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ABSTRACT

PKs:
How Their Construction of Self is Affected by Their Parent’s Occupation

By
Stephanie Patterson
Master of Sociology

This paper examines how PKs (pastor’s kids) negotiate other’s expectations of them and the effect that being a PK has on the PKs’ construction and experience of their self. To examine the social world of PKs, as they view it, this project uses a grounded theory approach. I conducted eighteen open-ended interviews with PKs belonging to the same non-denomination Christian movement. In analyzing the interviews taken of PKs, this paper uses a dramaturgical perspective while also using role theory. The study finds that many PKs feel expectations to present themselves as spiritual leaders and examples to others in order to protect their parents’ professional image, or minister’s face. This minister’s face that PKs feel they must present for their parents, often gives PKs roles in church leadership and a certain amount of moral authority, which can often lead them down a path to become ministers themselves. Also, the analysis shows that the ambiguity between the minister’s personal and private life, creates role ambiguity with their children and can lead to PKs feeling their parents are physically, spiritually or emotionally unavailable. The social expectations placed on PKs by a minister’s face give PKs many motivations for presenting faith. However, displaying faith in order to
maintain minister’s face can create a lack of sincerity in a PK’s faith. If PKs feel expected or forced to be Christians, then they can rely more on surface acting for presenting faith instead of managing their faith.
PART ONE: INTRODUCTION
These children also were supposed to be the symbols of the nation’s ideal of first families. Often they had to live a lie, and, at tender ages before the world, had to grow up in the pitiless glare of the public eye where every failure would be magnified, every success attributed to their father's influence, not their own abilities. And their rage had to be especially suppressed “for the good of the country” (Carson 1984:534).

The passage above is a quote from a study on the children of U.S. presidents (Carson 1984). As this quote suggests, as a result of their parents’ authoritative position, presidents’ children must assume the role of examples to their country. With the public’s expectations in mind, these children are often subjected to the pressures and stresses of their parents’ influential position. Their identity becomes permanently viewed as the child of a president. In accordance with the change in their parents’ identity, the children’s identity is also altered, as they too become examples to the nation; indeed, they are expected to maintain an exemplary ideal for the good of their nation. This portrait demonstrates how a profession can become so merged into one’s personal life that it can hold the power to govern the identity that one's family takes for itself.

Occupations, such as those that take place in the public eye, can draw attention to the more personal aspects of a professional's life and, consequently, can greatly affect the lives of the professional's family as well. Government authorities, community leaders, celebrities, and even counselors express feeling a need to present their professional roles when they are off work because they are still surrounded by the public (Hochschild 1979; Cronkite 1981; Norrell 1989; Lee 1992). Yet, how does this professional role affect the professional's private life? How are the family members and their identities, roles and overall senses of self affected by the extension of a public occupation into the professional’s private sphere?
To help answer these questions, this paper seeks to specifically understand the way in which pastor’s kids (or PKs as they are commonly referred) negotiate other’s expectations of them and the effects that being a PK has on the PKs’ construction and experience of their self. There is very little research on the effects that ministers’ profession can hold on their families’ identities; and much of this literature tries to understand PKs through quantitative data. While that data does provide insight in the demography of PKs, it does not make it clear how those demographics play a role in the PK’s experience of self. Thus, this paper hopes to add more insight to the limited research done on how PKs are affected by their parents’ work.

The analysis begins with a review of literature that gives context to how the church minister's occupation affects the identity of his or her children, their relationships and their faith. Church ministers are leaders in their religious community and so are not only expected to govern their congregation to be more righteous, but are also expected to live as moral examples (Lee 1992). This expectation, along with being in the public eye, creates ambiguous boundaries between their work and family life (Hall 1997; Lee 1999; Lee and Iverson-Gilbert 2003). The children of ministers often feel expectations to lead exemplary lives in church and, like the presidents’ children, are expected to live as supportive players to their parents’ self-presentation as public professionals (Lanham 1990).

From the literature review, the methodology and theoretical orientation are then discussed. To examine the social world of PKs, as they view it, this project uses a grounded theory approach. I conducted eighteen open-ended interviews with PKs belonging to the same non-denomination Christian movement. In analyzing the
interviews taken of PKs, this paper uses a dramaturgical perspective while also using role theory. PKs can feel expectations placed on them about how they should act, feel and even what they should believe; and dramaturgical theorists show how social settings, such as congregational gatherings, give individuals social cues about how they are expected to present to others their self, emotions, and even their faith (Batson 1993; Goffman 1959; Hochschild 1983). Also, role theory is important in understanding how PKs’ construct their self. PKs’ parents play the role of ministers and often that role can become all encompassing and played even within one’s family. Role theory shows how encompassing roles can become part of one’s person and affect how others close to them, like their family, interpret their roles in relation to those encompassing roles (Turner 1990:87).

Following this I present an analysis of the data I collected from interviewing PKs. Chapter One discusses the expectations PKs can feel to live as moral examples. Chapter Two examines how PKs can often be viewed as leaders and feel expected to become ministers themselves. Chapter Three describes how a lack of role and emotional boundaries in a minister’s profession affects his or her children, the PKs. Chapter Four and Five examine how the expectations of being a PK can affect their conversion process and their management of faith after their conversion. And lastly, Chapter Six discusses how the expectations of being a PK can turn their management of faith into a form of labor for their parents’ job which, if not checked, can ultimately lead to an alienation from their faith.
PART TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW
The Church

The PKs for this study are all from the International Church of Christ Movement. This movement started in Boston, Massachusetts in 1979 with 30 followers led by Kip and Elena McKean (Jones and Lamb 1991). Over the course of 12 years it spread to every major city around the world (Jones and Lamb 1991).

The church refers to its members as “disciples” (Jones 1997: 11). In order to become a disciple, an individual “studies the Bible” with other disciples of the church. The Bible studies are lead using a study series that is described to “prepare a person to make a decision to total commitment to Christ and to his kingdom” (McKean 1997:10). After the Bible studies are finished, the individual participates in a baptism ceremony and becomes a disciple and member of the church (Jones 1997:16). New disciples are then encouraged to have “quiet times” which means spending “daily time in prayer and personal Bible study in order to strengthen their conviction and remain faithful to their initial commitment to God” (Stanback 2005:29). Likewise, once a person becomes a disciple, he or she is given a “discipleship partner” who, that person will meet up with at least once weekly to, “confess sins and share about emotional burdens, struggles and temptations” (Stanback 2005:31). After individuals become disciples, they are then encouraged to study the Bible with other individuals in order to help them become disciples as well (Jones 1997:11).

Ministers of this church movement are referred to as evangelists and elders (Jacoby 1994). Evangelists play the role of “preachers” to the church. And elders are described as “overseers” of the church (Jacoby 1994:104). Together both elders and evangelists make up the ministry leadership of the church.
PKs in this movement (children of elders and evangelists) are often expected to lead lives as exemplary disciples; not meeting those expectations can have a direct effect on their parents’ job as ministers. For example, elders “must be men of impeccable character with outstanding family qualifications” (Jacoby 1994:105). One of the major conditions of being an elder is that his children are believers (Tit. 1.6).

Also, evangelists have shown to be impacted professionally when their kids struggle with their faith. For example, Kip McKean, the founder and leader of this movement was significantly affected professionally as a minister when his children began to have spiritual doubts:

In the eyes of the membership McKean’s extremely influential position as the chief leader of the church was a trust contingent upon his maintenance of an exemplary life in every way. Up until that time he had succeeded with flying colors. He was responsible for forging a worldwide movement that had grown from thirty to 125,000 members and planted a church in nearly every nation of the world in only twenty years. His children had excelled spiritually, athletically, and academically. (Stanback 2005:121-122)

And yet when his daughter’s faith began to waiver and she stopped attending church services, the “legitimacy of his leadership was thrown into question” and part of the reason for his sabbatical was in order to “devote more time to his wife and children.” (Stanback 2005:121). Thus, the integrity of the ministry leadership has been shown to be directly affected by their children’s faith.

PKs

In contrast to the sociological studies done on ministers, very little research has been conducted to investigate the experience of minister’s children. Studies on ministers note the unique interconnectedness between the ministers’ profession and the minister’s
family (Campbell 1998; Lee 1992, 1999, 2003). However, there is limited research done on how family identification processes, specifically the children’s self-identification, is affected by this interconnectedness.

Cameron Lee (1992) provides one of the only studies done on PKs that focuses on how their identities are affected by their parents’ occupations. To examine this phenomenon, Lee uses open-ended interviews in order to obtain a broader understanding of the lives of PKs. He states that there is a natural interconnectedness between the pastor’s profession and his family. As a pastor is a direct example of the lessons preached to the rest of the congregation, so to the way in which the pastor’s family behaves has a direct affect on the authority and respectability that the pastor has within his profession (Lee 1992:16). Consequently, many PKs express that their parents’ position as pastors often means that not only are their parents respected as leaders and examples, but that they themselves are inevitably and involuntarily seen as an extension of these leadership positions (1992:90). Lee discusses how because of this conflation, a congregation can have high expectations for PKs to act a certain way. In comparison to other children, PKs report they are held to a “double standard.” They also express feeling expectations from other parents in church to act as models for the other children (Lee 1992:91). Consequently, when PKs make mistakes they report that their actions are magnified, and are regarded with more surprise; leading many PKs to feel that their every move is being watched and analyzed by the entire congregation (Lee 1992:36). Thus, while other parents’ professions have little effect on the identity of their children, Lee’s study finds that a pastor’s occupation can be a dominant characteristic of his or her child’s self-image (1992:19). Through Lee’s 1992 study of PK identities, certain themes
emerge: family boundary ambiguity, ways public professions affect families, lack of privacy, and the effects of stereotypes and expectations on PKs. Since research on PKs is limited, this literature review focuses on the main themes found in this study (Lee 1992).

**Ministers are Always on Call**

Work naturally becomes integrated in public and representative professionals’ private lives. By public and representative professions, I mean any occupation that holds authority and brings a focus of public attention. Many public and representative professionals labor as government officials, celebrities, and other community leaders or advisors. When occupations are more symbolic or representative by nature, there can be “a blur between official and nonofficial life and between representative and non-representative acts” (Hochschild 1969:75). Hochschild (1969) gives the example of how ambassadors are always working; even while playing tennis they are expected to act as government representatives. Another study similarly describes how church therapists are also “on the job.” As such, they must look outside of the church for their own personal support because they are always surrounded by potential clients at church (Hill and Mamalakis, 2001).

Public and representative professions must deal with how their private lives affect their professional roles. For example, a study by Gould finds that, “presidents send messages regarding family values and their own emotional priorities in how they treat their wife, their children, and their relatives” (Gould, 1990:678). What happens in their family has a direct effect on how they are seen professionally. As Hochschild states about ambassadors, “public and private life, leisure and work are finely woven into each other and bound to the pervasive diplomatic task” (1969:81). Representative or public
professional roles are expected to always be performed and so unlike many other professions, their professional and personal lives are intertwined; both roles are so interconnected that they must simultaneously co-exist. As a result, the more public and more representative the professional role, the more it is expected that the role always be presented.

The position of minister is both highly public and representative for its church community. As a result, ministers may often be expected to act and behave in a way that is in line with what is expected of a minister and so may be seen as always being “on-call” (Norrell 1989:338). They are often characterized as having ambiguous work boundaries (Frame and Shehan 1994). How a minister acts in his personal life is often seen as a living example for others in the church to imitate. As one study describes, “what church members see (or think they see!) of the minister’s family life can easily tarnish the idealized image of their spiritual leader” (Lee 1992:17). Mace and Mace write, ministers are “almost obsessed with the feeling that they are expected to be superhuman, to provide models for the congregation and community” (1980:41). As the representatives of the church, ministers may be expected to always present themselves as such, and so are never “off” from their work role as a minister.

If ministers are expected to always play the minister role, then other parts of their personal life can get neglected. As one study states, for any “emotional, spiritual or social support” a religious leader receives from a community, they must likewise consider how that support is affecting them professionally (Hill and Mamalakis, 2001). Likewise, another study comments that many ministers are afraid to seek help from others because they fear being viewed as weak (Orthner et al., 1987:41). Ministers
seeking assistance in any area of their lives inevitably affects how they are viewed as ministers. And the all-encompassing element of the minister role leads ministers to experience increased levels of stress (Gross 1989). Thus, the minister role can make it difficult, and even stressful, for ministers to deal with the personal elements of their lives.

Constantly playing a role as spiritual leader can also be experienced as very lonely. One study shows that 40% of pastors feel high levels of psychological loneliness and isolation (Orthner 1986:64). Similarly, church therapists frequently report feeling isolation and also feeling that they must be guarded in most of their relationships within the church community because anyone can be a potential client (Faulkner and Faulkner 1997; Geyer 1994). Both ministers and church therapists in these studies can feel their public professional role is all encompassing and so it is difficult for them to personally connect with others.

**Family Boundary Ambiguity in Ministers’ Families**

There are ambiguous lines between the family and the ministry and there are no clear boundaries of when a minister is on or off work (Lee, 1992). As a result, many clergy families must deal with “family boundary ambiguity.” Family boundary ambiguity is defined as “the family not knowing who is in and who is out of the system. The family may perceive a physically absent member as psychologically present or a physically present member as psychologically absent. In either case, the family boundary is ambiguous” (Boss and Greenburg 1984:535). Many different types of families experience family boundary ambiguity (BA), including families that deal with illness, caregiving, death, etc. Additionally, multiple studies done on family boundary ambiguity
show that boundaries between work and family roles prevent stress, and depression (Boss and Greenberg 1984). Clearer boundaries have been shown to prevent spillover of negative emotions from one role to the next (Edwards and Rothbard 2000).

In a comprehensive review of boundary ambiguity, it has shown to be an ongoing theme with clergy families (Buckmiller et al., 2007). Often the minister’s family experiences this lack of clear boundaries between themselves and the minister’s congregation (Lee 1992 and 1999). Members of the congregation can often interrupt the pastor at home with legitimate needs, but do so at the cost of the family’s sense of self-containment. One PK from Lee’s study, states that often her family could never successfully spend time together without someone calling or coming over with some issue to discuss and interrupting her family’s time together (Lee 1992:37). Likewise, the congregation is likely to give increased attention to the happenings in the lives of PKs and expect PKs to act and behave in a way that is appropriate for their parent’s position (Lee 1992:44). As Lee observes that the “clergy family life cannot be understood apart from the quality of the family’s relationship to the congregation”; they are interconnected (1999: 479). Thus, this interconnectedness between the congregation and the clergy family, results in family members experiencing boundary ambiguity between their lives and the congregation.

As a public family, clergy families often experience a lack of privacy. Many family members report feeling constantly watched by others (Hall 1997; Lee1992). For example, U.S. presidents’ families are described as living in a “fishbowl-like” environment (Rosebush 1987:86; Watson, 2000). Likewise, PKs go through a similar experience. As Lee describes, a minister’s family members express feeling as if they are
growing up in a “glass house” (1992:31). The curiosity that the public, or the congregation, displays about a public family may result in boundaries being crossed and sense of privacy compromised. For instance, in Lee’s study one PK reports that a member of the congregation was caught going through her closet; another PK reports feeling that she was meticulously being watched by neighboring congregation members when her boyfriend would leave her house at night (1992:32-33). The curiosity that the community can have for public families often results in family members feeling that their personal privacy is being violated.

A lack of clear boundary lines between work and family life has been shown to have a negative effect on the health and well being of the minister’s family (Lee 1992, 1999; Lee and Iverson-Gilbert 2003). One study (Lee and Iverson-Gilbert 2003) shows that more congregational demands result in lower life satisfaction and well being for the minister, and a higher likelihood of the minister becoming burned-out. Likewise, the study also concludes that factors such as boundary ambiguity and family criticism from the congregation have a negative effect on a minister’s family life’s welfare (Lee and Iverson-Gilbert 2003). This research study and others like it suggest that the interconnectedness of a minister’s personal life with the congregation strongly affects the minister’s family, and without clear boundaries the effect is often a restriction on family autonomy, independence, and well-being.

While some research illustrates the constraints of having boundary ambiguity between a minister’s work and family, studies show that other factors can counteract the negative effects congregational demands may have on a clergy family. For example, demands of a congregation become significantly less stressful when those demands are
accompanied by social support from the congregation (Lee and Iverson-Gilbert 2003). Research (Campbell 1998; Lee and Iverson-Gilbert 2003) suggests that PKs are also more likely to rate their experiences as a PK as very good when they have both parents available. A study by Lee similarly states, “the parishioners’ influence on pastors’ kids appears to be secondary to the quality of the foundation and ongoing support provided by the parents” (1992:179). Thus, research suggests that the negative effects of stress and demands from the minister’s job can be offset when PKs experience parental availability and social support from the congregation.

Very little research on minister’s family boundary ambiguity has been done from the perspective of the family members. As one study of family boundary ambiguity within clergy concludes, “family stress might be indirectly inferred from this data, [but] further studies should incorporate data drawn directly from family members” (Lee 2003:256). Thus, while there is a significant amount of literature on family boundary ambiguity with clergy families, there is a need for more research on how family members are personally affected by and experience these social circumstances.

The Effects of Being a Supportive Player for a Public Professional

For public professionals, family is seen as a key component in their impression management (Gillespie 1980, Lee 1992, Cronkite 1981). Impression management is defined as the process by which people attempt to influence the image that others have of them (Giacalone et al. 1995, Goffman 1959). Research has examined that ways in which family members, their image and comportment, are important components of a public professional’s impression management. For example, Gillespie studies politicians as
public professionals and states, "the wife has long been a crucial, if unacknowledged, sociological component of a leader's 'political self-presentation'" (1980: 110). She goes on to say, that for politicians, the public wife becomes a vehicle for displaying legitimacy and authority through the family. Gillespie states that family represents, "stability and validity" (111). The family displays the public person's morality and so the actions of one’s family must be line with that impression management.

Family is expected to live as "supportive players" for the public professionals’ presentation of self. As Gillespie describes, "the public wife's contribution in this impression-strategy must assure viewers that the private life of her husband is ‘in control;' his public persona will not suddenly crack and allow an embarrassing 'scene' to emerge" (Gillespie 1980:111). The spouse is expected to act in a way that supports the politician’s public self. As such, public spouses are often expected to help manage the public image of a politician through “indirect channels” so they do not give off the impression that they are too powerful (Watson 2000). Thus, in the situation of a public figure, their impression management can become their spouse’s job as well.

Family members can feel as if they are also always “on call” to maintain the public figure’s impression management. Hochschild (1969) describes how ambassadors’ wives are expected to always play a “vicarious role” for their husbands’ jobs. They are expected to host and entertain certain people that are politically relevant and always carry themselves as representatives of their government. She states that for ambassador’s wives, while they have no official role or title, carry “privileges, obligations, and restrictions … [that] … nonetheless constitute a full-time ‘vicarious role,’ similar to that of the wives of high military officials, politicians, government officials, college
presidents, and ministers” (1969:75). Because of the nature of their husbands’ jobs, these wives are expected to lead and perform their own unofficial full-time jobs as public professionals’ wives. As one study of presidential families describes, the role of the president’s wife, while unofficial, is also a “well-defined position with powerful constraints” (Troy 2000). Though unofficial, being the wife of a public professional can be more demanding than an actual full time job.

It can be difficult for family members to find their individual identity when there are work expectations for how their family should behave. Often family members can feel trapped into derived identities, a “sense of self that is overly influenced by and dependent upon relationships with significant others” (Lanham 1990:23). The feeling of being forced into an identity can create a lot of role conflict for family members. As one study on clergy burnout indicates, “[it] produced confusion and pain when one, or more family members feel forced to conform to a lifestyle that is congruent with personal intentions and calling” (Rediger 1982:6). Clergy families can feel they must fit the most personal parts of themselves, like their faith, within the confines of ministry expectations. Similarly, another study shows that wives, whose identities are dependent on their husbands’ ministry, express experiencing lower self-esteem (Lanham 1990). Thus, clergy families deal with difficulty if they do not take on a derived identity, while simultaneously face feeling a lack of self-worth if they do.

Though most literature studies how spouses are affected by having a public professional in the family, all family members must work to preserve their family’s public image. As Hochschild states, “in general, the closer the association, and usually also the more equal to him in status, the more the associate shares his representative
function” (1969: 75). The children of public figures are very close in association and so often find themselves performing their own “vicarious role” for their parents’ professional image. For example, children of public figures, such as famous actors, athletes or politicians, are often significantly affected by the notoriety of their parent’s profession. These children express feeling defined by who their parents are and have expressed difficulty in trying to create their own identity (Cronkite, 1981).

There is very little research on children of celebrities and public representatives, which can, at least partially, be attributed to the difficulties of studying a population “upwards,” studying higher social classes (Nader, 1969; Hertz and Imber, 1995). Kathy Cronkite (1981), herself a celebrity’s offspring, discusses the difficulty of studying this demographic, “the children of politicians were even more cautious and protective than the Hollywood kids. Some, like the Kennedys, have an almost impenetrable shield of advisors, managers, and secretaries” (1981:23). While a public position can give family members the least amount of privacy, it can equally produce family members that desire to maintain what privacy they have. This makes it very difficult to study how family members, especially children, are affected.

Although there is a significant amount of literature on how an occupation affects a parent-child relationship, most studies emphasize how the relationship affects the parents, and less on how a parents’ occupation affects the child (Kopelman et al., 1983). One subject that does have some literature on the effects that parents’ occupation has on their child’s identity is with children of ministers and pastors. As Thomas Maeder writes:

Religion and psychotherapy are not merely occupations… nor are they professions easily left at the office when one goes home. Both are philosophical systems deeply concerned with the daily lives and social interactions of people; and in both cases their practitioners are expected, to
a greater or lesser extent, to embody, the principles they espouse. Their jobs become inseparable from their identities, and therefore become part of their families’ identities as well. (1989:49)

As Maeder discusses, the identity of a ministers’ family can become affected as well. In many instances, the way the family identifies itself is interlinked with, and expected to support, the obligations of the minister’s position.

PKs also experience expectations to be supportive players for their parents’ professional image. As one study describes, ministers, “are under pressure to perform, to be super-spiritual, to give leadership, etc., and they pass these same pressures on to their children by extension” (Bouma 1979:69). How well a family is able to fulfill these expectations can either strengthen or weaken the public professional’s image (Beasley, 2005). As exemplified in Lee’s study, one PK recalls how a church member scolded him for acting inappropriately as a PK, while simultaneously that church member’s son was doing the same thing (1992:87). Much like spouses, the children of public figures (like PKs) are key components in their parents’ professional impression management.

**Stereotypes**

In public and representative professions, family members can often feel expectations they must live as ideals for that position or even feel stereotyped by that position. A stereotype is an oversimplified set of beliefs about people from a certain group in society (Haslam et al. 2002). Stereotyping affects the family members’ relationships and identities (Hochschild 1996; Lee 1992). And it can be difficult for family members to separate the stereotypes they experience from their own identity (Lee 1992:71). Family members can also feel expected to act accordingly with the stereotypes
they are associated with (Lee 1992; Hochschild 1996). For example, ambassadors’ spouses often feel they must constantly act as representatives of American-like behavior. In her study of ambassador’s spouses Hochschild states,

The requirements for being considered typically American should, according to the State Department Newsletter, touch not only one's behavior, but one's attitudes, values, and personality. Either attitudes must accord with behavior, or real attitudes must be acceptable (1969:77).

Hochschild goes on to say that how the ambassador and his or her spouse act will be seen as what all Americans do and be compared to as stereotypical of Americans. Thus, the ambassador and his or her spouse experience expectations to conform their attitudes, values and personality to positive American stereotypes.

PKs must also often deal with stereotypes. One study (Bayer et al. 1972) states that children of clergy are usually stereotyped as: 1) academically superior with firm moral character and a commitment to serve humankind; 2) rebellious against their parents and against their parents’ religion; 3) or lastly as social outcasts. Likewise, Lee (1992) states that often PKs report being stereotyped as either “rebels” or “saints.” Either they are “saints” who are expected to be an example for others, have a lot of biblical knowledge, and basically live a life free from sin; or they are expected to be “rebels” who oppose the church and live crazy reckless lives of partying. Such stereotypes are difficult for PKs since most fail to fit into just one category, yet can experience pressure to do so. Ironically, some PKs report feeling subjected to both stereotypes simultaneously: there are some people who expect rebellion, while others expect flawlessness (1992:83).

How do PKs react to these stereotypes? Lee states that the expectations of perfection can cause PKs to “rebel” in the first place (1992:71). Other PKs report trying to maintain the image of being a “saint” in the church, while secretly also leading double
lives that reflect very little of what the church approves. Still others report trying to avoid being stereotyped one way or the other by attempting to stay as anonymous to the church as possible (1992:71). However a PK may choose to respond to stereotypes, these social expectations can make it difficult for PKs to find their own identity.

In conclusion, though the research on different elements of PKs’ lives, such as identity, presentation of self, stress, stereotyping, impression management and boundary ambiguity, is sparse, there is a good amount of research done on related social positions and roles, such as ambassadors, celebrities, politicians and their families. The profession of minister has no clear lines that separate the minister’s private life from work. As such, much of the literature shows that family boundary ambiguity is a prevalent topic when studying clergy family. The research shows that family boundary ambiguity can lead to negative effects such as lower life satisfaction and greater likelihood for burnout. However, the research also shows that social support from the congregation and parental availability has a counteracting affect on family boundary ambiguity.

Because of the public aspect of the minister’s role, the family identity is interconnected with that of the profession. The family is expected to be supportive players for the minister’s presentation of self. The family’s example often holds a direct effect on the credibility of a minister’s job. As a result, public families can feel defined by a profession’s image and expectations. They can feel their sense of self forced to be defined by the constraints of the public job, or feel stereotyped or boxed into a certain expected identity. Thus, the majority of the literature demonstrates how powerfully the profession of minister can affect the identity of PKs.
PART THREE: THEORETICAL ORIENTATION
Social surroundings give individuals cues and meaning to how they perceive themselves in a society. Through these cues, individuals can assess how others perceive they should be, act and even feel. For PKs, they grow up immersed in church “society.” Much of their parents’ lives are affected by their position as ministers and, so as a result, PKs’ lives are affected as well. The church’s expectations of how a minister should act, as a leader and a father, directly affects how PKs interpret how they are expected to be as the minister’s child. Thus, to understand how their parents’ position affects PKs, it is best to examine their experience through the lens of theories that outline how the self is shaped by society. In this study, specific emphasis is placed upon dramaturgical and role theory perspectives.

Dramaturgical theory (Goffman, 1959) describes how one presents one’s actions, feelings and even one’s self to guide and control the impression others form of one’s self-identity. Role theory describes how a role is a group of “behaviors and attitudes that are thought to belong together” to form a consistent performance (Turner 2002:233). Taken together, these theories allow us to examine how PKs’ identity, actions, and feelings are affected by the social circumstance of having parents as ministers.

Minster Role-Person Merger and PKs’ Role-Taking

The ambiguity and all-encompassing qualities of the minister role make it a role that easily merges with one’s person. As stated in the literature review, the occupation of the minister has no clear boundaries between the professional and private life (Lee, 1992). As a result, the role of minister can seem like one that must continuously be
presented since ministers are expected to be examples in all areas of their lives. When one fails to compartmentalize their role, Turner states that others will view “a particular role as accurately revealing a person” (1978:6). That is, the subject will continue to play a role even when the role does not apply. As Turner exemplifies, “the professional who carries the office bearing an air of authority into family and community dealings has become to a considerable degree the professional role played at work” (1978:3). For instance, this occurs when a minister still plays the role of a minister when he is dealing with his children. When ministers are unable to compartmentalize their role, then that role merges with their person.

If ministers are always playing the role of minister, then how do their children interpret their PK role in relation to their parents’ role performance? The role of the PK is one that exists in relation to the role of the minister. As Turner states, "a role cannot exist without one or more relevant other-roles towards which it is originated" (1990:87). It is not that individuals simply have a prescribed role, but individuals must decide their performance based on how they interpret the other-role, and so they are "role-taking.” For example, the role of "husband" cannot exist without the role of “wife.” Likewise, PKs understand their own role through also knowing the role their parents are expected to perform. Ministers are often expected by their congregations to lead by example in all areas of their life. If the ministers’ role includes being exemplary parents, then how do PKs interpret their role as sons or daughters of exemplary parents? If a minister takes on the role of spiritual leaders to the community, then how does the PK interpret the significance of a religious role on his or her own person? By understanding how PKs
interpret their parents' roles as ministers, one can better understand how PKs interpret their own roles as ministers' children.

The unclear boundary lines of the profession of minister, along with the expectations of being an example of what is preached, make it very difficult to find instances where a minister is not expected to be in the role of minister. Yet if the role of PK originates from a parental and professional role that is all encompassing, then PKs may in turn interpret their PK role to likewise be all-encompassing. If the role of PK does feel over-bearing then it can be difficult for PKs to interpret their beliefs, attitudes, sense of self, or emotions outside of this role.

**The PK's Self**

Goffman (1959) observes that individuals constantly use “impression management” techniques to control how others view the self they are displaying. Individuals will examine the social setting and audience in order to better understand the selves they are expected to present (1959:27). Though individuals may attempt to present their “real” selves, those selves are largely made up of the social rules set by the audience, or reference group, around them. Goffman refers to individuals as being performers and states that individuals present “the role we are striving to live up to” and that that is our “truer self” (1959:19). He claims that some performers are sincere and they believe the presentation they give as a reality; while other performers are more cynical and aware that they are putting on a show. Yet, no matter how sincere or cynical the performer is, everyone is performing to be the person they feel they are expected to be (1959:18).
This concept of one’s self-presentation for others is exemplified in Lee’s study on PKs. Lee states,

The difficulty for many PKs in their struggle for identity is that they often feel more like actors in a play than real people. It can feel as if the part has been written and the script set, with little tolerance for improvisation. The role expectations can be so rigidly defined that the PKs feel as if they are not allowed thoughts, feelings, or the right to define personal boundaries. It is the difference between feeling loved and respected for who you are, as opposed to being loved for the role you play in someone else’s life (1992:35).

As Lee exemplifies, much of the PK’s life can feel exactly like a play to be performed. In terms of reference group, or audience, PKs often grow up in the church and even maintain their friends and peers within the church. In terms of social roles, much of their role can come from being the child of a minister, and in terms of social norms, their parents are often preaching those norms to the church collective. Thus, much of PKs’ role-taking repertoire and sense of self can be derived from being born the child of a minister. As long as their reference group is the church it can be increasingly difficult for PKs to see any reality for themselves outside of being a PK.

To further Goffman’s theory of the self, Batson (1993) specifically examines the affects that social influences have on a person’s faith. From Goffman, Batson states three concepts – social roles, social norms and reference groups – as having a strong influence on individuals’ behavior in a religion. He uses the example of religious groups, like the Hare Krishnas, to show the power social influences have on an individual. New converts are encouraged to live with the group, spend a lot of time with the group, and give up all personal possessions and money. As a result, the converts have new social roles, norms and a reference group, which makes resisting adopting the group’s sense of reality somewhat difficult. Using Goffman’s theory, Batson shows that social support systems
have a powerful effect on individuals; so powerful, that often converts are viewed as being “brainwashed” (1993:32). The more one’s social influences are tied with one’s religion, the easier it is for that religion to form a person’s social roles, norms and become that person’s reference group, which in turn becomes that person’s reality. Therefore, understanding the culture of the congregation and how much the congregation and the family make up the PK’s reference group can give a better understanding of how PKs form their reality and identity.

The Line PKs Must Take

PKs grow up feeling high expectations and pressures on them to be examples and leaders in their church community. How these pressures socially affect them can be better understood by examining Goffman’s theory of “face.” Goffman (1967) discusses the power that expectations, or perceptions, of a person can have on that person’s identity. He states individuals will act in accordance to the way in which they see their setting, including those individuals in the setting and themselves. Goffman refers to this display from individuals as “taking a line” (1967:5). When “taking a line” individuals must consider the way in which others think of them, or the expectations others have for them, and then act in accordance to that image. Goffman refers to the image one perceives they have been given as their “face,” which he describes as “the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact” (1967:5). Thus, an individual will try to stay “in line” with the social “face” that he or she has. This face represents the image that individuals want to live up to that they believe others attribute to them. If individuals are not able to stay
in line with the face they have been given, then Goffman refers to them as having “lost face” with their community.

The expectations that PKs feel from their parents’ position can make it very easy for them to feel they have a face with which they must stay in line. Lee’s study (1992) recalls one PKs perception of having to maintain a certain image:

No preacher’s child can ever have a feeling of anonymity. Even now, as a woman, when I walk into a strange church two thousand miles from home, I can feel eyes directed toward me and hear a whispered echo, “That’s the preacher’s daughter.” And from that moment every move must befit such a niche in life (21). If PKs feel they must act according to what is expected of a “preacher’s daughter,” then their actions and sense of self must fit the face they feel they must uphold; otherwise, they can risk losing face not only for themselves, but also for their parents.

Emotion Work and Faith

As PKs are surrounded by social rules for governing their face, their self, and their role, there are likewise social rules for governing their feelings as well. Arlie Hochschild (1983) shows the effects that social surroundings have on the feelings of individuals. Hochschild states that social factors affect the labeling, interpreting and managing of emotions (57). She contends that individuals will: 1.) experience feelings, then 2.) determine if their feelings are “appropriate” according to the social cues, or "feeling rules" and, lastly, 3.) try to manage those feelings accordingly. In the social setting of the church, emotion plays a large role in the expectations of the church members. PKs can feel expectations to manage their emotions situationally as they develop and manage their faith.
How does one deal with discrepancies between what one should feel and what one actually feels? Hochschild states that when individuals attempt to control their feelings, they must go through "emotion work", the “act of trying to change in degree or quality an emotion or feeling” (1983:561). For example, when someone says they are trying to “psych themselves up,” in these moments the individual is conscious of a discrepancy between what one wants to feel and what one actually feels. Individuals often become aware of feeling rules through discussions of what is and is not appropriate to feel (58). For instance, when one says, "you have a right to feel this way" a feeling rule is being given. When one has a “misfeeling,” others may give a rule reminder of the proper way to feel. Through “misfeelings” individuals are able to understand the feelings they are called on to experience. Similarly, church can be a place that has many rules about how one should feel about their faith. Through growing up in the church and among the church leaders, PKs can be very conscious of what those feeling rules are and how they should feel in certain situations. However, the question becomes how much of their emotions match the feeling rules they perceive around them? And if their feelings do not match, then in what way do they use "emotion work" to change those feelings?

Hochschild (2001) discusses the way in which emotion management can be used as a commodity in customer service jobs. Emotion management is defined as changing one’s feelings to fit the situation (2001:13). She studies flight attendants and how they are expected to always smile and adjust their emotions to the convenience of the passengers. When one uses their emotion work in their profession as a commodity, Hochschild refers to their work as "emotion labor" (200). Similarly to flight attendants, there is a significant amount of feeling rules by which ministers are expected to govern their
emotions. Their actions are not only observed, but also are their reactions and emotions to issues of faith. Since many ministers can feel called to their profession, they can feel little effort is needed to produce expected faith emotions. However, as seen in the literature, their children’s faith can affect their professional credibility. PKs are born into those expectations of faith and yet failure to meet those expectations can cause harm to their parents’ jobs and reputations. For instance, if PKs do not feel they desire a relationship with God, then what message does that send to the rest of the congregation about how their parents are doing as spiritual leaders? As a result, PKs’ faith can be used as a commodity for their parent’s job.

Hochschild also states that when individuals exchange different parts of themselves as a commodity, they can often become estranged from what they have exchanged. As Hochschild states, “if we can become alienated from goods in a goods-producing society, we can become alienated from service in a service-producing society” (2001:7). In public-contact jobs, emotion management can be used as a commodity of labor. This often leads to emotion management becoming “standardized and unavoidable” according to Hochschild (2001:186). As a result, when individuals use their emotions as a commodity, they run the risk of becoming alienated from their emotions. If PKs use emotional labor in order to support their parents' job as ministers, then it is possible for this labor to alienate PKs from their emotions or even from their faith.

Through examining PK’s experience from a dramaturgy and role theory perspective, we are able to better understand how their actions, roles, self and even faith is affected by what they perceive from their social surroundings. How PKs perceive their
parents’ role as ministers, directly affects the role PKs take as their children. Similarly, Goffman shows how the selves people perform are often shaped by their social environment. Social environments, like a church, can often shape one's reality, role performances, and sense self.

Goffman also argues that in social settings, individuals are given a “face” they must uphold. As ministers are given an elevated social face to uphold in the church, PKs can feel they are given a face with high social value that they must always stay in line with, protecting not only their own face but also that of their parents. These role performances can also shape the emotions PKs feel. Growing up in the church and under the public eye, PKs are often very aware of the feeling rules in church and how they are expected to feel about their faith. Not following certain feeling rules about faith can lead to damaging their parents' position in the church and so can lead to PKs managing their feelings, and then becoming alienated from their feelings. It is clear that the social situation of the PK is one that involves considerable emotional and identity management. By analyzing PKs experiences from their own perspectives, this study hopes to help us better understand the social and emotional circumstance of being a child of a minister.
PART FOUR: METHODOLOGY
This study examines the perspective of the PKs by investigating their social world and how their behavior, self, faith, emotions and relationships are affected by that world. This study is inductive and it applies a grounded approach (Becker et al. 1961).

However, while the theory and themes of this study stem from the analysis of data it does not completely follow the guidelines of grounded theory, e.g. the survey questions were gathered from themes in the literature review (Charmaz 2001). Eighteen confidential interviews with ministers’ children were conducted and recorded. Afterwards, the transcripts were coded and recurring themes were analyzed.

The Sample

While Lee’s study examined PKs from many different denominations, my study samples PKs solely from a particular Christian movement that defines itself as non-denominational and has churches all over the world. My reasoning in only sampling one particular church movement is as follows: first, the religious practices of faith in this church are particularly social which means PKs are more self-conscious of their experiences. And second, I am a member of this movement and so understand much of the subculture within it.

The origin of this religious movement started in 1979 and was led primarily by college students (Stanback 2005). This sample of PKs is part of the second generation of this movement. Many of the parents of these PKs helped to establish the doctrinal practices and ideals of the church. Thus, some of the older PKs interviewed were held to be examples not only for their church peers, but also for the entire church movement.

How these PKs were parented was important because they could set precedent for how
the entire church parented and their behavior could set the example for the second generation to model. Thus, especially for the older PKs interviewed, the social pressures they felt could be quite extreme.

One of the reasons I chose my sample from this church is because of the social nature of many of their religious practices. The process of salvation consists of having Bible studies with members of the church and then a baptism ceremony (Jones 1997:11). Only after baptism is a person considered a member of the congregation. This salvation process is considerably more social than, say “praying Jesus into your heart,” which is a much more private practice for obtaining salvation; but this process also can be much more difficult to specifically recall. Likewise, the church promotes having more personal relationships with one another in which members are expected to confess and be open with each other about their lives while also holding them accountable to what they profess (Jones 1997:63). For example, it is commonly practiced for one member to regularly ask the other about how their “quiet times” (e.g. personal daily times with God) are going and give help in improvement when needed (Jones 1997:26). As a result, members tend to be much more socially conscious of their faith since they regularly practice expressing how they are doing. Thus, the social nature of religious practices in this church makes it easier for PKs to recall specific incidents and how they were affected.

The other reason I chose this church is because I am a member, and thus know and understand much of the subculture within it. Indeed, while I am not a minister’s child and only observe this phenomenon as an outsider, I am an insider to the church culture that surrounds the minister’s children and have observed how minister’s children
grow up in church. Being somewhat of an insider allows me to observe the social dynamics that affect minister’s children; and so also be familiar with the church history and how that could have affected individual experience. As an insider to the church, I was also able to ask specific questions that an outsider would not know to ask. For example, having “quiet times” everyday or dating only “believers” are examples of doctrine that are not readily spoken of with an outsider. These parts of church culture are usually only discussed with outsiders in Bible studies. Since the church culture has various nontraditional views, a participant can find it difficult to explain important events with those who are outside the church dynamic. As a member, I tried to allow PKs to freely discuss events without feeling judged, condemned or forced to alter their response to be more relatable to outsiders.

However, as an insider to the church culture, I tried to prohibit my own preconceived notions from limiting the knowledge I gained during the interviews. Similar to how the interviewers who collected data for the General Social Survey needed to maintain their equilibrium and move on in their interviews (Converse and Schuman 1974), I had to consciously suppress judgment of those who had alternate views of the church’s subculture. Likewise, being a member in the church may have affected what the subjects confided or did not confide in me. Those within the church may have wanted to avoid getting too personal because, in many cases, we are in similar social circles; or they may have wanted to display a positive image of the church and their parents because I was a part of their parents’ congregation and under their parents' leadership. Similarly, the few among the interviewed that have left the church may have neglected to fully express themselves out of the fearful assumption that I would reject their perspective. I
assured each respondent that I would keep everything they discussed completely confidential and would not discuss what they said with other church members.

The ministers for the church are referred to as *elders* and/or *evangelists*; these positions are usually paid staff positions and those holding those positions are regarded as spiritual authorities. As opposed to other studies (Rediger 1982; Lee 1992; Campbell 1998; Lee and Iverson-Gilbert 2003) I am also including elders’ children since elders hold a higher level of authority in this church movement than they usually do in other church movements (Jacoby 1994:4). Elders in this church are often on staff and their positions are seen to be dependent on their children’s behavior and faith (Jacoby 1994). Though leaders in this church are referred as evangelists and elders, this study refers to their children as pastors’ kids or PKs since PKs is a more widely used term in literature. Plus, evangelists or elders could also be referred to as pastors for their congregation.

In order to locate the PKs I wished to interview, I used convenience sampling (Miller 1997) and I asked minister’s children with whom I am acquainted. I also used snowball sampling (Miller 1986) and I asked those that I interviewed if they would be willing to suggest others who could participate in my study. I met with most interviewees in a public and casual setting, like coffee shops, while some interviews were conducted at homes or a work office at the interviewees’ convenience. All interviews were face-to-face and I openly tape recorded the entire interview. The interviews that were conducted at home did not have parents or others nearby who could hear our discussion, though a few interviewees had their small children in the same room as them. When conducting the interviews, I let the interviewees know that I was doing a study of minister’s children
for my thesis and that the focus was on bettering the understanding of their social world and experiences.

The Respondents

Eighteen interviews were done with ministers’ kids. All interviewees have grown up with a parent who is or has been employed as a leader in this Christian movement. This study tries to take a more grounded approach to interviewing by trying to allow key issues to emerge instead of forcing them from preconceived categories. I used a list of 15 broad, open-ended questions that address the themes in the literature review such as boundary ambiguity, stereotypes, and parental availability. I tried not to let these categories limit my findings. Instead, by opening the interview with broader questions such as “What is your overall experience as being a minister’s child?” or “What are some of the positives and negatives to being a minister’s child?” I tried to conduct the majority of my interview through follow-up questions and attempts to dig deeper into the social world that they believe makes up their lives as PKs. When I was unable to successfully use follow-up questions, I then would ask questions pertaining to the issues discussed in the literature such as pressures and stereotypes. Likewise, topics that seemed to be significant themes from earlier interviewees’ experiences I would bring up in later interviews. In doing so, I hoped that my literature review would not strictly guide my interviews and, thus, possibly disregard certain issues that the PKs found important and unique to their experiences. The interview questions I used are included in Appendix A.

At the conclusion of the interviews, I transcribed them in their entirety. Then, I coded the interviews and begin to look for common themes among the PKs’ individual
experiences. While coding I also wrote memos in order to probe the data and develop ideas that I could include in my paper. Some of the main themes that came up in coding were: expectations for PKs to live as examples and leaders; how their behavior and faith affected their parents’ credibility; family boundary ambiguity; how church expectations affected their faith; and leading a double life.

Those interviewed are from the same church movement, however many grew up in different states and in different countries. Since ministers’ kids are often known to many in the church community, giving a brief description of them with pseudonyms would still not ensure confidentiality; instead, overall demographics of participants in the study are given. Of those interviewed, twelve are members of this church and six are either part of another denomination or no longer go to a church. Twelve are male, and six are female. In terms of age, three are between the ages of 18 and 19, four are between the ages of 20-24, four are between the ages of 25-29 and five are thirty or over. And in terms of race, sixteen are white, and three are Hispanic.

Some PKs could fear that by disclosing certain aspects of their private life, they would inevitably compromise their reputation, their parents’ reputation and potentially their parents’ job. Consequently, in order to protect the interviewees I have changed their names and the names of the people and places mentioned. In some cases, I have changed an interviewee’s name several times throughout the discussion of the results to protect the identity of the interviewee, as one event used may be widely known throughout the church while the other event is a great deal more private.
PART FIVE: FINDINGS

CHAPTER ONE: MINISTER’S RULES
As children of moral leaders, PKs are expected to live by minister’s rules, a set of expectations that hold them to be moral examples of how one should behave as a leader of the church. The expectations to live by these rules come from their parents being held to the same standard. Many PKs express feeling that their parents govern them to live by minister’s rules. By living according to minister’s rules, PKs help their parents uphold a minister’s face, an image that a church minister claims for her or himself of being a church example in every area of life. However, for a minister to present him or her self as an example in every area of life would mean that his or her family is also exemplary. Thus, a minister’s family is also expected to present themselves as exemplary in order for the minister to keep in line with a minister’s face. However, the better PKs are at upholding minister’s face for their parents, the more they start to take on responsibilities in the church and so can start to be seen as church ministers themselves with their own minister’s face to uphold.

The Minister’s Children and the Minister’s Profession

Ministers are expected to lead by example. Their personal lives must reflect the doctrine they advocate. As Lee explains in his study of PKs, ministers “must also take on the role of being an example as a Christian, a spouse and a parent” (Lee 1992:16). Ministers are community leaders and are in the public eye, though that public may only be a small congregation. As such, very personal aspects of ministers’ lives, such as their relationship with their family and their relationship with God, are intertwined with their professional credibility.
Accordingly, as the minister’s family affects the profession, the profession also affects the family. In my interviews, many PKs describe a link between their own personal lives and their parents’ professional lives. As three ministers’ children state:

… I remember just really thinking through, ‘oh if I was to leave God’ or ‘if I was to, you know, go off the deep end here, he would lose his job. It’s one of the qualifications of being an elder, [that] all their kids have faith. And so I just remember certain times, I don’t think it was a huge fear that was always over my head, but I consciously had to try not to think about it you know. If I think about it too much I will get weirded out. I kind of remember just trying to put it out of my mind. -Wendy

I felt like if some people found out what I was doing, you know, I think a part of me was scared that my dad would lose his job, you know. How can you be a minister if your son is hopping all over the place with all of these girls? -Matt

The church’s qualification for eldership was that you have believing children and that your children are Christians. And umm, you know, so I better act like it or else my dad loses that position. [Like] you can’t control your family; therefore, you can’t have a role. My dad, he always said he’d much rather step down than, you know, have me hide something and him keep his position. And he emphasized that so fully, but I still felt like I didn’t want to put him and my mom through that. -Christian

These examples – Wendy’s link between her own personal relationship with God and her parents’ jobs, Matt’s connection with his parents’ jobs and his interactions with girls, Christian knowing that his actions could really affect his parents – show the interconnectedness that many PKs experience between their personal lives and their parent’s profession. They view their own actions and beliefs as affecting their parents’ professional credibility.

The awareness of this interconnectedness can lead PKs to govern themselves according to the expectations of their parents’ jobs. As Wendy states, “If I think about it too much I will get weirded out. I kind of remember just trying to put it out of my mind.” Wendy purposely tries not to the think of the interconnectedness because the more she is
aware of it, the more she thinks she will be affected by it. Likewise, Christian states, “I better act like it or else my dad lose that position,” as elder. Christian’s awareness leads him to feeling that he must act according to what is expected. He goes on to state that “the qualifications of eldership were that you have believing children.” The Bible verse he refers to states, “an elder must be blameless, faithful to his wife, a man whose children believe and are not open to the charge of being wild and disobedient” (New International Version, Titus 1:6). Whether explicitly or implicitly, ministers’ children are conscious on some level that their beliefs and actions hold a direct effect on their parents’ profession. As a result and for the sake of their parents’ credibility, it can be easy for PKs to feel the need to uphold the behavior and rules that come with being raised by ministers.

Minister’s Rules

As children of ministers, PKs can feel they are given special rules to follow. The congregation watches and often imitates how ministers lead their family, and so often their family is expected to be examples for the rest of the church. Wendy describes the way her parents, being conscious of the church, would govern her:

And probably the girls that didn’t wear bikinis, like I think, some of their parents would ask my parents kind of like ‘what do you let Wendy wear?’ Kind of like, “what are your expectations with this?” I think there was part of them that was like, ‘Ok, whatever we want the church to be as a whole, we’ve got to exhibit in our own children too.’

-Wendy

Ministers lead by example. Wendy’s swimwear at a pool party can become the standard for what other families in the church deem as appropriate. As Wendy states, “whatever we want the church to be as a whole, we’ve got to exhibit in our own children too.” Wendy perceives that her parents were also acting as ministers as they parented her.
Ministers are expected to act as examples, and when they parent as ministers, they are governing their children to that same expectation.

Being aware of their example role in the church as parents, ministers become more conscious of how they govern their children. This increase in consciousness can inevitably lead to a more rigid enforcement of parenting principles. In the following excerpt, David discusses the way his parents are continuously conscious of the decisions that they made regarding their parenting:

I know that that was tough, like having to convince my parents to even allow me to buy the edited music. Like, it wasn’t a question if I could get the parental advisory. But I was like, ‘well it is edited,’ and they were like, ‘no that is not OK.’ And I would have to convince them on that. Some of my friends, friends at church, would have music that wasn’t even edited. They would be allowed, or not have parents pay close enough attention to where they would go buy the CDs, and would have whatever. But for me, it was like I would have to twist their arm just to let me get the censored version. -David

David feels he is held to a different standard than the rest of his friends at church. His friends are allowed to get non-edited music, whereas David is not even allowed the edited versions. One possible reason for this difference, David expresses, is that his friends’ parents do not “pay close enough attention” to the music they let their children listen to. Inferring that if their parents were more aware of what they allowed their children to listen to, they might enforce a similar standard as David’s parents do. As moral leaders, ministers are not necessarily expected to have a different standard, but they are expected to exemplify the standard of their community. Thus, while it may seem that David is being held to a different standard than others, it would be more accurate to say that there are higher expectations for David to maintain the community’s standard.

Higher expectations to maintain an ideal standard can make it seem that ministers have another set of rules they must hold themselves to. The values a religious community
upholds covers every aspect of life and so ministers, as moral leaders, are expected to live exemplary lives according to those values. These expectations to live as moral examples create unique rules ministers abide by, which will be referred to as minister’s rules. As we’ve seen with David’s example, minister’s rules are not necessarily another standard that one must live by, but instead are higher expectations for a certain moral standard to be maintained. As we also see with David’s example, minister’s rules don’t just apply to ministers but also extend to the minister’s family as well. Minister’s rules are not rules set by the minister or even enforced by the minister. Minister’s rules are set by the church and enforced by the community. Minister’s rules are social things and are not created or possessed by a minister. While other parents at church may not necessarily “pay close enough attention” to the music their children listen to, ministers usually lack that freedom since what they allow their children to listen to could affect the precedent set by the other parents at church. Hence, whether ministers are debating appropriate swimwear or sanctioning the purchase of CDs by their children, they must govern their actions as moral examples and so follow minister’s rules.

PKs Upholding the “Minister’s Rules”

The higher expectations placed on ministers can develop into higher expectations, or minister’s rules, their children feel they also must live by. As Matt and Brad describe:

Some kind of stupid thing that me and another guy got into became pretty common knowledge and I had somebody from church pull me aside one time and tell me, ‘what are you doing? We expect more from you, you’re the minister’s son you should know better.’ So there was kind of this overly perfect expectation that you had to, you know, be without blemish.

-Matt
… Just like the whole aura [of] ‘dude, your setting such a bad example. Your supposed to be this kid that…’ you know what I mean, ‘with these parents that are leading this church and you are just like being disrespectful to all the adults.’ It was [that] kind of a feeling but [what] people would say, [was] like ‘do you understand the example that you’re supposed to uphold?’ -Brad

Matt and Brad, like their parents, find they are expected to be moral examples for others and so live according to the minister’s rules. A main way to recognize the existence of minister’s rules is through “rule reminders.” Hochschild states that through “rule reminders,” individuals show how they assess behavior (2003:58). When Matt is told, “We expect more from you. You’re the minister’s son. You should know better,” Matt is being reminded that he “should know” how he is supposed to be an example to others.

By PKs receiving “rule reminders,” they are being shown that they are also expected to follow the minister’s rules and live as a moral example. After Matt is taken aside, he expresses feeling he must live “without blemish.” Similarly, Brad expresses feeling an expectation to “understand the example that [he is] supposed to uphold.” Brad and Matt feel they must exemplify the standard the church lives by and their parents advocate.

Part of being a minister is being a moral example. However, as we see in the statements by Matt and Brad, minister’s children are also expected to follow minister’s rules and act as moral examples as well. Consequently, whether or not PKs adhere to the minister’s rules, there is still an expectation that they are supposed to live by them. For example, when Brad was not living by the minister’s rules, he did not cease to be an example for others. Instead, Brad was seen as a bad instance of a socially prescribed, positive example. In both instances, the PKs express feeling an expectation from their
congregation that, because of their parents’ social position, they are supposed to uphold
the minister’s rules and be positive examples of moral behavior.

**Upholding a “Minister’s Face”**

Ministers’ credibility, or professional face, is not only linked to how they
personally follow minister’s rules but, also, to how their children follow minister’s rules.
Face is the positive social value one claims for oneself when interacting with others
(Goffman 1967:5). The professional face ministers are expected to take is one that asks
them to live as examples. Thus, they are expected to always wear a minister’s face in
every part of their life. Ministers are moral leaders and examples for their religious
community. By presenting a minister’s face, they are presenting themselves as moral
leaders and examples. How one acts as a parent, spouse, or Christian has a direct affect
on how one will be seen as a minister. Like their parents, PKs can also feel this same
expectation to live as examples. As Matt and Abby describe:

> Cause I felt like the expectation was that you know, I was the minister’s son I have to be the shining example of a teenage student, teenage athlete, teenage Christian, all that stuff. I had to be flawless otherwise I was criticized for it. -Matt

> You know, having to maintain an image. Cause you know, when you’re a minister’s kid everyone is always telling you. “Be a good example, be a good example,” and so there is this pressure that you have to be like the perfect example. -Abby

PKs are not ministers and yet they can feel there are expectations on them to hold
themselves as moral examples and so be held to support the face of a minister. Both Matt
and Abby describe expectations placed on them to uphold perfection and describe how
they too are essentially expected to wear a minister’s face. Matt expresses feeling he had
to be a “flawless” example as an athlete, student and Christian. Abby describes the image of the “perfect example” she is expected to present to others. In both instances, Matt and Abby are very conscious that they are expected to present themselves as models to others. Abby also states she needed to “maintain an image.” And Matt states, “I was the minister’s son, I have to be the shining example.” Both Abby and Matt not only feel they must be models for others but that there is this example image or minister’s face that they need to uphold.

The minister’s face is not solely dependent on the minister’s behavior. Since their children are connected with their credibility, their children inherit a minister’s face as well. PKs take on the positive social value of being an example for others while simultaneously taking on the responsibility of affecting their parents’ credibility.

PKs also express feeling they must uphold a minister’s face in many parts of their lives. Kenny and David describe what holding a minister’s face entailed for them:

When you get to a certain age, you know, you’re supposed to feel like you’re ready to get baptized. And when you get baptized [you are supposed] to want to read your Bible every day. You are supposed to want to do well in school. You are supposed to want to bring your friends out to church… and you are supposed to be able to kind of lead your peers and be influential. People definitely expected the preacher’s kids to have a certain level of influence. -Kenny

Certain people could kind of just chill and show up and, you know, if they bring their Bible, their parents are excited, but that wouldn’t be the case for me. That was like a given that I would be there with my Bible and would participate and be a leader. Whereas some kids, the standard might be, you know, that [if] they were talking out of turn and like causing trouble in class they would get in trouble and anything else would be ok. For me, it was like, yeah I may not be causing trouble, or talking to my friends while I’m supposed to be listening. But just the mere fact that you are not contributing like they expect you to and being the outgoing example, like you had a whole other level there… whatever the teen minister or youth minister was looking for, you were supposed to be the
person that like fit that as closely as anyone could. And not like you had to be perfect, but in any area you were lacking, it was up to you to I guess it was almost like you had to be proof that you could actually do what they wanted you to do kind of thing, that is what it felt like. -David

Holding a minister’s face and being a good example means high expectations on PKs in many parts of their lives. By being expected to be examples in every area, PKs can feel like their lives are already scripted for them. Kenny describes the script he feels PKs are given: first PKs “feeling” ready at a certain age to get baptized, which is a ceremony in this church where one commits his or her life to God. Second, PKs should afterwards “want to read their Bible every day.” Third, they should “want to do well in school.” Fourth, they should “want to bring [their] friends out to church.” And lastly, PKs should be able to lead their peers and “be influential.” David also describes feeling that being an example meant that he needed to be whatever “the youth minister was looking for,” as if his role was scripted by the youth leader. He needed to be an “outgoing example” and contribute to Bible discussions and other interactions. David felt, “you had to be proof that you could actually do what they wanted you to do.” In both cases, the PKs express that the minister’s faces they held had very specific expectations on the identity they can present to others.

Just like their parents, PKs are expected to live by minister’s rules and be moral examples to others. By living as examples, PKs put on a minister’s face by which others identify them as leaders or examples in the church.
PKs are often given moral authority and expected to become ministers themselves. PKs have moral authority with their peers and can often feel they are held as the standard for others. Since PKs have a thorough knowledge of the minister’s rules, they can also know how to play the role of a church leader. Thus, many PKs express feeling they are expected to be in leadership or the ministry; and some report feeling a lot of pressure placed on them to following this “calling.”

The Moral Authority of a Minister’s Face

A minister’s face gives PKs moral authority at church. When PKs present a minister’s face they then must govern themselves by the high expectations that come with that face. However, if presenting a minister’s face indicates being an example or leader, then a minister’s face would also signify moral authority over others. As Matt describes, “I would sometimes have parents who were like, ‘hey my kid asked me this, or he wants to go into sports I know you’re an athlete… do you think it is a good idea?’” Matt lives up to being an example in sports and school, and so maintains the minister’s face he is expected to present at church. Parents seek Matt for advice exemplifying the moral authority presenting a minister’s face possesses. Similarly, Wendy and Sheldon recall the moral authority they are given:

If someone was to say, ‘hey this isn’t right,’ it was expected to be me. Or ‘turn the channel’ or ‘turn this scene’ with movies, or ‘turn this song,’ ‘we shouldn’t be listening to this.’ Yeah, it was kind of expected that I would be the one to say something. -Wendy

One time I drank before I was 21 with a kid out in [another] region that I knew really well and we had been buddies for a while and … we drank a lot. I didn’t get drunk. He got drunk. And then, I hated it because I ended up like spending the night cleaning up his throw up. It was terrible. But, so then after that happened, and everybody found out about it, and then
like four kids in our region … went drinking, just like a week after. This has never been a problem and then like a week after this happened, so it was just stuff like that. Not feeling like they are copying you but just feeling … “oh well I always wanted to do this. Oh well so and so did this so it’s kind of a license to do this.” Like I’m the standard. -Sheldon

In these examples, Wendy and Sheldon are conscious of how their opinion and actions hold a certain amount of sway with their peers. As Durkheim (1912:479) states, a leader in a religious society has “moral authority,” meaning the leader holds the power of society and is the voice of the group. For Durkheim, what the leader says represents the multitudes of individual sentiments that make-up the common sentiment of society. When PKs present minister’s face, they hold moral authority and, as Durkheim states, act as the “voice” of their society.

Wendy describes feeling that her peers depend on her moral authority in questionable matters. If she expresses disapproval, the others may likely agree with her that what they are listening to or watching is inappropriate. However, doing nothing or saying nothing are actions that also hold authority over her peers. If Wendy says nothing, the others may interpret her silence or participation as authorization for what is questionable. As Wendy states, “it was kind of expected that I would be the one to say something.” Whether she chooses to abide by the minister’s rules or not, she is still seen to have moral authority with her church peers. Her actions can be interpreted as representing the common sentiment or standard of the church.

The moral authority that comes from the minister’s face can make the bearer become the example or “standard” for others. Sheldon is not upholding the church’s standards when he decides to drink a lot of alcohol as a kid. Nor is he abiding by the minister’s rules and being a good example for others. However, just because he is not acting as an example does not mean he ceases to be an example. Whether he wants it or
not, he is the bearer of the minister’s face. When the church members learn that Sheldon was drinking, his actions lead to other kids doing the same. The minister’s face he presents means that he is supposed to be the example for others and uphold the standard. Not that he is expected to be perfect, but that he must exemplify what is expected. In this instance, Sheldon is a “bad” example and yet some of his peers still hold his behavior as the “standard.” As Sheldon describes it, he felt his drinking became like a “license” for other kids to do the same. If he could not keep this standard, then how could it be expected of others? In this instance, Sheldon is not expected to just exemplify the standard, but be “the standard.” Whether his example is good or bad, the moral authority of Sheldon’s minister’s face makes him an example and a standard for others. By wearing a minister’s face, a PK becomes the embodiment of the church’s common sentiment; and with that possesses moral authority in the church.

**Minister’s Face and Leadership**

Through presenting a minister’s face, PKs become accustomed to playing the role of leader in the church. Brad describes how being a PK helped him to be a leader in his campus ministry:

> Just being in the living room doing homework while [my parents] are having a leaders meeting. You understand the structure of a meeting: how that is going to go, how that is going to play out; the way that my dad handled situations, the way that he talked to the guys that he led. It made it a lot easier when I went to [another state]. I was a freshman and I was the only bibletalk leader out of like twenty five guys cause I think I was around that stuff. Now I did a terrible job, but I was around that stuff so much, that there was this feeling, of “alright this kid knows what he is doing.” even if I didn’t. I didn’t have a lot of experience but I had a lot of what to do, so that is like a huge leg-up… there is always kind of like a textbook way to do it and I don’t know, you are watching it in action over and over again. – Brad
Growing up around his parents and other leaders, and being asked himself to be an example for others, Brad is very aware of what the minister’s rules are and how to display himself as a leader in the church. As Brad states, he knew the “textbook way” to handle situations from watching the ministry leaders over and over again that were around his family. Living as examples and being around other leaders, PKs grow-up knowing how to present themselves as leaders in the church.

Though PKs may know how to play the role of leader, this does not mean that they are prepared to do so. While Brad was able to give the impression of a spiritual leader in the church, as someone that “knows what he is doing,” he actually admits that he did not have a lot of experience and that he did a “terrible job.” He goes on to say,

My critically analyzing of situations was very lacking. It was just like, ‘no this is how [the situation] has always been done, this is how it is supposed to be done, this is how it’s going to be done. No questions asked. There you go, what is wrong with you, don’t you get it.’ –Brad referring to how he would lead others in a situation when he was first made a leader in college

By watching his parents and others in leadership, Brad has a thorough knowledge of what being a church leader should look like. However, though Brad knows the “textbook” way to handle a situation, he reveals that he is lacking the ability to critically analyze the situation. He relies much more on what he has seen other leaders do, then on what he believes would be the right thing to do. PKs can give off the impression of being spiritual leaders; however, the faith they display could stem more from their knowledge of minister’s rules than their own personal conviction.
Leadership Roles

A PK’s knowledge of minister’s rules allows PKs to know how to play the role of a leader in church and a minister’s face gives them the moral authority of a leader as well. However, a minister’s face can also make PKs feel they are forced to be leaders whether they want to or not. As these PKs exemplify,

Leadership roles don’t do good things to me and I was placed in leadership roles from a very young age. I asked for it, you now, I thought that that was what I was supposed to do. Like it was my birthright probably as well…I wanted to be righteous, I wanted to make a difference, I wanted to be a good kid and I wanted to make my parents happy. Whether they told me that was going to make them happy or not, that is still kind of how I think. -Jacob

I went on a long walk with a minister who I had grown up with, who I am very close to and when I got to [this city] after [college], that’s when I went into the ministry. Everyone convinced me, “just try [being in the ministry] for a year so you can at least say you did it. Cause everyone thinks you should do it,” so I was like “OK.’ And [that minister] basically took me on a long walk when I was doubting it and I didn’t want to be in the ministry, and I was unhappy. And he said that just because of who I was - being a kingdom princess, being raised in the church, and knowing everybody (because I could pretty much go to any church in the world and know people). [The minister continued to say] “You were raised in this kind of kingdom structure where you are a princess in it [and] you can’t just go be anything you want to be. You have to fulfill your duty as the princess and that is to go in the ministry.” And so that was kind of coming at me from a lot of angles; so I kind of felt like I am going against God. –Sarah

Jacob and Sarah both try and live up to what they feel is expected of them as PKs. Jacob places himself in leadership roles because he feels that it is the fulfillment of holding to a minister’s face; that it is his “birthright.” Sarah is told that she needs to fulfill her “duty as a princess” in the church “kingdom.” By becoming leaders in the church they are living out the fruition of their minister’s face: that they themselves become ministers.

However, if a minister’s face gives PKs the impression that it is their “duty” or their “birthright” to become church leaders themselves, then their motivation to lead can
simply be out of obligation and not motivated by a true personal calling or faith. Though Sarah can feel it is her “duty” to go into the ministry, it does not mean she also has the desire. As she states, she felt “unhappy” in the ministry. Despite feeling the collective sentiment is for her to go into the ministry, it does not change how she actually feels about it. Similarly, Jacob states that being in the ministry did not do good things for him. Though he knows how to play the role of a church leader, he admits that his motivation was partly to “make my parents happy.” Both PKs express how they were swayed by the moral pressure of the church to be in positions of leadership despite what their own feelings were.

PKs are given a minister’s face and expected to be examples, as their families are examples for the church. They can feel morally obligated to set an example for others in every part of their lives as they act as a representative for the church’s common sentiment. Their knowledge of minister rules can make them experts at playing the role of minister. On the other hand, a minister’s face can also make them feel forced to be a leader and make them feel as if the direction of their lives is already planned out for them. Though the minister’s face gives them moral authority within the church, they can also feel controlled by the minister’s face they present. Presenting a minister’s face is not just a role they feel they must play but is actually experienced as the “birthright” they were given by their parents’ occupation.
PART FIVE, CHAPTER THREE: EMOTION AND ROLE BOUNDARY AMBIGUITY
The lack of role and emotional boundaries in being a minister creates barriers in the relationship PKs have with their parents. Since PKs’ actions affect the parents’ minister’s face, PKs can feel unsure if their parents are reacting to them as parents or as ministers. This lack of role boundaries can lead PKs to avoid any ministry related interactions with their parents. The emotional labor of ministry work can spillover into the home environment and further blur the lines for PKs regarding when their parents are off work. Some PKs react to the emotional tension caused by their parents’ work, by creating home environments where their parents feel they have “time off” from managing their emotions. However, as PKs work to create home environments that are not tainted by their parents’ jobs, they can end up creating lasting relationship boundaries between their parents as well.

**Role Boundaries**

The profession of minister holds few work boundaries. Often there are no clear work hours and the home is seen as a workspace. In terms of responsibilities, parenting can be seen as part of a minister’s job. And, a minister is both parent and religious leader to their children. As a result, the role of minister and parent overlap, creating ambiguity in the relationship between the two. As Abby states,

I guess there was just a part of me that wanted a normal life and to be a normal kid where your parents come home from work and they are done working. They come home from the office and they’re home now; and they get to be home with the family and they don’t have to continue working once they’re home… And it seems like in the ministry your workday is never done. In fact, most of your work day is meetings when everyone else is home from work. And so, I think that there was just a part of me that wanted to be a normal family …leave your work at the office, kind of thing. So when you’re home you’re my mom and dad,
you’re not the minister … It was like, “Can you just not answer your phone and turn the volume on the answering machine all the way down so we can have a night off?” But you can’t really do that in the ministry, you know.

As ministers, there are no set work hours or a defined work place. As Abby states, she desired that when her parents were home, “they get to be home with the family and they don’t have to continue working once they’re home.” She expresses a desire for clear boundaries marking when her parents are “done working” as ministers. As Abby states, “when you’re home you’re my mom and dad, you’re not the minister.” Abby desires clear work boundaries so she knows when her parents are not acting as ministers but are just her parents. Thus, the lack of clear boundaries between work and home creates ambiguity in the role that ministers have with their children.

**Role Ambiguity**

Being a minister is a job that encompasses almost every area of one’s life. How one acts as a parent, spouse or Christian is a reflection of a minister’s own professional face. Though clear spatial and temporal boundaries can be established in one’s ministerial duties, it can be difficult to “turn off” the minister role. This can lead to PKs feeling ambiguity concerning the role their parents are performing with them and what role is expected for the PKs to perform in response. As Abby and David state:

I don’t remember my parents asking a lot about my quiet times [personal times with God – i.e. setting time aside each day to read the Bible and pray]. I think that, I’m just guessing, that they had those communications more through my teen leaders. “Hey can you see how Abby’s doing with this?” Because they wanted to be my mom and dad, because for so long I viewed them as, “all you care about is everybody else in the church and church and church, and everything is about church… You know I would get so mad, like “if we didn’t go to this church I wouldn’t be feeling like this.” I always said, when I got married I didn’t want my dad to do the wedding. Everyone just always
assumed that my dad would be the one to marry me cause he’s a minister but I was like “no, he’s my dad he’s not my minister. So I always grew up with that kind of mind set, like “I just want you to be my dad and not the preacher that preaches to me.” – Abbey

That was the other thing of my parents being in the ministry and that being their job. I … felt shuffled off or kind of passed off to a kind of big brother figure … not because my parents didn’t care about me. They cared about me a lot; that is why they wanted to make sure I was surrounded by good people and good influences; almost like ministers understood that their kids probably wouldn’t want to talk to them about a lot of stuff because of that like barrier there. – David

These PKs express feeling ambiguity about what their parents’ motives are in parenting; if they are acting as their parents or their ministers. As Abby states, “all you care about is church… and everything is about church.” Abby is unsure whether her parents are acting in her best interest. If Abby feels the church is her parents’ motivation, then she may feel they are acting as ministers and not her parents. Similarly, David states that ministers understand that, “their kids probably wouldn’t want to talk to them about a lot of stuff because of that like barrier there.” Like Abby, David feels his parents’ position creates a “barrier” for his parents and him to have a talk about his spirituality. Instead of talking with his parents, David states he was, “passed off to a kind of big brother figure.” The overlap between the role of parent and minister can lead to relationship barriers between ministers and their children.

In order to create clearer relationship boundaries, PKs can feel more comfortable being ministered to by others. As Abby states, she did not want her dad to conduct her wedding. She states, “I just wanted him to be my dad and not the preacher that preaches to me.” Abby associates her parents’ preaching and other minister behavior as their job and so seeks to get rid of any aspect of their relationship that can be connected with their work. Likewise, both David and Abby express talking to a mentor about their spirituality
instead of their parents; another way to keep clear minister role boundaries. With both examples, the PKs work to establish clearer distinctions between their parents and their ministers, and in both instances, they are conflicted when they feel ambiguity in their parents’ roles with them.

**Parenting as Ministers**

With the overlap between the role of a parent and minister, PKs can distrust whether their parents react to their actions more to protect their minister’s face than to protect them. When Jill’s friend invites her boyfriend over to Jill’s house while Jill is asleep and her parents are gone, Jill recalls how her parents think it is Jill’s boyfriend and so decide to move Jill away:

So she [Jill’s friend who was staying over] wakes me up, and brings me downstairs, and basically – she lied to my parents cause she knew the rules and she said that he was my boyfriend and that I invited him over. And so they believed her not me and they drove her home right away and that was the end of it. Like they didn’t even want to listen to what I had to say at that point…

Basically, at that point they made a phone call to somebody of significant importance back in those days, without mentioning any names. And he said, “You have to move. You have to get her away.” And this was during Christmas vacation. And so we moved away during Christmas vacation in the middle of my eighth grade year. We moved to a different school; I wasn’t allowed to say good-bye to my friends. I wasn’t allowed to call them… and so they completely overreacted. Anyways, at that point I was like, “alright you think that I was being bad, I’m going to show you what being bad is.” That is when I feel like the pressures from the ministry was the most because I felt like they weren’t willing to listen to me at that point… So I purposely, in high school, picked all the wrong kids to hang out with. I totally started smoking pot everyday. –Jill

Jill feels her parents moved away because of their ministry responsibilities. Their minister’s face is threatened by this situation and in response they listen to their ministry
leader instead of listening to her. They move away without allowing Jill to say goodbye to her friends, and so take away her freedom to make her own decisions. Because her parents “weren’t willing to listen” to her, Jill feels her parents’ decision in this situation is ministry driven and so feels the “pressure from the ministry the most” in this moment. By how her parents react, Jill feels their parenting is ministry motivated.

If Jill feels her parents are “overreacting” in how they parent her because they are protecting their minister’s face, then she can feel little incentive to help them maintain that minister’s face. As she states, “you think I was being bad, I’m going to show you what being bad is.” Jill purposely picks all the wrong kids to hang out with and purposely acts in a way that will negatively affect her parents’ minister’s face. Her parents’ job prevents her parents from reacting to her simply as her parents, and so she purposely acts in a way that will force her parents to lose face as ministers.

The Emotional Boundaries of Ministering

Just as the ambiguous boundaries between the role of minister and parent can also transfer into the life of a PK, likewise a ministers’ emotion work can cross over to their children’s lives as well. A minister’s job involves a lot of emotion work. At each appointment they are expected to manage their feelings in the best possible way so they can help others with their problems. However, the emotional labor that is required can take a toll on a minister’s home life and affect PKs. As Brad and Matt describe:

My dad really bared the burdens of a lot of things and a lot of people all at once. I think he is still kind of that way. I think he is very resilient …. Like he can deal with a lot of very emotional, very tough situations and still be in his right mind. And I think people kind of rely on him to be that
for them. So I think to whatever degree he could, he could go from having a d-time [counseling session] with somebody that is talking about committing adultery with their wife, to a d-time with someone that wanted to kill themselves, to a d-time where people are worried that their kid might have gotten someone pregnant. Like he could just do that. He can kind of just unplug himself from the last thing that he dealt with. But at the end of the day when he got home you could just see it. He was really kind of worn down – so to that degree he did kind of bring his work with him. –Matt

You have [my dad] coming back from situations like all day long that are either things that he is doing wrong and conversations with negative people that are like angry with him or people that don’t believe what he believes. And he is studying the Bible with them because he usually gets like the worse cases of everybody … But if it is someone that is very negative towards the church or very negative towards God or whatever then he is always studying with those people. So when he comes back he’s kind of, like beat up and so that kind of adds to the stress level and … sometimes … a high tension in the house you know where “I need to relax cause this is like my time off” kind of thing. “I can’t have your problems on top of all the problems I have at the moment” kind of atmosphere. –Brad

Both PKs see the emotional toll that being a minister has on their parents. There is a significant amount of emotion labor involved in being a minister. They describe the minister’s job as going from one appointment to the next and dealing with negative and difficult situations with the expectation of the parents being emotionally equipped to deal with each situation. As Matt states, a large part of his father’s job is being able to counsel and help others deal with “very emotional, very tough situations.” As part of his job, others expected the minister to bear their burdens and “rely on him to be that for them.” Through bearing the burdens of others and counseling emotional situations, ministers must be able to manage their feelings in order that they may be in their “right mind.” In order to do this, Matt says that his father was able to, “unplug himself from the last thing that he dealt with” in order to emotionally be available to meet the needs of his next appointment. Brad describes his father as being emotionally “beat up” when he came
back from his meetings. Both Matt and Brad recognize that part of being a minister is being able to manage one’s emotions to best help others.

Since this emotion work is associated with their parents fulfilling their role as a minister, PKs describe feeling that their parents needed the home to be a place where they could have “time off” from their emotional labor. As Matt describes, when his father got home “you could just see it, he was really kind of worn down so to that degree he did kind of bring his work with him.” In appointments, Matt’s father “unplugs” the emotions he feels so he can best be used in his next appointment. However, when his father comes home, Matt feels his father brings all that he is actually feeling back with him. As Matt states his dad would, “bring his work with him.” Likewise, Brad describes his dad bringing his work emotions home. He states that the emotions of his dad’s job would “add to the stress level.” In both instances, Brad and Matt feel that the emotional strain of being a minister is brought home where they feel their parents are finally able to deal with their own emotions after helping other people deal with their emotions.

The emotional strain of being a minister can give the impression to PKs that their parents are unavailable to them for their own emotional needs. As Brad states he felt at times his dad’s emotional labor created an “I can’t have your problems on top of all the problems I have at the moment” atmosphere. Because of his father’s emotional labor, Brad feels his father is unavailable at home for any of his problems because this dad needs time to “relax” from the job. In this way, the emotional demands of being a minister interfere with the emotional demands of being a parent. The stress and strain that ministers can bring home from the job can create an environment at home that can make it difficult for PKs to bring their issues to their parents.
PKs’ Emotion Work

The emotional labor that ministers go through can result in PKs managing their own emotions with their parents. If PKs feel their parents need the home to be where they can have “time off” from their emotion labor, then PKs can feel they must manage their own emotions in order to create this environment. As Brittani and Brad describe:

I would call my parents upset and then that would make my mom upset because she was in [another country] and she couldn’t do anything about it, so then [the evangelist from there] came out and said “you’ve got to stop calling your mom and telling her why you’re upset, you’re freaking your mom out.” And I’m just like “umm, I always tell my mom how I’m feeling.” But, he basically made me feel like if I told her, I was going to hurt her and so I shouldn’t tell her anymore. So I just sort of like shut down because I didn’t feel like I had a lot of people to talk to, and … I was really shut down. –Brittani

Just be real with [my dad] that he really hurt my feelings. It was more kind of like, “maybe in the future if you would try not to do that as much.” You know, like, “if you could just try not to be like that, that would be cool. And it didn’t really hurt my feelings and I don’t think it was sin but just in the future…” So I don’t know, that was kind of our relationship for a couple of years. I would tell him how I would feel but it would be with like a sugar coating kind of thing. Just like fear of bogging him down; I didn’t want to add to it. I didn’t want him to think of me and it be like a negative. Like, “every time I get with him he is always like disciplining [correcting] me or something.” -Brad

Brittani and Brad both manage their emotions to what they think will help their parents cope with the demands of having a minister’s face. For Brittani, she is told she should not tell her mom how she feels because she could “hurt” her mom, so she stops talking to her mom about her feelings. For Brad, he still talks to his dad, but he “sugar coats” what he feels out of fear of “bogging” his father down with his problems. They both view that adding to the emotional demands of their parents’ job could hurt their parents and so they use emotion work, themselves, to either lessen or stop their expression of their emotions with their parents.
However, PK’s constant emotion management with their parents can place strain on the relationship they have with their parents. As Brittani describes, she felt she basically “shut down” after she felt she could not talk to her parents about her problems anymore. The emotional labor needed to be ministers can leave PKs feeling their parents are emotionally unavailable for them or even that PKs must use emotion work themselves to help their parents with their job.

**Creating Relationship Boundaries**

As discussed in previous sections, PKs can feel uncomfortable with having their parents minister to them and so can instead go to others for their ministerial needs. PKs can question their parents’ motives in interactions and so avoid issues that compromise their parents’ minister’s face. They can feel the emotional demands of the ministry on their parents and either avoid bringing their problems to their parents, or manage the feelings they express with their parents in order to protect their parents. In many instances, the role and emotional boundaries of the ministry cross over into the home life and in many instances we see how PKs respond by trying to maintain or create a distinction between their parents as being “parents” and “ministers.”

The lack of boundaries that the minister role has in family interactions leads to PKs working to create these boundaries themselves in their relationship with their parents. As Aaron and David describe:

Interviewer: How would you say that you personally are doing spiritually? And would you feel comfortable talking to them [your parents] about it now?
Aaron: Not really, no. Cause this is something that I was thinking about kind of recently, actually. I had a feeling, in a sense, that my spiritual well-being, or you could say, “where I was at spiritually” … had some
effect on my relationship with my parents. … I couldn’t really identify why I was feeling that way or pinpoint it but it was kind of concerning for me cause I felt like why should that matter? And I should have a great relationship with my parents no matter how I’m doing spiritually. But feeling that there was, an effect, you know, between my spiritual well-being and my relationship with my parents. It really bothered me and I may be totally imagining it on my part … I wouldn’t want to talk to my parents about [how I am doing spiritually] because unless things are going great or there are things that I can prove I am struggling with on a spiritual level. I wouldn’t want to show that to my parents cause … not that they would disapprove, but it would disappoint them probably, and I wouldn’t want to deal with that.

That is [my parents’] job and that is going to put a divide in the relationship there. So they would, without even giving [that kind of relationship] a try, it almost seemed like you kind of get passed off to the young youth minister; kind of a typical mold there. And that is going to be your big brother and you get to talk to him about all that [spiritual] stuff… So I would talk to him [youth minister] about all that and not my parents cause it was kind of like unspoken. And even to this day I see where there are deficiencies in our friendship because of that. It’s still kind of like that. –David

David and Aaron both express feeling their parents’ job affected the relationship they had with their parents. As Aaron states, where he is at spiritually “had some effect on my relationship with my parents.” Similarly, David says, “that is their job and like that is going to put a divide in the relationship.” They both feel that because of their parents’ job there are barriers in their relationship with their parents.

Though David feels he was able to go to his youth minister for help when he felt he could not go to his parents, he feels doing this actually created “deficiencies” in the friendship he has with his parents today. Likewise, Aaron feels there are still boundaries around what he can talk about to his parents; his “spirituality” places boundaries in his relationship with his parents. Unless he feels his “spirituality” is at an appropriate place, he does not feel comfortable talking to his parents about where he really is at in his religious practice. Both PKs sense a lack of boundaries that the minister’s role holds in
their family life, and in response they can try and create interactions that are separate from the expectations and strains of the minister’s job. However, by doing so they find that they also create their own barriers that in the long run lead to “deficiencies” in their relationship with their parents.
PART FIVE, CHAPTER FOUR: CONVERSION EXPECTATIONS AND MINISTER’S FACE
Every member of this church goes through a conversion process to become a disciple, or Christian. That conversion process consists of studying the Bible and then getting baptized. This process is very social and involves other disciples of the church taking an individual through a bible study series before their pledge their life to a “total commitment” to Christ (McKean 1997:10). In this section we examine the PKs’ experiences through this conversion process.

PKs express feeling pressure to play the role of a disciple while simultaneously feeling ease at playing that role. However, it can also be very difficult for PKs to see any divide in the role they play and their person since they have grown up conscious of the faith rules. A faith rule is any expectation or moral stance one experiences in regard to his or her religious beliefs. Faith rules go beyond a religious institution’s written doctrine; they are the unspoken rules that derive more from a religion’s culture. These expectations to become a disciple and get baptized can make PKs feel as if there is a script written for how they should feel, think and act about their own faith. Hochschild states, “since feeling is a form of pre-action, a script or a moral stance toward it is one of culture’s most powerful tools for directing action” (56). She refers to this script for one’s emotions as “feeling rules.” Likewise, a “script” exists for one’s faith called faith rules.

Expectations to Convert and Faith Rules

For PKs, the conversion process of studying the Bible and becoming a disciple can seem like the most natural and easy transition. PKs already present a minister’s face that follows a very similar script or standard to that of a disciple in the church. However,
though a minister’s face can make it easier to act as a disciple, it also can place a lot of pressure on PKs to convert. Emma and Michael admit feeling expectations to get baptized. When Emma is asked from whom she feels this pressure she responded:

The teen ministry, kind of to fulfill the example role that I have always been in, you know, ‘now she is an example, now she is even more of an example.’ I think …there are so many people that I have met, you know, through my parents that I feel like, my relationship with them wouldn’t be the same if I wasn’t a disciple, that went through my head a little bit.

Michael also recalls pressure:

You experience a lot of pressures in kind of a sad way. My parents shaped me into the individual that I am today and I am very thankful for that, but at the same time there is a lot of pressure on them, like, I guess cause I am not really baptized, I just try and live a good life…They appreciate that in the church I guess, but at the same time I’m not abiding by the same standard: with like dating outside the church. So my parents got a lot of pressure as well as I did to actually get baptized because how can they be leaders of a whole organized church and yet their own children are not baptized… So that was one of the biggest pressures. And when I would go to like big conferences with all the head ministers and people from church, I would feel a lot of pressure. They would always like ask me, ‘So why aren’t you a disciple,’ and I would be like ‘well right now I am not interested,’ and they like keep digging at me and digging at me. So I would still be nice to them, but it was almost to the point of like, ‘leave me alone’… And I think that actually drew me kind of further away from the church.

Emma and Michael both feel that as PKs there are more expectations placed on them to get baptized. For Emma, she is a PK and is supposed to be a model for others. So it is only natural that as an example to others she would voluntarily dedicate her life to living by the church’s standard. As she states, by becoming a disciple she will be able to, “fulfill the example role that she has always been in.” In other words, she will be fulfilling what is expected of presenting a minister’s face. Michael also expresses feeling that as a PK he is expected to become a disciple. He states, “My parents got a lot of pressure as well as I did to actually get baptized because how can they be leaders of a
whole organized church and yet their own children are not baptized.” As the son of a minister it is assumed that he will become a disciple. His parents lead others to be baptized, so why wouldn’t their son get baptized? Michael and Emma, both feel that as PKs there are expectations on them to get baptized.

The expectations PKs’ experience to get baptized can arise for different reasons. Emma states, “my relationship with them [others in the church] wouldn’t be the same if I wasn’t a disciple.” She feels the relationships she has established through her parents would change if she did not get baptized; in essence that this would affect the minister’s face she has tried to present. Also, as Michael had stated, he connects his decision to not be baptized with his parent’s image. For Michael, his adherence to the faith rules will have a direct affect on his parents’ minister’s face. PKs must manage the expectations of a minister’s face while they work on establishing their own faith.

Both Emma and Michael experience faith rules when they realize there are expectations on them for when they should find their own faith. For Emma, she recognizes there is a faith rule that she should get baptized, but does not express feeling very affected by it. For Michael, whose beliefs differ from the faith rules, we more fully see the difference between what one should believe and what one actually believes. Michael does not believe that he needs to get baptized and yet he is constantly given rule reminders, like “so why aren’t you a disciple?” This indicates to Michael that by this time in his life he should have already committed his life to being a disciple. These rule reminders make it clear to Michael that his beliefs are not acceptable. He tries to respond by expressing that he is not interested at this time. When others keep “digging and digging,” it becomes clear that he should feel interested in baptism and that his present
feelings about his faith are deviant. Faith rules are the expectations we have for beliefs, but as we see from Michael’s example, these rules can be expected of nonbelievers as well. So when Michael is surrounded by others, who fully believe he should be baptized, we see the expectations that can be placed on individuals for when, how, and what they should believe; we see the faith rules.

Conversion: Trying to Maintain Minister’s Face

Faith rules are even more evident in one’s conversion process. Studying the Bible and becoming a disciple can seem like a very natural transition for PKs since they already present minister’s faces. Plus, they already live by a similar standard through presenting minister’s faces so they know how to play a disciple role. However, for PKs becoming a disciple can be less of a life altering experience and more a well-scripted performance. As Sam and Christian recall:

It was actually really weird. Because in our church, it’s like there’s a set of studies, literal studies, you know, there is actually a name for each study. So… it was never finding my faith because I had faith since I was zero… It’s so funny. I remember doing my studies, and I had sat in and just heard my parents do every study so many times that I knew what [my teen leader] was going to study with me. I’d be like, ‘are we going to do the sin study next week?’ and he would be like ‘yes, yes we are, alright!’ Like I didn’t find it. Like when I got baptized I didn’t feel like I had any sins to get washed away. I hadn’t really done a lot of bad … everything was just like – this is how it’s supposed to happen … I had never done anything, on my own belief. Or no, it was my own belief, but it was all I knew. So when I was studying the Bible, I knew the right answer for literally everything. [Those studying the Bible with me would ask] ‘So do you feel like you’re a Christian?’ [I would answer,] ‘nope.’ Like in my mind it was like ‘no, yeah, whatever’ but I know that I am just supposed to say no. [They would ask] ‘So do you know that your sins are what put Jesus on the cross?’ ‘Yeah,’ ‘Do you feel bad?’ ‘I feel terrible.’ [And
they answered] ‘Well you seem ready.’ Yeah I’m ready, like why wouldn’t I be, you know. Like I could probably lead this [Bible study] … More than anything, the worst thing of it was that I knew what I was supposed to say. So it wasn’t genuine. My faith was genuine, which was good. But because I knew what I was supposed to say that was what killed me and that was what made my Christianity so weak.

—Sam

So we sat down and we studied the Bible and I was convinced that it would take me about two weeks because I knew all the answers because I had even memorized where certain scriptures were cause I had heard them so often that this is automatic. If anyone is ready to make this decision, it has got to be me. -Christian

PKs are immersed in the church culture. This immersion allows them to be very aware of what the church’s faith rules are and how to play the role of a disciple. As Sam states, “I knew the right answer for literally everything.” Similarly, Christian states, “I knew all the answers because I had even memorized where certain scriptures were cause I had heard them so often that this is automatic.” Sam and Christian state they knew the right answers for every question asked during the Bible studies. These PKs know what they should believe and how they should act about those beliefs. This knowledge of the faith rules allows PKs to be experts at playing the role of disciple.

The ease at which PKs play the role of disciple can give them the impression they will effortlessly become disciples. As Christian states, “I was convinced that it would take me about two weeks because I knew all the answers.” Christian’s knowledge of the faith rules made Christian feel that studying the Bible and becoming a disciple would be a very easy process for him. Likewise, Sam states feeling that not only is he ready to become a disciple but that he could probably lead his Bible studies. In both cases we see how these PK went into studying the Bible with a confidence in knowing the faith rules.
Though PKs may know how to play the role of a disciple, this does not make them disciples. As Turner states, “an accomplished thespian can give himself unreservedly to a role and take great pride in producing a convincing portrayal of the part but return to being a very different kind of person when the play is over” (1978:1). Turner goes on to say that a role’s attitudes and behaviors must carry over into other situations if the role has really merged to the person (1978:1). In other words, being an expert at playing a role does not necessarily make one closer to that role being a part of one’s person. And though a minister’s face may make PKs experts at playing the role of disciple, it can also make them see little need in merging that role with their person.

PKs are skilled at playing the role of a disciple at the expected times, yet in order for the role they play to become a part of their person they need to actually believe what they profess. For example, Sam knows how to play the role of a disciple. He knows how he should act and what he should say. However, Sam’s conversion account shows the divide between knowing the faith rules (playing the role) and what he actually believes (the faith he holds as a person). Sam professed to those studying the Bible with him that he felt terrible about his sins putting Jesus on the cross, but then says he actually didn’t feel he had any sins to wash away when he got baptized. Also, Sam states, when asked by those studying with him if he thought he was already a Christian, he replies “nope,” even though in his mind his actual answer was, “no, yeah, whatever.” He knows he is supposed to believe he is not yet a Christian because he has not yet finished his Bible studies. Instead of answering with what he actually believed, he answered with what he knew others thought he should believe. Similarly, what Sam professes does not always match what he says he actually believes; however, because he knows it is the “right
answer” he professes it anyways. Sam’s description of his conversion process exemplifies the divide between playing the role of disciple and having the role of disciple be part of one’s person.

In some cases, PKs describe the ways in which it can be difficult to differentiate the disciple role from their person. For instance, Sam feels he has had faith since he was “zero,” giving the impression that he believes his faith has always been a part of his person. Yet, he also states, “because I knew what I was supposed to say that was what killed me and that was what made my Christianity so weak.” Knowing how to play the role of a disciple (knowing what to say) makes it difficult for Sam to feel “genuine” as a disciple, or as a Christian. However, even though he feels disingenuous in the role he plays as a Christian, he finds it difficult to label what he believes as not genuine. Faith and belief seem like something so personal that it is difficult to think these things are not already a part of one’s person. For Sam, it is easy for him to play the role of a disciple, but difficult to differentiate the role from his person.

**Recognizing Deviant Faith: The First Step of Faith Work**

The process of making a belief a part of one’s personal faith involves work. Faith, by definition, cannot be played as a role. It is defined by the *World English Dictionary* as a, “strong or unshakable belief in something.” Thus, faith is something a person always believes regardless of social settings or roles. Most roles have expectations about beliefs attached to them, but when those beliefs are no longer advantageous or contingent on one’s social setting, when they are held and acted upon
regardless of the audience, then the role’s beliefs merge with the person to become their faith. The process of actively trying to make beliefs or faith rules into the faith of one’s person will be referred to as “faith work.” Hochschild shows in “Managed Heart,” that individuals can use “emotion work” to change their feelings to be more appropriately to feeling rules (1983:561). Similarly, faith, the beliefs of one’s person, can also be managed and changed to be more appropriate to faith rules.

If PKs are to merge their disciple role with their person, they must first recognize that simply and superficially playing the role of disciple is deviant to the faith rules. Many PKs realize this deviance when they start the conversion process of study the Bible to find their faith. As Christian and Jeff exemplify,

In a very humbling fashion it took me six months of studying the Bible. Because I started out the way that I thought I would answering the questions right, but as we dug deeper and talked about personal life application, ‘Christian, ok we know that you know what this means are you doing it, are you living it?” And the guys, I believe God put in my life, they didn’t allow me to get by with just right answers, and they wanted to see me have a heart that responded, not that measured up, but just a heart that responded and umm, we read scriptures about that concept, you know a lot. We talked about it and I remember this certain point where I was like, ‘I got it. I get it. I get what Jesus did for me and it wasn’t an intellectual thing.’ –Christian

I will never forget that first Bible study. Oh my gosh. We were doing the word study and we were talking about the Bible and I can’t remember what scripture we came to or what the point was but I remember it was just me and him. I said something, he closed his Bible sat back in his chair folded his arms and looked me in the eye and he said, something like, ‘what are you doing?’ And I was kind of like, ‘what do you mean?’ And he was just like, ‘you know, if you don’t want to do this we won’t do this, but I’m not going to keep studying the Bible with you if you keep giving me these little half hearted answers or if you are going to try and impress me with your Bible knowledge. If you aren’t going to be real, I’m just going to walk away right now,’ and umm, me being thirteen at the time I was just kind of like, “Whoa. What is going on here? You have just majorly, majorly caught me off guard here.” –Jeff
Those studying with Christian asked him, “Ok we know that you know what this means. Are you doing it? Are you living it?” Only by asking Christian if what he professes matches his actual behavior is Christian able to recognize the divide between what he professes and his actual beliefs. Similarly, Jeff is confronted that playing the role is not enough. He knows what he should believe and what he should say in his Bible studies. However, those studying with Jeff did not accept his knowledge of the faith rules as his own faith. As Jeff states, they would not allow him to rely on “half-hearted answers” or “Bible knowledge.” Though Jeff tries to just continue playing the role, he is surprised to find that more is expected of him. Only when Christian and Jeff are shown that their presentation of faith does not match up to what is expected of the faith rules do they realize the deviance in just playing the role of faith.

In both instances, these PKs are shown that faith cannot be played as a role, but must be a part of one’s person. As Turner states:

A third way to recognize salience and resistance to compartmentalization is to examine the attitudes and beliefs that a person holds. Merger of role with person is indicated by the acquisition of attitudes and beliefs appropriate to the role.

Following Turner, one may be an expert at playing a role; but only when the attitudes and beliefs of that role are acquired by an individual does that role merge with his or her person. This idea is found in the experiences described by Christian and Jeff. For both of these PKs, there is a divide between the role they are playing and their actual person; or as Christian describes it between “the right answers” and “a heart that responded.” Though Christian and Jeff know the script for playing a disciple, they are shown that according to the faith rules, just playing the role is not enough; the role must become a
part of their person. Only by being shown the difference between the disciple role and their person, are Christian and Jeff able to understand that their current understanding of faith is not appropriate.

The practice of Bible studies allows one to understand the faith rules of the disciple role and then use faith work to turn the beliefs that correspond to that role into a person’s faith. In other words, as Hochschild (1983) would say it, faith moves from “surface” to “deep,” or as Goffman (1959) would put it, from “cynical” to “sincere.” When Christian is confronted that his faith lacks sincerity, he describes going through a process in order to make his knowledge become a personal conviction. Through asking him about how his living practices are going, those studying the Bible with him are able to help him see the divide between the beliefs he holds because he has adopted a disciple role, and the faith of his person. Only then is he able to manage his faith to really believe and “get what Jesus did for” him. Similarly, when Jeff is shown that giving his “half-hearted answers” are deviant to the faith rules, he is then told to be as “real” as possible and admit when he does not know things. By being asked to be “real,” he is expected to stop trying to perform a familiar role and admit to the things he does not know. By becoming “real” to his faith, he is able to recognize where his faith needs more work to match faith rules more sincerely to the expectations of the role he plays as a disciple. Only by first recognizing one’s deviance to the faith rules will one use faith work to change those beliefs.
Managing One’s Faith in Bible Studies

Once PKs recognize the discrepancy between the role they play and their actual faith, can PKs use faith work to make their faith match the faith rules. Emma and Brad describe how they managed their faith in their studies:

I just had to really get down to it and realize, ‘OK, I’m not going to be with people, and for an eternity I will be with God.’ So, I need to really kind of see ‘who am I doing this for?’ And it took awhile. I would sometimes be crying [and] just praying. It was so hard to kind of differentiate what my motives were, you know. Like was it for boys. And I guess what it came down to was that it was for God. I was doing it for God cause I want to be forgiven of my sins and it wasn’t for people. And I think, I mean, it was hard, it was really hard to figure out what my motives really were. –Emma

I can’t remember a time that there wasn’t a motivation to do that. I mean even now, there is the motivation for the love of God and motivation for Jesus and stuff like that. But also, the motivations that I have never done anything other than this. This is what I have always given my time to. Which is kind of, you know, you have to be aware of that. You know what I mean? And not just doing it for doing its sake. You know, this is what excites me. This is what I love to do. I want to do this even more. Not like I want to make daddy proud as much as this is what I enjoy. -Brad

As PKs, there are many motivations for presenting a disciple role. Both Emma and Brad manage their faith by working through their motivation for faith. Brad describes being motivated, “to make daddy proud,” or because he has, “never done anything other than this.” Emma likewise, feels a motivation to do it for “people” or to do it for “boys.” Since, presenting a minister’s face places expectation for faith on them it can be hard for PKs to work through their motivation for presenting faith.

Brad and Emma describe the faith work involved in trying to make certain their motivation is for God. Emma describes crying and it being hard to make sure her
motivation is God. With so many other motivations for faith, she really works to make sure her presentation of faith is for God and not something else. Brad also describes his mental process in making sure his motivation is God, commenting that he is “not just doing it for doing its sake”; instead, being sincere about his faith “you know, this is what excites me. This is what I love to do. I want to do this even more.” He reminds himself that his motivations are not people-based, but instead it is for God. Both Emma and Brad recognize that if their motivation for faith is people, then their faith is simply a role played for others. To become sincere in their faith is a process earned by working through their motivations regarding how they manage their faith.

As Emma and Brad’s examples illustrate, PKs are surrounded by a set of faith rules and they are raised to follow them. Being raised with a set of faith rules can easily give PKs the impression that they were born with their faith. However, being surrounded by faith rules and expectations can actually have the opposite effect and make it more difficult for PKs to find their faith and make God the motivation of their faith. Though faith seems like something very personal and natural, Emma and Brad show that faith must also be managed and maintained.
PART FIVE, CHAPTER FIVE: MANAGING FAITH AND FACE AFTER CONVERSION
After baptism, PKs must continue to manage their faith to match the faith rules they have committed to uphold. However, expectations from upholding a minister’s face can lead to PKs relying on an insincere presentation of faith instead of actually managing their faith. The pressures of a minister’s face can even lead to PKs hiding parts of their lives from their parents and those at church. Only when PKs are able to get some distance from the minister’s face they are expected to uphold, are they then able to assess what affect their parents’ minister’s face has on their faith.

**Play the Role of Disciple: Surface Acting**

For PKs, it can be easy to know exactly how to present faith since they have grown up knowing the faith rules. They can act as masterful performers and often be rewarded with positions of leadership for their performance. However, the minister’s face PKs present can lead to PKs feeling little need in managing their faith. As Jacob recalls his early years as a disciple, he describes being…

Very conscious of always playing the role; not really being myself. Not necessarily that I feel like I acted a whole different than I would have if I had been myself, but the truth is that I wouldn’t be myself. That came from just the pressure … from me wanting to help my parents because I love them, you know that kind of stuff. Either way, that stuff catches up to you later in life. It doesn’t really bug me, you know. It didn’t really bug me when I was younger. But I definitely came to a point, I think that I was a sophomore in college, where everything changed in my life. I … wasn’t necessarily maliciously being fake or not being genuine, but I just realized how much of my life was from having everything spoon-fed to me. Everything just was made to pretend that it was perfect, when it didn’t really matter if it was perfect or not. It was just such a show… kind of like a joke. I hit that point in my life and the pendulum kind of swung in the opposite direction and instead of being a people pleaser; I became completely direct in everything.
Jacob describes being “very conscious of always playing the role.” Hochschild describes this consciousness of playing a role as “surface acting.” She states surface acting is, “disguising what we feel [and], pretending to feel what we do not” (33). As a disciple, Jacob puts on “a show” of where his faith is, instead of managing his faith to match the disciple “role” he presents to others.

Jacob states that he would rely on this role because of the “pressure” of “wanting to help [his] parents because [he] loves them.” He plays the role and relies on surface acting for presenting himself as a disciple of the church in order to support his parents. However, the pressure from a minister’s face can make PKs feel forced to present themselves as disciples and so rely on surface acting.

Christian recalls being very conscious of his performance of faith for others. As Christian states,

I would be very giving in the fellowship before and after church. And I would meet people and I would smile and introduce myself. And again, we had a lot of people in the home. Whenever I met people that came to the home … same routine. Part of that was a sincere desire to make a … good connection, but I didn’t really want it to get any deeper than that. And I think also talking about spiritual things or sharing little tidbits of what I was going through but not too much as to seem that I was doing poorly. So saying, ‘hey I wanted to talk to you. I wanted to initiate with you to tell you I am having a hard time with this. Can you give me some input or what do you think?’ And for someone that doesn’t know the whole picture that might seem very humble. But it was a way of clearing my conscience and also looking like I was spiritual and really wanted help… I got to speak at several teen events in small speaking roles. Sometimes just to welcome the group, and sometimes at church. I think a couple of times as a teenager, which was not something that many teenagers got to do, I was asked to speak to the church for the communion service which is usually like 10 minutes of sharing personally. And I would do the same thing. I would share a little bit and try to look “vulnerable” in small amounts and then I would share what I thought were great insights. Total facade.
Christian is a self-avowed expert at his performance of faith. Through the “minister’s face” Christian holds, he is seen as an example to others. Because of this, he is given special speaking opportunities at church functions that, he says, “not a lot of teenagers get to do.” He is treated as a leader for others in the faith and so plays the role accordingly. Yet, Christian’s performance of faith relies on surface acting. He describes wanting to “seem very humble,” “looking like I was spiritual,” and trying to “look vulnerable.” His actions are induced by what he perceives others want to see. He describes his performance as a “routine.”

By focusing on the appearance of faith, he completely neglects the management of his faith. While he does admit that part of his performance was a “sincere desire to make a good connection,” he also admits to not really wanting “it to get any deeper than that.” So much effort goes into his performance of faith, that he uses this performance to create distance from others looking any “deeper” at his unmanaged faith. Christian even uses this performance to give off the appearance that he is managing his faith when he initiates talks about “spiritual things” and shares things he is having a “hard time.” All of this surface acting allows him to avoid dealing with where his faith sincerely is. As Christian and Jacob state, their performance of faith could be disingenuous, a “total facade” or just a “show.”

**Double Life**

The pressure to save minister’s face and the lack of accessibility to lifestyles outside of the church culture can lead PKs to completely rely on surface acting to present their faith. Christian explains how he slowly began to lead a double life:
I didn’t go out to parties, I didn’t drink or smoke or fool around with girls or any of that cause I just didn’t have access to that and I knew why … I agreed with all of it but that doesn’t remove the temptation and want to be a part of what seems so cool and what everybody gets caught up with in high school. And I remember my junior year, though I had said “no” on the outset of things, my heart was such that I wasn’t dealing with my heart. I felt like, “wow, I really want that, I want that lifestyle. I want to be that guy that has got access to every social circle and who is impressive. And to be impressive in high school means that you have done the most bad stuff, I think, and are getting away with it. And so it was a heart level struggle on a lot of ends. I didn’t ever go to parties, but when you are that discontent with the way that you are living I think it made me start to feel like I don’t really want be a Christian if this is what it means. If it means that I can’t do what I was perceiving as fun. So I tried to sneak little doses of that from the things that I did by myself. You know what I watched on TV, the things that I thought about, without being super specific – the things that you can find on the Internet, all that kinds of stuff. Complete opposite from what I was convinced was right. And those things I could do without consequences. My parents would never know. I wouldn’t be in trouble. Also I remember I started swearing a lot in high school, cause that was easy to do. You don’t have to stay out late for that and it does sound kind of cool. And that is what it was about – about sneaking what I could without putting myself too far over the line to get in trouble.

Christian “didn’t have access” to the “bad stuff” that would go against the faith rules he is expected to uphold. Regardless of what he believes, he knows what he is expected to believe and so expresses having little choice at any alternative to the faith rules. However, abiding by the faith rules does not mean that he is managing his faith to the faith rules. As Christian states, “I agreed with all of it but that doesn’t remove the temptation.” Christian recognizes a divide between what he should believe and what he actually wants to do. It is at this divide that faith management is often used to match one’s faith with the faith rules. However, as Christian states, “I wasn’t dealing with my heart.” Christian chooses to not manage his faith such that it appears to conform to the
faith rules; regardless of whether Christian manages his faith or not, he knows that he is still expected to follow the faith rules.

Without managing one’s faith to the faith rules, presenting a faith that abides by faith rules can become surface acting. As Christian states, “when you are that discontent with the way that you are living, I think it made me start to feel like I don’t really want to be a Christian if this is what it means.” Christian gets to the point where he no longer wants to be a Christian. The divide between what he presents as his faith and where his faith actually is increases until he starts leading a double life. With his parents and those at church, he presents a faith that matches the faith rules, and yet when he is by himself or with his classmates he acts in ways that he knows are contrary to the faith rules. Without managing his faith such that it aligns with to the faith rules, the faith Christian presents to others becomes simply a performance.

**PKs’ Faith When Minister’s Face Is Gone**

When PKs no longer feel pressure to uphold a minister’s face, they are then able to assess what effect that minister’s face had on their faith. For example, Justin describes going out of state for college, away from people who are led by his parents. In this context he has a fresh start, and the opportunity to gain a fresh perspective. Since he is away at college, his everyday performance has no direct effect on his parent’s minister’s face, and he is free from the expectations placed on his faith from that face. However, he also can no longer rely on the positive social value of that face to assist in his performance of faith. As Justin recalls:

I remember I moved out there and I tried to play spiritual the way I thought I knew how. And there were people there that just saw right
through me. And I remember I didn’t fool anybody. They didn’t know the specifics but I had people in my life, thank God, that could tell that something was wrong and that I was not real. And over time, you know building relationships with them, getting to know them, and building trust, it all came out and I told them everything that was going on – everything that I was feeling, and everything that I was doing … secretly. But it took awhile and I think it took a change of scene, which to me I think is very important to my experience. You know, you are out of the church that your parents lead. In a way, I am my own man, my consequences are all mine, and nobody is impressed by my last name. It was refreshing, but it kind of shocked me awake, and I think it was the perfect environment for me to be real and come clean. And to be apart from the family for that to happen was good; that was needed.

Just as he did in his parents’ congregation, Justin tries to “play spiritual” and rely on surface acting to display his faith. However, the difference in college is that he no longer has a minister’s face to assist his performance. Without a minister’s face, Justin states that others “saw right through” his performance and that he “didn’t fool anybody.” Minister’s face allows Justin to be seen as a spiritual leader in his home congregation, however without that face his faith is seen as “not real.”

Without a minister’s face, Justin feels he is able to be his “own man.” If he acts or feels out of line with what is expected of him, then his “consequences” are all his own. He is free to “be real” and “come clean” about what he is doing in secret without fear of hurting his parents’ reputation. This freedom leads to Justin exposing where his faith really is to others. He is able to shed the role of disciple he was performing to leave only what is left of his actual faith. Where his faith actually is might not match the faith rules he thinks he should believe in, but only by coming clean with where his faith really is, is he then able to drop the façade and decide how he would like to actually manage his faith. A minister’s face was a valuable asset to help him display faith to others, but showed to actually be a hindrance to managing his actual faith.
PART FIVE, CHAPTER SIX: FAITH WORK FOR MINISTER’S FACE
PKs can be very aware that their faith can directly affect their parents’ job security. As a consequence, they know that protecting their parents’ minister’s face can directly affect how they manage their faith. However, when PKs are motivated to manage their faith to protect their parents’ job, then they risk becoming alienated from their faith.

How PKs’ Faith Management Affects Their Parents’ Job Security

Faith work is the management of faith. However, what happens when the motivation for faith work is for a job. Two PKs describe how they associated their presentation of faith with their parents’ job performance. As Aaron and Abby describe,

I mean it goes back to practicing what you preach. And even today, my parents go around to go visit other churches and do parenting classes, you know. And so for them to speak about the correct way to parent – to raise a family, you know, it would damage their credibility obviously. How can they speak about a model family if their family is not following up with that? Why would people want to listen to what they have to say if their family isn’t like the role model… and a lot of counseling revolves around the family. And having that in the back of my mind, you know, the knowledge that “ok, they are out there talking about this so what I do is going to affect their credibility and, you know, I better walk a straight path. I better stay in line otherwise they are not going to be able to work.” And if they’re not able to do their job effectively then they probably wouldn’t have that job anymore. Through the cause and effect I can pretty much understand and wow maybe it’s a little unfair that my parents’ job security would be correlated with my personal behavior. —Aaron

This is the main reason I kept everything a secret with this boyfriend. Ok so you know how in the Bible it talks about elders in the church, it’s always plural so there is always to be more than one elder in a church. Well there was only my dad and one other elder couple in the church and so this whole year I basically fell away in my heart. I was still going to church and kind of putting on the image and I was lying about my boyfriend because I knew that if it got out that my dad would have to step down from his role and he loves being elder, more than anything. Like my parents love being in the shepherding role. But not only would they have to step down but the other couple would also have to step down because
there was to be two… that was my hugest pressure that I ever felt, when I was not doing well, was to try and still put off the image for their sake, cause I did not want my dad to lose his job and I did not want [the other elder] to lose his job cause it wasn’t only my dad but it would also affect this whole other family. –Abby

These PKs connect how they follow the faith rules with their parents’ job security. For Aaron, this connection is more indirectly made. He associates their credibility as family counselors with his own behavior. Though perhaps not directly expected of an evangelist, Aaron states that through “cause and effect” he understood that, as he says, “my parents’ job security would be correlated with my personal behavior.” Similarly, Abby associates her parents’ employment well-being with her presentation of faith. As an elder, Abby understands that this position explicitly requires one’s children to be believers. Her faith is an asset for her father’s job. Not only so but she also understands that in a church there should be more than one elder. So if her dad loses his job the other elder would have to step down as well because he could not hold the position alone.

Thus, Abby feels that two jobs are dependent on her faith. In both instances, these PKs feel expected to uphold the faith rules; and that not following the faith rules could lead to their parents losing their jobs.

PKs also feel expectations placed on them to use faith work to uphold a minister’s face. The work of a minister is one that requires physical, emotional and spiritual labor. However, as we have seen in the example above, a minister’s credibility and job security is also linked to his or her family’s management of faith. As Aaron states, “Why would people want to listen to what [ministers] have to say if their family isn’t the role model?” Aaron connects how others might perceive his parents if his behavior is not in line with faith rules. However, as we have seen in the last section and even with Abby’s example,
to just follow the faith rules without actually managing one’s faith to be in line with those rules, leads to surface acting and can often come across as insincere. Thus, PKs are expected to manage their faith to be in line with the faith rules as part of upholding a minister’s face which in turn has a direct effect on their parents’ job security.

How Minister’s Face Affects PKs’ Faith Management

David and Lance describe how a minister’s face affect their management of faith; they describe how the pressure they felt from their parents’ positions as ministers affect their management of faith when it came to considering dating girls that would not be considered “believers” by the church (which went against the church’s faith rules (Jones 1997:45)),

Interviewer: How do you think your dad viewed dating her?
Lance: Well I know that he didn’t approve of it. Umm…
Interviewer: How do you think the Bible would have responded to you dating?
Lance: Good question. At this time I felt like I knew what the Bible said about it, or what people’s interpretations of what the Bible said about it, but I didn’t know that I agreed with it. For instance the most common passage that is linked with this is the “not being yoked with an unbeliever” and so in my eyes I would question what is yoked and who is a believer… I don’t know that I really came to any conviction about yoke or what it is to be a believer but I knew that if I were to pursue this relationship with this girl that I liked it would have drastic effect on my family, like people would know. I think a girl from church had somehow found out that I was on a date with this girl and then told the campus minister who then approached me about it and we had a long talk about it. And I knew that my mom was upset that I was considering this. But it was just way too much drama that I didn’t want to deal with. I knew it was going to be so much of a hassle and a burden that it just didn’t seem worth it; you know, the cost outweighed the benefits and so I just dropped it. –Lance

There were several other girls that I said I got really close with and in the back of my mind I was like ‘Hmmm, I wonder if there are romantic feelings on both ends and then because of that pressure I would just stop calling them and completely cut it off because I didn’t know what to do. –David
Both David and Lance got close to girls they felt they were not supposed to date. For Lance, he knows what the faith rules are. However, he also recognizes a discrepancy between “what the Bible [says] about” him dating this girl and “what people’s interpretations of what the Bible [says] about” him dating this girl. He goes on to question, “what is yoked and who is an unbeliever?” By asking questions and recognizing the discrepancy between the faith rules he feels expected to uphold and what he actually believes; he is engaged in managing his faith.

However, both Lance and David are led by a need to save minister’s face and follow the faith rules regardless of what they believe. As Lance describes, “I know that if I were to pursue this relationship with this girl that I liked, it would have drastic effects on my family.” So as a result, Lance “just dropped it.” Similarly, David describes feeling “that pressure” which came from his parents’ position. And so when David felt these “romantic feelings” towards a girl he is not allowed to date, he would then “completely cut it off.” In both instances, they feel a certain amount of pressure from the minister’s face they uphold to follow the faith rules. While Lance tries to manage his faith through the situation, in the end he says, “I don’t know that I really came to any conviction about yoke or what it is to be a believer,” but he says because of his family, Lance abides by the faith rules. In both instances, the PKs comply with the faith rules in order to uphold a minister’s face and not because it is their “conviction.” Thus, when PKs feel pressure to uphold a minister’s face, this face can act as a hindrance from PKs actually managing their faith; especially if PKs’ management of faith leads them in a different direction than what they feel they are expected to believe.
Minister’s face can also affect PK’s faith work in everyday situations. Wendy gives us an example of how minister’s face affects her management of faith,

I feel the pressure that some eyes are on me and I have the responsibility to process it in a spiritually or healthy way quicker than the rest… and some of it may be because of where my parents are at. I think if I sat there questioning or bitter with certain things that leadership comes up with or whatever, then it would be a reflection of, kind of, where is my respect at for God and for my parents…I think sometimes how I respond would show where my heart is at and be a reflection of how united I am with my parents in one way.

Wendy describes how she manages her faith to be in line with what “leadership comes up with.” Wendy feels she needs to, “process it in a spiritually or healthy way quicker than the rest” so that she can show how “united” she is with her parents. Wendy is motivated by how her faith would affect others’ perception of her parents. In these three examples, we see how upholding minister’s face affects PK’s management of faith.

**Spiritual Alienation**

Faith work motivated by a desire to uphold minister’s face leads to an alienation from one’s faith. As Aaron describes,

Say that I want to read my Bible, but… as soon as I open it up and start to read, it’s like I’m all of a sudden just going through the motions again and it just feels the same as when I really wasn’t enjoying it. You know, when I was doing it just because people wanted me to. It wasn’t enjoyable for me and it became like this thing for me. And so going through those same motions, it brings it back. It wasn’t any traumatic experience or anything but it just, it almost becomes a burden again. But you know it’s not every time. Like, the other day I was just feeling like I was curious what’s in the Book of Proverbs and reading that and really enjoyed it; and found something out that really helped me, you know, with my job search for instance. And so it was a really enjoyable and productive time. And that again motivates me that, ok it can be good again. So it’s just building up to the positive side and it definitely motivates me. I’m putting more positives and breaking down the negatives slowly. And that in turn is helping my relationship… Praying
is actually another thing that I haven’t really figured out how to do. It sounds funny, I know how to pray; I know how to go through the motions but haven’t really figured out how to make it work for me, you know, where it is meaningful, a really meaningful time.

Aaron describes reading his Bible and praying as part of how he performed his faith. However, his motivation for displaying faith was for others. As he says, “I was doing it just because people wanted me to.” His motivation was other people and maintaining a minister’s face.

When Aaron participates in acts of faith in order to uphold a minister’s face, he experiences a disconnection in his relationship with God. He states, “as soon as I open it up and start to read, it’s like I’m all of a sudden just going through the motions again.” Aaron continuously did faith work motivated by others and minister’s face and so when he tries to genuinely connect with God he finds it difficult. He knows how to pray and read his Bible for people, but it is difficult for him to do it because he “enjoys it” and not because “people want me to.” Trying to be motivated out of an enjoyment to commune with God is difficult for him. As Aaron states, “I know how to pray, I know how to go through the motions.” However, he states he does not know how to pray in a “meaningful” way. He states in another part of the interview that his relationship with God has been this way for years. Thus, being a PK can make them experts at presenting a faith while simultaneously can lead them to feeling alienated from their faith.
PART SIX: DISCUSSION
Drawing from the results presented in the previous sections, I have suggested that ministers are given a minister’s face that they and their family must live by. As found in the literature and PKs’ accounts, the minister’s role intertwines the professional and personal life of the minister (Campbell 1998; Lee 1999, 2003). How they act as a parent or Christian has a direct effect on how they are perceived as a minister. And as a result, PKs can also feel that their example holds a direct effect on their parents’ minister’s face. Christian exemplifies this sentiment when he states, “I better act like [he is expected to] or else my dad loses that position.” And likewise, just a Hochschild (1969) described how ambassadors’ wives are given a “vicarious role” that they are expected to present to help their husbands’ professional image, PKs are also given a “minister’s face” they are expected to always present to help their parents’ image as examples.

Many PKs in this study report feeling like they need to be examples of proper behavior in every part of their life, in a similar way that their parents are expected to live as examples. As Matt states, “I was the minister’s son, so I have to be a shining example of a teenage student, teenage athlete, teenage Christian.” In the same way, as one study writes ministers, “are under pressure to perform, to be super-spiritual, to be in leadership, etc., and they pass these same pressures on to their children by extension” (Bouma 1979:69). However, by living according to a minister’s face, PKs can feel they are given a role that is already ascribed for them. As Kenny exemplifies by describing what he perceives as the expectations for how his whole life should be lived. Similarly, Lee also observed about PKs that, “it can feel as if the part has been written and the script set, with little tolerance for improvisation” (1992:35). Thus, as ministers work to live as examples for the church, their children also live with the same expectations.
While a minister’s face gives higher expectations to PKs, it also gives them a certain amount of moral authority in the church. An example of this is when Wendy describes how she felt her friends would expect her to speak up if something wasn’t right. Or, how other kids seem to use Sheldon’s drinking experience as a “license” for them to do the same shortly afterwards. Likewise, for many PKs presenting a minister’s face and their upbringing make it easy for them to act as leaders. As Brad describes, he knew the “textbook” way to act. Thus, just as PKs are given the face and moral authority of a leader, they are also raised to act as a leader; and so naturally fulfilling a minister’s face role would mean becoming ministers themselves. As Sarah describes, she was told it was her “duty” to become a minister because being raised by ministers made her a “kingdom princess.” However, though it seems very natural for PKs to become church leaders, it can actually be damaging if they feel coerced into it. As Jacob states, “leadership roles don’t do good things for me,” and yet he felt he had to be a leader because, as he put it, it was his “birthright.” Likewise, as Rediger has found in his study of clergy burnout, the pressure of maintaining, public family roles “produces confusion and pain when one or more family members feel forced to conform to a lifestyle that is congruent with personal intentions and calling” (Rediger 1982:6). PKs can seem like a natural choice for the ministry and yet as shown in the literature and this study’s findings, becoming church leaders can have negative effects if they feel forced or pressured into it.

The ambiguity between the minister’s personal and private life, creates role ambiguity with their children. As shown in the literature and the interviews included in this study, ministers have ambiguous work boundaries. As Abby states, “in the ministry your workday is never done.” The lack of work boundaries has show to
have a negative effect on the minister’s family (Lee 1992, 1999; Lee and Iverson-Gilbert 2003). As a result, PKs report their feeling more comfortable with being spiritually ministered to by others. As David states, “their kids probably wouldn’t want to talk to them about a lot of stuff because of that like barrier there.” Similarly, Abby exclaims, “I just wanted him to be my dad and not the preacher that preaches to me.” Both Abby and David feel ambiguity in their parents’ roles and seek clear lines distinguishing the two. Furthermore, studies have shown that clearer work and family roles can prevent stress and depression with ministers (Linville 1987). Likewise, the findings of this study seem to show similar results. Abby felt the “pressure from the ministry,” the most when she felt the churches needs came before her own.

The emotional spillover of the ministers’ job negatively affects their relationships with their children. As Matt describes, his father “was really kind of worn down so to that degree he did kind of bring his work with him.” Research shows that clearer boundaries can prevent spillover of negative emotions from one role to the next (Edwards and Rothbard 2000). The emotional demands of the ministry can leave PKs feeling they must manage their own emotions with their parents. As Brittani describes, one church leader actually told her she could not go to her mom for emotional support. She states, “he basically made me feel like if I told her, I was going to hurt her.” However, managing or suppressing one’s emotions around one’s parents can have negative effects. As David describes, he feels like there are “deficiencies” in his relationship with his parents because he never would talk to them about spiritual things. Or as Aaron describes, he feels even now he cannot talk to his parents unless he is in a good place.
spiritually. Thus, family boundary ambiguity can lead to PKs feeling their parents are physically, spiritually or emotionally unavailable.

The rules for what and how individuals should believe something is referred to in this paper as “faith rules.” Faith rules is exemplified when observing how the ministers’ job can also have a prevalent affect on their children’s faith. Presenting a minister’s face makes it easier for PKs to play the role of disciple; however, it also makes it more difficult for them to find their faith. For example, a number of PKs reported feeling additional expectations to get baptized because their parents are ministers. When Michael did not want to get baptized, he was constantly asked why not, which led him to believe his feelings of faith were deviant. PKs report feeling there is a script, or faith rules, for how they should find their faith. As Sam describes, growing up around the church and other Bible studies allowed him to know, “the right answers for literally everything” when it was his turn to study the Bible. However, knowing how to play the role of faith does not equate to genuine faith. As Sam exemplifies, he told those he was studying with that he felt terrible that his sins put Jesus on the cross because he knows that is what he should say; but then admits he actually didn’t think he had any sin to wash away. It can be easy for PKs to rely on their knowledge of faith rules without thinking about what they actually believe.

Other PKs recall how they were shown the difference between what they know they should believe and what they actually believe. Jeff describes that when he tries to present his faith as what he thinks it is supposed to be, he is accused of giving “half-hearted answers” and “Bible knowledge.” When he decides to “be real” he is able to deal with where his faith is. Only by recognizing the discrepancy between what PKs actually
believe and what they are supposed to believe can they then use faith work so their beliefs will match the faith rules.

One way PKs are able to manage their faith is by sorting through their motivations for professing their faith. As Brad describes, he had to figure out if his motivation was primarily “to make daddy proud.” Similarly, as Emma describes, “it was really hard to figure out what my motives really were.” By honestly dealing with what their motivations are and making their motivation only for God, these PKs manage their faith to conform to the faith rules.

The social expectations placed on PKs by a minister’s face give PKs many motivations for presenting faith. However, displaying faith to fulfill minister’s face can make faith just a role PKs feel they must perform. Jacob described that his motivation for faith became “wanting to help my parents because I love them.” But ultimately being motivated by this left Jacob feeling he was “not genuine.” Similarly, Christian describes how he would follow the faith rules because he knew living with his parents he would not “have access to any alternative.” However, if PKs feel expected or forced to follow the faith rules, then they can rely more on surface acting for presenting faith instead of managing their faith. As Christian states, he stopped, “dealing with [his] heart.”

PKs can so easily become experts at simply playing the role of faith without managing their actual faith, that they can even be seen as leaders in the church. As Christian describes, he would “seem very humble,” “looking like I was spiritual,” and trying to “look vulnerable,” and through this performance he would be given special public speaking roles in the church. PKs know the faith rules, they know how to play the role of faith, and they wear a minister’s face; as a result it can be so easy for them to rely
on their performance and not cultivate their actual faith. However, as Christian explains, his faith was a “total façade.” Thus, while a minister’s face can make it easier for PKs to play the role of faith, it can actually hinder them from maintaining their actual faith.

Lastly, drawing from the results, presenting a minister’s face can hinder PKs’ faith management. PKs grow up very conscious that their behavior and actions affect their parents’ minister’s face. As Aaron exemplifies, “my parents’ job security would be correlated with my personal behavior.” Likewise, faith is most effortlessly shown when it is genuinely felt. Thus, PKs’ faith management can be motivated through a desire to uphold their parents’ minister’s face. As Wendy described, she would try and “get her heart there quicker” because partly she is a leader and others look to her example but also, she states, because it is a “reflection of how united I am with my parents.” She manages her faith in part for parents’ minister’s face. As Aaron exemplified, he knew how to pray and read his Bible but it was difficult for him to do it in a “meaningful” way. He was motivated for so long to do it for others and protect his parents’ minister’s face, that he then found it difficult to find enjoyment or meaning from it. He became alienated from parts of his faith. Thus, though minister’s face makes it easy for PK to play the part of faith, it ultimately can hinder them from managing and connecting with their actual faith.
PART SEVEN: CONCLUSION
Through my findings and research on PKs, I sought to discover the way in which their identity, relationships and emotions are affected by their position as PKs. Similar to Goffman’s theory of “face” and “face work”, the journey to staking claim of a minister’s face begins when PKs abide by minister’s rules and offer every area of their lives as examples for the church. Likewise, a minister’s face also gives PKs moral authority with their peers with expectations that they too will become leaders within the church. Additionally, PKs also experience a lack of clear boundaries between their parents’ ministerial and familial life, which can lead to ambiguity in their relationships with their parents. As PKs deal with presenting a minister’s face and family boundary ambiguity they are also expected to manage their faith and identity. Living as examples causes PKs to be very conscious of the church’s faith rules; so much so, that it is easy for them to rely on their knowledge of the faith rules, instead of managing their faith. Only when they recognize the difference between their knowledge of faith rules and their faith are they able to manage their faith to coincide with the faith rules. As PKs manage their faith as Christians, the possession of a minister’s face assists them in presenting an image of strong faith while simultaneously making it difficult to simply cultivate their faith and not stay at the level of their performance. Similar to Hochschild’s theory of emotional labor, PKs use their management of faith as “faith labor” in order to preserve their parents’ position as ministers; however, by using their faith as a commodity, they risk alienation from their faith.

All in all, being a PK shows to have significant effects on one’s sense of self, relationships and faith. The previous literature on PKs is very sparse yet, as shown in this study, their parents’ occupation greatly affects them. Likewise, it could be assumed that
the children of politicians or celebrities experience similar affects from their parents’ job; however, little research is available about this because of the lack of accessibility to them. Thus, further research on PKs could give valuable insight into the effects that family-occupational boundary ambiguity has on offspring. Further research should be done specifically examining the dynamics of, and interrelations between, faith work and faith labor.
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Interview Schedule

1. How would you say your overall experience as being a minister’s child has been?

2. Could you give me some of the positives and negatives of being a minister’s child?

3. Did you ever feel that others treated you differently because of your parent(s) occupation? If so, in what way?

4. Have you ever felt that you were looked to as an example for others in church? If so, can you think back to a time that you can remember being expected to be an example?

5. Are there certain expectations on you because of your parents’ profession? If so can you think of a time that you felt expected to behave a certain way?

6. What about expectation about how you should look? Are there expectations for what movies you should watch or music you should listen to? Are there expectations about what friends you have or where you are allowed to go?

7. Can you think of a time that you were afraid that your actions could have a negative affect on your parent’s reputation or job?

8. As a minister’s child are there expectations for how you should feel about things or express your feelings?

9. Do you ever feel pressure to not show emotion or show more emotion? If so in what way?

10. Tell me about a time when you felt expected to act a certain way though your feelings did not match up.

11. Describe your faith. What was the process of finding it if you have found it?

12. How did your parents’ involvement in the church affect your home life? How did it affect their relationship with you?

13. Have you ever fallen away? And if so can you describe the process and what it means to you?

14. How are your religious beliefs similar or different from your parents’ beliefs?

15. Is there anything else that you would like to add?