direct effect on worshiper’s involvement in the worship service. Also, the majority of worshipers perceived the

effect to have been substantial. These data support the relationship between affect and motivation because worship involvement is an outcome of motivation. Therefore, the data suggests that the dichotomy does exist in the church setting. This type of analysis is always subject to coding bias. The categorical frequency was reported as the summation of incidents for a particular motivator or a hygiene factor and divided by the total number of responses for motivation or hygiene factors.

Another post hoc analysis was performed to find out if the categories for motivators and hygiene factors were applicable to a number of Lutheran congregations or specific to one Lutheran congregation. There were responses from thirty-eight churches. Two churches had a number of responses: church A (online) had twenty-seven reported motivation incidents and twenty-four reported hygiene incidents; while church B (face-to-face) had twenty-six motivation incidents and twenty- three reported hygiene incidents. Comparing the percentages of the incidents reported by church A, church B, and those not associated with either church A or church B data suggests that although the proportions of responses in each category varied, the categories that emerged were relatively stable across the three groups (see Appendix C).

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

General Discussion

This researcher set out to expand the examination of motivation – hygiene theory in a church worship context. A better understanding of how language is used to strengthen the members and attract and retain the non-member of a societal foundation, religious activity, would add to the scope of human communication scholarship. The practical application could be useful for congregational leaders because it could possibly enable them to construct a more positive worship service experience by assessing the rhetoric and its processes in connection with the motivation of the attendees. Although there may be some factors that are outside the scope of human control, most of the factors lay within the range of things pastors and congregational leadership can influence.

Taking a moment to review, motivation-hygiene theory covers content and process, as well as intrinsic and extrinsic motivations because it stems from two, independently operating desires that individuals possess: their desire to grow psychologically, and their desire to avoid pain or unpleasantness. The results of this study are encouraging for the extension of Herzberg's (1966) motivation-hygiene theory into adult volunteers of non-profit organizations, particularly to a church worship service. The data confirmed the independent functioning of motivating and de-motivating factors that was observed in the Katt and Trelstad (2009) study. Additionally, these findings could provide practical information for certain churches concerned about member motivation by identifying specific factors that act as motivators or de-motivators.

In the process of reviewing the initial factor names of Katt and Trelstad (2009) by comparing them to the original Herzberg (1966) study definitions, some of the factors from

before were brought together under one label (e.g. sermon topic and music), others were kept the same (e.g. interpersonal and spiritual), still another had name change (worship service management) in keeping with Herzberg's (1966) original conceptual definitions (see Table 4), and there was one "new" category (overall experience). The factors that exemplify motivators are the categories of spiritual, overall experience, and personal participation. The hygiene factors include interpersonal, worship service conditions familiarity, worship service management, and doctrine. Pastoral care emerged as neither a motivator nor de-motivator.

Church worship is the preeminent form of social religious activity in our society (Presser & Chaves, 2007); it stands to reason that the most frequently reported positive experiences would be God-centered, overall experience (23.5%) and spiritual (37.8%). Recalling, overall experience centered on the variety/routineness, difficulty/ease, or creativity/lack of creativity of respondent's experience which involves the macro processes of the worship service from the format (order of service) to the music to the depth of the individual's spirituality. A good example is "*The whole evening tied things together from Scripture and made it come alive in my life*" (emphasis mine), speaking of a Maundy Thursday service. Individuals that are engaged in the worship service will have a more positive experience and be more likely to attend another service (Meyer, 2009).

In this study, the spiritual factor (37.8%) constituted the majority of the motivator responses. The spiritual factor in combination with the overall experience factor yielded 61.3% of the responses. This means those reporting stating they were engaged in the service and attentive to what was being said. Coupling these two factors with personal participation, the reported percentages equal 68.4%. In other words, the person is engaged in the service rather

than just being there. It is noteworthy to mention that, in this study, the cognitive (15.3%) and behavioral (14.3%) aspects of spiritual were brought to prominence. Putting this in the context of being a Christian, it means the respondents grew in spiritual understanding and they acted upon their understanding (Meyer, 2009).

The human interaction factor, interpersonal (26.4%), received the largest percentage of hygiene factors. There are volumes of journals and books dealing with interpersonal relationship dynamics (Khandekar, 2005) and there is not enough paper to contain all the scholarship in one article. Focusing on this study, the data suggest interpersonal dynamics in a worship service create the most- needed-to-pay- attention- to hygiene factor by worshipper and church leaders. It is curious and ironic that the command Jesus gave, “Love one another as I have loved you” (John 13:34, NIV), is the least understood and requires the most attention.

According to the data, the next two hygiene factors are worship service management and worship service conditions. Worship service management incorporates how well something was handled or how well the planned change in the service was accepted or how smoothly the service was flowing. For instance, paraphrasing from the worshiper’s point of view, the pastor did not handle a medical emergency discretely when informed about it during service. Instead, there was a commotion about it and the person felt embarrassed. Another example, “The Maundy Thursday service last year - it was a real dud - low energy - poorly planned - poorly executed.”

The subject is dicey because so many facets come into play with different scenarios. In light of the present research, it would behoove pastors to know their managerial style and communicative style in order to be watchful for those incidents where an area of growth can happen (Carter, 2009). There are voluminous amounts of knowledge to aid the congregations

concerning leadership in general, church leadership, and worship leadership from books, articles, and journals to courses taught in universities and seminaries on the subject (Stewart, 2008).

Recalling, worship service conditions involve anything from the air conditioning not working properly to poorly trained lay assistants. It is when one or several of these conditions is not met that they tend to cause people to react by looking at the source, commenting to the person next to them, and so on; basically, it is an annoyance. It is not unusual for people to remember something that is associated with dissonance or discomfort (Bower, 1981; Ellsworth & Scherer, 2003; Schwartz, 2012). Congregational leaders can easily address the worship service conditions by making sure equipment is working properly and lay assistants are trained well.

Similarly, familiarity, a psychological concept, has a sense of comfort or discomfort associated with it because of outside influences. For instance, “feelings of betrayal or abandonment” or “I don’t like it when Pastor is not here.” Even though, more often than not, sentiments of familiarity were connected with hygiene, there were reports of comfort associated with it (e.g. “the familiar old hymns were sung” or “I love Easter services because we always sing...”). When it comes to familiarity, congregational leaders should use some wisdom concerning this hygiene factor. Pastors need and should be allowed times of spiritual refreshing, relaxation, and family. To require pastors to be “in the pulpit” fifty-two weeks would be a recipe for burnout for both the pastor and the congregation (McMinn, Lish, Trice, Root, Gilbert, & Yap, 2005; Doolittle, 2007; Chandler, 2009; Miner, Dowson, & Sterland, 2010). However, having the pastor “away” more than he or she is there may cause the congregation to wonder if he or she should be a pastor (McMinn, 2005; Hileman, 2008, Miner et al., 2010). In the same manner,

while it is comforting for familiar songs to be sung, it can produce too much routineness and the services become stagnant (Thompson, Hamilton, & Rust, 2005).

Pastoral care is similar to the professorial care that Katt and Condly (2009) observed because it involves the leader's genuine concern for the people. Katt and Condly found that professorial care was the third most reported positive incident. So, pastoral care was expected to have received a large amount of responses. Surprisingly, it did not; pastoral care only received 2.0% motivation factor and 1.1% hygiene factor of responses. This lack of responses is surprising considering the number of references, motivator responses (26.53%) and hygiene responses (45%), concerning the pastor saying or doing something in regards to the service itself. However, reflecting on this from the pilot study of Katt and Trelstad (2009), it appears to have the same amount of influence in the worship service. A word of caution needs to be addressed concerning pastoral care. Pastors visit, counsel, and pray with the people of the congregation outside of the worship service. Therefore, because it is not reflected in a worship service study does not mean it is not happening.

The final category to be discussed is doctrine (motivation, 3.1% and hygiene, 9.2%) which involves denominational theological precepts or denominational policies. It is a great definer of the character of particular denominations and central to understanding their role in the world. In both this study and Katt and Trelstad (2009), who reported that doctrine received 23% of the hygiene responses, revealed that doctrine was mostly a hygiene factor. Congregational leadership should be aware of doctrinal stances that could cause strife in the community of attendees and be prepared for the struggle. For instance, in the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America (ELCA), a change in policy took place in 2009 concerning the ordination of practicing

homosexuals. The ELCA went from not allowing the ordination of homosexuals to allowing it (ELCA, 2009). This caused an upheaval in a good portion of the local churches and an exodus of over 600 churches from the ELCA (Barnhart, 2012). Taking a cue from cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957), denominational policies that cause dissonance within an individual create a psychological imbalance. This requires a shift in thinking to return to homeostasis which might not be possible for the individual to change his or her belief in order to align themselves with the denominational policy. Thus, explaining the hygiene responses. Also, in this study, there were some motivator responses signaling that if attendees' personal views agree with doctrine stances, then doctrine could serve as a motivator.

An interesting finding in this study is that familiarity, pastoral care, and doctrine could serve as either motivators or hygiene factors. While these categories may not have had a larger number of responses, this researcher discovered, from the post hoc analysis, that they created strong negative feelings associated with involvement (“a lot”, 51.4% and “moderately”, 12.2%). These three hygiene factors, like the others, should be taken into serious consideration by congregational leadership when planning a positive worship service experience.

The data support the idea that worshipers report experiencing positive worship services in the presence of motivators, the factors which provide for psychological growth. Just as important, worshipers call for their hygiene need to be met and thus avoid pain and unpleasantness, which are sources of de-motivation. Also, given that motivation and hygiene factors are independent of one another, the presence of one does not negate the necessity of the other. Therefore to the extent that pastors and congregational leaders are capable, they should provide motivators and meet the hygiene needs of the worshippers attending their services. Most

pastors and congregational leaders are no strangers to arranging a worship service and the communicative behaviors that create a positive worship environment. This study is a reminder for them to focus on things to do and the things to watch out for by raising the awareness of importance of attending to both.

Also, a post hoc analysis of the data indicates that the categories that emerged from this study are fairly stable across several churches, which suggests these findings can be a diagnostic tool of communication related motivators and hygiene factors for a single church. The ability to achieve a diagnostic picture of a single congregation would be beneficial for congregational leadership to analyze and adjust their worship service to create a more positive worship experience. The stability of the categories would give the congregational leadership a guide to use for their assessment. Future research involving more churches will help to further establish the stability of the factor categories.

Limitations and Implications for Future Research

The present study has several limitations. First, the average age of participants was sixty-two. The average age of this study is almost two-thirds older than the median age of U.S. citizens (37.2 years old) that was reported by the U. S. Census Bureau (2010). While this age may be fairly typical of worshipping Lutherans, the future of the Lutheran church will have to incorporate younger adults (ages 20-35). Subsequent research involving a sample where the average age is closer to the U. S. Census Bureau demographic would give a clearer picture of what motivates and demotivates younger Americans. It is possible that, because the survey was conducted mostly online and without a personal visit from the researcher, congregational leadership and individuals did not deem it relevant for them. This could account for only two

churches with more than three responses (twenty-seven for one and twenty-six for the other). However, it provides a template on which to build and model future studies. An additional limitation is the surveying of only American church goers. Expanding the research to include other countries, a cross-cultural analysis could extend motivation-hygiene even farther and provide valuable knowledge for congregational leaders around the world.

The current study examined the motivators and de-motivators of the worship service in a small percentage of churches within the Lutheran denomination. This could be expanded by studying a larger percentage of Lutheran churches and/or other denominations. A further limitation is an inevitable outcome of exploratory research since, the previous research conceptualizing the motivation-hygiene factors was limited; the present study represents a promising, but cautious, exploration of these factors that could perhaps benefit from future studies.

A larger content analysis could investigate different worship services across a wide variety of churches in order to solidify the meaning of the motivation-hygiene factors in a church worship service. Further development of worship service motivation-hygiene components could prove to be valuable, extending the understanding of the role of worship service as a form of communication and a representation of how improved organizational content and process benefit the church. For example, using the worship service management factor, a congregation might be getting responses like “the service was a real dud.” Upon examination they find that their main content (music and sermon) does not flow together. By making the adjustment of having the music and sermon give the same message, the next response by might be “hymns were sung and

the sermon was especially meaningful and tied to the gospel/epistle for that Sunday”. This could be repeated for various worship service factors.

Additionally, this study could be replicated with different churches and populations. The results could be analyzed and compared to this research. It would be enlightening to note the differences between rural, urban and suburban Lutheran churches. Also, the scope could be expanded by examining inter-denominational differences. In addition, surveying churches that offered one worship service style as opposed to churches that offered several worship styles would offer a unique perspective. Experiments similar to this one could be conducted to further investigate all these possibilities.

Conclusion

The current study is important to communication research because the church worship service is contextually rich and has distinguishable attributes that form a collage of verbal and nonverbal messages. The results of this study suggest the motivation-hygiene theory might be a useful lens through which to examine the motivation of church worshippers. The people who come to a worship service do so voluntarily. By studying the motivation of adult attendees, the congregational leadership can plan and create positive worship experiences. Also, by better understanding worshippers’ motivation to remain active in and promote a church worship service extends the scope of motivation-hygiene theory into another context.

APPENDIX A: EXPLANATION OF RESEARCH

Title of Project: Church Worship Communication Study

Principal Investigator: Anne Trelstad, Nicholson School of Communication

You are being invited to take part in a research study. Your participation is voluntary. You do not have to answer any questions that make you feel uncomfortable.

- The purpose of this research is to study factors that affect the attitudes of church worshippers.
- You are asked to complete a brief survey, which will take about 15 minutes to complete.

You must be 18 years of age or older to take part in this research study.

Study contact for questions about the study or to report a problem: If you have questions, concerns, or complaints you may contact Anne Trelstad or Dr. James Katt at 407-823-3296.

IRB contact about your rights in the study or to report a complaint: Research at the University of Central Florida involving human participants is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board (UCF IRB). This research has been reviewed and approved by the IRB. For information about the rights of people who take part in research, please contact: Institutional Review Board, University of Central Florida, Office of Research & Commercialization, 12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501, Orlando, FL 32826-3246 or by telephone at (407) 823-2901.

Thank you for your participation.

APPENDIX B: WORSHIP SERVICE CRITICAL INCIDENT SURVEY

We are interested in experiences that you had while attending your church's worship services. We are particularly interested in experiences that had to do with a specific service, rather than with the church as a whole, or with your church life, in general. Please take time to thoughtfully respond to the following questions. Please write legibly, but don't be concerned with spelling or punctuation.

Part A

Think about a time in the past when you felt especially good about one of the worship services, as a result of some event or series of events. In the space below, briefly describe that time and event(s) that led to it. Use the back if necessary.

For each of the following questions, check the answer that best describes your situation.

In the case you just described, how long did the feeling last?

- less than an hour
- more than an hour, less than a day
- more than a day, less than a week
- more than a week, less than a month
- more than a month

In the case that you just described, did the way you felt affect your involvement at church?

- did not affect my involvement
- affected it a little
- affected it moderately
- affected it a lot

How seriously were your feelings about the worship service affected by what happened?

- did not affect my feelings about the worship service at all
- affected it a little
- affected them moderately
- affected them a lot

Part B

Think about a time in the past when you felt especially bad about one of the worship services, as a result of some event or series of events. In the space below, briefly describe that time and the event(s) that led to it. Use the back if necessary.

For each of the following questions, check the answer that best describes your situation.

In the case you just described, how long did the feeling last?

- less than an hour
- more than an hour, less than a day
- more than a day, less than a week
- more than a week, less than a month
- more than a month

In the case that you just described, did the way you felt affect your involvement at church?

- did not affect my involvement
- affected it a little
- affected it moderately
- affected it a lot

How seriously were your feelings about the worship service affected by what happened?

- did not affect my feelings about the worship service at all
- affected it a little
- affected them moderately
- affected them a lot

Please answer the following questions.

I am _____ years old.

My sex is ___ female ___ male.

I have been affiliated with my current congregation for ___ months ___ years.

**APPENDIX C PERCENTAGES OF CHURCH A, CHURCH B, AND ALL OTHERS
MOTIVATION – HYGIENE FACTORS**

Table 6 Percentages of church A, church B, and all others motivation factors.

Category	church A (online) Motivation N= 27	church B (face-to-face) Motivation N= 26	All Others Motivation N= 45
Overall Experience = (OE)	25.9%	23.8%	24.0%
*Spiritual	*48.1%	*61.8%	*30.0%
Affective = (SA)	3.7%	19.0%	10.0%
Cognitive = (SC)	18.5%	19.0%	12.0%
Behavioral = (SB)	25.9%	23.8%	8.0%
Personal Participation = (PP)	3.7%	9.5%	4.0%
Pastoral Care = (PC)	3.7%	9.5%	2.0%
Doctrine = (D)	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%
Familiarity = (F)	0.0%	9.5%	6.0%
Interpersonal = (I)	7.4%	0.0%	4.0%
Worship Service Conditions = (WSC)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Worship Service Management = (WSM)	11.1%	9.5%	16.0%

Table 7 Percentages of church A, church B, and all others hygiene factors.

Category	church A (online) Hygiene N= 24	church B (face-to-face) Hygiene N= 23	All Others Hygiene N= 40
Overall Experience = (OE)	5.3%	7.1%	5.0%
*Spiritual	*10.5%	*0.0%	*2.5%
Affective = (SA)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Cognitive = (SC)	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%
Behavioral = (SB)	10.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Personal Participation = (PP)	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Pastoral Care = (PC)	0.0%	3.6%	2.5%
Doctrine = (D)	15.8%	7.1%	12.5%
Familiarity = (F)	10.5%	17.9%	22.5%
Interpersonal = (I)	31.6%	10.7%	17.5%
Worship Service Conditions = (WSC)	21.1%	17.9%	20.0%
Worship Service Management = (WSM)	0.0%	17.9%	17.5%

*Spiritual comprises of affective, cognitive, and behavioral components

REFERENCES

- Baab, L. M. (2007). The future church: Identity and persuasion on congregational websites. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A*, 68.
- Baard, P. (1994). A motivational model for consulting with not-for-profit organizations: A study of church growth and participation, *Consulting Psychology*, 46 (3), 1061-4087. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Baesler, E. J. (1997). Interpersonal Christian prayer and communication. *Journal of Communication and Religion*, 20, 5-13.
- Baesler, E. J. (1999). A model of interpersonal Christian prayer. *Journal of Communication and Religion*, 22, 40-64.
- Bainton, R. (1950). *Here I stand: A life of Martin Luther*. New York: Abingdon Cokesbury Press
- Barnhart, D. (2012). Revised list of congregations voting to leave the ELCA since august 2009, Retrieved on May 20, 2012 from <http://davidbarnhart.blogspot.com/2012/01/revised-list-of-congregations-voting-to.html>.
- Beulens, M. & Van den Breock, H. (2007). An analysis of differences in work motivation between public and private sector organizations, *Public Administration Review*, 67, 65 - 74. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00697.x.
- Bower, G. H. (1981). Mood and memory. *American Psychologist*, 36, 129 – 148.
- Butler, D. M. & Herman, R. D. (1999). Effective ministerial leadership, *Non-Profit Management and Leadership*, 9 (3), 229-239.
- Bycio, P. & Allen, J. (2004). A critical incidents approach to outcomes assessment, *Journal of Education for Business*, 80 (2), 86 - 92. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

- Byrd, K.R., Hageman, A., & Isle, D. B. (2007). Intrinsic motivation and subjective well-being: The unique contribution of intrinsic religious motivation, *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 17(2), 141–156.
- Carter, J. (2009). Transformational leadership and pastoral leader effectiveness. *Pastoral Psychology*, 58(3), 261-271. doi:10.1007/s11089-008-0182-6.
- Chandler, D. (2009). Pastoral burnout and the impact of personal spiritual renewal, rest-taking, and support system practices, *Pastoral Psychology*, 58(3), 273-287. doi:10.1007/s11089-008-0184-4.
- Chell, E. (2003). The critical incident technique. In, Lewis-Beck, M., Bryman, A. and Liao Futing, T. (eds.). *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, USA, London, UK, Sage, 218-219.
- Clough, W. (2006). To be loved and to love, *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 34(1), 23-31.
- Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales, *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 20, 37-46.
- Covert, M. B., & Johnson, J. L. (2009). A narrative exploration of motivation to forgive and the related correlate of religious commitment, *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 28(1), 57 – 65.
- Danielson, C. (1998). Is satisfying college students the same as decreasing their dissatisfaction? East Lansing, MI: *National Center for Research in Teaching*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service no. ED 422812).
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior*. New York: Plenum Press.

- Degli Antoni, G. (2009). Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic motivations to volunteer and social capital formation, *KYKLOS*, 62 (3), 359-370.
- Doolittle, B. (2007). Burnout and coping among parish-based clergy. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 10(1), 31-38.
- Drapela, V. (1969). Personality adjustment and religious growth, *Journal of Religion and Health*, 8(1), 87-97.
- Duin, J. (2008, September 21). Americans leaving churches in droves, *The Washington Times*, p. A.
- Eisenberg, E. M., Goodall, H. L., & Trethewey, A. (2007). *Organizational communication: Balancing creativity and constraint (5th ed)*. Boston, MA: Bedford/St Martin's.
- Ellsworth, P.C., & Scherer, K.R. (2003). Appraisal processes in emotion. In R.J. Davidson, K.R. Scherer, & H. H. Goldsmith (eds.), *Handbook of Affective Sciences* (pp. 572-595). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Esmond, J. & Dunlop, P. (2004). Developing the volunteer motivation inventory to assess the underlying motivational drives of volunteers in Western Australia. Australia: Clan Wa, Inc. Retrieved October 26, 2009.
- Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, (2009). ELCA assembly adopts 'Human sexuality: Gift and trust', *ELCA News Service*, Retrieved on May 20, 2012 from <http://www.elca.org/Who-We-Are/Our-Three-Expressions/Churchwide-Organization/Communication-Services/News/Releases.aspx?a=4232>.
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Evanston, 111: Row Peterson. Retrieved on May, 20, 2012, from <http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=voeQ>

8CASacC&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=leon+festinger&ots=9w69Qzwdtx&sig=1oamAbXhh
nna6oJsL4UsOYHSJI#v=onepage&q=leon%20festinger&f=false.

Finke, R., & Iannaccone, L. R. (1993). Supply-side explanations for religious change. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 527, 27-39.

Flanagan, J. C. (1954). The critical incident technique. *Psychological Bulletin*, 51(4), 327 – 358.

Fleiss, J. L. (1971). Measuring nominal scale agreement among many raters. *Psychological Bulletin*, 76 (5), 378–382.

Fleiss, J. L. & Cohen, J. (1973). The equivalence of weighted kappa and the intraclass correlation coefficient as measures of reliability, *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 33, 613–619.

Freelon, D.G. (2010). Recal: Intercoder reliability calculation as a web service. *International Journal of Internet Science*, 5 (1), 20–33.

Freeman, W. J. (1978). Managing for motivation: Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory and its application to 4-H leadership. *National Intern Report*, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service no, ED 193507).

Fugar, F.D.K. (2007). Frederick Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory revisited: The concept and its applicability to clergy (A study of fulltime stipendiary clergy of the global evangelical church, Ghana. *Journal of Science and Technology (Ghana)*, 27 (1), 119-130.

Gordon, R.D. (2007). Beyond the failures of western communication theory. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 2(2), 89-107.

- Gorham, J., & Millette, D. M. (1997). A comparative analysis of teacher and student perceptions of sources of motivation and demotivation in college classes. *Communication Education*, 46, 245-261.
- Gorsuch, R. L., & Wong-McDonald, A. (2004). A multivariate theory of God concept, religious motivation, locus of control, coping, and spiritual well-being. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 32(4), 318-334.
- Hackman, J. R. & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory, *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 16,250-279.
- Hadaway, C. K., Marler, P. L., & Chaves, M. (1993). What the polls don't show: A closer look at U.S. church attendance. *American Sociological Review*, 50, 741-752.
- Haddock, G., Rothman, A.J., Reber, R., & Schwarz, N. (1999). Forming judgments of attitude certainty, importance, and intensity: The role of subjective experiences. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25, 771-782.
- Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. Cleveland, OH: World Publishing.
- Herzberg, F. (1974). Motivation-hygiene profiles: Pinpointing what ails the organization. *Organizational Dynamics*, 3(2), 18-29.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). *The motivation to work* (2nd ed.). New York: Jolin Wiley & Sons.
- Hileman, L. (2008). The unique needs of protestant clergy families: Implications for marriage and family counseling, *Journal of Spirituality in Mental Health*, 10(2), 119-144.

- Hoover, S. M. (2003). Religion, media and identity: Theory and method in audience research on religion and media, in J. Mitchell and S. Marriage (eds), *Mediating Religion: Conversation in Media, Religion and Culture*, London, New York: T & T Clark.
- Horne, J. S. (1990). Visions and voices: The last temptation of Oral Roberts. *Journal of Communication and Religion*, 13 (2), 15-23.
- Huck, J., Al, R., Rathi, D. (2011). Finding KM solutions for a volunteer-based non-profit organization, *VINE*, 41(1), 26 - 40. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/03055721111115539>.
- Iannaccone, L. R. (1992). Religious markets and the economics of religion. *Social Compass*, 39(1), 123–31.
- Iannaccone, L., Olson, D. & Stark, R. (1995). Religious resources and church growth. *Social Forces* 74(2), 705–31.
- Jamison, I. B. (2003). Turnover and retention among volunteers in human service agencies. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 23(2). 114-132.
doi: 10.1177/0734371X03023002003.
- Johnson, T.L.; Rudd, J.; Neuendorf, K.; & Jian, G. (2010). Worship styles, music and social identity: A communication study. *Journal of Communication and Religion*, 33(1), 144 -174.
- Joseph, S.A. & Thompson, T.L. (2004). The effect of vividness on the memorability and persuasiveness of a sermon: A test of the elaboration likelihood model, *Journal of Communication and Religion*, 27(3), 217-244.

- Katt, J. A. & Condly, S. J. (2009). A preliminary study of classroom motivators and de-motivators from a motivation-hygiene perspective. *Communication Education*, 58, 213-234.
- Katt, J. A. & Trelstad, A.R. (2009). Application of motivation-hygiene theory to a church worship context, *Florida Communication Journal*, 37(2), 1-10.
- Kaylor, B. (2011). Accounting for the divine: Examining rhetorical claims of God's inspiration. *Journal of Communication and Religion*, 34(1), 75-88.
- Kelley, D. (1978). Why conservative churches are still growing." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 17, 165-172.
- Khandekar, R. P. (2005). Twelve choices: A framework for interpersonal process and strategy. *Journal of Business and Economics Research*, 3(1), 65 -79. Retrieved on May15, 2012 from journals.cluteonline.com.
- Kim, J. S. (2011). New church rising. *International Review of Mission*, 100(1), 26-36. doi:10.1111/j.1758-6631.2011.00054.x.
- Landis, J. R. & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data, *Biometrics*, 33, 159–174.
- Lundberg, C., Gudmundson, A., & Andersson, T. D. (2008). Herzberg's two-factor theory of work motivation tested empirically on seasonal workers in hospitality and tourism, *Tourism Management*, 30 (6), 890-899. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2008.12.003.
- Maltby, J., Lewis, C. A., & Day, L. (1999). Religious orientation and psychological well-being: The role of the frequency of personal prayer. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 4, 363–378.

- Martos, T., Ke'zdy, A., & Horva'th-Szabo, K. (2011). Religious motivations for everyday goals: Their religious context and potential consequences, *Motivation and Emotion*, 35, 75–88.
DOI 10.1007/s11031-010-9198-1.
- Maslow, A. H. (1970). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Maslow, A. H., & Frager, R. (1987). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Meyer, J.C. (2009). Unity in response to mystery: Uniting diverse views to plan worship. *Journal of Communication and Religion*, 32, 62 – 92.
- McEwin & Jacobsen-D'Arcy. (2002). Developing a scale to understand and assess the underlying motivational drives of volunteers in Western Australia: Final report. Perth:Lotterywest & CLAN WA Inc.
- McGregor, I., Nash, K., & Prentice, M. (2010). Reactive approach motivation (RAM) for religion, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 99 (1), 148–161.
DOI: 10.1037/a0019702.
- McKinney, W. & Hoge, R. (1983). Community and congregational factors in the growth and decline of protestant churches, *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 22, 51 -66.
Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1385591>.
- McMinn, M. R., Lish, R., Trice, P. D., Root, A. M., Gilbert, N., & Yap, A. (2005). Care for pastors: Learning from clergy and their spouses. *Pastoral Psychology*, 53(6), 563-581.
doi:10.1007/s11089-005-4821-y.
- Miller, K. (2006). *Organizational communication: Approaches and processes* (4th ed). Belmont, CA: Thomson.

- Miner, M. H., Dowson, M., & Sterland, S. (2010). Ministry orientation and ministry outcomes: Evaluation of a new multidimensional model of clergy burnout and job satisfaction. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83(1), 167-188.
- Neyrinck, B., Vansteenkiste, M., Lens, W., Duriez, B., & Hutsebaut, D. (2006). Cognitive, affective and behavioral correlates of internalization of regulations for religious activities. *Motivation and Emotion*, 30, 321–332.
- Papa, M. J., Daniels, T. D., & Spiker, B. K. (2008). *Organizational communication: Perspectives and trends*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Paragament, K., Steele, R. & Tyler, F. (1979). Religious participation, religious motivation and individual psychosocial competence, *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 18(4), 412-419.
- Pettegrew, H.K. (1993). The relationship of organizational climate factors and motivation and satisfaction among volunteers in evangelical protestant churches (Trinity Evangelical Divinity School). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 54 (07A), 2614. (Publication No. AAG 9334542).
- Pietro, D. (1996). What good are conferences, anyway? *Principal*, 75(4), 2122.
- Ryan, R. M., Rigby, S., & King, K. (1993). Two types of religious internalization and their relations to religious orientations and mental health. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 586–596.
- Ruthankoon, R. & Ogunlana, S.O. (2003). Testing Herzberg's two-factor theory in the Thai construction industry. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 10 (5), 333-342.

- Schermerhorn, J.R., Hunt, J.G., & Osborn, R.N. (2003). *Organizational Behavior: Instructor's Resource Guide. (8th ed.)*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Schwarz, N. (2012). Feelings as information. In Van Lange, P., Kruglanski, A., & Higgins, E. T.(eds.). *Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schwarz, N. & Clore, G. L. (1996). Feelings and phenomenal experiences. In, Higgins, E. T., & Kruglanski, A. W. (eds.). *Social psychology: Handbook of Basic Principles*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Scott, A. (2009). Consumption values along a faith continuum: exploring loyalty amidst dissatisfaction, *Indian Journal of Economics and Business*, special issue, 187-199. Retrieved from <http://www.freepatentsonline.com/article/Indian-Journal-Economics-Business/280093147.html> on April 26, 2012.
- Scott, C. R. (2007). Communication and social identity theory: Existing and potential connections in organizational identification research. *Communication Studies*, 58(2), 123-138. doi:10.1080/10510970701341063.
- Shockley-Zalabak, P. (2006). *Fundamentals of organizational communication: Knowledge, sensitivity, skills, values (6th Ed.)*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Starks, B. & Robinson, R. V. (2007). Moral cosmology, religion, and adult values for children, *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 46(1), 17–35.
- Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Shapiro, D. L. (2004). The future of work motivation theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 29(3), 379-387. doi:10.5465/AMR.2004.13670978

- Stewart, A. (2008). The workplace of the organized church: Theories of leadership and the Christian leader, *Culture and Religion: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 9 (3), 301-318. DOI: 10.1080/14755610802535645.
- Stoll, L & Petersen, L. (2008). Church growth and decline: A test of the market-based approach, *Review of Religious Research*, 49(3), 251-268.
- Sturgill, A. (2004). Scope and purposes of church web sites. *Journal of Media and Religion*, 3(3), 165-176. doi:10.1207/s15328415jmr0303_3.
- Syptak, J. M., Marsland, D. W., & Ulmer, D. (1999). Job satisfaction: Putting theory into practice. *Family Practice Management*, 6(9), 26. Retrieved April 26, 2012, from ABI/INFORM Global. (Document ID: 45841359).
- Thomas, J.N. & Olson, D. V. A. (2011). Testing the strictness thesis and competing theories of congregational growth, *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 49(4):619–639.
- Thompson, D., Hamilton, R. W., & Rust, R. T. (2005). Feature fatigue: when product capabilities become too much of a good thing. *Journal of Marketing Research (JMR)*, 42(4), 431-442. doi:10.1509/jmkr.2005.42.4.431.
- Underwood, D. (2002). *From Yahweh to Yahoo: the religious roots of the secular press*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.
- U. S. Census Bureau. American Fact Finder. (2010). *Profile of General Population and Housing Characteristics: 2010* (2010 Census Summary File 2: DP-1). Retrieved from http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=DEC_10_SF2_SF2DP1&prodType=table.

volunteer. (n.d.). *Online Etymology Dictionary*. Retrieved April 26, 2012, from Dictionary.com

website: <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/volunteer>.

Wood, O. R. (1973). An analysis of faculty motivation to work in the North Carolina community college system. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University, Raleigh.

Wren, D. A. (1972). *The evolution of management thought*. New York: Ronald Press Co.

Wrench, J. S.; Corrigan, M. W.; McCrosky, J. C.; & Punyanunt-Carter, N.M. (2006). Religious fundamentalism and intercultural communication: The relationships among ethnocentrism, intercultural communication apprehension, religious fundamentalism, homonegativity, and tolerance for religious disagreements. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 35(1), 23–44.

Zulick, M. D. (2003). Prophecy and providence: The anxiety over prophetic authority. *Journal of Communication and Religion*, 26, 195-207.