MORAL DEVELOPMENT AS A COMPONENT

OF THE EDUCATION OF PROTESTANT MINISTERS

By

Klaus Dieter Issler

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Curriculum

1984

ABSTRACT

MORAL DEVELOPMENT AS A COMPONENT
OF THE EDUCATION OF PROTESTANT MINISTERS

By

Klaus Dieter Issler

The purpose of the study is to describe the educational emphasis placed on the moral development of ministerial students in the curriculum of Protestant seminaries. Three research questions guided the inquiry focusing on educational tasks, faculty-student interactions and institutional influences. Five aspects of moral development, identified from the literature, were employed in the study: moral knowledge, moral thinking, moral sensitivity, personal values and will power.

Personal interviews were conducted with four faculty members from each of 6 mid-western Protestant, denominational, graduate, theological seminaries (23 male and 1 female). The following demographic information was compiled from the professors: mean age=53 years, mean years of teaching experience=20 years, and 13 professors had previous full-time pastoral experience (mean=9 years).

The study identified six major themes of factors which faculty perceived as influencing students' moral development: 1) field education ministry and life experiences, 2) faculty-student relationships, 3) one's relationship with God and related worship experiences, 4) discussion of moral issues, 5) peer interaction and group work and 6) institutional

structures. Each of the themes incorporates factors which either facilitate or hinder development toward moral maturity.

One of the interview items requested faculty to rate students' degree of moral learning at the seminary in five categories. Classical disciplines faculty tended to rate students' degree of learning in moral thinking and personal values higher than ministry-related disciplines faculty. Almost all of the professors rated students' degree of learning in moral knowledge as high. A good majority of professors rated students' degree of learning in moral sensitivity and will power as fair or little.

Due to the ever-present socialization process, the students' moral maturity is continually being affected by aspects of seminary education. Theological educators are encouraged to shift from a passive-unconscious involvement in the moral development of seminary students to a more active-conscious posture of deliberate educational planning.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Though undertaken and composed by a single author, a dissertation is made possible by the motivating encouragement and shared resources of a number of people. Due to the limited amount of space, only a few of these fellow workers can be identified below.

The substance of the study was made available through the cooperation of the six participating seminaries. The presidents or deans of the seminaries, and the faculty members generously gave of their time, and candidly presented their insights and mature reflections of theological education.

Members of the doctoral guidance committee provided assistance for differing aspects of the project. Professor Norm Bell guided my study of the procedures of educational research and responded to questions about word processing hardware and software. Professor Charles Blackman directed my attention to the "person factor" in curriculum development and innovation and helped me to appreciate the importance of an andragogical (adult education) orientation to the change process. Professor Richard Prawat provided additional resources in my study of cognitive, social and moral development theory and research and ably assisted me in the design

of the interview protocol.

Special mention is reserved for Professor Ted Ward, chairperson of my guidance committee, advisor, mentor and friend. Professor Ward offered his expertise in moral development theory, as past director of M.S.U.'s Values Education Project, and his expertise in theological education, as a much in demand consultant and speaker within theological circles. Despite his various responsibilities and travel schedule, Professor Ward generously offered his time, insights and encouragement throughout the whole project.

Many special friends and family members have helped also--too many to personally identify--but many of them live either near Cleveland, Ohio; Anaheim, California or Lansing, Michigan. In addition to these friends, special funding of the doctoral studies was generously made available through the faculty graduate education program at the International School of Theology, San Bernardino, California. A special thanks to Alan Parks, who assisted me in the statistical analysis of my data and to fellow doctoral student, Don Moore, for encouraging me to purchase a word-processor.

Three of my colleagues and their wives offered their moral support during our time in East Lansing. We looked forward to those long-distance phone calls with J. P. and Hope Moreland, Bill and Patty Roth and Don and Lois Weaver.

My father and mother, Bill and Ruth Issler, have both consistently modeled lives of moral excellence--a rich heritage for my own character development and they have

generously given of themselves. My children, Daniel (5 yrs.) and Ruth (2-1/2 yrs.) brought the joy only children can give amidst the constant pressure of completing the doctorate.

Beth, my wife, companion and partner in this project ably guided our little two-ring circus and household while I was preoccupied with studies. Through our experiences in East Lansing we have both added to our maturity and have grown closer together. Our joint commitment to each other and to the project made the completion of this dissertation possible.

My own interest in the study of moral character was prompted by One who exemplified best the moral life while on earth. He was not interested in pious platitudes, but in a lifestyle which was consistently moral, in both thought and deed. How ought we to treat others? He said, "A new commandment I give to you, that you love one another; as I have loved you, that you also love one another" and again, "Love your enemies, do good to those who hate you, bless those who curse you, and pray for those who spitefully use you."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

Chapter 1

IDENTIFYING THE PROBLEM

Even though pastoral candidates feel they have a divine
calling, in most cases, undertaking some formal education is
a necessary prerequisite for being invited or appointed to a
pastoral role in a parish. Because of their prominent
leadership responsibility for this religious community,
ministers are usually expected to be persons of stability
and maturity--leaders who are of exemplary moral character.
Currently, completing a course of study in a seminary
provides the prospective minister with the basic require-
ments for entrance into a Protestant parish. Thus, formal
pastoral education is expected to play an important function
in preparing candidates for the demanding role of a pastor.

Purpose of the Research

The purpose of the research is to describe the
educational emphasis placed on the moral development of
ministerial students within the curriculum of Protestant
seminaries, as perceived by its faculty. These findings
provide a basis for recommendations regarding further
curriculum research as well as the improvement of

theological education.

Importance of the Research

The pastoral ministry has long been regarded as one of the learned professions, along with such vocations as medicine and law. The professions have usually been considered a field of service distinct from other vocational endeavors, such as those occupations comprised of technical workers and clerks. A greater burden of responsibility and decision-making is placed on the professional. In his book-length treatment on the subject of the professions, Moore suggests that there are at least six clusters which constitute a set or scale of defining characteristics (1970): a) full-time practice, b) commitment to a calling, c) formal organization with a set of peers apart from the laity, d) specialized training or education, e) service orientation, and, f) autonomy restrained by responsibility (pp. 5-6).

As an aspect of their autonomy, professionals are those who have, what sociologist Herrick calls, "guilty knowledge" --knowledge of things dangerous to know which can involve guilt (cited in Reeck, 1982, p. 17). The surgeon decides whether an organ needs removal; the psychologist can shape the mind; the minister can determine God's will. The impact of these kinds of decisions on people may be beneficial or they may be harmful.

> Because of the dangers connected with their work, professionals are expected to undergo highly controlled

training and to adhere to high ethical standards (Reeck, 1982, pp. 17-18).

Where and when do professionals learn or acquire such high ethical standards? For example, a high expectation of trustworthiness is placed on lawyers. "All states require good moral character as one of the prerequisites for the practice of law" (Mackert, 1970, p. 472). Yet, where and when does this "moral character" appear? In recent years, an emerging concern for ethical or moral education is growing among professional educators. In 1977, the Hastings Center (New York), funded by the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and the Carnegie Corporation of New York, began an extended study of the teaching of ethics in American higher education, including such fields as bioethics, engineering, social sciences and journalism.

One Hastings report focuses on legal education (Kelly, 1980). The report begins with a citation from Schwartz, former dean and now Professor of Law at UCLA. Schwartz paints a bleak picture regarding the role of the American law school in the moral development of law students. An inhospitable environment for ethical inquiry is created by the following factors:

   extraordinarily high faculty-student ratios that
      establish a distance between students and faculty;

   lack of a significant affective component in legal
      education other than intense emphasis on intellectual
      performance;

   faculty skeptical of their ability to affect the moral
      standards of students, in part because of a belief
      those standards are largely fixed by the time
      students reach law school;

        faculties largely comprised of nonpractitioners or
           expractitioners teaching as a result of their
           distaste for the ethics of practice;

        willingness of law schools to delay the socialization
           (i.e., basic professional formation) of lawyers to
           apprenticeship following the three years of legal
           education; and

        the "permissiveness" of the dominant set of ethical
           rules for lawyers in our country, the American Bar
           Association's Code of Professional Responsibility
           (cited in Kelly, 1980, p. 1).

To what extent are the above factors a commentary on professional education at large? And, more specifically, what role does theological education have in affecting the moral development of ministerial students? The few studies which have dealt with this issue (cited in Chapter 2) have focused on the individual seminary student, or, in two cases, the effects of a course related to moral development or Christian ethics. The present study attempts to take into consideration the broader context of seminary education and gives attention to the role of faculty and other school-wide influences on the moral development of future ministers.

Statement of the Problem Situation

Since ministers assume a prominent leadership role within their religious community, there must be a concern in the seminaries for an appropriate professional preparation of ministers. The heart of the pastor's role is that of ministry or service.

Ministry to people

A commitment to ministry and servanthood as the proper leadership style for a pastor is typically expressed by Protestant church leaders (Richards & Hoeldtke, 1980, chap. 7; Torrance, 1979; Ferris, 1982). In the words of Jesus Christ, from the Gospel according to Matthew, chapter 20, verses 25-28 (Note 1),

> You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great men exercise authority over them. It is not so among you, but whoever wishes to become great among you shall be your servant, and whoever wishes to be first among you shall be your slave; just as the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give His life a ransom for many.

A focus on serving others has much in common with the human service functions of other helping professions such as counseling, health care and social work. "The helping professions. . .are concerned with service to people. Their special responsibility is human welfare, a ministry to human beings" (Combs, Avila & Purkey, 1978, p. 5).

With a ministry focus, pastoral education requires information about the object of that ministry--people: the nature and development of human beings. To be sure, within each religious community there are differing perspectives of what specific theological message ministers ought to communicate to their people, but all ministers give that message to people--a common element across all pastoral ministries. Thus, curriculum content and learning experiences of pastoral education must reflect some understanding of the nature of mankind and human development, and more

specifically, the nature and process of moral development.

At the pragmatic level, most Protestant parishes today, both denominational and independent, require seminary training of pastoral candidates before these individuals can assume an official pastoral role in a parish. This suggests, among other things, that parish members believe that pastoral education is what provides a "readiness for professional practice" for prospective ministers (Menges, 1975).

Thus, it is assumed that what the pastoral student learns as a result of the pastoral education curriculum will actually make a difference in the lives of the people to whom the pastoral student will eventually minister. In the first place, the character of the pastor's life will present an example of how to live morally. Second, the pastor's knowledge and conception of the nature and process of moral development will affect his or her perceptions in assessing and analyzing the needs of parishioners. Finally, because the process of socialization continues during the seminary years, ministers will tend to use the same methods of moral education with their congregations as were used by the seminary faculty with them.

The research focuses on how seminaries conceive of and practice their task of contributing to the moral development of pastoral students.

Background of the Problem

Some measure of confusion is evident in discussing the topic of moral development within the realm of theological education. Most seminary catalogs make it clear that one of the seminary's aims is to contribute to the spiritual development or formation of its students. The confusion concerns the relationship between moral development and spiritual development.

An elaborate discussion of the issue is beyond the scope of the chapter. Suffice it to say that the study assumes there are both natural and supernatural (or spiritual) developmental dimensions for each of the various domains of human development. Thus, there are both natural and spiritual facets to the moral domain of human development. It is further assumed that the development of moral aspects of spiritual growth is dependent, to some extent, on prior or concurrent development within the natural dimension of moral development.

> The spiritual practice of the presence of Christ, it has been well said, is bound up with the moral practice of the presence of man (Task Force on Spiritual Development, 1972, p. 21).

Matters of the spirit (both divine and human), though affecting the natural realm, are not, in themselves, amenable to empirical research. In the New Testament literature, whenever there is a discussion of spiritual realities, the writers typically employ natural analogies to convey the intended information of the supernatural. For example:

> The wind blows where it wishes and you hear the sound
> of it, but do not know where it comes from and where it
> is going; so is everyone who is born of the Spirit
> (Jesus--John 3:8)

> Like newborn babes, long for the pure milk of the word,
> that by it you may grow in respect to salvation
> (Peter--I Peter 2:2).

> And I, brethren, could not speak to you as to spiritual
> men, but as to men of flesh, as to babes in Christ. I
> gave you milk to drink, not solid food; for you were
> not yet able to receive it. Indeed, even now you are
> not yet able . . . (Paul--I Corinthians 3:1-2).

Spiritual development

According to the New Testament literature, spiritual development is affected by and affects the whole of human development and is not just some separate religious dimension of mankind. There are cognitive, psycho-emotional, social and moral aspects of spiritual development (Ward, 1982). Representative examples from the New Testament literature are given for each domain:

> (1) cognitive-- "We have not ceased to pray for you and
> to ask that you may be filled with the knowledge
> of His will in all spiritual wisdom and
> understanding" (Colossians 1:9).

> (2) psycho-emotional--"The fruit of the Spirit is love,
> joy, peace, patience. . ." (Galatians 5:22).

> (3) social--"But if we walk in the light as He Himself
> is in the light, we have fellowship with one
> another. . ." (I John 1:7a).

> (4) moral--"But solid food is for the mature, who
> because of practice have their senses trained to
> discern good and evil" (Hebrews 5:14).

Since the pastoral ministry involves promoting spiritual growth, then ministers must be concerned with the whole of human development.

<u>Human development</u>

A growing body of information is being accumulated from research efforts studying aspects and processes of human development in a variety of areas (e.g. neurochemistry, cognitive psychology, sociology, etc.). It is apparent that a host of complex elements, both internal and external to an individual, influence the developmental process.

> Several considerations are basic to any theoretical formulation of the processes of human psychological development. A biopsychosocial model is required, in which the influence of the biological, the psychological, and the social are all given sufficient emphasis. Further, these three factors cannot be considered in isolation from each other. The mutually interactional influences of the biological, the psychological, and the social at all age-stage levels of development must be appreciated. (Thomas, 1981, p. 581)

Although a host of factors interact to influence human development, for the purposes of conceptualization and manageability in research, there is a need to divide the numerous factors into broad categories, despite the difficulty in making sharp distinctions. Current research efforts may be classified into these broad domains of human development: (1) physical, (2) cognitive or intellectual (including language development), (3) personality, self-concept and emotional, (4) social, and (5) moral (Elkind & Weiner, 1978; Ward, 1982). A brief discussion of each domain (excluding physical development) follows.

<u>Cognitive development</u>. The pioneering efforts of Piaget have spawned most of the research interest in the field. Much of the psychological research intensity is being given to this domain (e.g. Flavell, 1977; Forman & Sigel, 1979).

In general, there are three main research paradigms: (a) structural types influenced by Piaget, (b) functional types within a behavioristic, social learning, and cognitive-behavioral tradition, and (c) those that take a process approach (e.g. information processing) (Sigel, 1981). Research in cognitive development has yielded concepts such as equilibration, stages of operation, discrimination learning and concept development.

Personality (self) and emotional development. Throughout the history of psychology, the main focus has been to explain the person or the self, and, as a result, a multitude of theories has been created (Corsini, 1977; Cartwright, 1979). Main streams of theories include (a) trait, in which the units of personality are analyzed--e.g. Cattell, (b) psychodynamic, in which conscious or unconscious motivational forces compel most or all of social behavior--e.g. Freud, (c) behavioristic or environmental, in which overt behavior is measured based on a classical learning model--e.g. Skinner, or a social learning model--e.g. Bandura, and (d) humanistic or phenomenological, in which the focus is on a person's experience--e.g. Rogers (Draguns, 1982). Some of the important concepts arising from these theories are motivation, self-concept, and locus of control (Staub, 1980).

Emotions may be considered a subset or major concept of personality development. Other terms are also used in the literature to describe emotions such as "affect" and

"feelings" (Giblin, 1981). Some concepts surfacing from this literature are aggression, empathy and attachment (Ciccheti & Hesse, 1982; Lewis & Rosenblum, 1978).

Social development. For a long time, the field of social development was the exclusive domain of behaviorists/environmentalists. Now more attention is being given to this domain from a cognitive-developmental perspective. In this domain, a focus is placed on understanding the socialization process and the development of social awareness. Concepts coming from this field of inquiry include role/perspective-taking or social cognition, social attachment, social deprivation, and peer-group influence (Bandura, 1977; Shaffer, 1979, Damon, 1983; Overton, 1983).

Moral development (Prosocial development). Increasing research attention is being given the subject of moral development. Though it has common ties with affective development (Krathwohl, et al., 1964), cognitive development (Rest, 1983), and social development (Damon, 1983), moral development is recognized in the literature as a distinct focus of research (Bridgeman, 1983; Kohlberg, Levine & Hewer, 1983; Rest, 1983; Weinreich-Haste, 1983; Kurtines & Gewirtz, 1984; Staub, Bar-Tal, Karylowski & Reykowski, 1984). Concepts relevant to this field include moral reasoning in which a distinction is made between the structure and content of a moral decision, moral norms as distinct from social conventional norms, modeling and rule-generation, and the identification of environments

which are more conducive to promoting moral development (e.g. a "just" environment or a mildly pluralistic environment).

Morality and moral education are also becoming popular topics across our nation, especially in the aftermath of Watergate. Whole issues of educational journals have been devoted to discussing the topic (e.g. Journal of Educational Thought, Vol. 1, 1981: "Moral education"; Phi Delta Kappan, March 1981: "Moral education: An emerging consensus"; New Directions for Higher Education, Vol. 33, 1981: "Professional ethics in university administration" and Journal of Higher Education Vol. 3, 1982: "Ethics and the Academic Profession"). The subjects of morality and character development are also of great interest to the Church, since members are exhorted to holy living, and high expectations are placed on pastors to lead exemplary moral lives.

Thus, moral development is seen as comprising one of the domains of human development.

Moral development and the pastoral ministry

The study gives primary attention to the domain of moral development, although the ministry of the pastor can influence other domains of the human development of parishioners. What attention is directed toward the moral development of pastoral students during their years at the seminary? How is the construct of moral development perceived and implemented in the curriculum?

Statement of the Research Questions

The inquiry is guided by three research questions. These questions can best be understood in relation to the various concerns of the research.

The first research question arises from a concern about how seminary faculty understand the nature and process of moral development. What practices of the professor, and what learning experiences are seen as contributing to the moral growth of the student?

> Research question 1: How do faculty understand the educational tasks in relation to promoting the moral development of pastoral students?

How faculty members relate to students can, in various ways, influence students' development toward moral maturity. What kind of interaction emerges between faculty and students?

> Research question 2: How do faculty interact with students concerning matters which may affect the students moral development, both in and out of the classroom?

The final question gives attention to some of the program elements and structured aspects of the seminary which affect the students' growth toward moral maturity.

> Research question 3: As perceived by the seminary faculty, what aspects of the seminary program are intended to influence or have influenced the students' moral development?

Definition of Terms

The following three terms are significant to the study and require further clarification.

Moral development. The term "moral" is commonly used within three distinct realms of thought bringing some confusion into any discussion of the matter: (1) moral (civic) vs. religious, (2) moral vs. immoral (evaluative), and (3) moral vs. amoral or non-moral (descriptive) (Straughan, 1982). The study uses the third category--the descriptive sense. The focus of the research is on the moral area, as opposed to amoral areas. Moral concerns involve such issues as war, civil disobedience and divorce, and probably would not include such matters as the flavor of ice cream and music.

In a very general sense, the concept of morality issues from a distinctive aspect of social relationships--the ought of dealing with others. More formally, then, issues of the moral area or domain relate to how one ought to treat others and the degree to which one takes into consideration how one's actions will affect the welfare of others. In sum, moral development is concerned with the development of morality, over the life-span, relating to perceptions of situations and feeling empathy with those involved, reasoning and decision-making skills, one's values and motivation to act, and the ability (ego controls) to implement a plan of action (Rest, 1983).

<u>Learning experiences in the seminary program</u>. The term refers to the explicit, planned program of studies and extra-curricular programs and activities that are offered at, or are under the jurisdiction of, the seminary as published in the catalog and other official statements. Included is the coursework as well as activities such as the chapel service, field education and student organizations. Also, it may involve implicit aspects of the program which are not formally stated but are known by the faculty and students (Eisner, 1979).

<u>Seminary or pastoral education</u>. The theological and professional education of ministers refers to a two- or three-year post-graduate course of study leading to a master's degree (usually, the Master of Divinity degree, M.Div.). This course of study is undertaken at a seminary, also known as a graduate school of theology.

Population and Sample

The population for the research is composed of faculty of Protestant, denominational, graduate schools of theology in the United States. The sample consisted of 24 seminary faculty from a cross-section of six denominationally diverse seminaries in the midwest. Four faculty participated from each school.

Delimitations and Generalizability

The research is limited to the description of the
perceptions of faculty members regarding the seminaries'
practice of moral education. Faculty responses to the
personal interviews were taken at face value and were
assumed to be accurate representations of thought and
practice. The study did not include the perceptions of
seminary students.

The following major factors affect the generalizability
of the study: (1) the selection of the interview sites
(seminaries) from a specific geographical region, (2) the
inclusion of seminaries in the study based on willingness to
participate, (3) the participation of many respondents who
were either recommended by the administration or volunteered
to participate in the study, and (4) the investigation of a
small sample size. Data acquired from the interviews and the
conclusions drawn may indicate some trends relevant to other
Protestant seminary faculty in the country. In addition, the
research may have applicability for other contexts of
professional education such as medicine, law, and teacher
education.

Overview of the Dissertation

Chapter 1 has presented the focus of the study, the
problem of educational attention to the moral development of
seminary students. This problem was placed within the larger
context of the professions--the distinct responsibilities of

professionals and the emphasis of professional education (such as legal education) on moral development. The three research questions were described in relation to the concerns of the research. In addition, important terms, the population and sample, and the delimitations and generalizability of the study were clarified.

Chapter 2 reviews the precedent research of the study. The first section describes various curriculum analyses of theological education. The analyses involve attempts to improve and unify the curriculum. One neglected issue in the curriculum is identified: the personal development of seminary students. The second section of the chapter describes the empirical precedents for the study. Studies are cited which focus on perceptions of seminary faculty, the moral development of seminary students and other graduate professional students, and other relevant studies from higher education and public education concerning the perceptions of teachers in matters of moral development.

Chapter 3 describes the research design and methods of the study. A discussion of the following procedures is provided: the selection of the sample, the development of the interview schedule, the collection of the data and the analysis of the data. Finally, the limitations and methodological assumptions of the study are identified.

The findings of the study are presented in chapters 4, 5 and 6. Each chapter treats responses related to one of the research questions. Chapter 4 discusses the findings based

on the first research question: educational tasks and moral development. Chapter 5 presents data related to the second research question: faculty-student interactions and moral development. Chapter 6 deals with the third research question: the seminary program and moral development.

Chapter 7 presents the conclusion of the study. Following a brief review of the earlier chapters, the conclusions of the study are presented: six major themes of factors which faculty perceived as influencing students' moral development. A section on qualitative observations is included. Finally, recommendations for curriculum improvement are identified as well as recommendations for further research.

In summary, the study examined the educational emphasis placed on the moral development of ministerial students within the curriculum of six Protestant seminaries, as perceived by its faculty. Attention was directed at professors' understanding of the nature and process of moral development, professors' interactions with students regarding matters which may influence students' growth toward moral maturity, and programmatic elements of the seminary intended to influence the moral development of students. The findings described current conceptions and practices of moral education at the six seminaries, with indications of possible trends in other Protestant seminaries.

End Note

1. References to the New Testament literature are taken from the <u>New American Standard Bible</u>. Lockman Foundation, 1963.

Chapter 2

PRECEDENTS IN THE LITERATURE

The chapter clarifies the conceptual and empirical framework of the study. The purpose of the study is to describe the educational emphasis placed on the moral development of ministerial students within the curriculum of Protestant seminaries. The first half of the chapter recounts various curriculum analyses of theological education. The analyses involve attempts to improve and unify the curriculum. One neglected element in the curriculum is identified: the personal development of seminary students. Four factors from the literature affecting the personal and moral development of the students are discussed: 1) classroom teaching approaches, 2) admissions criteria, 3) faculty relationships with students, and 4) campus climate or culture.

The latter half of the chapter identifies the empirical precedents for the study. First, a description is provided of research which focused on perceptions of seminary faculty regarding different issues. Next, studies focusing on the moral development of seminary students are discussed. Similarly, there is a treatment of research on the moral

development of graduate students from other professions.
Finally, relevant studies are cited which investigated
perceptions of faculty concerning matters of moral
development and moral education from the fields of higher
education and public education.

Curriculum Analyses of Theological Education

Along with law and medicine, the Protestant religious
ministry constituted one of the three oldest learned
professions of America (Moore, 1970). Certain similarities
are evident when comparing the development of preparation for
entering these professions. Generally speaking, until the
latter half of the nineteenth century, the self-study or
apprenticeship model was the predominant method of preparing
American young men to enter these professions. Students would
be apprenticed to some preceptor--a practicing professional:
minister, lawyer or physician. The actual training would
require students to read various divinity, law, or medical
textbooks (usually limited to the preceptor's own library),
as well as attend the preceptor in his practice. They could
not directly work with the clients/parishioners. Students
were limited to observing the "treatment/ministry" and
performing various menial errands for the preceptor (Kaufman,
1976; Winkleman, 1975).

Other means of "reading divinity" were available to
ministerial candidates. A few students could remain at the
college for additional study with the president (or professor

of divinity), a variation on the self-study method mentioned above. Another version was devised due to the need of the new western frontier. Since colleges were far away and expensive, some churches decided to educate their own pastoral candidates. A local group of church leaders (e.g. the presbyteries) would administer both the program of reading divinity and the ordination examination (Lynn, 1981).

Though seminaries emerged in America in the latter half of the eighteenth century, as did the professional schools of medicine and law (Note 1), little similarity marked the purposes and contexts of these schools (Winkleman, 1975). Most of the early medical and law schools were proprietary institutions. Then, during the twentieth century, these professional schools became associated with universities. Theological seminaries have always been and continue to be the church's schools and as such are in the service of the church. A second difference concerns the fact that the vast majority of seminaries are currently not associated with a university.

> Theological education. . .is the only major
> professional field largely separated from an organic
> and living relationship to the graduate facilities of
> great universities (Waggoner, 1966, p. 92).

(Departments of religious studies exist in many graduate schools, yet their focus is the academic study of religion rather than the preparation of practicing ministers.) Thus, ministerial education is unique among the older professions in that it is highly responsive to its constituency, the church, and it is largely isolated from the mainstream of

professional education associated with the university
(Brubacher & Willis, 1968, pp. 209-210).

Theoretical-Practical Tension in Ministerial Education

Contemporary Protestant ministerial education largely reflects two distinct theoretical approaches (traditional and professional) which influence how the seminary tends to understand its mission and role.

> The great debate (one of the great debates) raging today within and among seminaries is whether a seminary is (should be) a professional training school, or a graduate school for education in theology, or some mixture of both (Task Force on Spiritual Development, 1972, p. 8).

Theoretical emphasis: Traditional Model

The traditional approach to theological education seeks to conserve and advance the knowledge of the Christian message which emphasizes academic study and the pursuit of scholarship.

> The content of theological education is a biblically and theologically founded scheme of studies which is objective, tightly structured, logically organized, discipline-centered, and focused on the intellectual growth of the student (Harter, 1980, p. 335).

This style of curriculum dominated theological education for most of its history, and it remains alive and healthy today. But as graduates moved out from the schools to serve in parishes, demands were placed upon them for which they had not been trained (e.g. skills of administration and counseling). Alumni raised their voices that the seminary curriculum was not relevant to the functions of the ministry, and thus the professional model came into being.

Practical emphasis: Professional Model

> The aims are typically focused in the church and the
> functions of the minister within its corporate life,
> i.e. to train and prepare persons for the professional
> leadership of the church (Harter, 1980, p. 336).

In 1956, Niebuhr coined the term "pastoral director" to

convey the imagery of this conception of ministry.

This more competency-based approach to professional

readiness has precedents in other professions (e.g. teacher

education). Research directed by the Association of

Theological Schools has tended toward this professional

model. The "Readiness for Ministry" project (Schuller,

Strommen & Brekke, 1980) identified 444 criterion statements

of ministry function. These statements have been grouped

into 64 core clusters. The purpose of the project was to

devise "a taxonomy of criteria for which assessment

instruments will be developed" (Schuller, Brekke, &

Strommen, 1975, p. vi).

The two models of theological education and ministry

point to the crux of a continuing debate in ministerial

education.

> Over a relatively short history, theology within most
> theological seminaries in the United States has changed
> from divinity, a unified enterprise into a fourfold
> quasi-independent division of scholarly disciplines and
> a twofold division of theory and practice (Westerhoff,
> 1982).

Brought over from Europe in the nineteenth century, the

traditional four-fold division of the curriculum (Biblical

Studies, Dogmatics/Systematic Theology, Church History/

Historical Theology, and Pastoral Theology), still remains

with us today (Lynn, 1981). Some change has taken place in that additional sub-divisions are now accepted (e.g Biblical Studies is divided into Old Testament and New Testament Studies). Despite efforts of redirection (see the following discussion), the seminary ship remains on its steady course. With the increasing specialization of training and departments, the debate is not only theoretical, but is also very political (Hough, 1981).

Theoretical-Practical Balance in Ministerial Education

Serious attempts have been made to design a curriculum which would provide a balance between the theoretical and the practical. A major example of this was the "Theological Curriculum for the 1970's" project (Curriculum Task Force, 1968). It was organized by the American Association of Theological Schools "for the purpose of designing an innovative curricular model that would better train people for ministry than do our present models" (p. 669).

According to The Association of Seminary Professors in the Practical Fields, the proposed model did not quite accomplish the proper balance.

> The model of education adopted by the proposal writers apparently was an attempt to resolve the perennial issue of academic vs. professional education. But instead of resolving the issue, the model results in equivocation, with the scales tipped finally in favor of the academic side (Lapsley et al., 1969).

Batson and Wyckoff (1973) offered an alternative model which also involved a major revision of seminary education.

Rather than the research orientation of academic

doctorates, it suggests graduate study toward a specialized competence in a particular academic area and its relation to professional ministry (p. 111).

Unifying the curriculum of ministerial education appears to be a continuing concern. Hayes outlined a variety of ways to reduce the polarities between scholarship and functional competency:

(1) recruit faculty who demonstrate a balance in ministry;

(2) remain accountable to the profession of ministry;

(3) develop forums for interaction between recognized scholars and outstanding practitioners;

(4) view theological schooling as "ongoing," rather than terminal;

(5) break down false labels of "practical" versus "theoretical," and "tough-minded" versus "soft";

(6) allow for diversity of course content and evaluation (various types of subject matter call for different testing procedures); and

(7) encourage theological faculty members using sabbaticals in pastoral and other forms of parish ministry (Hayes, 1978, p. 45)

In a similar vein, Hough (1981) suggested that "the first priority for reform in theological education is attention to pedagogical style" (p. 159). He asserted that our social structure must evidence and affirm unity and that "our pedagogy becomes a sign of the unity of our corporate task" (p. 159). Courses should be designed which focus on major global issues facing the church. Also, courses could be clustered around selected thematic centers in order to overcome a rigid theory-practice distinction. Team teaching would be another example of uniting together in the work of

the school, especially when faculty members of the practical and the theoretical teach side-by-side.

Yet Hough agreed that serious attention must also be given to the lifestyle of the person. "One of the most serious deficiencies. . .has been the lack of attention to the whole area of spiritual discipline" (1981, p. 162).

> It appears that some discussion of corporate exercises in the practice of the "holy life" might be entertained as a necessary part of theological educational reform. This could be another unifying experience for the whole community (p. 162).

Westerhoff also affirmed such an emphasis on the person of the pastor as a critical focus for reform.

> The status of the clergy, I suggest, lies not in the fact that they are professionals like any other professionals, but that they are extraordinary persons. A professional minister may be best defined as someone who has acquired a body of knowledge and developed particular skills; an ordained priest is best defined as a sacramental person. The function of the seminary is first of all the formation of priestly character and then secondarily ministerial knowledge and skills (1982, p. 163)

A Focus on Personal Development

The "Readiness for Ministry" Project attempted to identify what Protestant church members and ministers expect of ministers (Schuller et al., 1980). One of the eleven major areas of ministry identified was that of "disqualifying personal and behavioral characteristics".

> The theme states by negation the expectation that ministers and priests be whole and healthy persons. They are expected to be people whose security is not based on a self-image propped up by the ministerial role or others' conditional acceptance of his or her views, of the trappings of material success. The theme thus suggests an expectation that, just as ministers

and priests should abide by an accepted moral code, they should also exhibit characteristics many would associate with psychological health (Aleshire, 1980, pp. 49-50).

Two major curricular emphases have already been presented as the predominant rallying points of ministerial education: the traditional and the professional. Both emphases make their contribution to the preparation of ministerial candidates. Since the traditional curriculum has a theoretical emphasis, it contributes primarily to the student's intellectual development. In the professional approach, there is an emphasis on the development of professional skills and competence. Lloyd suggested that, in addition to these two important goals, "the development of the man himself as a person" is yet a third critical goal in ministerial preparation (1969, p. 420).

> While seminaries feel they place high priority upon the personal quality of their graduates, they have been far more effective in furthering the [first] goal of intellectual and academic development than they have in the second [professional] and third [personal] educational goals (Lloyd, 1969, p. 421)

> In the article, Lloyd raised two relevant questions:

> (a) What personal qualities, what personal capacities, what personal values are needed in today's professional, ordained minister; and

> (b) What in the total preparation for the active ministry will raise up that kind of men; what elements in the total educational and training mix are needed to foster those requisite personal qualities and capacities? (p. 420).

In relation to the first question, the present study focused specifically on the moral development of the ministerial candidate. The remaining portion of this section deals with

the second question, i.e. what educational elements could foster these capacities. Four factors were identified in the literature which have had prominent roles in affecting the personal and moral development of seminary students: (1) classroom teaching approaches, (2) admissions selection criteria, (3) relationships with faculty and (4) campus climate or culture.

Classroom teaching approach

Since seminaries have generally followed the traditional approach, the emphasis has been on transmitting content, most usually accomplished by the lecture method. In theological circles, an increasing awareness is being manifested concerning how students learn and how to facilitate personal development.

> The greatest defect in theological education today is that it is too much an affair of piecemeal transmission of knowledge and skills, and that, in consequence, it offers too little challenge to the student to develop his own resources and to become an independent, lifelong inquirer, growing constantly while he is engaged in the work of the ministry (Niebuhr, 1957, p. 209).

> We talk too much about what we are trying to teach and pay too little attention to how students learn (Feilding, 1966, p. 19).

A concern for integrating personal and professional identity is seen as one necessary agenda item of seminary education (Batson & Wyckoff, 1973). This identity involves a degree of awareness of oneself in relation to the various tasks of the ministry, and an openness to expand beyond one's present horizons. In reviewing published expectations of professionals in general and of the helping professions

in particular, Paravonian concluded that one of the main

categories of goals for pre-service education should be

developing a

> self-concept congruent with the demands of the
> profession. This goal includes the development of a
> professional identity involving personal-social
> responsibility, ethical standards, and commitment to
> professional expectations (1981, p. 277).

Attention should be given to the critical learning

process of "perceptual-conceptual restructuring" instead of

simply transmitting a certain body of content. This type of

learning involves

> shifts within the perceptual sets or cognitive
> structures of the individual so that he "sees" himself
> and his world in a new way, his reality changes. Such
> learning, learning of who one is and what he values,
> involves changes in the basic structures of one's
> conceptual reality rather than simply the addition of
> information or concepts within the existing conceptual
> and perceptual structures (Batson & Wyckoff, 1973, p.
> 105-6).

This is supported by some past studies which have

indicated that effectiveness in the helping relationship is

a function of the perceptual frame of the helper (Combs,

1969, pp. 70-75). Research was conducted with counselors,

school teachers, college professors, student nurses and

Episcopal priests as subjects. The specific effective

factors that were identified involved the helper's general

perceptual frame, the helper's perceptions of people, the

helper's perceptions of self, and the helper's perceptions

of the helping task.

With a focus on "perceptual-conceptual restructuring",

the context for learning would be organized to support and

prompt personal development. A forum could be provided in which students expressed themselves. Also, students would require a conceptual framework within which they could interpret their own development.

Admissions selection criteria

Despite the kinds of efforts mentioned above, altering basic orientations and personality structure is a difficult and time-consuming undertaking. Attention should also be directed at what kind of students are matriculated into the seminary program. From studies based on counselor training programs, Carkhuff asserted that "the best index of a future criterion is a previous index of that criterion" (1969, p. 85). More explicit selection criteria and better means of evaluating applicants against the particular goals of the seminary could help seminaries admit students who are better prepared to achieve the seminary goals.

A similar principle has relevance from organizational theory.

> Thus, the degree to which an organization selects its participants affects its control needs in terms of the amount of resources and effort it must invest to maintain the level of control considered adequate in view of its goal (Etzioni, 1964, p. 69).

For an educational institution, the application of the principle is seen in a different perspective. With more selectivity in admitting students, on the one hand, a lesser amount of resources (both human and educational) would be required for the same degree of student development, or on the other hand, the same amount of existing resources would

be available to facilitate greater development than what is currently achieved.

Increasingly, various assessment measures (e.g. Theological School Inventory, Minnesota Multiphasic Personality inventory-MMPI) are being employed by seminaries to gain a better image of students for screening of admissions and for guiding students through the program (McConahay, 1971), though these instruments must be used with caution (Menges, 1975, p. 192). Also, more efforts could be directed at guiding applicants in pre-seminary learning experiences to help them meet selection criteria levels prior to being matriculated into the program.

Faculty modeling and relationships with students

Students usually have a few unforgetable teachers who have significantly influenced their lives (e.g. Epstein, 1981). In contributing to the personal and moral development of the student, the example and guidance of a teacher is a critical factor.

> We see the need for the assistance of the faculty in the growth process of the student as substantive and immediate. A young person who comes to a theological school as part of the preparation for ministry, finds only a partial preparation in the classwork, chapel exercises, and field education. Personal preparation is also necessary, and this can only come with the help and leadership of those who are more mature, more secure in the faith, more personally integrated in the life of prayer, who can be seen as committed Christians, caught in the act of loving the Lord and their fellow men (Task Force on Spiritual Development, 1972, p. 44-45).

Often a professor's contribution to the personal and professional formation of the student is constituted by what

the professor is observed doing rather than by the
information he or she transmits (Feilding, 1966, p. 101).
For example, when faculty regularly attend the seminary's
chapel services (instead of missing them), a value is
conveyed of the chapel's importance in the lives of the
faculty. But there are also more active modes in which
faculty can influence their students, both in and out of the
classroom.

> However, if the task of a theological school is
> preparation for the ministry, then the faculty, beyond
> the classroom situation but not divorced from it, must
> involve themselves in the personal preparation of the
> candidate. They must make sure that the institution is
> providing all the means for personal growth and for
> spiritual development that are possible within its
> framework (Task Force on Spiritual Development, 1972,
> p. 11).

Faculty must take the initiative in pursuing some form of
relationship with students since "the key to personal
development. . .lies in the quality of relationships in
which people participate" (Lloyd, 1969, p. 427).

Campus environment and atmosphere

As McLuhan has stated, often "the medium is the
message." The campus environment includes such items as the
interactions with administrative and support personnel,
extra-classroom activities, the form of student government
and the architecture and facilities. The perspectives,
attitudes and values held in common by the total social
organization making up the school is what Lloyd labels the
"campus culture" (1969, p. 430).

These factors, though often unnoticed (and thus referred

to as the "hidden curriculum") have a significant shaping effect on the personal and moral development of students. For example, competition among students is often used as a prime motivator, yet it will be skills of cooperation and compromise that must be drawn upon in the ministry. Likewise, because of the seminary's tendency toward a transmissive educational mode, some seminaries actually encourage or reinforce passive personalities and high dependency needs in their students (Feilding, 1966, p. 163).

The Role of the Seminary in Personal Development

Certain faculty think that educational goals directed at the personal life of students are outside the domain of the seminary's purview. This perspective may stem from a serious respect for the integrity and responsibility of the student in this matter (Feilding, 1966, p. 168).

> This is not due to any lack of appreciation of the importance of the religious life. Rather it is due to the assumption that those who come to the seminary are already so grounded in their religious experience, that. . .they can be trusted to look after matters for themselves (Brown, 1934, p. 155).

Or it may issue from an understanding that the student's intellectual development is the exclusive concern of seminary--even to the neglect and detriment of other aspects of personal development (Solanky, 1978, p. 127). Thus, for some seminaries, the only concern for the personal development of the student is expressed in a "brief idealistic paragraph in the seminary catalogue" (Task Force on Spiritual Development, 1972, p. 35).

Summary of the Literature on Curriculum Analyses

Protestant theological seminaries continue today much as they have since the mid-nineteenth century. The relationship with the church is a close one. But the seminary, an institution of professional education, remains largely independent of the university system, unlike other professional schools. The curriculum retains a tension between the theoretical and practical, between the traditional and professional models of education. Attempts have been offered as bases for unifying the curriculum, yet these have been implemented by only a few seminaries. In many cases, attention directed toward the personal development of students is meager at best--possibly due to the uncertainty regarding its inclusion as a legitimate and realistic educational goal.

Empirical Studies in Theological Education

This section is devoted to describing the empirical precedents for the study (primarily dissertation studies). A brief review of major studies of seminary education prepares the way for a treatment of research involving seminary faculty and studies related to the moral development of seminary students. Then, research outside of the realm of theological education is utilized to support the study. A few of the reports deal with the moral development of professional students. The rest of the research cited here investigates perceptions of higher and public education

faculty concerning matters of moral development. Each study
is presented with its findings and then a final section
summarizes what can be gleaned from these empirical studies.

Investigations of Theological Education

The twentieth century marked the period in which "the
study of theology" was itself seriously studied. A signifi-
cant precedent for investigating professional education was
set in 1910 by Flexner in his famous report on medical
education. This report had such an impact on the reform of
medical education that the Carnegie Foundation for the
Advancement of Teaching, sponsor of the Flexner report,
implemented a plan to evaluate other professional fields:
legal education (Redlich, 1914; Reed, 1928), engineering
education (Mann, 1918), teacher education (Learned & Bagley,
1920) and dental education (Geis, 1926). Theological educa-
tion only received slight notice in 1911 with a few pages of
comment in one annual report (Pritchett, 1911, pp. 94-99).

National reports on theological education

The task of examining seminary education was largely
taken up by a group of concerned theological educators. In
1918, the Conference on Theological Education was organized
and began consultation work with various seminaries. This
group was the foundation of what was to become the accredit-
ing association for theological education, the Association
of Theological Schools (ATS). Though only informally
involved in the first study in 1924 (Kelly), ATS has

directed the four other major studies of theological education: Brown & May, 1934; Niebuhr, Williams and Gustafson, 1957; Feilding, 1966, and Schuller, Strommen and Brekke, 1980. An additional study investigated the pre-seminary education of seminary students (Bridston & Culver, 1964).

Denominational reports on theological education

The concern for evaluating theological education was eventually shared by various church bodies. For example, the following denominations authorized and conducted surveys of their own seminaries: the American Baptists (Northern Baptists) (Hartshorne & Froyd, 1944-1945), the Episcopal Church (Pussey & Taylor, 1967), the United Church of Christ (Fukuyama, 1972), and the Christian Church--Disciples of Christ (Cotten, 1973). The Mennonite Church (Bender, 1971) and the United Methodists (McCulloh, 1980) suggested new models for ministerial training. Even the nondenominational university-based seminaries had their own report (Lindbeck, 1976).

Dissertation studies on theological education

Additional information about theological education is also becoming available through dissertation studies. These have treated a wide range of assorted topics: admissions practices (Sandusky, 1964), field education (Barrick, 1975), psychological measurement instruments for use with students (Johnson, 1976; Cardwell, 1978), seminary education's effect on students' attitudes (Pierson, 1976) and leadership

orientation (Buzzell, 1983), factors related to three categories of theological orthodoxy (Beam, 1982), the socialization process at the seminary which affects the ministerial role learned by students (Kornfield, 1980), career data of seminary graduates (Elmer, 1981), the process of seminary curriculum development (Rowen, 1982), the nature and role of seminary trustees (Solanki, 1982), sex-role preferences of faculty and students (Wetherbe, 1983), and approaches to integrating psychology and theology (Eliason, 1983). It is evident that there is an increasing interest and emphasis on the investigation and evaluation of theological education.

Precedents in Theological Education

The following section describes a total of ten studies involving either the perceptions of seminary faculty members or the moral development of seminary students.

Perceptions of seminary faculty

Perceptions of seminary faculty members were investigated in four projects. (Two related studies involving the perceptions of non-seminary adult educators are also included.)

Shannon (1975). The purpose of the study was to investigate the faculty's perception of its role regarding 12 areas of governance in the seminaries of the United Presbyterian Church of the U.S.A. All faculty in four of the seven seminaries received the questionnaire. The seminaries

included in the study were San Francisco, McCormick, Princeton and Pittsburgh, of which Shannon was the dean. Responses were indicated on a Likert-type scale across the three variables for each area of governance--perceptions of what is: 1) actually true, 2) desirable, and 3) probable in light of the current situation.

Faculty perceived that they had much influence in decision-making related to workload, screening of faculty, tenure, promotion, admission of students, degree require- ments, and instructional procedures. They felt their influence in these critical areas was both desirable and probable. Faculty perceived that they had moderate to little influence in decision-making related to financial resources (e.g. for personnel, instructional program and research), physical plant utilization, appointment of President and dean(s), disciplinary life of students and tuition/financial aid. Although, faculty desired a greater influence in the allocation of resources (for personnel, programs, and research), plant utilization, and tuition, they did not think more input in these areas was probable.

An interesting finding was the faculty's perception that they had moderate to little influence in student life and discipline. Though they did not desire to have a greater influence, they thought it probable that their influence in this area would be greater.

Sweeny (1979). Sweeny investigated the ministerial expectations of seminary faculty, church lay leaders and

seminary seniors of two Conservative Baptist seminaries. A review of the literature suggested that, in general, a serious gap existed between clergy and laity concerning the expectations placed on ministers. One conclusion of the study was that faculty perceptions of the pastoral ministry were highly homogeneous. Divisions along lines of practical pastoral experience and teaching fields were not supported by the data.

Grubbs (1981). Seminary faculty and students responded to a questionnaire seeking to identify whether their educational orientation was more andragogical or pedagogical. Data were collected from 16 midwestern seminaries: 122 faculty members and 332 students. The mean score of all faculty members' perceptions of seminary students was slightly beyond the midpoint of the continuum, thus indicating a tendency toward the andragogical pole. Yet, the students tended to rate the faculty's educational orientation toward the pedagogical pole.

A significant difference was found among faculty on the basis of teaching area. Pastoral ministries and religious education faculty tended toward more of an andragogical orientation than faculty members in other teaching areas. The findings did not support differences based on age, professional rank, type of institution granting the highest degree, highest degree attained, and length of teaching service. There was a significant difference found between male and female faculty. Female faculty tended to be more

andragogical in orientation. This finding was statistically
significant, but was based on 112 male respondents and only
7 female respondents.

The Educational Orientation Questionnaire used by
Grubbs was developed by Hadley (1975) for his dissertation
study under the supervision of Malcolm Knowles. Hadley's
purpose was to develop an instrument which could assess
adult educators' orientation with respect to constructs of
andragogy and pedagogy. The instrument demonstrated that it
was able to detect differences in orientation among these
variables: sex, subject matter or specialty, level of
position and type of organization. Level of formal education
showed slight differences, but no significant differences
were associated with the age of adult educators.

Another study employed Hadley's questionnaire at
Oklahoma State University (Jones, 1982). The research found
that there was an overall significant difference among
departments, and a significant difference on one of the six
subscales in relation to degrees earned, sex, percents of
teaching load, amount of time spent off campus working on
extension or service projects, and number of years
experience teaching in higher education.

Ferris (1982). The study investigated the emphasis on
servant leadership in the curriculum of four Reformed
seminaries. A questionnaire survey of faculty and students
identified a lack of agreement regarding which curriculum
elements were intended to develop servanthood leadership

styles. Informal curriculum elements were cited as examples of demonstrated servant minister qualities more often than formal elements. For example, the data indicated that faculty modeled these qualities. In relation to admissions practices, little or no attention was given to the qualities of a servant minister in selection criteria. The preferred teaching methods among the faculty were lecture, reading or research, and discussion of lecture or research. Finally, the seminary programs did provide adequate training in the traditional disciplines.

Moral development of seminary students

The following six studies were the only ones identified which treated matters of moral development in relation to seminary students (three studies resulted from doctoral dissertations, and three studies were available in journals). The first study looks at the helping behavior of seminary students. The other five studies focus on levels of moral reasoning as measured by the particular researcher's written adaptation of Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Interview or as measured by Rest's Defining Issues Test. Three of the five studies make an assessment of the level of moral reasoning for purposes of comparing the scores with other groups, or in comparison with other variables. In the final two studies, students participated in an experimental workshop or course and pre- and post-test scores were compared for differences due to the treatment.

Darley and Batson (1973). The researchers were
interested in studying the influence of situation and
personality variables on helping behavior. On the campus of
Princeton seminary, they re-enacted the parable of the Good
Samaritan with 47 seminary students. Situational variables
included the content of one's thinking and the amount of
"hurry" in one's journey. Students were told that the study
was investigating vocational careers of seminary students.

Various measures related to the personality variable of
types of religiosity were adminstered in the first part of
the study. Then each student was told to prepare a brief
three to five minute extemporaneous message on one of these
topics: (a) job opportunities for seminary students, or (b)
the parable of the Good Samaritan. Students were instructed
to report to another building where the message would be
taped. In addition, students were assigned one of three
"hurry" orientations for proceeding to the next building:
(a) high hurry- "Oh you're late. . . !"; (b) intermediate
hurry- "The assistant is ready for you so please go over
right now"; or (c) low hurry- "It'll be a few minutes before
they're ready for you. . . ."

A victim (confederate) was positioned in the alley way
between the two buildings in the place where the students
would pass. The victim was slumped over on the ground, with
eyes closed and did not move. As each student passed by, the
victim would cough twice and groan. The victim was prompted
to discourage attempts to be helped when offered by any

students. Students were rated by the victim and were also
evaluated on a helping behavior questionnaire administered
in the next building (e.g. "When was the last time you saw a
person to be in need of help?").

The most important factor for predicting helping
behavior was the hurry variable, so that subjects in a hurry
were not as likely to help as much as those who were in less
of a hurry. One interpretation of the data indicated that,
in the minds of some students, there was a conflict whether
to give help to the experimenter and complete the assigned
task, or to help the victim. Thus the issue was not purely
insensitivity, but a conflict of options and priorities, as
is typical of life situations. The results also indicated
that the three types of religiosity (as means, as ends, or
as quest) did not yield significant results.

The "message-content of thinking" variable did not
predict helping behavior, even when a student was preparing
to give a message on the Good Samaritan. A reanalysis of the
data leading to Darley and Batsons' no-effect conclusion
concerning the Good Samaritan message was done by Greenwald
(1975). Using a Bayesian analysis procedure rather than
significance testing, Greenwald concluded that

> Since the results were (a) actually more favorable to
> an alternate hypothesis of at least moderate effect [of
> the Good Samaritan message], but (b) not very strongly
> so, it is most appropriate to reserve judgment
> regarding the message effect until more data are
> collected (p. 583).

Rest, Cooper, Coder, Masanz and Anderson (1974); Rest, Davidson, and Robbins (1978). In validating his new Defining Issues Test (DIT), Rest included a group of seminary students for purposes of comparison. The DIT "P score" represents a measure of principled thinking at stages 5 and 6 of Kohlberg's hierarchy. The DIT is an objective test employing six moral dilemmas and twelve multiple choice questions for each dilemma. The P score is based on the subject's rating of the four most important statements related to the dilemma. Doctoral students in moral philosophy and political science at the University of Minnesota were identified by Rest prior to the study as the "expert panel" on providing accurate responses to the DIT. Their scores would then be contrasted with scores of the other groups included in the study.

Participants included 73 ninth graders, 40 twelfth graders, 40 juniors and seniors in the College of Education, 25 seminary students, and the 15 doctoral students previously mentioned. The seminary students attended a "liberal Protestant seminary" in the St. Paul/Minneapolis area. The seminary students and doctoral students were grouped together as 40 graduate students, though some separate measures were reported for the seminary students.

Comparisons were made on two counts, P scores and the percentage of subjects predominantly using principled thinking (those having P scores above 50%). The results follow: ninth graders-30.3 (25%), twelfth graders 33.8

(7.5%), college students 50.4 (45%), seminarians 55.5 (60%), and doctoral students 65.2 (93%).

Lawrence (1979). Lawrence was a member of Rest's research group at the University of Minnesota and attempted to develop a taxonomy of component procedures of moral judgment-making using similar groups of comparison as in the Rest study. Three groups were compared on different measures: ninth graders, seminarians, and graduate philosophy students. Concerning the seminarians, Lawrence concluded that (a) seminary students did not understand high-staged items as well as the graduate philosophy students, and that (b) seminarians gave the high-staged items or principled items lower objective ratings and rankings than ninth graders. Since Lawrence's second conclusion regarding seminary students was so disconcerting, the study was given a more detailed inspection.

The scores on which the conclusion was based are reproduced in Table 2-1. The two scores include the mean P scores, a ranking of principled items related to stage 5 and stage 6 thinking and a D score, a weighted ranking of all stage responses. Seminarians scored lower than ninth graders on the P score (22.47), but scored between ninth graders and graduate philosophy students on the D score (24.89).

A closer analysis of Lawrence's study reveals four issues which may have affected the scores of the seminarians' level of moral reasoning: (1) sample size, (2) reliability of the P score in comparison to the D score,

Table 2-1

<u>Mean DIT Scores in Lawrence Study</u>

	P Score	D Score
Graduate philosophy students (n=30)	56.78	32.23
Seminary students (n=16)	22.47	24.89
Ninth graders (n=29)	30.75	18.9

<u>Note</u>: From "The component procedures of moral judgment-making" by J. Lawrence, 1979, Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, p. 44.

(3) different perceptual frames of the groups, and (4) the concept of "obedience" in Kohlberg's theory and Rest's DIT. Each of the issues will be treated below.

1. The sample was composed of 30 graduate philosophy students, 29 ninth graders and 16 seminary students.

> The seminarians were chosen from an extreme fundamentalist theological college attached to a close-knit conservative Baptist community (pp. 14-15).

> It was expected that the seminarians would represent a group of adults with high educational levels but low moral judgment levels (p. 15).

Of the 16 "seminarians", 7 were enrolled in a B.A. program, 3 were currently enrolled in both B.A. and Master's level courses, and only 6 students were solely in a Master's degree program. What particular master's program the students were enrolled in (e.g. a three-year M.Div. program or a one-year music degree) was not stated. Thus, only 6 graduate seminarians were actually included in the study, yielding a disproportionate number of cases in comparison to the other groups.

2. Regarding the reliability of the P score in comparison to the D score, Rest himself has admitted that,

> Davison's index [the D score] is more sensitive to change because of its better reliability and because it uses information from all items, not just stage-5 and stage-6 items as the P index does (Rest et al., 1978).

Thus, if attention were given to the D score (Table 2-1) the comparison between scores of the three groups is closer to what would be expected.

3. On the matter of perceptual frames, Lawrence indicated that the seminary students may have interpreted

the dilemmas differently than the philosophy students. "It seems the seminarians were attending to a different task, religious problem-solving" (p. 104). If this was the case, then it would be more difficult to make comparisons between groups on Lawrence's taxonomy of components since the other two groups rarely cited religious criteria in their deliberations about the dilemmas.

4. Finally, an issue beyond the scope of Lawrence's study concerns the concept of obedience. For Christians, obedience to God is an ultimate goal. For Kohlberg, obedience is either rated as stage 1 thinking (obedience to fixed rules) or stage 4 thinking (law and order, rule-oriented). Since Jesus, who was supremely obedient to God, is sometimes offered as an example of stage 6 thinking, there is a critical conceptual problem on the matter. No resolution is attempted here. Suffice it to say, responses by those who believe in obedience to a divine authority tend to be rated around the stage 4 level in conventional thinking and not principled thinking. This may also explain why seminarians did not rate high on the P score.

One conclusion which seems justifiable from the study is that philosophy students utilized more complex cognitive processes and more complete problem-solving skills than seminary students. Seminarians in the study tended to use simple reasoning and approached the dilemmas with pre-packaged solutions. Lawrence suggested that "the tenets of the seminarians' conservative belief system pre-empted cognitive

processing" (p. 103).

Lindskoog (1973). The author hypothesized that differences in religious attitudes, beliefs, and practices of seminary students as well as religiously neutral factors would vary systematically with their self-actualization scores. Self-actualization was measured by the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) developed by Shostrom in 1964. Data for the study included 164 responses from students attending a seminary in the southwest. On the basis of the scores, three samples of 15 students were chosen to represent high, average and very low self-actualization. Life history information, obtained by indepth interviews (conducted blind as to group membership), provided the variables of comparison. Religiously neutral factors were considered to be political-social attitudes, family structure, demographic data and levels of moral development. A self-report adaptation of Kohlberg's interview (based on a 1963 journal article) was used by the researcher. Three graduate students in psychology scored the responses.

Data specifically related to seminarians' self-actualization and levels of moral development proved inconclusive. Methodological problems may have contributed to this result. Scorers were given only two and a half pages of instructions for rating responses (in comparison to Kohlberg's current scoring manual containing over 300 pages). Judges 1 and 3 rated responses around stage 4 and judge 2 gave scores between stage 3 and 4. The author stated that the similar

ratings may have resulted from concepts which were not sufficiently operational, or from the judges' incomprehension of the concepts.

Grant (1975). Discussions of moral dilemmas (1-1/2 hours) over 10 weeks were used in an experimental design to explore the effects on the moral orientation of 27 Clinical Pastoral Education (CPE) students at Andover Newton Theological School. The study was based on Kohlberg's earlier model of moral education (Kohlberg, 1981). Assessments were made using a written abridged version of Kohlberg's interview. Some differences in moral orientation between the groups were found. Extraneous variables may have contributed to the differences. The control group (n=23) viewed the taking of pre- and post-tests as an intrusion. Shorter answers were given to the post-test, making it difficult to score. While no significant changes were found in the Moral Maturity Scores (MMS), there were some changes within each group: the experimental group tended to increase in the MMS, and the control group tended to decrease in the MMS.

Smith and Westerhoff (1980). The study attempted to investigate whether the moral reasoning of seminary students was influenced during participation in a required ethics course at Duke Divinity School. A 50-minute written version of Kohlberg's interview was used as a pre- and post-test to measure levels of moral reasoning. No mention of Kohlberg's work was made in the course. The study was conducted over a

three year period and included students' scores from each of the three times the course was offered. The teaching method essentially remained the same, but the content of the course was revised for the second and third offerings. Comparisons were made for each year. Table 2-2 presents the data of the study. Each succeeding year more students had post-test scores in the stage 5 range and a greater percentage of students used theological categories in post-test responses. The authors concluded that the course content is just as important as the teaching method. A concern was also registered since most of the students were still in the conventional range of moral thinking (stages 3 and 4).

Precedents in the Parish Ministry

The following two investigations focused on the level of moral reasoning of lay parishioners.

Coder (1975)

Coder conducted a six-week experimental study of moral education with members of two churches attending adult education courses: a suburban Catholic church (A group, n=33) and an urban Congregational church (B group, n=13). A control group (C, n=13) consisted of subjects enrolled in church seminars. Originally, more people had participated in the study (N=87), but 28 total persons from the three groups did not return post-tests. Ages ranged from 25 to 55 with the average age being 35. Group A experienced a series of two-hour weekly discussions of moral dilemmas. Group B

Table 2-2

Student Scores in Smith and Westerhoff Study

	Stage 3	Stage 4	Stage 5	% usage
1975-76 (n=20)				
Pre-test	15	5	0	18%
Post-test	10	6	4	70%
1976-77 (n=23)				
Pre-test	17	6	0	20%
Post-test	5	11	7	80%
1977-78 (n=22)				
Pre-test	13	8	1	19%
Post-test	4	10	8	92%

% indicates percentage of all students who used theological
categories in their responses.

Note: From "Teaching moral theology" by H. L. Smith and J.
Westerhoff, March 1982, Duke Divinity School Review, 45, pp.
55, 56 & 58.

received one-hour weekly lectures, with questions, but no discussions were involved. The following assessments were made for each participant: level of moral judgment (the DIT), moral comprehension, law and order orientation, intelligence, and liberalism. The study was included in Rest's efforts to validate the DIT (Rest et al., 1974).

Results on the DIT (using an earlier four-dilemma version) showed no significant differences between any of the three groups on the pre-test, and no difference between the two experimental groups on the post-test, though these two groups differed with the control group. The author suggested that the study gave evidence to disconfirm assumptions that moral dilemma discussions are more effective means of facilitating the development of moral judgment. Factors affecting the conclusion include: the motivation to be in the experimental group, the small sample size, and the delay in returning mailed post-tests by some of the subjects--from two weeks to nine months. The DIT predicted moral-political stance more often than other variables.

Ernsberger (1977)

Another study revealed the importance of factors related to the religious milieu for the moral development of adults. Measures of moral judgment and religious orientation were given to 169 adult members of four churches. Of the four churches, two churches included principled-level moral teachings in their official doctrines and the other two

churches included only conventional-level teachings. Among
the two "principled" churches, the importance given to
morally-principled considerations was positively correlated
with members having either (a) been teachers of religious
classes with youth or adults, or (b) been church committee
members who had to deal with the social-ethical aspects of
religious commitment. In addition, the considerations of one
of these two churches was positively correlated with the
degree of intrinsic religious identification. Finally, the
preference for principled-level considerations was higher
for intrinsically religious members of morally "principled"
congregations than for intrinsically religious members of
morally "conventional" congregations. This study suggested
that specific qualities of congregational life, involvement
and doctrine may be more conducive to facilitating adult
moral development.

Precedents with Other Professional Students

As with theological education, there is a growing
concern for personal and moral development among other
professions. The following section highlights moral develop-
ment studies in legal, nursing and dental education.

Law students

Two different assessment were made in Willging and
Dunn's (1981) study. First, an attempt was made to assess
the effects of the first year of law school on the moral
development of 139 students at the University of Toledo.

Pre- and post-tests on the DIT were taken at the beginning and end of the school year. Since post-tests were to be taken home and returned, only 63 valid responses were received. Pre-test scores for those who did not return the test (mean P score = 50.57) were comparable to the mean P score for the 63 who did return the test (49.54). The post-test score (52.13) was not statistically significant at the .05 level.

Students in their final year are required by the law school to take a course on "Legal ethics and professional responsibility." A total of 41 students took the course during one year. A pre-test was taken on the DIT (mean P score = 52.22) as well as a background questionnaire. The post-test (mean P score = 52.78) was, again, not statistically significant at the .05 level. A confounding factor included the resentment of a good number of the students for having to take the course. Attendance and participation was sporadic. Students were preoccupied with finding a job and taking the bar exam. The authors suggested that an elective course in the first year of studies may be more effective.

Nursing students

Eberhardy (1983) presented two real-life nursing ethical dilemmas to two groups of nurses (all female): 13 masters' level nursing students with at least five years of professional nursing experience (average age = 32.9 years) and 13 undergraduate nursing students with no prior professional nursing experience (average age = 21 years). In

addition, 14 masters' students from the public health field were interviewed (average age = 29.5 years) to provide a basis for comparisons between educational level and specific professional experience in nursing. Responses were analyzed for the assumption of personal responsibility to resolve the dilemmas and the identification and application of moral rights of the individuals involved in the dilemmas. Nursing students at the masters' level (with professional experience) did take personal responsibility and applied moral rights to their decision choices, at a significant level, more often than either undergraduate nursing students or masters' candidates in public health. Thus, professional experience was considered a critical factor.

Dental education

Students from all four years of dental school (N = 483) were given a written moral judgment measure (Green, 1981). From a review of the literature "the weight of evidence indicates that dental schools do affect negatively the values of their students" (p. 137). The instrument employed was developed by the author and resembled the DIT; the dilemmas were specifically designed for dental students. Significant differences in P scores were found between the first and second year students. Green suggested that,

> Since the biggest differences occured in the first two years, perhaps it was not the clinical experience that affected students the most, but rather the stress of competition for grades; the teacher-centered, authoritarian environment; and the perfectionistic demands in pre-clinical courses (p. 140).

Precedents with Faculty in Higher Education

The following three studies investigated faculty perceptions of matters related to the moral development of students.

Renaud (1979). The author was interested in understanding how 66 faculty and 740 students from the colleges of Business, Natural Science and Social Science at Michigan State University defined academic dishonesty. Part I of the questionnaire was designed to measure how faculty and students perceived 33 selected behaviors in relation to what they personally considered an appropriate standard for academic work. Part II included 10 behaviors governed by University regulations on scholarship and grades; engaging in any one of these behaviors was considered an act of dishonesty. Faculty were specifically asked whether they had discovered any of the behaviors over the past academic year and, if so, on how many occasions and what action was taken.

Overall, faculty perceived the behaviors, at a significant level, more seriously than both undergraduate and graduate students. Regarding individual behaviors, faculty perceived the following actions as more serious than students: 1) letting a friend copy a paper, 2) submitting a paper for two courses changing only the title, 3) not accurately reporting lab experiment findings, 4) critiquing a take-home final for classmates when the class was instructed to do their own work, 5) failing to use quotation

marks with material copied verbatim, 6) signaling answers during an exam, and 7) faking footnotes (pp. 74-75). Concerning student dishonesty, the action taken most often by faculty was warning the students (42), next was penalizing the student's grade on the assignment (37) and then, no action was taken (24). Occasionally the student would have to repeat the assignment (13), the course grade would be penalized (9) or the student would be referred for University disciplinary action (3) (p. 127).

Coles (1973). A similar study was conducted in a church-related college of the Seventh-day Adventist Church regarding the student behaviors of general conduct, drug use, mischief, sex offenses, drinking, cheating and theft. The purpose was to discover what degree of difference of opinion was evident among 128 faculty, 355 students and 300 parents concerning these behaviors. Of the three groups, the faculty were the most conservative in opinions about cheating. Parents were most conservative in six other categories of behavior. Significant differences of opinion were evident among all three groups in relation to seven areas of student conduct.

Wixom (1982). Personal interviews were taken with 161 faculty, freshmen and seniors from three institutions of higher education: the University of Utah, a state institution, Brigham Young University, a large church-related institution, and Westminster College, a small private liberal arts college. The faculty and students were

presented with four distinct models for dealing with values in the college classroom: 1) factual-intellectual--facts but no values are taught or discussed; 2) value-neutrality--both facts and values are discussed, but professors do not disclose their own values (associated with Kohlberg's earlier position); 3) value-advocacy--both facts and values are discussed and professors advocate their point of view but avoid encouraging students to agree or disagree with them; 4) authoritarian--facts and values are taught as absolutes; professors advocate their views and encourage students to agree, and discourage students to disagree. The factual-intellectual and authoritarian models were considered the two extremes of the continuum and the other two models were located on the continuum.

Responses were very similar among the respondents in that students and faculty were satisfied with the particular level at which values were taught at all three institutions and there was a congruence between what was taking place and what they believed ought to be taking place. The majority of repondents from each institution preferred the value-advocacy model of the teaching of values. No statistically significant differences were related to demographic or academic factors, including affiliation with the regionally dominant Mormon Church.

Precedents with Teachers in Public Education

In the following section, seven studies are cited. The first four studies investigated teachers' thinking about moral eduation and their role and practice in moral education. The final three studies take a broader perspective and look at factors related to classroom atmosphere and organizational factors of schools.

Wallace (1980)

The Moral Education Attitudinal Survey (MEAS) was administered to 334 teachers in Suffolk County, NY. The instrument was developed by the researcher and content validity was verified by an expert panel of experienced researchers. The MEAS consisted of 52 statements organized into three parts. The second part included 32 statements regarding six teacher approaches to moral education: 1) role modeling (to provide moral exemplars), 2) rationalistic (to provide opportunities to discuss moral issues), 3) holistic (to establish a just community as a learning environment), 4) activistic (to encourage students to become active in social projects), 5) humanistic (to develop sensitivity for others), and 6) conventional (to provide rules and behavior codes and to enforce them). The teachers considered that each of these six types involved appropriate means of moral education. The only statement teachers considered an inappropriate action was the item suggesting that teachers tell students what is right and wrong (though, in practice, implicit messages of right and wrong cannot be avoided).

Moeller (1982)

The author interviewed (via tape recorder) 24 Wisconsin
home economics teachers to identify teachers' implicit
theory of moral education. Two major variables were used in
the analysis: DIT scores, measuring the percentage of
principled moral reasoning, and participation in in-service
education on family-focused home economics. Teachers
identified 280 different ways to engage in moral education.
The most predominant form of moral education was the
discussion of moral issues. Since the public school must
relate to students of diverse cultural perspectives,
teachers sometimes felt frustrated that their own belief
systems were not appropriate for this pluralistic setting.
Three particular moral education models were identified:
character development (6), moral analysis approach (7),
avoidance of moral education (4) and a combination of the
three models (7)

Silver (1982)

Teachers (N = 25) from a midwestern, independent,
secondary school participated in a moral education program
based on Kohlbergian research. The program involved meeting
weekly for 30 to 45 minutes over a period of two school
years. Following this program, teachers were interviewed to
investigate the differences in their thinking about moral
education and acts of teaching. Many of the teachers, though
indicating that they (1) thought more about moral education,
(2) had experienced a shift in thinking and (3) had accepted

parts of the program, reported limited practice of moral education. Other teachers did not report changes in their thinking or teaching of moral education, though they had considered the possibility of the program. A few teachers reported changes both in thinking and in teaching while two teachers indicated that there was no change at all. Silver suggested that,

> In fact the school structure remains unscathed, the academic program is inviolable, and moral education has become an add-on extra-curriculum program (p. 162).

One factor probably affecting the teachers' receptivity to the program was the institution of the program from a decision by an administrator. Little attention was given to teacher participation in the process of implementation.

Lubomudrov (1982)

Another study focused on the relationship among teachers' level of moral reasoning, their understanding of educational issues and the teaching practices they adopt. Case studies were developed for eight elementary teachers from the same school district in Salt Lake City. Each teacher had at least five years of teaching experience; ages were from 28 to 37 years. Four teachers had DIT scores below 25, and four teachers had DIT scores above 34. Participants were selected from a pool of 27 teachers who had taken the DIT. Data were collected through interviews, videotapes, observations and analyses of teachers' written assignments.

Differences were evident in "teaching perspectives" between the two groups on the following variables:

1) understanding of rules, 2) the roles of a teacher, 3) expectations concerning the interaction of students in the classroom, and 4) general orientation toward educational issues. For each teacher, the teaching perspective that was held consistently reflected cohesive attitudes and practices about educational issues. In addition, environmental factors (e.g. relationship with principals, "grading" requirements, district policy) also affected teachers' understanding and their teaching behavior.

Gerety (1980)

As in the previous study, Gerety tested 30 secondary school teachers (from one junior high and one senior high school) with the DIT. Students from one of these teachers' classes took a Classroom Environment Scale (CES), intended to measure the social climate of a classroom. From the 30 teachers, one teacher was randomly selected from each quartile level of moral judgment, based on the DIT scores. Then, 25% of the students from one of these teachers' high-level academic classrooms were randomly selected to be interviewed using the Classroom Moral Atmosphere Interview (CMAI) developed by the researcher. DIT scores were compared with subscales of the CES and scores on the CMAI.

Results indicated that DIT scores related at a significant level with the CES subscales of innovation and teacher support. No correlation was found between the CMAI and teacher level of moral judgment, as measured by the DIT. Scores on the CMAI did indicate a statistical difference

among the four classes and the differences among the four classes corresponded to the level of moral judgment of the teacher.

Bayer (1980)

The author examined 20 organizational and instructional practices (such as attendance policies, grading, required courses) of a public school to investigate teacher and parent perceptions on: 1) what is being taught by each practice, 2) what should be learned to be an effective citizen or to be self-controlled, and 3) at what Kohlberg stage of moral judgment is each practice aimed. The study was undertaken in a white, middle class school district in Michigan. Nine junior high schools were included in the study, involving 18 teachers and 76 parents. Based on responses to the author's Citizenship Education Survey, parents and teachers did agree on the hidden curriculum nature of school practices, but they differed in their identification of what each practice actually taught. Regarding practices which related to behavior, parents and teachers agreed on the particular stage of moral judgment being taught. Hidden curriculum practices were frequently identified as necessary for controlling and educating for effective citizenship.

Powers (1980)

The Cambridge Cluster School (a mini-school within Cambridge High School in Boston) was the site of one of the experiments in Kohlberg's "just community" approach to moral

education. Powers provided an analysis of the four-year
longitudinal project. The purpose of the project was to
investigate the development of the school's moral atmosphere
and the students' moral judgment. Over the four years, 60
students were assessed by Kohlberg's Moral Judgment
Interview, and about 20 students were interviewed on the
moral atmosphere interview. This instrument was designed to
describe the moral characteristics of the school's social
atmosphere by assessing the collective norms and values
(based on responses from the students interviewed) in terms
of Kohlberg's moral stages and the seven phases of the
development of the collective norm (Kohlberg et al., 1983,
p. 56). Additional data came from transcripts of weekly
community meetings and informal interviews with staff and
students following the meetings.

In each year of the four years, there was evidence of
the development of the collective norm. Also, the average
moral judgment stage increase was 15 moral maturity points.
As one example, though stealing was commonplace at the high
school, during the second year of the Cluster project a norm
against stealing developed and there were no further
instances of stealing during the next three years. On the
other hand, a collective norm against the use of drugs never
did develop. The findings suggested that a just community
approach can facilitate the development of a higher stage
and phase of moral atmosphere which can have effects on the
ways in which students treat each other--thus turning

aspects of the hidden curriculum into an intentional process
of moral education.

Summary of the Findings from Empirical Studies

Theological education is receiving more serious
research attention. Yet, few studies have been specifically
concerned about the moral development of seminary students.

Theological education

Though seminary faculty, overall, perceived themselves
as andragogically oriented, students perceived faculty as
more pedagogically oriented (Grubbs, 1981). Faculty in
non-ministry related disciplines tend to be more pedagog-
ically oriented. Seminary faculty, as a group, have a highly
homogeneous perception of the expectations placed on
ministers (Sweeny, 1981).

The seminary program provides adequate training in the
traditional disciplines, yet the informal (hidden curriculum)
elements are most often cited as examples demonstrating
servant-leader qualities (Ferris, 1982). Seminary faculty
have moderate to little influence in decisions relating to
student life and discipline and yet they do not desire more
influence (Shannon, 1975).

Seminarians who are in a hurry to perform a task are
less likely to help out a victim, as those who are in less
of a hurry (Darley & Batson, 1973). A course in theological
ethics can help stimulate students' level of moral reasoning
in an upward direction (Smith and Westerhoff, 1980).

Seminarians manifest (as measured by the DIT) a level of moral reasoning that is a little higher than college juniors and seniors but much lower than doctoral students in moral philosophy and political science (Rest, et al., 1974; Rest, et al. 1978). A majority of seminary students evidence (as measured by an abridged, written version of Kohlberg's interview) a conventional level of moral reasoning (stages 3 and 4) (Smith & Westerhoff, 1980). Lawrence's (1979) study indicates that seminary students tend to interpret moral dilemmas more simplistically than do graduate philosophy students.

Parish ministry

Moral dilemma discussions may not be a more effective means of facilitating moral development than class lectures (Coder, 1975). It is possible that church doctrines may only include moral teachings at a conventional level of moral reasoning (Ernsberger, 1977).

Professional students

Nursing students with previous professional experience assumed personal responsibility in moral dilemmas and applied the moral rights of the victims in their choices more often than did students without professional experience (Eberhardy, 1983). First-year dental students had significantly higher P scores (DIT) than second-year students (Green, 1981).

Faculty in higher education

Faculty hold a high view of academic honesty (Coles 1973), yet in the face of student infractions, faculty tend to give out only warnings (Renaud, 1979). The value-advocacy model of teaching values is the preferred ideal among faculty of a variety of institutions of higher education (state, church-related and private), though another teaching model may prevail in practice (Wixom, 1982).

Teachers in public education

Public teachers working with younger children indicate that a variety of teacher roles are appropriate for promoting moral growth and good citizenship (Wallace, 1980; Moeller, 1982). Teachers at varying levels of moral judgment tend to view educational issues differently (Silver, 1982) and this may have different effects on the moral atmosphere of the classroom (Gerety, 1980). The level of teachers' moral reasoning may be an important factor in the classroom, but an equally significant factor is the educational context which may constrain moral education activities (Silver, 1982; Lubomudrov, 1982). Hidden curriculum practices are often identified as necessary for classroom control and the training for effective citizenship (Bayer, 1980). When an intensive effort is made to encourage a "just community", development of higher collective norms can follow as well as specific influences on the moral behavior of students (Powers, 1980).

Conclusion

The chapter presented the conceptual and empirical grounding of the study. A review of various analyses of theological education surfaced a concern regarding one neglected element of the curriculum: the personal development of seminary students. Empirical research in theological education, though sparse in previous periods, is evidently on the increase. Seminary faculty have been queried on a number of issues. A few studies have been directed at investigating the moral development of seminary students. The precedent for interviewing faculty concerning matters of moral development and moral education primarily comes from studies in higher education and public education. Sufficient work has been done in these arenas to provide a foundation on which to ground similar studies within theological education.

End Note

1. The first medical college was established in Philadelphia
   1765 (Kaufman, 1976) and the first law school was
   established either in 1782 or 1784 in Litchfield,
   Connecticut (Reed, 1928). The first seminary was
   established in New York in 1784 as the Seminary of the
   Dutch Reformed Church (it is now called the New Brunswick
   Theological Seminary in New Jersey) (Winkleman, 1975, p.
   68).

Chapter 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

In order to describe the educational emphasis placed on the moral development of students at Protestant seminaries, the study employed the personal interview as the primary means of collecting data. This chapter describes the research design, the population and sample, and the procedures of instrument development, data collection and data analysis. A statement of the limitations and methodological assumptions of the study completes the chapter.

Research Design

The study can best be identified as descriptive research. Isaac and Michael (1981) affirm the contribution that descriptive studies can make to the advancement of knowledge. They present a four-fold purpose for this type of research (p. 46):

    (a) to collect detailed factual information that describes existing phenomenon,

    (b) to identify problems or justify current conditions and practices,

    (c) to make comparisons and evaluations, and

(d) to determine what others are doing with similar
problems or situations and benefit from their
experiences in making future plans and decisions.

Though the primary intent of the study was to fulfill
the first purpose of describing information about existing
phenomenon, the other purposes did receive some attention in
the final chapter. A series of personal interviews was
arranged to collect most of the data. In addition, selected
official documents were secured from the schools.

The study proceeded in four general phases:

1. Selection of institutional sites and faculty
   informants

2. Development of an interview instrument

3. Collection of data through personal interviews

4. Analysis and synthesis of the findings.

Population and Sample

The following section provides a description of the
population of the study, and lists the procedures which were
employed in selecting the institutional interview sites and
the sample of faculty informants.

Description of the population

The population of the study consisted of faculty
members teaching in Protestant, denominational, graduate
schools of theology. This section explains the exclusion of
non-Protestant seminaries and nondenominational seminaries
as institutional sites for the population.

<u>Protestant vs. non-Protestant seminaries</u>. The
population of the study was limited to faculty persons in
Protestant seminaries in order to focus on a more comparable
grouping of professors. The professional education for
religious ministry comprises a wide spectrum of religious
communities. The Association for Theological Schools (ATS),
the recognized accrediting body for theological education in
the United States, includes a total voluntary association of
196 American theological schools: 165 full members, 11
schools which are in the candidate status, and 20 schools
which are associate members (Taylor, 1984). Though, ATS
accredits seminaries from diverse religious sectors
(Protestant, Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, and Jewish),
most of its membership is Protestant.

The seminary faculty and the parish ministries of these
various religious communities comprise too diverse a
population for one study. For example, the Jewish rabbis
regard the Hebrew Bible (the Old Testament) as the only
authoritative religious document, whereas the Christian
faiths venerate, to various degrees, both Old and New
Testaments. All Roman Catholic priests and all Eastern
Orthodox bishops are unmarried, whereas almost all
Protestant ministers are married. Also, the Roman Catholic,
Eastern Orthodox and Jewish educational systems for the
preparation of priests or rabbis are significantly different
from the professional preparation of Protestant ministers.

Protestant seminaries and their faculty are much more

homogeneous in nature. The formal aspects of the seminary program are very comparable. Despite some ecclesiastical and denominational differences, the curriculum is fairly similar across Protestant seminaries. The most common degree awarded to first-level graduate practitioners is the Master of Divinity degree (M.Div.), a standard program offering at all graduate seminaries. This degree program requires a bachelor's degree, generally involves three years of study and covers approximately the same required subject matter. Faculty are organized in similar academic departments and perform similar administrative and teaching functions at the seminary.

In light of this comparability, the population was composed of faculty teaching in Protestant graduate schools of theology. In the United States, there are approximately 150 Protestant seminaries—all offering the Master of Divinity degree (Jacquet, 1983). The number of faculty teaching at each seminary varies and may range from less than 10 to more than 50.

Denominational vs. nondenominational seminaries. Protestant seminaries can generallly be divided into four main types (Fletcher, 1981), though additional categories may be needed (M. J. Taylor, personal communication, May 16, 1984):

1. denominational seminaries which are regionally organized and supported (such as seminaries of the Episopal Church and Lutheran Church in America),

2. denominational seminaries which are nationally
   organized and supported (such as seminaries of the
   Southern Baptist Convention and Lutheran Church-
   Missouri Synod),

3. free-standing interdenominational seminaries (such
   as Union--N.Y., Fuller, and Dallas seminaries),
   and

4. university-based divinity schools (such as at
   Harvard, Yale, and Chicago).

The number of seminaries in the last two categories is very
small (less than 30). The vast majority of Protestant
seminaries are denominationally related.

Seminaries related to a denomination must be responsive
to the value system of their constituency. In most cases,
clergymen of the denomination are members of the board of
trustees or directors of the seminary. Also, a part of the
seminary budget is underwritten by the member churches of
the denomination (the specific percentage of support varies
among the denominations ranging from small to significant
amounts). Nondenominational seminaries are independent in
that they are not regulated by the values of a specific
denomination.

Thus, it was determined to focus the study on
denominational seminaries due to their similarity, their
direct responsiveness to the values of the parish ministry,
and to their greater number.

Selection of sample interview sites

The sites from which the sample was drawn came from
seminaries located in the midwest: northern Illinois,
northern Indiana, and western Michigan. Significant clusters

of Protestant seminaries are located in the vicinity of some major U.S. cities (Note 1). The largest cluster is located near Chicago. Also, this particular grouping of seminaries represents 10 of the 12 major American Protestant denominational families which were identified in ATS's "Readiness for Ministry" project (Schuller, et al., 1980, pp. 57-58; Notes 2, 3 and 4).

Within this geographical area a total of 17 Protestant, denominational, graduate, theological seminaries were identified (Note 5). These 17 schools enrolled between 65 and 500 M.Div. students (mean = 179), total number of students between 80 and 1,000 (mean = 317), and employed from 9 to 38 full-time faculty members (mean = 20). The interview sites were drawn from this list of 17 seminaries.

Soliciting participation in the study

Due to the denominational breadth of this particular grouping of seminaries, and due to the possibility that some schools would probably decline involvement in the study, it was decided to initially approach all of the 17 seminaries regarding participation in the interview study. In January 1984, contact was made with the president (or dean) of each seminary, briefly explaining the project and inviting participation (see Appendix C). Shortly thereafter, calls were made to request responses to the invitation to participate in the study.

As a result, six seminaries responded positively to the invitation and participated in the project (Note 6). In each

school four faculty members were interviewed thus providing 24 total interviews from which data were collected and analyzed. For the purpose of formally testing the interview protocol, the interviews conducted at two of the six seminaries were designated as the pilot study. In order to maximize the utility of all interviews, where comparable, pilot study data were folded in and reported in the findings along with data collected using the final form of the interview protocol at the other four seminaries.

Description of participating institutions

The following six Protestant graduate schools of theology participated in the study (Note 7).

Calvin Theological Seminary. Founded in 1876, Calvin Seminary is located in Grand Rapids, Michigan, on a campus shared with Calvin College. The seminary is accredited by ATS and is supported by the Christian Reformed Church in North America, a denomination comprising 634 churches and 215,411 members. There are 133 students enrolled in the M.Div. program (240 total students), and the seminary employs 16 faculty members.

Concordia Theological Seminary. Founded in 1846, Concordia Seminary is located in Fort Wayne, Indiana, and is accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS) and ATS. The seminary is affiliated with The Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod which comprises 5,710 churches and 2.63 million members. There are 340 students enrolled in the M.Div. program (539 total students) and the

seminary employs 35 faculty members.

Grace Theological Seminary. Founded in 1937, Grace Seminary is located in Winona Lake, Indiana (about 40 miles west of Fort Wayne), and is the graduate training institution for the Fellowship of Grace Brethern Churches which includes 284 churches and 42,023 members. The seminary is accredited by the NCACS, has 273 M.Div. students (427 total students), and employs 17 faculty members. An additional seven faculty members are adjunct members who teach at the adjacent Grace College.

Grand Rapids Baptist Seminary. Tracing its history to 1949, Baptist Seminary is located in Grand Rapids, Michigan, sharing a campus with the Grand Rapids Baptist College. The seminary is accredited by the NCACS and is the graduate training institution of the General Association of Regular Baptists, comprising 1,571 churches and 300,000 members. There are 132 M.Div. students currently enrolled (277 total students) and 12 faculty are employed by the seminary.

Northern Baptist Theological Seminary. Founded in 1913, Northern Baptist Seminary is located in Lombard, Illinois (just west of Chicago). The seminary is accredited by the NCACS and ATS, and is affiliated with the American Baptist Churches/USA, which includes 5,817 churches and 1.61 million members. There are 110 M.Div. students enrolled in the program (235 total students) and 14 faculty members are employed.

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. Through mergers of previously existing institutes and seminaries, Trinity was founded in 1959 and is located in Deerfield, Illinois (just north of Chicago). Trinity is accredited by the NCACS and ATS and is affiliated with the Evangelical Free Church which comprises 805 churches and 103,900 members. There are 491 M.Div. students enrolled (966 total students) and there are 38 faculty members on the teaching staff.

Selection of the faculty respondents

In each seminary, four faculty were interviewed: one of the chief administrative officers (either the president or dean) and three other faculty members. For the purposes of the study, those interviewed were required to have a good understanding of their seminary program and the seminary environment. Thus seminary faculty were defined as those who had regular full-time appointments (excluding part-time and visiting faculty) and who had taught at the seminary for at least the past two academic years. This length of service criteria was waived in one case where the dean had recently come to the school. Also, one visiting instructor participated in the study. The instructor had just received a full-time appointment for the next academic year.

Representation of departmental affiliation. For each school, it was attempted to solicit faculty members representing both the "classical" disciplines and the "ministry-related" disciplines in order to collect data from different perspectives. As mentioned in chapter 2, a

continuing tension remains between the "theoretical" and "practical" aspects of seminary education. It was deemed important to incorporate these two emphases in selecting individual faculty members.

The traditional seminary departments include Biblical studies, Dogmatics, Historical Theology and Practical Theology. Further sub-disciplines are currently evident (adapted from Ferris, 1982, p. 46):

        Biblical Studies
            Biblical introduction
            Biblical languages
            Hermeneutics
            Biblical history
            Biblical theology

        Dogmatics
            Systematic theology
            Christian ethics
            Apologetics
            Philosophical theology

        Historical Theology
            Church history

        Practical Theology
            Homiletics
            Evangelism
            Christian education
            Pastoral care and counseling
            Church administration
            Church planting and church growth
            Missions

In general the "theoretical" emphasis is associated with the first three departments (Biblical Studies, Dogmatics and Historical Theology). The "practical" emphasis is usually associated with the last department, Practical Theology. The labels of "theoretical" and "practical" are too ambiguous for purposes of identifying these two educational clusters. Instead, the terms "classical"

disciplines (for the theoretical emphasis) and "ministry-related" disciplines (for the practical emphasis) were used.

Selection bias. For the purpose of including sufficient numbers of ministry-related faculty in the study, an equal representation of the two disciplines was selected from each seminary: two faculty members from the classical disciplines, and two faculty members from the ministry-related disciplines. This 50% distribution does not typify most seminaries. Usually the classical disciplines faculty make up around 75% to 90% of the total faculty, and the ministry-related faculty constititute about 25% to 10% of the total faculty.

Selection process. Initial correspondence with each seminary was directed through the office of the president or dean. In three of the seminaries, the researcher was permitted to randomly select the individual faculty members from each seminary. Seminary catalogs supplied a directory of currently employed faculty. From each of these seminaries, faculty rosters of those teaching in the classical disciplines and ministry-related disciplines were made (of those fulfilling the length of service criterion).

For each of these two listings of disciplines, faculty names were placed in alphabetical order. Numbers were then serially assigned and a table of random numbers was employed to select three faculty from each list--the third selected was designated as an alternate. In four cases, alternates had to be included in the study where those originally

contacted could not be interviewed due to a sabbatical leave or time constraints.

In the other three schools, the president or dean recommended the names of four faculty members (which had been selected on the criteria mentioned above). These faculty members were contacted and appointments made. In two cases, other names had to be recommended and these faculty members were interviewed.

Demographic information

Of the total 24 faculty members who were interviewed, 12 were affiliated with the "classical disciplines" and 12 faculty were affiliated with the "ministry-related" disciplines. The classical discipline respondents included faculty from the following departments: Systematic Theology (5), Old Testament (3), New Testament (2) and Church History (2). The ministry-related discipline respondents included faculty from these departments: Christian Education (8), Practical Theology (2), and Missions (2).

Ages of the faculty members ranged from 40 to 65 years (mean = 53 years), and total seminary teaching experience ranged from 5 to 35 years (mean = 20 years). For those faculty having previous full-time pastoral ministries (n = 13), experience ranged from 2 to 17 years (mean = 9 years). One female respondent participated in the study (Note 8).

Instrument Development

An interview schedule was designed for use in the study (see Appendix A). As suggested by Borg and Gall (1979, p. 292), the questions were designed to meet specific objectives--issues related to the three research questions of the study:

1. How do faculty understand the educational tasks in relation to promoting the moral development of students?

2. How do faculty interact with students in matters which may affect the students' moral development, both in and out of the classroom?

3. As perceived by the faculty, what aspects of the seminary program are intended to influence or have influenced the students' moral development?

Guidelines for question construction

Due to the nature of the subject matter and the current state of information about this topic in the context of theological education, it was decided to employ a more qualitative means of data collection: the open-ended interview. Gorden (1980) suggests five advantages of the interview:

1. The interview provides more opportunity to motivate the respondent to supply accurate and complete information immediately.

2. The interview provides more opportunity to guide the respondent in his interpretation of the questions.

3. The interview allows a greater flexibility in questioning the respondent.

4. The interview allows greater control over the interview situation.

5. The interview provides a greater opportunity to
   evaluate the validity of the information by
   observing the respondent's nonverbal manifestations
   of his attitude toward supplying the information
   (pp. 62-63).

The three basic approaches of open-ended interviews are
(1) the informal conversational interview, (2) the general
interview guide approach, and (3) the standardized open-ended
interview (Patton, 1980, p. 197). The latter approach was
used since it provided: (a) greater comparability of
responses, (b) more efficient use of limited time through a
highly focused format, and (c) minimizing of interviewer
effects (Patton, 1980, pp. 202-203).

Specific reference. Guidelines suggested by the
literature were taken into consideration in the formulation
of the interview protocol. Though the general nature of the
protocol was open-ended, attempts were made to sufficiently
direct the responses to a particular frame of reference
(Payne, 1951, pp. 229-230). One means of accomplishing such
a focus was by framing questions with a more personal and
concrete reference (Lortie, 1975).

> I favor four criteria in assessing different kinds of
> data on sentiments: (1) indirect versus direct
> questions, (2) personal versus impersonal referents,
> (3) concrete versus abstract referents, and (4)
> cathetected versus low-affect issues . . . . If a
> question stimulates evaluative comments which
> indirectly reveal the respondent's objectives, the
> chances of evoking ideological statements are reduced.
> Respondents are better able to provide details on
> personal experiences and, if well interviewed, will be
> more spontaneous than in discussing general matters (p.
> 110).

<u>Word choice</u>. Selection of words was also an important consideration (Payne, 1951, Chap. 9 & 10). The particular words chosen for each question were required to be clearly understood, without being too simplistic. "If the wording is too simple, it will insult respondents; if it is too complicated, the question is likely to be misunderstood" (DeLamater, 1982, p. 22).

<u>Question order</u>. Another concern dealt with the particular order of questions. It is generally agreed that questions should follow some sort of psychological order (Sheatsley, 1983, p. 221). Since the opening question is very important in that it sets the tone for the interview and also contributes to the rapport being established, this initial question was designed to be very general in nature, and non-threatening. Responses to the question were not analyzed. The more difficult and sensitive questions were asked at a place where the interview was well underway.

Questions related to one area were grouped together. In this regard, one should be aware that this common strategy also tends to encourage context effects on the responses (Schuman & Presser, 1981, p. 75). Despite the research on question order effects, these particular effects are not easy to predict and it is not known that separating the items would eliminate the order effects (pp. 75-76). When the interview moved to another topic, it was helpful to prepare the respondent with some transitional statement.

Varying respondent tasks. To help alleviate respondent fatigue and boredom, the format of questions was varied, providing a timely change of pace. With a few questions, respondents were referred to a sheet of paper or card (Gorden, 1980, p. 264; Sheatsley, 1983, p. 221). This provided a visual focus which aided memory; it also involved a physical task and a different form of contact between interviewer and respondent.

Evaluation of the interview. A final series of questions requested information about the interview itself. Respondents were asked if they could remember any of the questions which seemed ambiguous to them (question 20). Only one response was given, and it was in reference to interview question 11. One means of identifying questions which are more sensitive or threatening in nature was to ask a specific question to that effect (e.g. "Do you happen to remember which questions you think most people would consider difficult to answer?"; question 21) (Sudman & Bradburn, 1982, pp. 56, 72). Less than five professors responded affirmatively to the question. References were made to either interview question 4 or 9. Question 4 was probably difficult to answer because there was no real objective basis on which to make a judgment. For some, question 9 was difficult probably because they really had not thought about the matter, as was apparent in their answers. A final question allowed respondents to suggest topics which they felt were salient to the interview, but were not covered (question 22; Payne, 1951, p. 36).

Source of questions. Sudman and Bradburn (1982) state
that "most questionnaires consist of some questions that have
been used before and some new questions, although even the
new questions may be adapted from earlier ones " (p. 14).
Likewise in this case, some questions were adapted from
existing sources (such as Lortie, 1975; Bussis, Chittendon &
Amarel, 1976, Prawat, in press, and relevant dissertation
studies cited in Chapter 2).

Types of interview items. A few questions were
reducible to a closed format through preliminary testing of
open-response questions. Due to the exploratory nature of
the study, most of the questions were retained as open-
response items. For some of these questions, the initial
response was followed with semi-structured probes.

Summary of use of responses. Responses to the interview
questions were used in the following ways.

 # 1. Responses were not used; this was an introductory,
   non-threatening question.

 # 2-18. Responses were analyzed and are presented in
   the findings chapters.

 # 19. Responses were grouped with responses to other
   interview questions; this was a catch-all
   question.

 # 20-21. Responses were previously discussed in the
   Instrument Development section under "Evaluation
   of the interview."

 # 22. Responses are incorporated in the section on
   recommendations for future research in the final
   chapter.

Information presented to respondents

During the pilot study, it became apparent that the faculty members and interviewer would need a common basis of understanding regarding the concepts of "moral" and "moral development." Three pieces of information about these concepts were presented to the respondents at different points during the first half of the interview (see Appendix B). Before interview question 4 was read, a brief explanation was given regarding the moral domain. A 4 x 6 card was handed to the respondent on which was printed a general definition of the term "moral".

Following this, the interviewer presented a list of five aspects of moral development: moral knowledge, moral thinking, moral sensitivity, personal values and will power. These general categories arose from a consideration of the themes of research in the field. The definition of each aspect, as given to the respondent, is provided below. Also, a particular researcher who could be identified with concepts related to the general category was enclosed in parentheses.

> Moral knowledge:
> the information and comprehension one has of (a) Biblical precepts and moral principles as well as (b) specific moral issues; (Hogan, 1973).

> Moral thinking:
> the capability to analyze the relevant factors of a moral issue or situation, and to make a decision or judgment based on some logical rationale; (Kohlberg, 1981).

<u>Moral sensitivity</u>:
the capability to empathize with others concerning
their needs and rights with a sense of compassion,
justice, and responsibility; a sensitivity to one's
conscience and the Holy Spirit; (empathy-Hoffman, 1982;
caring and responsibility-Gilligan, 1982).

<u>Personal values</u>:
the particular moral convictions, beliefs, and
responsibilities to which one is committed by conscious
choice or those values adhered to by unconscious
practice; (valuing process-Raths, Harmin & Simon, 1966;
affective taxonomy, levels 3, 4, and 5-Krathwohl, Bloom
& Masia, 1964).

<u>Will power</u>:
the resolve and capability to act on one's moral
convictions in the face of countervailing forces; the
capability to resist temptation; (executing a plan,
Rest, 1983).

The five-aspect sheet was handed to the respondent. The

interviewer read through the list and included an example to

clarify each of the five aspects (see Appendix B).

Before reading interview question 7, the interviewer

presented a sample list of moral issues which are discussed

in seminary classrooms. The list was developed from

responses received during the pilot study (see Appendix B).

These pieces of information provided a general framework

of understanding for respondents. During the first interviews

of the pilot study, some faculty respondents expressed some

frustration in attempting to understand the questions. When

this information was used in subsequent interviews, it seemed

that faculty had a clearer understanding of the subject

matter. One of the faculty members who was interviewed toward

the end of the project expressed that the information was

very helpful for the interview.

Information about respondents

Though the data were collected in face-to-face interviews, confidentiality of responses was maintained by assigning codes to respondents and fictitious names to each institution. Due to the nature of the selection process some demographic information was already known regarding the department and institution in which faculty taught. Additional information was solicited relating to age (i.e. month and year born), total years of teaching service at the institution, and the number of years, if any, they had served in the pastoral ministry before beginning their teaching career. This information was collected on a form filled out by the respondent at the beginning of the interview (while the researcher set up the tape recorder and microphone; see Appendix B).

Preliminary testing of the interview schedule

At various points during the period of instrument development, several practice interviews were undertaken and the questions (and their order) were continually revised. A more formal testing was conducted in the pilot study with two of the six seminaries. Some minor modifications were made, and a final form was developed and used in the interviews at the four remaining seminaries (see Appendix A).

Data Collection Procedures

Personal interviews (averaging from 45 minutes to 1 hour and 30 minutes in length) were conducted with 24 faculty

members over a period of seven weeks, beginning near the end
of February. Handwritten notes were taken and recorded
directly on the interview form. In taking notes of responses,
attempts were made to be telegraphic but to use words of the
respondents. Except for one case, the interview was also
recorded on cassette tape, providing a corroboration of
handwritten notes. In addition, the appropriate official
documents were secured (i.e. catalogs, and application forms)
to identify information requested for an applicant.

<div align="center">Data Analysis Procedures</div>

Handwritten interview notes, transcribed interview
responses and the appropriate seminary documents were
analyzed in a manner similar to two of the procedures
identified by Miles and Huberman (1984): data reduction and
data display.

> Data reduction: Data reduction refers to the process of
> selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and
> transforming the "raw" data that appear in written-up
> field notes (Miles & Huberman, 1984, p. 21).

An example of the process of identifying units of responses
is presented in Chapter 4.

> Data display: We define "display" as an organized
> assembly of information that permits conclusion drawing
> and action taking (Miles & Huberman, 1984, p. 21).

The units of responses were analyzed for recurring themes.
From these themes, general categories were empirically
derived. The categories were used in the organization and
presentation of data. An example of the process is given in
Chapter 4.

<u>Variables related to differences in response</u>

A corrollary purpose of the study was to identify variables which might be related to signficant differences in responses. It was assumed that differences in responses were most apt to be related to the following two variables: (a) primary discipline of the faculty member (classical or ministry-related disciplines) and (b) years of full-time pastoral experience.

Responses to ten of the interview questions were amenable to division into mutually exclusive categories and were tabulated in frequencies (questions 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 17 and 18). These nominal data were cross-tabulated with the two variables of interest and placed in contingency tables. (Responses to questions 10 and 18 were excluded from this analysis since the number of cases in most of the cells fell below five). Data in the contingency tables were submitted to statistical tests of significance.

<u>Statistical treatment</u>

Three general categories of tests were utilized to measure association at the nominal level: (a) three chi-squared related measures: chi-square (or Fisher's Exact test for the 2 X 2 matrix), phi-squared and the contingency coefficient C, (b) an odds ratio measure: Yule's Q, and (c) a proportional-reduction-in-error measure (PRE): Goodman and Kruskal's lambda (Reynolds, 1977). Except for the chi-square and Fisher exact test, all of the above measures yield results between 0 and the absolute value of 1. These measures

provide an indication of the strength of association, something the chi-sqare test does not give. On a continuum of scores, Yule's Q tends to yield higher results while Goodman and Kruskal's lambda tends to be a more a conservative measure and the others produce results somewhere between the two.

One cautionary note should be mentioned concerning the use of the chi-square distribution. Though the chi-square test is commonly used in social science research, there is a controversy regarding its utility with small samples (e.g. Bradley, McGrath & Cutcomb, 1979). Chi-square is based on a continuous distribution. With very small samples there is only a limited number of possible outcomes, the resulting sampling distribution is described by a series of discrete plotting points. Lutz suggests that,

> as a guide for the proper use of the chi-square test, it now seems that it can be used with samples as small as 8 when there are only two measurement categories and 20 when there are more categories, provided that the sample's distribution is not highly skewed (overwhelmingly concentrated in only a few of the available categories)" (1983, p. 324).

In light of this caution, nominal data fitting a 2 X 2 contingency table were tested by the Fisher Exact test, an alternate to the chi-square, which provides an exact statistic rather than a correction as in Yates' formula. The Exact test is recommended for contingency tables with one degree of freedom when the expected cell frequencies are very small (Lutz, 1983, 338). Two of the measures, Yule's Q and the contingency coefficient C, are limited to use on 2 X

2 matrices. The conventional alpha level of .05 was used to indicate statistical significance.

Document analysis

The official documents and statements concerning admissions practices were analyzed for content related to moral development. Categories of specific requirements were derived and tabulated.

Limitations of the Study

The study was confined to personal interviews with full-time faculty teaching at Protestant, denominational, graduate, theological seminaries. Faculty who participated in the study were employed by seminaries which were selected from a regional grouping of representative seminaries. This regional grouping of seminaries, from which the interview sites were drawn, represented much of the diversity in size, educational mission and theological heritage which is characteristic of most American Protestant seminaries.

An attempt was also made to include one element of diversity among faculty: departmental affiliation. Identifying only one element does not preclude the existence of several significant bases of difference among professors of seminaries.

No claim is made regarding the complete generalizability of findings and conclusions, since the sample is small and was not randomly selected. The findings indicate the current situation among these and related seminaries and provide some

direction for further investigation.

Methodological Assumptions

Any method of data collection brings with it inherent assumptions. The personal interview is a complex interaction involving a host of variables which may affect the responses recorded. Dijkstra and Van der Zouwen (1982) identify three basic "disturbing components" in their model of the interview process: question-variables, interviewer-variables and respondent-variables. Another factor, structural task-characteristics (e.g. particular method of administration, instructions for response behavior) is seen as conditioning the relationships between these three variables and the response (p. 10).

Attempting to deal with these reponse-effects involves another assumption.

> A first general approach to improve the quality of the data gathered is to try to eliminate the effects of these disturbing variables as much as possible. For this approach it is not necessary to know how responses are affected by these variables; it is only assumed that responses are affected, and that response effects will diminish, as far as conditions can be created in which these variables are expected not to exert their influence (Dijkstra & van der Zouwen, 1982, p. 5)

The following plan was designed as means of providing a context which sought to diminish these effects.

Question variables

The purpose was to design questions that were valid and reliable. Both formal and content-related characteristics were taken into consideration in question development. An

attempt was made to apply the guidelines developed by major authorities on questioning--guidelines previously mentioned in the section on Instrument Development.

Interviewer variables

The aim was to minimize response effects due to the variation of interviewer behaviors across all interviews. A pattern of standardized interviewer behavior was developed and followed, for the most part, in the actual interviews. (This procedure dealt with some of the factors within the control of the interviewer--other variables such as age could not be controlled.

Respondent variables

The objective was to encourage honesty on the part of the respondent and to discourage responses motivated solely to please the interviewer or to present the respondent in a favorable light. Care was taken to guarantee anonymity of responses. Also, suggestions related to asking potentially threatening questions were followed in construction of questions and in the ordering of questions (Sudman & Bradburn, 1982).

Summary

The study attempted to gather data related to the educational emphasis placed on the moral development of students in six Protestant seminaries. The design called for personal interviews with four faculty members per school-- two respondents within the classical disciplines and two

respondents within the ministry-related disciplines. A brief sketch of participating institutions and a listing of demographic information of respondents is included. In addition, procedures of sampling and data analysis were explained.

End Notes

1. Significant clusters of Protestant, graduate seminaries are located near Chicago, New York city, Washington, D.C., Los Angeles, Berkeley (near San Francisco) and Boston. The first number that appears represents the number of seminaries within the greater metropolitan area of the city. The second number indicates the number of seminaries within an area bounded by 100 miles radius of the city.

Chicago	10	14
New York City	5	13
Washington, D.C.	3	10
Los Angeles	0	8
Berkeley, CA	5	7
Boston	5	6

2. One listing of Protestant denominations identified 48 distinct groups (Eternity Magazine, May 1976). See Appendix D for a complete listing of all 17 American and Canadian denominational families.

3. Both the large Southern Baptist and Christian Church (not Disciples) denominational families do not have a seminary located within this particular grouping. The Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) sponsors the Disciples Divinity House, which is located near and affiliated with the interdenominational Divinity School of the University of Chicago. The House is primarily a residence hall and the dean of the House (the only officer employed) is also considered on the faculty of the Divinity School.

4. The first set of numbers listed below indicate the number of denominational families represented in the particular cluster of seminaries (for the metropolitan area first, and then for the 100 mile radius). The second set of numbers identifies the number of nondenominational schools within the greater metropolitan area first, and then the total number of nondenominational seminaries within the 100 mile radius.

	Denom. Families		Nondenom. Schools	
Chicago	9	9	1	1
New York City	3	6	2	3
Washington, D.C.	1	8	2	2
Los Angeles	0	6	0	4
Berkeley, CA	3	5	2	2
Boston	4	4	2	3

5. One seminary was dropped from the list due to the small number of M.Div. students, 13; total number of students, 34; and the small number of full-time faculty, 3. Another listing was dropped since it was primarily a residence hall, using the educational facilities of an interdenominational seminary.

6. One additional seminary responded to the invitation while the study was well under way. The school was not included in the study due to the late response.

7. Descriptions were based on information from each seminary's catalog, ATS's annual fact book (Taylor, 1984) and the yearbook on American churches (Jacquet, 1983).

8. In those seminaries (including non-Protestant seminaries) accredited by ATS, females comprise less than 11% of all full-time faculty members (Taylor, 1984, p. 38).

Chapter 4

FINDINGS:

EDUCATIONAL TASKS IN PROMOTING MORAL DEVELOPMENT

Chapters 4, 5, and 6 present the findings of the study. The purpose of the study is to describe the educational emphasis placed on the moral development of ministerial students in Protestant seminaries. Each chapter deals with one of the three research questions, and includes the responses to interview questions related to that particular research question. Before the first research question is discussed in the present chapter, an overview of the three "findings" chapters and the procedures of data analysis are presented.

Overview of the Findings Chapters

Each <u>research question</u> is stated and accompanied by a descriptive listing of the related <u>interview questions</u>. During the development of the data gathering instrument, the interview questions were designed to address the following three research questions.

Research Question 1

How do faculty understand the educational tasks in relation to promoting the moral development of students?

Interview questions were designed to elicit responses which would identify a professor's conception of the nature and process of moral development. A brief description of the nine questions follows.

Question 4: . . .estimate of student learning in five aspects of moral development (knowledge, thinking, sensitivity, values, and will power)?

Question 6: . . .experiences students have reported as being the most helpful to their moral growth?

Question 7: . . .purpose in raising moral issues in the classroom?

Question 8: . . .familiarity with moral development theory?

Question 9: . . .ways to help students develop more sensitivity?

Question 13: . . .common student character faults which particularly concern you? Follow up probe: . . .means for dealing with this character fault?

Question 14: . . .seminary program aspects which may inadvertently hinder students' moral development?

Question 17: . . . moral influences during your own experience of seminary as a student?

Question 18: . . .one change in the program you would make to influence students' moral development?

A discussion of the findings from the nine questions is presented in chapter 4. The chapter deals with each of the interview questions and responses, and a final summary section concludes the chapter.

Research Question 2

How do faculty interact with students in matters which may affect the students' moral development, both in and out of the classroom?

An inquiry was made into ways that faculty relate with students (or how they intend to relate), assuming that such interactions may influence students' growth toward moral maturity. Four questions were directed at the issue.

Question 2: . . .how students should remember you 20 years from now?

Question 3: . . .when meeting with students out of the class what do you enjoy doing?

Question 10: . . .how would you deal with a case of plagiarism?

Question 11: . . .when a student has personal problems, who should take the initiative to seek the other, the student or professor?

The findings from the four questions are presented in chapter 5 in a similar fashion as in chapter 4.

Research Question 3

As perceived by the faculty, what aspects of the seminary program are intended to influence or have influenced the students' moral development?

Five of the interview questions helped to focus the professor's attention on some of the program elements and structured aspects of the seminary.

Question 5: . . .what top 2 or 3 courses influence students' moral development?

Question 8 (alternate): . . .theories covered, resources used, expected student outcomes, time allotted, percentage of student body taking course—[for courses specifically treating the subject of moral development; only asked of those professors who teach such a course]?

Question 12: . . .avenues for student participation in
  seminary governance?

Question 15: . . .what feedback do students receive
  regarding their personal and moral development?

Question 16: . . .at faculty meetings, are matters related
  to a student's personal and moral life discussed?

Chapter 6, in which these findings are reported, is
organized differently than both chapters 4 and 5. Professors'
responses from the same seminary are grouped together in
order to gain a composite picture of the total program. The
chapter concludes with a summary of the different programs of
the six seminaries.

Overview of Data Analysis Procedures

To clarify the procedures used to organize the interview
data, the overview describes the tasks involved and then
illustrates the use of these tasks with a sample of
professors' responses to one interview question. The illus-
tration which follows (Figures 4-1, 4-2 and 4-3) exhibits the
particular procedures which were used with each interview
question in analyzing the data. The procedures involved two
major aspects of content analsis: data reduction and data
display (Miles & Huberman, 1984; see Chapter 3, "Data
Analysis Procedures").

Data Reduction:
Identifying the Basic Unit of Analysis

Each professor's response to a question was reduced to
a unit or units of comment which could then be grouped and

compared with other professors' responses to the same question. The intent was to capture in the unit the essential comment which directly answered the interview question. The process involved bypassing tangential and general remarks and selecting what was germane to the question at hand. One or more units may result from a professor's response to a question, depending on the number of distinct ideas mentioned. Similar remarks were incorporated into one unit. A unit or "comment", may be a word, a phrase, or a complete sentence--some manageable and meaningful unit of thought.

An example of such an analysis demonstrates the application of the procedures. A sample of three complete responses (a), (b), and (c) based on interview question 2 are cited and analyzed in Figure 4-1 (Note 1).

The initial task involved identifying the essential answer to the interview question. The selection process was initiated during the actual interview with the notes that were recorded by the researcher. Later, response units to the same question were identified and listed together. The selection process was supplemented by listening to recorded interview tapes and reading transcribed interview responses.

The underlined portions of the citations in Figure 4-1 indicate the essential units which were used from the interview responses. In professor A's comment, two distinct ideas emerged: (1) "having taught them a subject matter", and (2) "to think critically and carefully". For professor

Interview question #2: When you are remembered by your students,. say, 20 years from now, what would you most like it to be for?

Sample interview responses

(a)   Having not only <u>taught them a subject matter</u>, but also having taught them <u>to think critically and carefully</u> with their renewed minds <2115> (Note 1).

(b)   <u>A professor who really cares, out of the classroom as well as in the classroom.</u> <5128>

(c)   Two things, I suppose, one, that I <u>took my discipline seriously enough and taught them in that area well</u>, so that they didn't feel that, when it was all over, that they didn't put in a lot of hard work and a lot of energy--that it wasn't to any real value. And, the other, I suppose, that I give them, to the extent that it is possible in a professor-student relationship, the time spent, <u>a model of pastoral sensitivity</u>, spirituality. But that when they thought back on it, it wasn't negative modeling, but something positive. Maybe through devotions that we have in class, or just <u>the way in which I treat people</u>, and so forth. And, so, in some ways, that they would find in it positive modeling for their own pastoral work in the way they would interact with others. <0415>

Figure 4-1

<u>Illustrative Analysis of Response Comments</u>

B, only one main idea was identified: "a professor who really cares, out of the classroom as well as in the classroom." And, for professor C, two essential ideas became apparent: (1) "took my discipline seriously enough and taught them in that area well", and (2) "a model of pastoral sensitivity." The second comment by professor C, "a model of pastoral sensitivity", could be further amplified with the descriptive phrase, "the way in which I treat people." The briefest possible excerpt or mild paraphrase, was used for analysis purposes.

Data Display: Clustering Response Units

Empirically derived categories were created from thematic clusters of response units. All of the professors' response units to the same question were placed in a list (Figure 4-2; additional response units were included from other professors to demonstrate the procedure).

Categories were created from the clusters which emerged from such a list, and were not known prior to the exercise. The intent was to capture the recurrent themes in the perceptions of seminary faculty. In any such listing, there may be more comments than professors (N=24), since some professors offered more than one idea. From all of the responses to interview question 2 (in actuality, a total of 46 comments), three major clusters or categories emerged from the data (Figure 4-3). Professors' comments focused on themes emphasizing (1) student learning, (2), the professor

Responses from interview question 2

(a) ". . .taught them a subject matter." <2115>

(b) ". . .taught them to think critically and carefully." <2115>

(c) ". . .a professor who really cares, out of the classroom as well as in the classroom". <5128>

(d) ". . .took the discipline seriously enough and taught them well in that area." <0415>

(e) ". . .a model of pastoral sensitivity. . .the way in which I treat people." <0415>

(f) ". . .to help develop their gifts." <9628>

(g) ". . .genuine knowledge of the subject matter." <2515>

(h) ". . .a model of a whole Christian person." <4625>

(i) ". . .assisted the students in understanding and appreciating the history of the Church." <3416>

Figure 4-2

<u>Illustrative Listing of Response Comments</u>

Responses from interview question 2

    (1) Focus on student learning:

        (b) ". . .taught them to think critically and
            carefully." <2115>
        (f) ". . .to help develop their gifts." <9628>
        (i) ". . .assisted the students in understanding and
            appreciating the history of the Church." <3416>

    (2) Focus on the professor as person:

        (c) ". . .a professor who really cares, out of the
            classroom as well as in the classroom." <5128>
        (e) ". . .a model of pastoral sensitivity. . .the
            way in which I treat people." <0415>
        (h) ". . .a model of a whole, Christian person." <4625>

    (3) Focus on the professor as subject matter
        specialist:

        (a) ". . .taught them the subject matter." <2115>
        (d) ". . .I took the discipline seriously enough and
            taught them well in that area." <0415>
        (g) ". . .genuine knowledge of the subject matter."
            <2515>

Figure 4-3

Illustrative Clustering of Response Comments

as person, and (3) the professor as subject matter specialist.

Sometimes, fine distinctions were made between categories. For example, though statements (a) and (i) are very similar, it seemed that statement (a) placed more emphasis on the subject matter whereas statement (i) placed more emphasis on the student's learning of the subject. The general categories that resulted should not be considered as hard and fast, though the majority of comments within a category evidenced a strong thematic relationship. When categories included a number of comments, further subdivisions became apparent and were identified. The creation of the general clusters facilitated the process of bringing organization and meaning to the data and indicated some general trends in faculty perceptions.

Analysis: Educational Tasks in Promoting Moral Development

In this chapter, the focus is on how faculty understood the nature and process of moral growth, and how this process could be influenced.

Research Question 1: How do faculty understand the educational tasks in relation to promoting the moral development of students?

Nine of the interview questions are discussed, in this order: 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 18, 13 and 17. A summary of the nine questions was provided earlier in the chapter.

Estimated Degree of Student Moral Learning

Interview question 4: Let's say that someone has taken a poll of this year's senior students regarding their degree of learning, at the seminary, in each of these five aspects (refer to list: knowledge, thinking, sensitivities, personal values, and will power). For each of the five aspects, please identify what you think students would indicate as their degree of learning: high, fair amount, or low? Now, for a seminary, I would think that learning would be high in moral knowledge? (Wait for a response.) What about moral reasoning? moral sensitivity? personal values? will power? (Tables 4-1, 4-2 and 4-3)

Frequencies of professors' responses are displayed in Table 4-1 (the "fair amount" and "low degree" categories were collapsed since almost all of the responses were in the fair amount range). The definitions for each of these five aspects are presented in brackets.

Moral knowledge

[the information and comprehension one has of (a) biblical precepts and moral principles, as well as (b) specific moral issues]

Almost all professors thought that students would have a high degree of learning of moral knowledge. One professor disagreed, making a distinction between courses in biblical studies and principles and course in ethics. The professor felt that knowledge of ethical areas was very minimal at the seminary.

Moral thinking

[the capability to analyze the relevant factors of a moral issue or situation, and to make a decision or judgment based on some logical rationale]

Most of the professors did not feel students' develop their moral thinking to a high degree, as a result of the seminary training, but rather to a fair amount (Table 4-1).

Table 4-1

Estimated Degree of Student Moral Learning

Interview question 4: . . .degree of learning, at the
    seminary, in each of these five aspects.

Aspect of Moral Development	High degree of learning	Fair amount of learning	Don't know
Moral knowledge (n=24)	23	1	0
Moral thinking (n=24)	10	13	1
Moral sensitivity (n=22)	6	14	2
Personal Values (n=24)	12	11	1
Will Power (n=21)	3	14	4

Note: The number of responses (n) varies on two of the items
    due to the use of different versions of the interview
    questions during the pilot study.

Those teaching in the classical disciplines may tend to rate students higher in this area, than professors of the ministry-related fields (Table 4-2). No correlational trends surfaced in relation to the pastoral experience of professors.

Moral sensitivity

[the capability to empathize with others concerning
their needs and rights with a sense of compassion,
justice, and responsibility; a sensitivity to one's
conscience, and to the Holy Spirit]

The majority of professors felt students' development of moral sensitivity was at a fair amount; fewer professors put it at a high level of learning (Table 4-1). No correlational trends were associated with professors' academic discipline or with previous pastoral experience.

Personal values

[the particular moral convictions, beliefs, and
responsibilities to which one is committed by a
conscious choice, or those values adhered to by
unconscious practice]

Half of the professors rated students as developing personal values to a high degree as a result of seminary and about the same number rated student learning at a fair amount (Table 4-1). As with moral thinking above, the classical professors may tend to give students a higher degree of value learning than those of the ministry-related disciplines (Table 4-3). Previous pastoral experience was not associated with response differences.

Table 4-2

Estimated Degree of Student Learning: Moral Thinking

Interview question 4

Estimate:	Number of Classical Professors	Number of Ministry-related Professors	totals
High degree of learning	7	3	10
Fair amount of learning	4	9	13
totals	11	12	23

Fisher Exact Test

p = .073

Strength of association:

Q = .680

C = .362

$\phi^{\bullet}$ = .156

λ = .300

Table 4-3

Estimated Degree of Student Learning: Personal Values

Interview question 4

Estimate:	Number of Classical Professors	Number of Ministry-related Professors	totals
High degree of learning	8	4	12
Fair amount of learning	3	8	11
totals	11	12	23

Fisher Exact Test

p = .069

Strength of association:

Q = .684

C = .366

ϕ^2 = .155

λ = .444

Will Power

> [the resolve and ability to act on one's moral values
> in the face of countervailing forces; the ability to
> resist temptation]

A few more professors (n=4) were reluctant to respond

to this aspect because they felt there was no basis to make

a judgment (Table 4-1). For those professors who did rate

students' learning in the area of will power, the majority

felt it was either a fair amount or a low degree of learning

at the seminary.

Helpful Learning Experiences

> Interview question 6: Either as a part of their course-
> work, or as some part of their seminary experience,
> students are often required to do certain activities or
> projects which may contribute to their own moral
> growth. Would you happen to remember which particular
> activities or experiences, either in or out of the
> classroom, students have reported as being the most
> helpful to their own moral growth? (Tables 4-4 and 4-5)

A total of 50 comments were made by 22 professors.

Responses were organized into two classifications: on-campus

experiences (26 comments) and off-campus experiences (24

comments). Though the question requested the professor to

assume the perspective of the student, responses also

included items which were deemed helpful by professors (as

seen in the following remark).

> Often, chapel is given to it [moral issues], I don't
> think the students themselves would give a positive
> response that chapel is a positive helpful thing in
> their environment, but often chapel is given to moral
> issues <2115>.

Campus experiences which influence students' moral

Table 4-4

Campus Experiences Influencing Students' Moral Development
(26 comments by 16 professors)

Interview question 6: . . .experiences. . .being the most
helpful to their [students's] own moral growth.

1. Classroom experiences (7 comments)

   ". . .everyone who teaches theology also has overlapped
   training in philosophy and ethics. . .I'm sure
   discussion of moral issues intrudes in the classroom."
   <5115>
   ". . .here's the principle, and let me take you [students]
   through the process that I've gone through." <0126>
   ". . .dramatization, simulation games I've found those
   very effective." <0326>
   ". . .sermon on marriage and family as [students'] first
   [preaching] assignment." <3326>
   ". . .working on teams, doing it together." <1628>
   ". . .I have them [students] plan a retreat [together in
   groups, and the students ask] how am I going to grade
   it? And a question of justice and 'It isn't fair' is
   raised." <0427>
   ". . .three courses at the seminary that are led by
   process-style teachers." <4626>

2. Seminary worship functions (6 comments)

   ". . .often chapel is given to moral issues." <2115>
   ". . .we have had some chapels that have been very soul
   searching in this area." <0128>
   ". . .I've heard it mentioned very often is worship,
   chapel attendance." <9318>
   ". . .the chapel is helpful, a setting for those who go."
   <6428>
   ". . .Days of Prayer encourage them in their own values,
   a time for reflection and confession." <1225>
   ". . .on Days of Prayer we meet together for united
   prayer." <4218>

Table 4-4 (cont'd.).

3. Peer interaction (5 comments)

". . .when they get together in fellowship groups."
<0115>

". . .to get an upper class student to befriend new
students." <1115>

". . .student prayer groups voluntarily meet during the
week to pray for mission fields." <7218>

". . .contact with foreign students. . .they meet people
with different styles, different moral sensitivities,
and that's expanding." <2428>

". . .certain specialized informal gatherings of
students." <0615>

4. Unclassified (8 comments)

". . .the fall and spring Bible conference helps their
knowledge." <7225>

". . .the annual lecture series was established for this
very purpose to deal with moral issues." <4517>

". . .we often [informally] debate after chapel,
discussion, interaction." <3115>

". . .the Wednesday [advisee-advisor] groups--I attempt to
make it a time for personal growth." <3517>

". . .when they write out their verbatim for theological
reflection [concerning a recent ministry experience] and
reflect on the moral issues and the struggles
parishioners were having." <5416>

". . .Elijah's Pantry for food needs, in which you can
contribute and take out. I don't see anyone taking
advantage of this." <9218>

". . .and there's worship of a less formal nature,
[personal] Bible reading." <7318>

". . .what happens in a kind of communal setting [at the
seminary]? It relates to acceptance, it relates to
tolerance, it relates to love." <7428>

development include different classroom experiences and assignments (7 comments), worship functions (6 comments), peer interaction (5 comments) and various unclassified responses (8 comments) (Table 4-4).

Most of the comments (17 of 24) relating to significant off-campus experiences focused on the field education ministry which students are required to fulfill (Table 4-5). Professors stated that this kind of situation forces students to be confronted with living issues and real problems and concerns, not usually faced in the classroom. Specific reference was made to Clinical Pastoral Education (CPE), a training program for dealing with hospital patients and their families, and SCUPE (Seminary Consortium for Urban Pastoral Care), a training program for ministry in the inner city. Other comments (7 unclassified comments) spoke mostly of situations in which students would be confronted with making moral decisions.

A good number of professors (n=11) made comments related to both on-campus and off-campus experiences. Eight of the professors only referred to off-campus experiences and three professors only spoke of on-campus experiences. No correlational trends surfaced regarding responses by professors in the first two categories.

In summary, an experience-oriented emphasis was evident in most of the responses. Students are involved in activities which encourage them to reflect on their own experiences (including the more spiritual functions, such as chapel and

Table 4-5

Off-campus Experiences Influencing Students' Moral
   Development   (24 comments by 18 professors)

Interview question 6: . . .experiences. . .being the most
   helpful to their [students'] own moral growth?

A. Field education ministry assignment (17 comments)

   ". . .mainly the pastoral ministry experience. It
   provides an opportunity to apply knowledge." <4225>
   ". . .Christian Service requirements put them to the
   test." <0218>
   ". . .outside activities in Christian Service,
   opportunities to witness and preach." <3226>
   ". . .the field work puts them in touch with family
   problems. . .in the hospital with emergency room
   situations, child abuse, alcoholism. They become more
   sensitive to the dynamics." <5325>
   ". . .ministry internships in another country." <6428>
   ". . .an extended field experience." <2427>
   ". . .their pastoral work where they are faced with moral
   problems." <1416>
   ". . .working with people in the church, the field
   education internships where they have to deal with real
   issues--a deacon's divorce, injustice in the city."
   <6526>
   ". . .a teacher training workshop at a church. Students
   were responsible to the church also, and it gave them
   increased motivation." <9628>
   ". . .situations in field work, when they disagree with
   the church or pastor, when they see parishioners with
   moral problems." <6617>
   ". . .their field education has a significant influence,
   facing a living context." <5615>
   ". . .CPE [Clinical Pastoral Education] in the hospital
   where they face critical decisions." <1626>
   ". . .the CPE at a hospital has a formative influence on
   some students." <5416>
   ". . .the peculiar needs of people trapped in the inner
   city. We have a program here you may have heard of
   called SCUPE [Seminary Consortium of Urban Pastoral
   Care]. Here I feel, Klaus, is something that our
   students can get involved in right now." <3517>
   ". . .SCUPE." <9528>
   ". . .SCUPE is an integrative experience." <4626>
   ". . .SCUPE." <3615>

Table 4-5 (cont'd.).

B. Unclassified (7 comments)

". . .they've [students] gotten into a situation where they have to make a decision. . .at work, or it's counseling, or it's in a church." <4117>

". . .I've seen them in a crisis situation and I've seen them come through." <0128>

". . .that students. . .would have identified those moments in their life as being significant ones where they were really. . .challenged to make decisions." <5415>

". . .the most helpful experiences for them is the requirement of the workplace or other secular community contact. . .[those] who are required, by virtue of their job or something else, to make choices, moral choices." <4217>

". . .to meet professors on different occasions and to talk on a different level. . .in the home, or at a missions fellowship supper." <3428>

". . .a number of our faculty members have taken positions of leadership in the community as far as fostering the whole emphasis on right-to-life. These faculty members, in turn, have influenced quite a number of students to take an active role." <8325>

". . .class assignments that put them in contact with other people. . .like spending some time with teenagers." <1528>

days of prayer), or to be exposed to the experiences of others. In the seminary setting, there is an exposure to and involvement with faculty and fellow students. Off campus, students might be confronted with more contemporary experiences in diverse settings such as their church ministry, a ministry in the hospital or inner city, or even at their place of employment. In these situations, students are either confronted with someone else's experience, or the student is faced with making a decision to act in light of the situation.

Purpose of Moral Discussions

Interview question 7: Let's look more closely at the aspect of moral thinking. One particular classroom activity which is useful here is the discussion of moral issues. For example, here is one list [see Appendix B] of some of the major moral issues being discussed in different seminaries. When you raise moral issues in the classroom, what is your main purpose? What do you primarily hope to accomplish? (Tables 4-6 and 4-7)

Professors' comments (total of 45) were arranged into two broad categories: (a) the professors' purpose in discussing moral issues (36 comments) and (b) factors related to the discussion of moral issues (9 comments).

Professors' purpose in discussing moral issues (Table 4-6)

The more prominent themes in this section focused on helping students to understand the diverse issues and ambiguities involved in order to achieve some balance and breadth in perspective and to be more sensitive to those

Table 4-6

Professors' Purposes in Discussing Moral Issues
(36 comments by 21 professors)

<u>Interview question 7</u>: When you raise moral issues in the
   classroom, what is your main purpose?

  A. To think through the issue (13 comments)

     ". . .to learn how to think about them." <1528>
     ". . .I want them to think it through." <9128>
     ". . .to be aware of the problem." <8225>
     ". . .to get beneath the superficial, apparent issues and
       find out what really are the philosophic issues."
       <1226>
     ". . .to learn how to do moral thinking." <0427>
     ". . .to do clear moral thinking so that they can't be
       taken in easily." <6317>
     ". . .the ability to make good decisions in bad
       situations." <5217>
     ". . .to help understand the moral ambiguities involved."
       <5416>
     ". . .to help understand the differing perspectives, that
       there are more than two sides of an issue." <3615>
     ". . .to try to broaden their perspective, that there is
       more than one side to a Christian position. . .the
       breadth of the complex issues, the number of options."
       <3626>
     ". . .to try to accomplish a balance. . .to bring breadth
       into the discussion." <6517>
     ". . .to get the student to appreciate the integrity of
       other positions." <8115>
     ". . .to illuminate what does it mean to adopt a
       position." <6617>

  B. To find the biblical norm/universal principle (9 comments)

     ". . .what principle is at stake. Is that the only one?
       <7427>
     ". . .to try and find the biblical principles that would
       give us the ability to deal with the problem." <2126>
     ". . .to show them the relevancy of Truth." <9117>
     ". . .how do the Scriptures speak to those philosophic
       issues?" <6226>
     ". . .analyzing what the biblical claim was in the
       particular situation and what that claim might be today
       in the Christian era." <8415>
     ". . .to understand and reflect on the fundamental moral
       principle, what ought to be applied and how does it
       apply." <8416>

Table 4-6 (cont'd.).

". . .to make them square it up with what Scripture teaches, and that it's just not from my [the professor's] heritage bag." <0526>

". . .to show that biblical thinking is moral thinking, and not to commit the Pharisaic error in attending to small details and neglect the larger issues." <1517>

". . .try to make some distinctions between the cultural factors in human behavior and those that are really moral." <0217>

C. To encourage students to take a position (8 comments)

". . .to help articulate their own point of view, not to state my [the professor's] point of view." <9626>

". . .and I'm trusting that they will begin to build, perhaps, conviction about it." <1128>

". . .to solidify their thinking." <6225>

". . .the goal is, thus, to be able and willing to act in such a way." <7415>

". . .that the student must begin to make commitments, they must begin to formulate a position." <7615>

". . .that they have to make a decision. They've been trained to hide behind the crowd. . .to know themselves, to develop a conscious self-identity." <3428>

". . .to see themselves as existentially involved, the nobility of action." <3317>

". . .I hope they will never say, 'Well Dr. so and so said it', but rather, 'What is our responsibility to this tragic situation?'" <9218>

D. Helping students in their future ministry (2 comments)

". . .that they can understand how to present the issues to their congregations and people." <8318>

". . .as preventive communication through the pulpit. . . to minister to the people." <1326>

E. Unclassified (4 comments)

". . .increasing their sensitivity about where people are in the church, to not be so judgmental." <8628>

". . .on some issues, if I feel strongly about them, [to encourage the students to] see them the way I do." <8528>

". . .to help them to be more sensitive to the fact they are God's men--sensing a responsibility to meet those [personal] requirements in the pastoral epistles." <1325>

". . .dealing with the problem in the twentieth century of obeying the Bible vs. the countervailing laws." <5515>

with differing viewpoints (13 comments); identifying the biblical norms and principles which were relevant to the issue (9 comments); encouraging students to articulate their own positions as well as make decisions and commitments to these positions (8 comments) and preparing students to minister to their congregations (2 comments). An additional four unclassified comments were offered.

Factors related to the discussion of moral issues (Table 4-7)

Professors made reference to the background, abilities and interests of students which affect their moral development (6 comments). To aid the discussion process, some professors mentioned using actual or hypothetical case studies (3 comments).

In summary, a variety of means are utilized to expose students to the complexity of moral issues and to encourage them to articulate and commit themselves to a position. Due to the students' limited experience, and the more intellectual nature of seminaries, students may tend to perceive moral issues as merely academic--without the sense of urgency and relevance which is characteristic of people who are actually facing the issues in a life context. Most seminary students are assumed to be already functioning at a high level of moral reasoning and conviction. Some students need to be weaned off a more limited norm-based conception of morality.

Table 4-7

Factors Related to the Discussion of Moral Issues
(9 commments by 7 professors)

Interview question 7: When you raise moral issues in the
    classroom, what is your main purpose?

A. Students' background, level of functioning and interest
   (6 comments)

   ". . .we get some students who have been raised in a very
     legalistic home and that has to be unlearned before
     they can really be ethical." <6117>
   ". . .I find that, mostly [the students] have their moral
     prejudices well in place." <0126>
   ". . .maybe part of our problem. . .is that we are going
     on some of these assumptions, that by the time they
     reach graduate level in a theological seminary, many of
     these steps [of moral development] they've already gone
     through." <6226>
   ". . .we are at our level in the theology class,
     assuming, presupposing the students have already
     achieved a very high level of moral reasoning [and
     convictions about some basic moral issues]." <2218>
   ". . .the student here is more concerned with the
     [theoretical] theological foundation, than he is the
     particular [moral] issue because he's not dealing with
     that [in his experience]." <7117>
   ". . .maybe our seminarians don't struggle enough with
     the issues like abortion, or the moral implications of
     what is happening on the TV. . .but I think our
     seminarians are struggling more with issues in other
     areas, as it relates to ministry, like, 'Does the Bible
     really teach that each church should have more than one
     elder?" <8126>

B. Classroom instructional methods (3 comments)

   ". . .the Old Testament is filled with narrative and
     experience and personal relationships. . .and we're
     able to look at people at almost every social level
     . . .and try to analyze the decision-making process, on
     moral as well as theological grounds." <1217>
   ". . .in a lot of our practical courses, we use case
     studies as the final examination—to help students see
     that. . .it's not so cut and dried." <6325>
   ". . .I like to approach many things biographically, that
     is, tell stories of what happened to great people,
     either in the past or in the present. . .it's a
     question of inspiration." <7317>

Knowledge of Kohlberg's Moral Development Theory

Interview question 8: This particular aspect of moral thinking and reasoning has recently received some research attention in the fields of psychology and education. Now, I realize that this research may not be a part of your own discipline. Do you happen to be familiar with such psychological theories of moral reasoning and thinking? (Table 4-8)

How familiar are seminary professors with theories of moral development and moral reasoning, specifically, with Kohlberg's theory? Ten of the professors (n=21) made reference to Kohlberg in response to the question. Most of these professors (eight) were affiliated with the Christian or Religious education department of the seminary (Table 4-8). Two professors associated with the more classical disciplines expressed some familiarity with Kohlberg's theory. A classical professor offered this comment and critique.

> What I find attractive about it is that, contrary to Margaret Mead and this sort of 1920's nonsense of total cultural relativism, I find it interesting that somebody now, with Dewey's mantle yet, should be saying that there is something quite objective in cross-cultural, transcultural [contexts] about moral stages. But the thing that I find, then, difficult is the suggestion that the higher stage has been reached only, apparently, by Jesus, Gandhi and Kohlberg, himself--with some doubts about the other two. That makes the thing a little less convincing <6317>.

A statistically significant correlational trend was found concerning professors' academic discipline and knowledge of Kohlberg's theory (Table 4-8). It stands to reason that ministry-related professors, whose disciplines are more closely aligned with the social sciences, would be more familiar with moral development theory. Previous pastoral

Table 4-8

Knowledge of Kohlberg's Moral Development Theory

Interview question 8

Familiar:	Number of Classical Professors	Number of Ministry-related Professors	totals
Yes	2	8	10
No	8	3	11
totals	10	11	21

Fisher Exact Test

p = .026

Strength of association:

Q = .829

C = .466

ϕ^2 = .278

λ = .500

experience was not a predictor of such knowledge.

Developing Moral Sensitivity

Interview question 9: Let's look at the aspect of moral sensitivity [see page 113 for a definition]. What do you think is the most effective way to help students become more mature in their moral sensitivity? (Table 4-9)

A total of 27 comments and suggestions were made by 16 professors regarding how to influence students' moral sensitivity. Responses were divided into four general categories. Seven comments focused attention on life situations in which students are confronted with different moral options and where they are forced to make moral choices. Experience-oriented classroom methods received a mention in five comments, such as group work, movies and dealing with case studies. Five comments indicated that one's moral sensitivity is bound up with one's relationship to God. An additional nine unclassified comments were made.

Recurrent themes with those in previous sections are evident here. Development is primarily encouraged through personal encounters, be it in self-reflection, in one's relationship with God, or with others--in the classroom, on campus, or off campus. For some seminaries, the cultural background of the students is more diverse and the location of the campus is within a metropolitan setting. Thus, students have greater opportunities to face differing moral sensitivities. Again, as mentioned in the section discussing interview question 6, there may be an assumption that

Table 4-9

Ways to Help Students Develop Moral Sensitivity
(27 comments from 16 professors)

Interview question 9: . . .the most effective way to help
   students become more mature in their moral sensitivity.

A. Personal encounters with others and life situations
   (7 comments)

   ". . .I suppose confrontation with life situations."
   <4416>
   ". . .life in itself, and life in the Body of Christ can
   only do it." <3317>
   ". . .the discussion process, the dialogical process is
   very helpful. . .for example, to talk to business
   people about how they handle moral issues." <5526>
   ". . .I suppose competent dialog with a moral position
   other than the student's." <9615>
   ". . .this is learned in the school of the Holy Spirit:
   experience. And when you get out in the ministry, you
   find a child dying, then you learn compassion a little
   better than you do in the classroom when you talk about
   theology." <7318>
   ". . .living and working with people of different
   backgrounds, kind of mixed settings." <4628>
   ". . .studying in a context with multi-racial students
   where the students don't all view it from the same
   perspective." <6626>
   ". . .ultimately, you have to live the questions. You can
   form an opinion on abortion, but you also have to
   counsel somebody very close to you who has an unwanted
   pregnancy and live that tension." <7528>

Table 4-9 (cont'd.).

B. Experience-oriented methods in the classroom (5 comments)

". . .I don't think you can do that just by lecturing. I
think you can help with better forms of communication
which stimulate feeling--I'm thinking of movies."
<4326>

". . .problem-solving in moral situations; do a case
study approach." <3626>

". . .personal encounter groups where they share personal
life histories and are involved in interaction and
self-disclosure." <7626>

". . .their human sensitivity, by and large, is
sufficiently developed, that, by the use of other
materials and telling them stories based on other
people's experience, they are able to enter in quite
well to the experience of others." <1416>

". . .I would have to create situations. I can do it with
simulation and role play, and such devices. I can do it
by showing them a movie and then debriefing them and
getting them to engage in kinds of reflection." <3427>

C. Personal relationship with God (5 comments)

". . .moral sensitivities grow as we develop in our faith
life and in our own relationship to Jesus Christ. . . .
If we can help students to foster their own devotional
life--the Holy Spirit through the Word will give them
the power to demonstrate that same love that God has
shown them in Christ." <0325>

". . .from the Christian point of view and the pastor's
point of view, morality is not something detachable
from, it has a context in his liturgical, devotional
life with God." <9317>

". . .recognizing that the heart of human living is this
dynamic relationship or dialogue with the living God;
that we're either, say, answering Him, being
responsible before Him, moving toward Him, or we're
trying to evade Him or evade convictions that are part
of our life." <2428>

". . .the first thing is to know the Lord Jesus better.
I'm a firm believer in the continual reading of the
Gospels--thinking after [like] Christ." <8517>

". . .that they get back into the best sourcebook for any
moral or theological sensitivity, namely the
Scriptures." <5318>

Table 4-9 (cont'd.).

D. Unclassified (9 comments)

". . .help them to learn what their responsibilities
might be--that's a revelation to some students. . .to
find out their spiritual responsibility from the
Scripture." <3515>

". . .that's an aspect that I can't control as a
teacher." <3528>

". . .I have a hunch that this [moral sensitivity] is the
kind of thing that you don't really teach--you talk
about it, but you don't really teach it. I think it can
be learned." <6427>

". . .there are things that people can be taught and
required to do that, as a matter of fact, do contribute
my thinking, that that would also be true in moral
development. But how and where?" <9415>

". . .in classes, trying to be concrete, and holding to a
particular theory where there is a consistency with
your actions." <2617>

". . .awareness is a good place to start. . .to raise the
knowledge level." <9515>

". . .seeing good servants of the Word, combined with the
personal life, that they don't just mouth cliches:
models. The models our children see on televsion are
idiots." <1317>

". . .the most effective way, of course, is to be raised
in a family context where the sensitivity has been part
of one for many, many years." <2415>

". . .I'm not so sure, quite frankly, how conscious I
have been of creating a morally sensitive person.
Within my own thinking, I guess, I have kind of
presupposed that, among the student body, as more of an
assumption." <5415>

students already possess a high degree of moral sensitivity.

Hindering Moral Development

Interview question 14: In your opinion, are there any aspects of the seminary curriculum or program which may, inadvertently, contribute to hindering the students' growth toward moral maturity? (Table 4-10)

In this section, two general categories emerged from 23 comments made by 18 professors. Eleven comments related to the educational orientation and academic requirements. Another theme involved faculty modeling and availability (four comments). Eight additional unclassified comments covered a range of topics.

Many of the hindrances come from the educational orientation assumed by the seminary which places a higher emphasis on intellectual development than personal development. Students are under the burden of fulfilling academic requirements and reaching for high grade point averages (GPA) and there may be a tendency to make these ends the goal rather than preparing for ministry in the church. Reversing these goals may contribute to an overly competitive atmosphere apparent in many seminaries in which students' self-concepts become identified with their GPA.

Professors have a large amount of material to cover and may tend to adopt a more pedagogical orientation rather than an andragogical one in which students take on more responsibility for their own learning. Due to their own busy schedules, faculty may neglect or place a lower priority on

Table 4-10

Aspects Which May Hinder Students' Moral Development
(23 comments by 18 professors)

Interview question 14: . . .any aspects of the seminary
program which may inadvertently contribute to hindering
the student's growth toward moral maturity.

A. Educational orientation and academic requirements
(11 comments)

". . .I think we put too much emphasis on the cognitive
in some of our classes. . .the lack of attention, at
least in the past, to address personal issues of the
home. . .and the extreme pressures of exam schedules."
<4226>

". . .and if it becomes that impersonal. . .that you just
go through a factory of academic requirements, if that
attitude is instilled, and that you judge people only
by a grade point average in those courses, then you
would be hindering it." <5326>

". . .legalism is a deadly enemy for moral maturity,
namely, if you show up at chapel. . .read this number
of pages, and write this number of papers, you are
spiritually qualified to serve God." <9218>

". . .the design of our curriculum at the seminary is
weighted toward classical theological education, so
that a student can get very few courses that will deal
with moral issues." <5528>

". . .the high number of required hours and the high cost
of seminary education combine to make it very difficult
for the student to take the time to reflect spiritually
and morally." <4517>

". . .we lack a sufficient emphasis on ethics as related
to Scripture. Students are not prepared well to think
through ethical problems." <2515>

". . .we do not coordinate the reading program, so that
professors demand more than they should, and temptation
sets in for students [to falsify reading reports]
because they cannot physically do all the reading."
<2526>

". . .the educational bureaucracy is so complex that it
frustrates the students. Maybe students ought to be
more mature to overcome it, but it does hinder growth."
<6615>

Table 4-10 (cont'd.).

". . .I think too much is competitive. In some courses I
think there's too much of an emphasis on information
acquisition and not enough on learning how to think,
how to find the information when you need it. . . . If
you get enough information in your brain, you get an A
on the exam." <0628>

". . .we perpetuate, by our own pedagogical methods, a
longer period of adolescence than what is necessary
. . . . Maybe if we were willing to surrender a little
bit of our own authority, we would assume less
responsibility with regard to [covering] the subject
matter, we could, perhaps, produce a somewhat more
personally mature product." <8416>

". . .the program is structured so that they [students]
don't have to make judgments themselves, in some sense,
responsibility is taken out of their hands." <3428>

". . .a tendency to treat the subject matter just as a
body of knowledge to be mastered so that the student
takes pride in getting high grades and maintainng a
high grade point, rather than helping students see the
relationship between all of this knowledge and
ministry--serving people." <1325>

B. Faculty modeling and availability (4 comments)

". . .our students would like more time with faculty. . .
whether it's our workload or [student-teacher] ratio, or
our own performance or attitudes, we're not social
enough with our students." <6326>

". . .maybe the biggest deterent. . .is the attitude of
us faculty, who might give the impression to students
that we are overly concerned for our image--about being
seen by them as great intellectuals. . .and looking to
them just as, kind of, numbers in the grade book."
<7325>

". . .our advisor-advisee system, which is a pastoral
type of function, does not function as well as it
really ought to. . .we've struggled with it for years
and it just doesn't seem to get that much better."
<8318>

". . .all learning is a two-way street. . . . For good
learning, there has to be some opening on both sides.
I think if a professor doesn't risk something, the
classes are going to be dull. . .and, also, the student
has to risk something. . .to test ideas." <8428>

Table 4-10 (cont'd.).

C. Unclassified (8 comments)

". . .the faculty have to wear at least three hats:
there's an ecclesiastical role, an academic role and a
personal role." <6427>

". . .there's a lack of interdisciplinary courses."
<0617>

". . .there's a failure of the seminary (in most
seminaries) of not doing all the right things. Maybe we
could spend more time making curriculum changes, to
have courage and take a risk." <4615>

". . .poor communication among employees." <2615>

". . .the pressures from the outside are great, and I
don't think the schools and the church have coped with
this particularly successfully." <1318>

". . .most of the students living off campus, which
hinders fellowship because it limits the opportunity
for one-to-one interaction." <8326>

". . .to better coordinate the student's field
education." <4526>

". . .the discipline committee is in danger of making too
many exceptions to accommodate students. It's an issue
of toughness. They tend to be pastoral in orientation
--every soul has a possibility of redemption." <4626>

contacts with students outside of the classroom, thus limiting opportunities for students to be exposed to faculty models.

Suggested Changes at the Seminary

Interview question 18: If you, yourself, could change one thing about the way the seminary currently influences students' growth toward moral maturity, what would that be? (Table 4-11)

A total of 26 responses were made by the 24 professors in which four main themes became apparent. One set of statements made reference to providing a forum for discussing and reflecting on moral issues (7 comments). Emphasis was also placed on increasing the contact and interaction between faculty and students (6 comments). Another set of comments directed attention toward spiritual concerns, such as those related to worship experiences (3 comments). Professors also suggested that there be more of an integration between theory and practice (3 comments). In addition, seven unclassified comments were made.

Common Student Character Faults

Interview question 13a: In your exposure to the seminary students over the past few years, have you noticed any common character faults, attitudes, or problems among the students which particularly concern you? (Table 4-12)

A total of 33 comments were offered by 22 professors. Most of the responses were organized under two headings: personal immaturity (16 comments) and student values and priorities (13 comments). Additional responses mentioned the

Table 4-11

Suggested Changes in the Seminary Program
(26 comments by 24 professors)

Interview question 18: . . .change <u>one</u> thing about the way
the seminary currently influences students' growth toward
moral maturity.

A. Provide a forum for thinking about moral issues
(7 comments)

   ". . .in an orientation setting with new students, to get
   at this much earlier in their experience here. . . .
   What we need to think seriously about is that kind of
   overlap between logic, critical thinking and
   application of it to morals and values." <5115>

   ". . .we kind of owe it to our students today, to give
   them an exposure to these issues. . . . But they should
   have an understanding of the magnitude of the problem,
   and. . .that they know what they believe and why they
   believe it." <7416>

   ". . .more courses in ethics." <7225>

   ". . .to develop a course [specifically on moral
   development] to help the students evaluate themselves,
   where they are." <6526>

   ". . .a required course on moral thinking. That may seem
   like a stilted response, just a course, but it's a
   place to start." <0528>

   ". . .to provide a forum for wrestling with ethical
   problems, to know what is 'moral maturity', and to
   answer the issue of how to <u>do</u> what is right." <4515>

   ". . .to encourage the students to take the course on
   spiritual development. . . . One course can't do it
   all, but it's one thing." <2325>

Table 4-11 (cont'd.).

B. Provide for more interaction between faculty and students
   (6 comments)

   ". . .design a strategy that would put the students in
   more personal contact with the individual professors
   . . . . And what we've got to do is provide greater
   opportunities for intense interpersonal relationships."
   <5126>
   ". . .I would like to change the student-teacher ratio
   . . . . The sheer press of time, because of the
   [present] teacher-student ratio, makes it impossible for
   them to be friends, to be the counselors." <7226>
   ". . .that there would be greater involvement and contact
   between faculty and students. . . . I think a lot takes
   place in those casual interactions." <1415>
   ". . .if we could have more meaningful interaction,
   faculty member with student." <9128>
   ". . .a greater sensitivity on the part of the faculty to
   see students as persons, to relate on a personal level
   as well as on a professor-student level." <2325>
   ". . .more structured faculty-student dialogue,
   communally, not on a one-to-one basis." <9428>

C. Provide more of a spiritual emphasis (3 comments)

   ". . .it would be something measurable, like
   worship--chapel attendance, and daily devotions."
   <0318>
   ". . .to celebrate a weekly Eucharist; it has
   implications for morality." <6317>
   ". . .there are daily things we can watch for. . .here's
   something I'm trying in my own personal life. When a
   student steps in my office here. . .and before he walks
   away, "Let's have prayer together." Don't make it
   elaborate and lengthy, but let's just talk to God about
   this. . . . In little ways like that." <6218>

D. Provide more of an integration of theory and practice
   (3 comments)

   ". . .to cut back more and make it less academic and more
   experiential oriented." <1326>
   ". . .more integrative type courses and experiences, like
   the colloquy elective." <5617>
   ". . .that there would be more learning in the context of
   ministry, with students and faculty alongside. . . .
   The ministry is best taught in context." <626>

Table 4-11 (cont'd.).

E. Unclassified (7 comments)

". . .more communication. . .for the faculty to be more
aware [of matters related to moral issues and moral
development] and to make students aware of this as a
basic concern. . .just increasing awareness." <2517>

". . .I think I'd, well, force them to make some more
decisions as to what they're going to study and not
study; take some more responsibilities for their own
education." <0427>

". . .more classes to the theology department. . . . What
will produce convictions is to be taught Biblical
theology." <5117>

". . .somehow to create in students a sense of intense
involvement in more things outside of the classroom
. . . regular conversations with faculty and students
. . .a climate of more involvement in those 5 aspects."
<4615>

". . .This one isn't even feasible, I know, but at
another seminary, they don't even give letter grades.
[On a sheet of paper they give students] much more
evaluation of their gifts and strengths and suggestions
for improvement. . . . I think it pushes the professor
to know the student better." <4628>

". . .less competition and more student work in groups."
<8628>

". . .it would be the development and control of
off-campus experience. Some type of program that would
assure us that they have moral confrontations on a
variety of levels." <1217>

Table 4-12

Common Student Character Faults
(33 comments by 22 professors)

Interview question 13a: . . .any common character faults, attitudes, or problems among the students which particularly concern you?

A. Personal immaturity (16 comments)

". . .I find that the aspect of stick-to-it-tiveness is missing to a great extent. You know they are so conditioned to everything happening quickly, instantly." <6126>

". . .avoidance of adult responsibility. . .I find some students refusing to grow up." <0528>

". . .carelessness on the part of the seminarian in terms of meeting obligations: paying bills, attendance in chapel, turning in ministry reports, turning in assignments on time. . .breaking appointments." <6117>

". . .books borrowed, perhaps with the best of intentions, from the library, and not checked out, and carried out in briefcases." <8225>

". . .sins of slothfulness, laziness." <0318>

". . .many are not concerned about common courtesy." <0615>

". . .it is naivette--they're very naive about certain things and part of this comes from years of academic cloistering. They are very naive about how people are thinking in the real world and how they respond." <8217>

". . .I get real concerned about the insensitivity of students. . . . And I look at some men and I can see that they are very emotionally and socially totally insensitive to others by the way they speak, behave, react, develop relationships and all the rest, and some have no relationships." <4217>

". . .one of the big problems we face here is pride. Here is a student who has problems. . . . So the guy keeps it to himself, even though that problem could perhaps be alleviated. . .but you see, he's going to be a pastor and pastors don't have problems like that." <7128>

". . .is just horribly obnoxious, when you see a senior who is cocky, and arrogant, you just tremble within. That haughty spirit is just waiting for the fall. . . and anything you can do to help them fall now, under controlled conditions." <1218>

". . .what I perceive to be a weakness is that we do probably attract a little bit too large a percentage of authoritarian types who tend to be somewhat rigid and judgmental." <9416>

Table 4-12 (cont'd.).

(Personal immaturity--cont'd)

> ". . .a moral fault fostered by some denominations. . . the students will tell others what to do since they are a rank above the people." <8517>
> ". . .I wonder how, on an independent-dependent scale, a personality scale, I suspect they're [students] as a group pretty dependent as compared with medical doctors, attorneys--some other kind of professional groups." <5427>
> ". . .in contrast to the sixties, now students have generally been passive, more passive, immature, more unsure of themselves, more desirous of spoon-feeding than a few years back. . . . We don't see a certain level of maturity in students that have graduated from college." <8428>
> ". . .what really bothers me with a few students is lack of spiritual growth, although they may grow a great deal academically." <4117>
> ". . .students have a tendency to disdain the past; they think not much can be gained from it." <0615>

B. Student values and priorities (13 comments)

> ". . .the competition for grades, first of all." <5517>
> ". . .the chief thing is that the students are identifying who they are in terms of their grades; they think their grades are an indication of who they are before God, spiritually. . . . Students put too much stock in grades." <1515>
> ". . .students tend to live by an unconscious value system, that they cannot and they do not bring their values to an objective structure where they can articulate them and manage and use them in a self-conscious way." <6115>
> ". . .the pressures of society, the problem of injustice-- as evangelicals we're quick to articulate a position, but still not do something about it. We're just too busy." <1526>
> ". . .the number of students, for example, who are in the library, when the pressure is on before exams, etc., rather than in chapel. . .we need a higher priority on chapel attendance. . .students skip chapel, yea, even the faculty do." <4517>
> ". . .the apathy of students, they don't take advantage of the opportunities to learn to grow outside of the classroom." <8615>
> ". . .the privatism of this generation. They're more concerned for personal achievement and success, and less willing to give time for social causes." <7626>

Table 4-12 (cont'd.).

(Student's values and priorities--cont'd)

". . .the narcissistic attitude. Many students seem to be in seminary to find themselves, you know, 'Because I want to do this, I think I would enjoy the ministry,' rather than a sense of wanting to serve God and His cause." <8528>

". . .there's been a change since the early seventies, it's the 'me generation.'" <7617>

". . .they miss the vision of the greatness of the vocation of the ministry, it's just another job. . . they judge it by the mundane criteria of other professions, for instance, the salary." <1326>

". . .there's a lack of understanding of the servant role. Students' are more concerned about what they gave up [materially]--sometimes the concern is beyond the normal bounds." <6325>

". . .the implications of materialism and so forth have also affected--students come in at a much higher standard of living. Some of our students at seminary make more money than the seminary professors." <3126>

". . .there's a higher level of tolerance regarding divergent lifestyles. There used to be an historic statement regarding the use of alcohol and tobacco--now it's not an issue." <4626>

C. Students' family life (3 comments)

". . .we are concerned about the domestic issue. . . . I think the need is greater now--the moral climate of the day, the ease of separation, divorce, even in the Christian world. Those things disturb me, greatly." <7226>

". . .this is becoming, increasingly, a concern to the seminary, it's the student's attitude to and relationship to his wife and children. . . . Too often there's a strain and a stress created in the home, in the family, that is a moral responsibility to the student that he does not see." <4218>

". . .it's a sad factor, not a vice, but a tragedy. Due to the lack of funds, the marriages are not as happy as it should be during the early stages of a marriage. The woman has to work and she can't be a mother--it makes it harder." <6318>

D. Unclassified (1 comment)

". . .it's not directly relevant, but the cultural deprivation manifested in a lack of a competent grasp of the English language." <7317>

home situation (3 comments).

Professors faulted some students for their irresponsibility in fulfilling tasks, their naivette about the people to whom they will be ministering, their insensitivity toward fellow students and seminary employees, their arrogant, authoritarian and judgmental character, and their general dependency on the seminary and faculty.

Some of the students' values and priorities have become skewed as a result of societal values (materialism and a focus on self) and as a result of seminary life where there may be a tendency to overemphasize intellectual development and grades. Pressures to fulfill academic requirements and pay the bills can often affect the marriage relationship.

Means of Dealing with Character Faults

Interview question 13b (probe): What do you think the seminary can specifically do to help deal with this [the previously mentioned character fault]? (Table 4-13)

From those 17 professors who suggested some student problems, twenty comments were offered. Responses regarding how a professor would see himself or herself or the seminary dealing with character faults is treated here because it provides another indication of the professors' conception of promoting moral development. These comments relate to a diverse array of character problems which were discussed above. Though the problems were varied, it was felt that the means of dealing with these problems could be compared.

More than half of the professors (ten out of seventeen)

Table 4-13

<u>Means of Dealing with Student Character Faults</u>
(20 comments by 17 professors)

<u>Interview question 13b</u>: What do you think the seminary can
    specifically do to help deal with this?

A. Through didactive-cognitive encouragement (10 comments)

   ". . .I remind them of their responsibility to their own
     wives and family." <1226>
   ". . .we stress it in the pastoral ministries department
     and emphasize it to all of our classes by reminding our
     men that they are servants, it's a privilege not a
     burden to serve Jesus Christ." <0325>
   ". . .through personal dialogue, reminders in class, in
     groups." <8615>
   ". . .from the first day on campus they are confronted
     with their family responsibilities." <9218>
   ". . .as an individual, I confront them in class and talk
     about it individually with them and make appeals to see
     it as a spiritual issue." <6528>
   ". . .to the extent that I am able in class to pound the
     pulpit, I try to make them aware of this, of
     cultivating meaningful and perceptive sensitivities,
     morally, so they're aware of other people, their needs,
     their hurts." <1217>
   ". . .that's difficult. I try to sensitize them, to raise
     their level of consciousness. . .to get the point
     across that they are servants, to convince them of the
     truth value of this." <6326>
   ". . .constant conversation--as openers in class, at the
     beginning of the quarter, occasionally in chapel, in
     Wednesday groups, individually--keep it [the issue of
     competition for grades] as a topic of conversation,
     keep an openness about it." <1517>
   ". . .I personally encourage the students not to worry
     about grades." <8317>
   ". . .I give a spiel in class. . .I don't know what the
     ultimate answer is [overemphasis on grades]." <0515>

Table 4-13 (cont'd.).

B. Through faculty modeling (3 comments)

". . .through faculty models of the servant role. . .to
reflect the model of ministry they saw in the faculty."
<5325>

". . .I think that it's good for students to see us in
action. . . . Even now, students see me in various
ministries. Some faculty who are not as involved in the
local church take students with them--when they go
preaching, they might take a student; when they go into
some seminary situation, take a student. This way
students can see us out in the field and their values
change a little bit, I think, for that." <517>

". . .I can't fault the students, I see it in myself, the
professors don't model that kind of involvement [in
inner city ministries]." <6526>

C. Unclassified (9 comments)

". . .in group work that the students engage in. . .in
ministry groups. . .other students are able to confront
them." <8416>

". . .a forum is offered during the lunch hour with a
meal and is open to the campus. About 15-20 people
attend and issues are presented and discussed." <6626>

". . .too many nipples are in the students' mouths. Maybe
we ought to be a little more European. . .'We're here
lecturing, our resources are here, at the end of the
line you have to pass comprehensive examinations; now
we don't care how you learn the stuff.'" <3427>

". . .the chapel is a means of fostering in students a
relationship to Jesus Christ. . .to see themselves as
servants, and not lords of His people." <8325>

". . .more of a link between the academic and the field
work." <2617>

". . .there are opportunities for wives to audit classes.
. .and the seminary women's fellowship meets two times
a month." <4226>

". . .we wonder how much we've influenced them at this
stage of life, after they've stayed here either 3, 4, 5
years. In other words, we're not so naive anymore as to
how much we've changed people's minds or influenced
them. I guess we're much more modest today than maybe
we were 20 years ago." <0428>

". . .a long-term solution is in our recruitment and
selection of students [concerning the apathy of
students]. . .our recruting pattern." <6615>

". . .[regarding the use of the English language] they
grow up that way, and we make repairs as we can."
<9317>

would use a didactive-cognitive mode of encouraging more
mature conduct and character. These kinds of verbs were used
in their conversation: "remind", "confront", "stress",
"talk", "make them aware", "raise their level of conscious-
ness", "convince", and "encourage." No correlational trends
were found which related a didactive- cognitive mode with
either academic discipline or previous pastoral experience.
Another theme focused on the example and model of faculty (3
comments). Additional responses were unclassified (9
coments).

Moral Influence During Own Seminary Education

Interview question #17: Now, please, think back to your
own experience of seminary as a student. What proved to
be the most influential in encouraging your moral
maturity? (Table 4-14)

This section was included in the chapter for purposes
of comparing influences professors remembered as a student,
and the influences emphasized by the professor in his or her
current teaching. (The question was adjusted slightly for
the few professors who had not attended a theological
graduate school. In that case, professors were asked to
reflect on their graduate education in the university
setting.)

Professors offered 34 comments. Sixteen of the professors
(n=22) indicated that a professor or a number of professors
had significantly affected their lives. The professor usually
took a personal interest in them, encouraged them in their

Table 4-14

What Influenced Professors During Their Seminary Education
(34 comments by 22 professors)

Interview question 17:   . . .your own experience of seminary
     as a student. What proved to be the most influential in
     encouraging your moral maturity?

A. Influence of a professor (16 comments)

   ". . .the influence of Professor Jones, a particular
      teacher who wedded for me the spiritual and the
      academic." <5115> (Note 3)
   ". . .it was the way my better teachers could make the
      Bible relevant, both academically and practically
      . . . . I always looked for people who could
      integrate." <0117>
   ". . .the fact that there was two professors that took a
      personal interest and I felt that I could go and talk
      to them at anytime and that I would not be intruding."
      <2128>
   ". . .probably the personal contacts with the professors
      and having them relate to me the practicum of their
      life--how they made their theology work, how they made
      moral principles work in reality." <1217>
   ". . .sitting at the feet of one of the greatest
      theologians. There's a fine line between idolizing a
      person and modeling. . .other things were almost
      peripheral to me to watching a man of God in action."
      <0218>
   ". . .in other words, the personal life of the faculty,
      and the model they set, was by far the most outstanding
      factor in my remembrance of my seminary days. I got
      theology and I got all these other subjects, but it's
      not what I remember today." <6225>
   ". . .a couple of seminary professors who were models of
      ministry and Christian concern." <0325>

Table 4-14 (cont'd.).

(Influence of a professor--cont'd)

  ". . .the confidence the faculty had in me to give me
  responsibility, to encourage me. . . . They've got
  confidence in you--they introduce me to other people in
  a positive way. . .I think that was a high motivating
  factor." <7326>

  ". . .I probably wasn't conscious of this at the time,
  but the moral modeling among the faculty." <5415>

  ". . .in grad school, my mentors. . . . I was the
  personal valet of my advisor after he suffered a heart
  attack." <4427>

  ". . .the treatment by a number of the professors of me
  and other students. . .a kind of evaluation or esteem
  for what contribution we could make to ministry. Some
  of these are kind of subtle, how they handled us, how
  they informed us of certain things, whether they took
  us into their homes. . . . That affected us because we
  saw another side of the man back of the desk." <9428>

  ". . .the godly lives of the people really influenced
  me." <6526>

  ". . .my relationships with individual professors."
  <0615>

  ". . .a few professors who took the time to relate on a
  personal level. . .who were concerned for my total
  development." <2617>

  ". . .my perception of the faculty, of the moral
  character of the faculty." <0626>

  ". . .in both grad school and seminary, the help in
  developing self-esteem--the affirmation received."
  <4628>

B. Interaction with fellow students (5 comments)

  ". . .the similarity of thought among peers and
  discussion of issues." <9415>

  ". . .my personal experiences in a student club". <0416>

  ". . .meeting international students." <9517>

  ". . .interacting with other students of different
  backgrounds." <2528>

  ". . .my peers--a setting with different kinds of
  people." <8628>

Table 4-14 (cont'd.).

C. Seminary courses and chapel services (9 comments)

". . .a course in moral-philosophical theology." <7415>

". . .a course in basic Christian ethics. . .provided the
most formative influence. . .Dr. Jones did an excellent
job." <4416>

". . .my homiletics classes were exceedingly helpful."
<7325>

". . .it was unstructured, for example the discussion led
into a controversy and some moral principle was
involved--it was the tangential things in class that I
remember." <9318>

". . .for me it was the emphasis on moral knowledge. . .I
came to seminary with a high sense of moral
sensitivity." <5226>

". . .more than anything, it was the study of Scripture."
<8325>

". . .a deeper understanding of the biblical material."
<4415>

". . .the chapels were very important to me." <1526>

". . .and then the chapels at the seminary. I cherished
the chapels. I attended when I could. I appreciated the
worship at the seminary." <5517>

D. Off-campus experiences (4 comments)

". . .my greatest spiritual growth was working as a
student volunteer with Inter-Varsity." <4517>

". . .my field work experiences." <7416>

". . .giving me responsibility for ministry assignments."
<1326>

". . .probably being married and working with the YMCA."
<5126>

work and modeled an exemplary life. No correlational trends were associated with either academic discipline or previous pastoral experience. Other significant influences included interaction with fellow students (5 comments), seminary courses and chapel services (9 comments) and certain off-campus experiences (4 comments).

Qualitative Observations

Some of the responses in the chapter are worthy of special attention. A few professors indicated that the seminary assumed students were already morally mature, especially in moral thinking and moral sensitivity. Thus, a special focus on encouraging students' moral development is not seen as necessary. However, a few professors suggested that some students come to seminary with very narrow conceptions of morality and professors need to help students broaden their perspectives.

Professors were able to identify a number of learning experiences and factors which positively influence the students' moral development. Yet, when asked how they or the seminary would deal with a specific character fault of students, the majority of professors stated they would adopt a purely didactive-cognitive mode of reminding and exhorting students to improve their action.

A divergence of opinion was evident among professors regarding how well students develop their moral thinking skills and personal values. The classical professors tended

to rate students' learning as high in these two areas, whereas the ministry-related professors tended to rate students more toward a fair amount of learning.

Summary

Professors tended to rate students' degree of learning at the seminary in moral knowledge as high; they estimated a fair amount of student learning in moral sensitivity, and a little less learning in will power. A difference of opinion was evident regarding student learning on moral thinking and personal values.

A number of learning experiences were identified which help students grow toward moral maturity. A general theme of experience-oriented activities surfaced from the responses. The largest category of comments related to field education experiences. Other groupings made reference to situations in which students are forced to make moral choices, experience-oriented instructional methods in the classroom, worship experiences and interaction with peers.

When professors raise moral issues in class, they attempt to help students think through the issues, identify the relevent biblical principles, and encourage students to commit themselves to a position. An additional purpose is to prepare students in how to present and deal with moral issues in their future ministries. Professors assume that students have mature moral thinking skills, yet some students come to seminary with immature conceptions of morality. In most cases

ministry-related faculty are familiar with moral development theory, such as Kohlberg's theory.

A variety of experiences can facilitate the development of moral sensitivity, such as exposure to people with real needs and those from differing backgrounds than the student's. Some process-type methods can be used in the class to simulate these kinds of situations. Professors also indicated that moral sensitivity grows out of one's relationship to God.

Factors which may hinder moral growth relate to the academic requirements, the pressure for high grades and a general lack of student responsibility of their own learning at the seminary. In addition, faculty may be too busy or preoccupied with their own responsibilities to initiate personal contact with students.

Suggested changes at the seminary would include providing a forum in which faculty and students could deal with critical moral issues. Another group of responses was directed toward increasing interaction between faculty and students. Some professors would wish to give a greater emphasis to matters of worship and one's relationship to God. Other professors would like to see more integrative courses and experiences, linking theory and practice.

Professors were concerned about students' immaturity (insensitivity, irresponsibility, arrogance, dependency) and distorted values and priorities (competition for grades, unconscious value system, apathy, self-centeredness,

materialism). To deal with these faults, a majority of professors would remind students of their responsibility and raise students' level of consciousness about problem areas. In addition, faculty could model the appropriate attitude and behavior.

Finally, professors remember mostly their own seminary teachers as most influential in their own moral development. Seminary teachers provided encouragement, an example and inspiration for their lives. Other influences included fellow students, courses, greater understanding of the Bible, chapels, work experience, marriage, and field experiences.

End Notes

1. See Chapter 5 for a fuller treatment of responses to interview question 2.

2. Numerical codes (located within angular brackets) have been assigned to each professor's comment to maintain anonymity.

3. Fictitious names have been substituted for real names.

Chapter 5

FINDINGS:

FACULTY-STUDENT INTERACTIONS
IN RELATION TO MORAL DEVELOPMENT

Chapter 5 presents the findings related to the second

research question.

> Research question #2: How do faculty interact with
> students in matters which may affect the students'
> moral development both in and out of the classroom?

How faculty members relate to students can, in various ways,

influence the students' own development toward moral

maturity. A few topics had been selected to provide some

idea of faculty perceptions of their own ways of relating to

students. Responses to the interview questions were analyzed

following the same procedures which were described in

Chapter 4 and are presented in the same manner.

Overview of the Interview Questions

Four interview questions are treated in Chapter 5 (2,

3, 10, and 11). Interview questions 2 and 3 were general in

nature, making no specific reference to the issue of moral

development. Question 2 sought to discover what faculty

would like students to remember about them "20 years from

now." Question 3 looked at the particular outcomes or

purposes faculty have in mind when meeting with students outside of class.

The other two questions (10 and 11) described for faculty members a particular situation and then asked them how they would deal with the student involved. Question 10 focused on a hypothetical case of academic dishonesty (plagiarism) while question 11 had a more general reference to a student experiencing some personal problems.

What Students Should Remember about Faculty

Interview question 2: When you are remembered by your students, say, 20 years from now, what would you most like it to be for? (Table 5-1)

Responses to the question were organized into three categories: (a) focus on student learning (19 comments), (b) focus on the professor as person (17 comments), and (c) focus on the professor as subject matter specialist (8 comments).

Focus on student learning

A total of 19 different comments from 18 professors related to a focus on student learning. Responses solely to this category were given by 6 faculty members. Professors thought students would primarily remember them as helping the students gain a comprehension of the particular subject matter (9 comments) and develop essential skills (7 comments). There were three unclassified comments. No correlational trends were associated with professors'

Table 5-1

What Students Should Remember About Faculty
(46 comments by 24 professors)

Interview question 2: . . . .remembered by your students 20
    years from now?

A. Focus on student learning (19 comments)

Comprehension of the Subject Matter (9 comments)

". . .related theology to the Gospel they preached."
    <3318>
". . .insight into the ways of God through Scripture."
    <5517>
". . .opened windows, gave inspiration and excitement
    to the subject matter." <1428>
". . .opened a new appreciation of the saving gift of
    God." <6317>
". . .assisted students in understanding and
    appreciating the history of the Church." <3416>
". . .helped them understand the discipline, integration
    of many fields." <6626>
". . .remember the principles and concepts; how they
    apply to life." <4126>
". . .getting the material on a practical level so they
    can use it." <2225>
". . .getting a few ideas under their skin, kind of
    praxis ideas--where theory and practice intersect."
    <5427>

Development of essential skills (7 comments)

". . .to think critically and carefully." <2115>
". . .making them think." <8528>
". . .recognize issues people are facing, a way of
    wrestling, interacting." <0617>
". . .to help develop their gifts." <9628>
". . .skills in the study of the Word, understanding,
    teaching and to apply it to their lives." <1517>
". . .students feel comfortable and competent in
    the text [knowledge and skills]." <5217>
". . .mastering the discipline of homiletics." <9325>

Unclassified comments (3 comments)

". . .actually helped them grow." <6615>
". . .subject matter that was helpful to students."
    <0515>
". . .being able to minister to them in the areas where
    they have needs." <2117>

Table 5-1 (cont'd.).

B. Focus on the Professor as Person (17 comments)

Professor's example and personal influence (7 comments)

". . .a model of a whole, Christian person." <4626>
". . .a model, example." <5126>
". . .consistency, character." <1226>
". . .presented the Word humbly, honored Christ." <9218>
". . .through personal contact, students have grown in
   the Lord." <0517>
". . .personal and formative influence on them." <1416>
". . .an enabler who helped them." <7628>

Professor's concern and empathy for the students (7 comments)

". . .cares about the students." <1526>
". . .a professor who really cares, out of the classroom
   as well as in the classroom." <5128>
". . .caring, underneath, about students." <3615>
". . .for being a caring teacher, an authentic person."
   <4528>
". . .sensitive to their struggles, understand their
   crises." <7325>
". . .someone to consult about their problems." <2326>
". . .model of pastoral sensitivity. . .the way in which
   I treat people." <0415>

Professor's convictions (3 comments)

". . .an urgency, passion for the ministry." <3617>
". . .committed to the evangelical faith." <7515>
". . .committed to the Word and Jesus Christ." <2126>

Table 5-1 (cont'd.).

C. Focus on the Professor as Subject Matter Specialist
     (10 comments)

Professor's knowledge of the discipline (5 comments)

     ". . .respect for your expertise, experience." <2326>
     ". . .aware of the field, mastered the skills
          of the discipline." <6325>
     ". . .took the discipline seriously enough and taught
          them in that area well." <7415>
     ". . .genuine knowledge of the subject matter." <2515>
     ". . .knows the content of the field." <8526>

Professor's presentation of the subject matter (5 comments)

     ". . .having taught them a subject matter." <2115>
     ". . .presented the Word." <3218>
     ". . .handled the material effectively." <7217>
     ". . .responsible in teaching." <9615>
     ". . .communicated the conviction that this is worth
          their life and death attention." <5428>

academic discipline or with previous pastoral ministry experience.

Focus on the professor as person

A total of 17 comments, mentioned by 16 of the professors, gave emphasis to the professor as person. Only two professors gave responses which were assigned exclusively to this one category. Professors mentioned that they would like students to remember the example of their life (7 comments), that they had expressed a genuine concern for the students (7 comments), and that they had particular convictions or values (3 comments). No significant correlational trends were found associated with professors' academic discipline or with previous pastoral ministry experience.

Focus on the professor as subject matter specialist

Only 10 professors made comments focused on the professor as subject matter specialist. No professor identified remarks for this category exclusively. Professors felt that what students would remember would be (1) their degree of competence in the discipline and (2) their presentation of the material in class. No correlational trends were associated with professors' academic discipline or with previous pastoral ministry experience.

Agenda for Student Encounters

Interview question 3: When you meet with students, that is besides in the classroom, what one or two things do you most enjoy doing with them? (Table 5-2)

Follow up probe: Is there anything you hope might result from such meetings with students? Do you have some purpose? (Table 5-3)

The intent of the first part of the question was to set up a more specific reference for the second part of the question. Primarily, professors like to converse with students (n=22) about a variety of subjects (Table 5-2). Topics of conversation may include: issues in the professor's own discipline, assignments and field experiences, student goals, aspirations and future plans for ministry, current student needs and topics of interest, the issue of the day, and sharing experiences. A few professors (n = 6) mentioned that they also enjoy getting together with students on a more social basis, such as joking with students, inviting students to their home, playing in sports together (e.g. racquetball), taking students on expeditions (a combination of educational and social functions), and joining students in school functions such as choir, and fellowship meals.

Most professors (n=15) have some purpose in mind in their encounters with students outside of the classroom. A few professors (N=5) have no real purpose or agenda in that they like the students to set the agenda for the meeting. Finally, two professors stated that sometimes they might have a purpose, and at other times, they have none.

A variety of purposes were mentioned by the professors (table 5-3). These purposes were grouped into two general categories: (a) those concerned with helping the student (13 comments), and (b) those purposes in which professors want

Table 5-2

What Professors' Enjoy Doing with Students

Interview question 3: . . .when you meet with students, what do you most enjoy doing?

1. Discussions with students (22 Professors)

a. Student's aspirations, life goals, vocational goals
   (7 comments)
   b. Discussion relating to the professor's discipline
   (5 comments)
   c. Difficulties in life, struggles, deeper issues
   (4 comments)
   d. Listening to and answering their questions, seeking
   resources (3 comments)
   e. Class assignments, field ministry reports, etc.
   (2 comments)
   f. Share experiences (2 comments)
   g. Where they are, whatever they're thinking (2 comments)
   h. The issue of the day (1 comment)

2. Social engagements (6 Professors)

   a. Athletics
   b. Professor's home
   c. Student functions (choir, meals)
   d. Off campus activities (expeditions)
   e. Fun, joking in the hallways

Table 5-3

Professors' Purposes in Student Encounters
(18 comments by 17 professors)

Interview question 3: . . .do you have some purpose?

A. Helping students (13 comments)

". . .encourage a move to the next step professionally."
    <2626>
". . .encourage them in the Lord's leading." <6225>
". . .clarify their sense of calling; to take away their
    sense of Angst and burden about life and service."
    <7428>
". . .encourage them to publish." <8218>
". . .instill certain ideas." <4515>
". . .importance of giving primary attention to their
    family." <1226>
". . .open their mind about a few more options." <4526>
". . .use their time wisely, develop a time schedule."
    <6326>
". . .help them become mature Christians, discipleship."
    <8528>
". . .open to discuss their feelings, to analyze how
    others see them and their ministry." <0415>
". . .to become effective stewards." <7317>
". . .to become good theologians, good pastors." <4318>
". . .help deal with personal difficulties due to
    academic pressures." <6617>

B. Developing personal relationships (5 comments)

". . .develop personal relationships to get to know the
    students." <6126>
". . .to relate on a person-to-person level, and to take
    time to listen." <1325>
". . .building relationships with them, especially with
    a view to discipleship." <9528>
". . .develop personal relationships with students, some
    of my former students are close friends." <4615>
". . .develop an open relationship, to see me as someone
    who is available." <6628>

to develop more open personal relationships with students (5 comments). No correlational trends were associated with professors' academic discipline or with previous pastoral ministry experience.

Dealing with Academic Dishonesty

Interview question 10: Now, I'd like to present a hypothetical situation involving a case of academic dishonesty. Let's assume that a student has submitted a term paper for one of your courses. After grading the paper and checking your files, you notice that almost half of this term paper is a verbatim copy of a paper written by a former student three years ago. For the sake of our discussion, let's assume two students have done this: for one student, this was the first offense; the other student has done similar things in a few other classes. How would you tend to deal with these situations? (Tables 5-4, 5-5, 5-6, 5-7, 5-8 and 5-9)

Probe: A. Would you handle the matter by yourself, or refer it to someone else? B. What particular academic consequences would you give to the student? C. In talking with the student, what would you hope to accomplish?

The variety of responses to this question (65 comments by the 24 professors) were organized into six general categories: (a) professors' mind set (25 comments), (b) confronting the student (16 comments), (c) academic consequences (5 kinds of responses), (d) factors considered in making a decision about the consequences (5 comments), (e) helping to prevent cases of academic dishonesty (3 comments), and (f) referring the matter to someone else (16 comments).

Table 5-4

Professors' Orientation About a Case of Plagiarism
(25 comments by 20 professors)

Interview question 10

A. Affirm the student, despite the problem (9 comments)

". . .try to rescue the person." <7128>
". . .discipline, Biblically, is never to destroy the person, but always to lift them up." <5126>
". . .don't want to destroy the student." <3628>
". . .deal with student in a redemptive way." <6617>
". . .I want to be redemptive." <0217>
". . .ideally, to reclaim the student." <3517>
". . .use the occasion for growth." <5428>
". . .we'd be more gospel oriented, hoping we could rehabilitate the student." <2326>
". . .that he would have a genuine experience of growth." <7317>

B. Tension between the institution and the person (6 comments)

". . .professor has two kinds of relationships, an official one [as Dean student forfeits credit], and a personal one [I want to help you]." <3226>
". . .there is forgiveness, but you can't escape the [academic] consequences." <7325>
". . .what is at stake is that you're educating the student, but you also must protect the integrity of the program." <8427>
". . .a tension between the academic integrity at the seminary, and the student who is a Christian and dealing with him over the long run." <4528>
". . .to maintain the integrity of the institution; also try to help the individual deal with the problem." <9628>
". . .to reclaim the student; have him see what he's done to the others--fairness to other students." <8517>

Table 5-4 (cont'd.).

C. Unclassified   (10 comments)

". . .deal with it on the basis of the spiritual
    implications; it's a sin problem and he needs to
    get right with the Lord." <8225>

". . .he has to face up to the Lord, and to admit it to
    the Lord." <7526>

". . .I identify with the hurt that's involved." <3128>

". . .try to be transparent as a professor, to admit my
    own weaknesses." <6526>

". . .there's a high level of trust placed in our
    students." <2416>

". . .the system assumes honesty, the student has
    violated that trust." <3617>

". . .if the student is without conscience, I have an
    obligation to prevent his entrance into the
    ministry." <5317>

". . .to what extent are we overburdening the student."
    <6326>

". . .a cheating pattern may indicate that he will tend
    to cheat in his ministry." <1526>

". . .there are certain kinds of sins of such nature
    that if you do it even once, you're not fit for the
    ministry." <2318>

Professors' mind set (Table 5-4)

A total of 25 comments made by 20 professors alluded to the essential orientation used in approaching the student with such a problem. A number of professors (n=10) mentioned that they would want to rescue and rehabilitate the student--to use the occasion as a means for helping the student to mature.

Another group of six comments expressed the tension of loyalties and responsibilities a professor faces in dealing with the student and the offense. Faculty have an obligation to the institution concerning earned credit and the integrity of the educational program, as well as fairness to other students who have legitimately completed the assignments. On the other hand, the professor is dealing with an individual who is a fellow Christian, a person who is in need of forgiveness and assistance with a problem. An additional ten comments were unclassified.

Confronting the student (Table 5-5)

A total of 16 comments were made by 12 professors explaining what they would be doing when meeting with the student. The majority of responses indicated that professors would be looking for a favorable response of confession and repentance and a willingness to talk about the problem. If the student was resistant or denied the matter, then more serious consequences might result.

Professors would also attempt to clarify for themselves what actually happened and why it happened. They would want

<u>Table 5-5</u>

<u>How Professors' Confront a Case of Plagiarism</u>
(16 comments by 12 professors)

Interview question 10

A. Look for a favorable response (8 comments)

".. .genuine repentance, and not remorse--that he got
caught." <3128>
".. .open and honest and willing to talk it out." <9117>
".. .depending on a favorable response." <1225>
".. .hope he would admit readily to what he'd done."
<8427>
".. .confront to see the student's repentance [does he
confess, or is there resistance]." <7528>
".. .determine whether he's simply a rascal, or a
person with a moral dilemma." <0317>
".. .to determine the degree of responsibility." <4617>
".. .to see the level of contrition; does he stonewall
it or deny it." <9626>

B. Ask for the student's meaning of the action (4 comments)

".. .I'm more interested in the reason why, than the
offense." <3117>
".. .why did they do that, what mitigating
circumstances." <6217>
".. .what they thought they were doing." <2427>
".. .what he thought he was doing." <1615>

C. Substantiate the facts (2 comments)

".. .I would want to substantiate the story." <4126>
".. .to make sure I have the facts straight as they
view it." <8427>

D. Ask if the student understands the concept of plagiarism
(2 comments)

".. .were they confused about what plagiarism is?"
<5615>
".. .to see if they understand what plagiarism is."
<3515>

to substantiate the facts of the action (2 comments),
understand the meaning of the act of dishonesty--what was
the student's perspective on what was done (4 comments), and
what is the student's concept of plagiarism (2 comments).

Academic consequences (Table 5-6)

Most of the professors (n=10) would allow the student to
rewrite the paper. Some professors might give the student a
lower grade, while others would not. Students would fail the
course, according to four professors. These students would
forfeit their right to receive credit for the course. In two
cases, professors would just assign an "F" to the paper, but
the student would probably pass the course--just barely. A
few professors (n=3) did not specify a consequence, but made
reference to whatever the school policy would dictate. A
group of four professors gave multiple responses, since the
consequence depended on the seriousness of the dishonest
behavior.

Factors related to assigning consequences (Table 5-7)

A few factors on the matter were identified in the
responses of four professors. For some a decision would
relate to the weight of the paper or the year of the student.
Others have no blanket rule and judge each situation on a
case-by-case basis. Another professor would assign the same
penalty to a student, whether it was the student's first
offense or third offense. Fairness was the consideration
here. Finally, one professor would tend to assign a lower
grade because this grade would become a significant reminder

Table 5-6

Academic Consequences for a Case of Plagiarism (n=23)

Interview question 10

Consequence	Number of Professors
Rewrite the paper	10
"F" on the paper	4
"F" on the course	2
What school policy states	3
Depends on situation (mixture of consequences above)	4

Table 5-7

Factors in Making a Decision about Consequences (n=4)

Interview question 10

". . .give a lower grade, since the penalty is a permanent brand, a reminder." <9427>
". . .it depends on the weight of the paper (major or minor)." <5317>
". . .it depends on the year of the student." <4226>
". . .I have no blanket rule; I judge each individual case." <0428>
". . .penalize the same [whether first offense or a repeated offense]; it doesn't make sense not to do the same." <7427>

Table 5-8

Helping to Prevent Cases of Academic Dishonesty (n=3)

Interview question 10

". . .sometimes we facilitate cheating; I keep students' papers, they can look at them in my office. I don't give the same exam twice." <6626>
". . .is it partly my fault? Have I overburdened him?" <9326>
". . .on reading reports, I make the student sign his name." <7526>

to the student of the action.

Helping to prevent academic dishonesty (Table 5-8)

Some professors evidenced a concern to not inadvertently contribute to the student's temptation to act dishonestly. A professor commented that one colleague uses the same tests year after year, thus inviting dishonesty. Reading reports may be the easiest assignment to falsify. Students are required to sign their name on the reports turned in to one professor. Another professor keeps all student papers in the office. Students may look at them in the office, but may not take them.

Factors related to referring the matter elsewhere (Table 5-9)

This final section describes when faculty would consider referring a case of academic dishonesty to someone else or the appropriate faculty committee. A total of 17 comments were made by 13 professors. In some cases, faculty would need to report or discuss the matter with an administrative officer on the first offense. For others, if a pattern of such behavior was developing, then the matter would be referred. One professor stated that each case would be reported to the faculty committee, so that there would be consistent treatment of the matter. Another professor mentioned that rarely would the matter be made known to the administration. The professor was able to deal with these kinds of situation individually.

Table 5-9

Factors Considered in Referring a Case of Academic
    Dishonesty to the Administration
(16 comments by 13 professors)

Interview question 10

"On the very first offense, I report it or discuss it with
    the. . .

        President."<3415>
        Dean." <7626>
        Associate Dean." <0615>
        Registrar and Dean of students." <6326>

". . .if it is a major term paper." <226>
". . .only if I doubted the facts of the matter, or if
    personal bias against the student might be involved."
    <2615>
". . .when the matter has implications for other faculty."
    <0526>
". . .if the student was resistant." <1528>

If a pattern of similar behavior was developing:
    ". . .would raise a question in a faculty meeting." <3117>
    ". . .recommend to the appropriate committee to
        discontinue student from the program." <8415>
    ". . .refer matter to the appropriate committee." <3517>
    ". . .refer matter to the appropriate committee, and put
        the student on notice." <5526>
    ". . .the faculty would need to look at that." <2628>
    ". . .possibly be expelled." <7226>

". . .for any offense, I would always refer it to the
    committee for consistency of treatment." <3218>
". . .rarely would I ever have to take it to the
    administration; I could take care of it on an individual
    basis." <9225>

Taking the Initiative to Counsel Students

Interview question 11: Let's assume that a professor knows that a particular student is experiencing some personal problems, or say that the professor senses that a student might need some personal advice. In most cases, should professors (a) let students take the initiative to seek out professors, or (b) should professors take the initiative to seek out students? (Table 5-10)

The majority of professors (n=14) stated that, in most cases, they should take the initiative to seek out students. As one professor stated, "Everyone of us is a pastor to them" <3318>. A possible correlational trend may be associated with those professors who did have previous pastoral experience (table 5-10) (no association was apparent with professors' academic discipline). The pastoral orientation of these professors probably prompts this reaching out to students. Many of the seven professors who would let the student take the initiative were concerned to not take away the adult responsibility of the student.

Yet almost all of the professors indicated that they would, in some cases, reach out to the student in a time of need. Table 5-11 outlines 48 comments from all the professors regarding a situation of student need. These comments were organized into 5 categories: (a) indirect initiatives toward students (8 comments), (b) direct initiatives toward students (17 comments), (c) school structures to facilitate dealing with problems (7 comments), (d) why students may hesitate to seek out to professors (4 comments), and (e) why faculty may hesitate to seek out students (12 comments).

Professors may pray for the student, share some of their

Table 5-10

<u>Taking the Initiative to Counsel Students</u>

Interview question 11

Who takes the initiative:	Number of Professors with no previous pastoral experience	Number of professors with previous pastoral experience	totals
Professors should	4	10	14
Students should	5	2	7
totals	9	12	21

Fisher Exact Test

p = .080

Strength of association:

Q = -.724

C = .378

ϕ^2 = .167

λ = .143

Table 5-11

Ways of Initiating Student Counseling
(48 comments by 24 professors)

Interview question 11: . . .a student is experiencing some personal problems.

A. Indirect initiatives with students (8 comments)

". . .the first initiative should be prayer, that the student would feel free to open up to me." <3517>

". . .do a lot of praying." <2117>

". . .in weekly faculty prayer meetings we share with each other an apparent problem with a student." <6218>

". . .present materials, or discuss problems that would precipitate him coming to see me." <7117>

". . .the professor might have been dealing with a problem in class that strikes him at home; he'll go to the professor with the problem." <8225>

". . .be friendly to him; by making it easier for him to come and see me." <9117>

". . .try to provide an environment in which the student can comfortably come to me; through little hints in casual conversation; try to develop some level of confidence." <8217>

". . .in class, you can be transparent and share with students the struggles you've been through; that causes them to be more transparent with you." <3126>

B. Direct approaches with students (17 comments)

". . .after class, take student aside and tell him I'm aware of the problem, and praying for him, and he can feel free to come and see me." <1325>

". . .I can talk to you after class, or make an appointment." <7528>

". . .I want you to know I'm available; if there's anything I can do to help, please come and see me." <2128>

". . .to know of my availability if there's anything I can do." <0226>

". . .say, I'm available; don't force yourself on the student." <5628>

". . .I may invite the student to talk together over coffee; ask leading questions." <0517>

". . .be sensitive to the Spirit; watch for opportunities to be alone with the student, to give a door he could come through." <6526>

". . .seek a chance to talk to the student." <8615>

". . .I'd make sure they knew my door was open." <3427>

Table 5-11 (cont'd.).

(Direct approaches with students--cont'd.)

". . .maybe the student is groping for help; sometimes a step in his direction will be very helpful." <7217>

". . .if the teacher takes the initiative, in Christian love, as a friend, he can help the student." <2115>

". . .I wrote a long note on a student's paper: you should talk to someone, if you would like, you could talk to me." <3518>

". . .I wrote a note on a student's paper about controlling his anger and the student responded positively." <4428>

". . .when we call in students we tell them we're going to be asked for recommendations for him down the road; now you've got a problem in this area." <0225>

". . .personally, I encourage students to see the dean who is responsible for student counseling, rather than do it myself; he's qualified to do counseling." <5218>

". . .I ask my colleagues if anything has been done." <6617>

". . .we routinely refer problem students for professional career counseling." <8626>

C. School structures to facilitate counseling students (7 comments)

". . .we have an advisor-advisee system to keep track of students having problems." <9626>

". . .we have a counseling-advisor system." <0416>

". . .there's a faculty committee that periodically reviews student records; if we see a problem, we send a memo to the student's advisor." <2427>

". . .the vehicle we have is an advisor-advisee system." <0318>

". . .we have a structured program where the Assistant Dean is asked to interview such students." <1218>

". . .there is a structure set up for that; the Assistant Dean for Student Affairs gets many of these things automatically." <4225>

". . .the Dean sends around a sheet every four weeks to faculty to indicate students having difficulty in class; names appearing more than once will be contacted by the Associate Dean." <6115>

Table 5-11 (cont'd.).

D. Why students may hesitate to come to faculty (4 comments)

". . .student has too much at stake and avoids letting professors know of the problem, especially those professors who grade his papers or from whom he needs recommendations for placement." <3115>

". . .because students are timid in approaching a faculty member." <4325>

". . .he may be groping for help, doesn't know how to make a decision, he's timid." <9217>

". . .or possibly he's unaware of problem." <1217>

E. Why faculty may hesitate to seek out students (12 comments)

". . .I wish I were more sensitive; not moving at such a fast pace." <9126>

". . .we can't always do it because of the press of time." <7226>

". . .because of the time schedule." <9326>

". . .depends on the relationship with the student, of course." <3617>

". . .depends a lot on the students, if there's a relationship so I can take the initiative." <2628>

". . .once in awhile, I'll be aggressive, depending on the relationship, if the guy's got shock absorbers." <4526>

". . .depends on the personality of the professor, it's an individual matter, I would be reticent." <5317>

". . .depending on the energy level of the professor." <0515>

". . .with an unprepared approach, all kinds of psychological defense mechanisms may crop up." <4217>

". . .the professor fears recrimmination by students since the professor will be less popular." <2326>

". . .the professor is fallible, it might involve a personality clash." <1326>

". . .we worked here to encourage students to a kind of self-determination; the students ought to also take responsibility." <4415>

own struggles in class, and be friendly to students, hoping that this would prompt a student to come to them. Many professors would want the student to know that they are available and willing to help the student. Most of the schools have developed some structure to assist in identifying students with needs and notifying the dean of students or the students' advisor.

Some professors know that students may be very hesitant to seek the aid of faculty in a time of need because it may jeopardize their chances of receiving certification or degree candidacy. Other reasons may include timidity, indecision or ignorance of the problem itself.

But faculty are also human and experience their own struggles and needs. Faculty may neglect or hesitate to seek out a student for a number of reasons: busyness, insensitivity to students' problems and relationships with students. Whether a professor takes the initiative or not appears to be no simple matter. A number of complex factors must be taken into consideration.

Qualitative Observations

Some of the responses in the chapter deserve special notice. With regard to question 10 and the case of plagiarism, some faculty expressed the tension that existed in assuming two roles. One role related to being a member of an academic institution in upholding the integrity of the program. Professors must be fair to other students who have earned

grades, and be faithful to the school policies regarding consequences for infractions. The other role involves assuming a pastoral orientation and seeking to counsel and encourage a needy fellow believer--of coming alongside and sharing the burden.

A similar tension was evident in some responses to question 11. Who should take the initiative to bring student and professor together when the student is experiencing a personal problem: the professor or the student? On the one hand, professors want to encourage adult responsibility and wean students off of a dependency on the professor and school structures. On the other hand, professors, with deep pastoral feelings, want to reach out and seek the student to provide assistance and comfort.

In dealing with the case of plagiarism (question 10), there was a great diversity in what consequences would be meted out to the student. A student might receive an F in the course, or the student may be given an opportunity to do another paper with no penalty. Most of the faculty would refer the matter to another school official if a pattern of plagiarism was observed. Yet one faculty member stated that the matter would always be referred to the appropriate committee to provide consistency of treatment, while another faculty member would rarely refer the matter to the administration and would rather deal with the student personally.

Summary

Faculty would like to be remembered for how they helped students to learn information and skills; for the kind of person they were, for showing concern, for holding certain convictions, and being an example; and for the capability professors manifested in their own discipline.

In meeting with students outside of class, professors mostly enjoy conversing with students on matters related to the students' lives as well as issues related to their discipline. A few professors attempt to get involved socially with students. When they meet with students, many professors have some purpose in mind to help and encourage the student in specific ways. Some professors desire to develop closer relationships with students. A few professors have no real purpose in such encounters.

When professors discover a case of academic dishonesty, they wish to help the student to arrive at some personal resolution of the matter. A difficulty faced by some faculty is the tension between upholding the integrity of the academic program and meeting the personal needs of the student in such a situation. Professors are watching for a repentant attitude when confronted with the infraction and professors wish to understand why the student would attempt such an action--what meaning did the behavior have for the student.

A great disparity exists in what penalty is assigned to students (rewriting a paper with no penalty, a lower grade

on the rewritten paper, F on the paper or failing the whole course) and at what point the professor would report or refer the matter to the administration (always, rarely, depending on the weight of the term paper, on the first instance of wrongdoing, only if a pattern develops, etc.). In addition, a few professors made comments about what they do to help students avoid such temptations.

In most cases, when a professor learns that a student has a personal need, the majority of professors would take the initiative to seek out the student and offer assistance. There may be a tendency for those professors with previous pastoral experience to choose this option rather than let the student take the initiative. All professors would take the initiative if the situation was desperate. At first professors would use indirect methods to pave the way for the student to feel free to come to them (such as making casual conversation in the hallway, sharing their own problems in class, praying for them).

Professors also identified a number of factors which may prevent students from seeking a professor's help (being timid, afraid of not being recommended to graduate) and some factors which may discourage professors from seeking out the student (not a close relationship, too busy, a personality clash with the student). Seminaries have devised structures to assist faculty in monitoring such needs. One such structure is the advisor-advisee framework in which a number of students are placed in the care of a faculty member, or a

Dean of Students may be hired to focus attention on student
development and needs.

Chapter 6

FINDINGS:
INSTITUTIONALIZED INFLUENCES ON MORAL DEVELOPMENT

Chapter 6 presents the findings related to the third

research question.

Research question 3: As perceived by the faculty, what
aspects of the seminary program are intended to
influence or have influenced the students' moral
development?

The professors' attention was focused on some of the program

elements and structured aspects of the seminary program.

What curricular attention has been given to promoting

students' growth toward moral maturity?

Responses to the interview questions and information

from school documents were analyzed following the same

procedures which were described in Chapter 4. The presenta-

tion of the findings in the chapter is different from the

two previous chapters. Since the focus of the chapter is

institutional influences, a discussion of each seminary's

program constititutes the main outline sections of the

chapter. Responses from professors teaching at the same

institution are joined together to provide a composite

picture. In order to preserve anonymity, the following

fictitious school names were randomly assigned to each

seminary: Colonial, Cornerstone, Foundational, Heritage, Historical and Memorial.

<u>Overview of the Interview Questions</u>

Five interview questions are treated in Chapter 6 (5, 8-alternate, 12, 15 and 16). Since the interview questions are not listed in the body of the chapter because of the different outline, the questions are cited below. (Question 8-alternate involved a series of six questions related to the seminary course which specifically covers the topic of moral development. This series of questions is cited in Appendix A.)

> <u>Interview question (Ques.) 5</u>. Let's assume that a student is interested in further moral growth and has asked you to recommend some courses at the seminary. Now, I realize that probably all of the seminary courses will have some implications for encouraging moral growth. But, which top 2 or 3 courses would you recommend that the student be sure to take before he/she graduates?
>
> <u>Ques. 12</u>. When students wish to suggest changes in the curriculum, academic policies, student life, and related matters, what particular avenues at the seminary are available to accomplish this?
>
> <u>Ques. 15</u>. At any time during their seminary years, do the students receive some form of feedback regarding their own personal and moral development by someone or some group from the seminary? (Probe for specific procedures.)
>
> <u>Ques. 16</u>. Think back to the faculty meetings this school year. Do you happen to remember if matters related to a student's personal or moral life were discussed in any meetings? (Probe for frequency; purpose of the discussion, what concerns were evident; and what implications or action points resulted from the discussion.)

In addition to these findings, data are presented about two other matters. Since chapel services were frequently

mentioned as a means of moral development, some descriptive information is given about the chapel (frequency and length of services, whether student attendance is required or not, and who or what committee is responsible for chapel). This information was received through letters from each school.

Also, findings are presented regarding some admission practices. Based on the application and reference forms of each school, what specific information related to the applicant's moral maturity is requested?

Colonial Theological Seminary

The following findings relate to the program at Colonial.

Courses influencing students' moral development (Table 6-1)

Professors made reference to twelve different items. An equal number of required and elective courses were mentioned (six each). Nine of the courses are taught in the classical departments, and three of the courses are taught in the ministry-related departments. Two courses were mentioned by all four faculty members.

In three seminary courses, the subject of moral development is discussed; one course is required, and the others are elective. The three courses are all taught by one professor, the only faculty member teaching on moral development theory. In the required course (Teaching Ministry of the Church), the subject is only introduced very briefly.

Table 6-1

Courses Influencing Moral Development at Colonial Seminary

A. Courses mentioned more than once:

1. Basic Christian Ethics (R, C, 3 cr, 4)
   A study of the principles of Christian conduct.

2. Christian Social Ethics (R, C, 3 cr, 4)
   A study of the structures and forces of social existence and an address to current issues in social morality.

3. Philosophy of Religion (R, C, 3 cr, 2)
   A study of representative philosophical issues implicit in religious existence.

4. A required elective course chosen from the department of Moral and Philosophical Theology; it may or may not be a course specifically dealing with ethics (E, C, 3 cr, 3)

5. Pastoral Care (R, M, 3 cr, 2)
   An introduction to the church's pastoral care of the individual, the family, the congregation, and members of the community.

6. Courses in Church History (R, C, 2)

B. Courses mentioned only once:

1. Fundamental Apologetics (R, C, 3 cr)
   A course in the principles of Christan Theism and in the science of its defense.

2. Theology of the Social Gospel (E, C, 3 cr)
   An examination and assessment of main doctrines, such as those concerning God, Christ, humanity, and kingdom, in the American "social Christianity" of 1865-1918.

3. The Apologetical Theology of C. S. Lewis (E, C, 3 cr)
   A study of the methods used by C. S. Lewis to communicate and defend Christianity.

4. Studies in Spirituality (E, C; not listed in catalog)

Table 6-1 (cont'd.).

5. The Art of Cross-cultural Ministry (E, M, 3 cr)
   Crucial areas of cross-cultural ministry are examined
   in the light of principles of ecclesiology and
   missiology and the data of social and cultural
   anthropology. The course addresses such matters as:
   understanding another culture or sub-culture, coping
   with change and cultural differences, and preparing
   oneself for ministry in another culture.

6. Courses in the History of Missions (E, M)

Courses covering the subject of moral development

1. The Teaching Ministry of the Church (R, M, 3 cr)
   A study of the biblical and theological foundations of
   the teaching aspect of the church's ministry. Special
   consideration is given to the catechizing of children
   and youth. Perspectives from the social sciences are
   included.

2. The Christian Nurture of Children (E, M, 3 cr)
   A study of the moral, spiritual, emotional, and social
   development of children from birth to adolescence, and
   the implications for the teaching ministry of the
   church.

3. Youth Ministries (E, M, 3 cr)
   A study of the moral, spiritual, emotional and social
   aspects of adolescence, and their implications for the
   church's various ministries to youth.

Legend:
        R = Required course in the M.Div. program
        E = Elective course
        C = Course offered within the Classical departments
        M = Course offered within the Ministry-related
              departments
        # cr = Number of hours or credits assigned to the
              course, if listed in the catalog
        # = Number of professors (n=4) who mentioned the course

        Required course sequencing not listed in catalog.

In the two elective courses, about one-fifth of the course is devoted to dealing with issues of moral development. The purpose of teaching the material is to make the students more aware of themselves than to learn the particular stages. In both courses, students are required to do a small field project, interviewing children or adolescents. Since the students begin to realize that the child's reasoning is limited, the professor hopes that, "it will be the last time they [the students] give one of those dumb children's sermons." Besides the Piagetian developmental theory which is covered, the following moral development texts are used as major resources:

Duska, R. & Wheelan, M. Moral Development: A Guide to Piaget and Kohlberg. Paulist Press, 1975.

Dykstra, C. Vision and Character: A Christian Educator's Alternative to Kohlberg. Paulist, 1981.

Wilcox, M. Developmental Journey: A Guide to the Development of Logical and Moral Reasoning and Social Perspective. Abingdon, 1979.

This professor also teaches a few sessions of the Family Ministries course (an elective) where he uses the following text:

Ward, T. Values Begin at Home. Victor, 1979.

Student participation in seminary governance

Students have various avenues of making their wishes known. Student-directed vehicles include: course evaluations (in which students themselves design the forms, compile and report the results to each faculty member), the student newspaper, and the student senate, which has its own

committees. Avenues to which students have access include: an
elected student observer at faculty meetings and elected
student representives on almost all faculty committees
(educational policies, curriculum revision, admissions and
standards, social functions, worship, and special functions).
At the beginning of each term the Dean calls together student
representatives of each class and some faculty members, and
they analyze the student workload and sequencing of exams for
the term. Students may also approach an individual faculty
member or they may make an appeal to the denominational
board.

Feedback on Students' Personal and Moral Development

Responses from faculty included three formal vehicles
for reviewing an individual student's development. The most
regular opportunity for personal feedback involves the
advisor or counselor-advisee relationship. Much of the
school's monitoring system is built around this system.
Approximately 12 students are assigned to the care of a
faculty member throughout the student's time at the
seminary. Weekly voluntary meetings together may include
times of Bible study, prayer and general discussion.

Some structured questionnaires and forms from ATS's
"Readiness for Ministry" project are used to assist in
reflecting on personal growth and readiness for ministry.
Also, first year students take a psychological test and the
faculty counselor discusses the results with the student.
During the second year the faculty counselor meets with the

student to go over a list of nine personal qualities and the student's school record.

Following a field education ministry assigment, students turn in a report on their experience and then undergo an interview or "talk down" with their faculty counselor regarding the experience, the field supervisor's evaluation and the student's own reflection on the ministry. Also, as a part of their field education requirements, students are required to write a paper in which they reflect on a particular ministry experience in terms of their theology. Students meet in small groups led by a faculty and present their papers and receive criticism and suggestions from the group.

The Admissions and Standards committee regularly reviews students' academic records (grades, late papers) to monitor progress in the program and to watch for danger signals. Sometimes, a memo will be sent to the student's counselor for a follow-up interview to investigate difficulties. One faculty member felt that the system involves a lot of paper shuffling, hand holding, and prying into students' lives. However, the counselor-advisee system does manifest a concerted effort on the part of the seminary to retain a personal focus on the student. Additional faculty comments suggested that students receive some feedback through casual counseling and talking in the hallways and after class.

Discussions at faculty meetings

Each spring, because of the seminary's responsibility to the denomination, faculty must vote whether students are

recommended for the ministry and graduation. In preparation for this, each faculty counselor must write a brief evaluation of students in their charge. These evaluations are distributed to all faculty members. At the faculty meeting, a student's progress and potential for ministry is discussed and, then by an affirmative vote, the student's name is placed on a list of recommended candidates. The list is submitted to the seminary's board of trustees for approval.

Earlier in December and January, a sheet is passed around for faculty to list any students they think may be experiencing difficulties, whether academic or personal. For those names that appear repeatedly on the list, the Admissions and Standards committee will contact that faculty counselor. The faculty counselor meets with the student and will suggest possible avenues of dealing with the matter (for example, an additional internship). Besides recommendation for candidacy, faculty may, on occasion discuss personal matters, such as a student's moral development, or the quality of a student's sermon, or how the student relates to other persons. Smaller faculty committees have been designed to take up such matters.

Chapel services

Colonial's chapel services are held on Monday and Friday. (The Wednesday slot is set aside for faculty counselors and their advisees to meet on a weekly basis.) Services usually last about 30 to 40 minutes and attendance

is voluntary. Chapel services are the responsibility of the
chapel committee (members are elected each year) comprised
of two faculty members and two students.

Relevant application information requested

Only general references are made concerning the personal
life of the student. The student must write a one-page auto-
biography including information about childhood, education
and personal development. The student must also give a brief
statement about a personal Christian commitment. Reference
forms include requests for general information concerning
matters regarding Christian doctrine or life which should be
noted. In addition, a request is made from the student's
college counselor and major college professor for candid
statements about the student in matters related to, among
other things, the applicant's character, personality and
social sensitivity. A note in the school catalog provides
general guidelines for student conduct.

Cornerstone Theological Seminary

The following findings relate to the program at
Cornerstone.

Courses influencing moral development (Table 6-2)

This particular interview question was not asked of the
professors (the school was one of the sites of the pilot
study). To allow some kind of comparison with other schools,
a list has been compiled of possible courses from the catalog
which faculty might have suggested. Had the question been

Table 6-2

Suggestive Listing of Courses Influencing Moral Development
    at Cornerstone Seminary

1. Pastoral Problems and Procedures (R-3rd yr, M, 3 cr)
   This course devotes extensive consideration to the
   problems faced in the pastoral ministry. The specific
   curriculum is planned by student and instructor cooper-
   ation. Laboratory techniques are used in addition to
   lectures and class discussion. Student projects are
   developed.

2. Christian Ethics (E, C, 2 cr)
   [taught alternate summers by a visiting professor]
   A study and evaluation of the major theories of
   goodness, obligation, and motive; and the development of
   a consistent Christian theory of value and obligation.

3. Seminar on Biblical Ethics and Contemporary Issues
   (E, C, 2 cr; advanced students only)
   This study evaluates the various philosophical systems
   of ethics and emphasizes the Christian's personal
   ethical responsibilities in the church and in society.
   Includes a study of selected ethical problems in
   contemporary culture.

4. The Philosophy of Ministry
   [in planning stages, not listed in catalog]
   It would deal with the character of the minister:
   personal life, habits, consistency, servant attitude,
   and development of character.

Legend:
    R = Required course in the M.Div. program
    E = Elective course
    C = Course offered in Classical desciplines
    M = Course offered in Ministry-related disciplines
    # yr = Year when the required course is scheduled
    # cr = Number of credits assigned to the course

asked of faculty, additional courses would have probably been mentioned. At Cornerstone, there is no specific course which deals with the topic of moral development.

Student participation in seminary governance

The student council is the chief vehicle for making suggestions for the program, usually after they have polled the student body. Recommendations are given to the dean, who in turn submits them to the Academic Affairs committee (Dean and department heads), which then submits the issue to the whole faculty at a faculty meeting. The Assistant Dean of Student Affairs sits on the council. There are student representatives on three faculty committees: Bible Conference (student body president), Missions Conference (president and vice president of the World Missions Fellowship) and Library and Learning Resources (two student representatives).

Feedback on students' moral and personal development

There is no structured format which assesses students' development during their time at the seminary, besides what is done for entrance to the program. When faculty become aware that a student is experiencing problems, the student's name is referred either to the Assistant Dean of Student Affairs, or the Academic Affairs committee.

Discussion at faculty meetings

When matters are brought to the whole faculty, which is infrequent, usually the purpose is to make faculty aware of the situation and to pray for the student. A smaller group of faculty, either the Admissions and Retention committee or

the Academic Affairs committee normally deals with such matters.

Chapel services

Chapel services are held four times a week and last about 40 minutes. Attendance is required of all students. A faculty Chapel and Conference committee oversees the services (student body chaplain, and three faculty members).

Relevant application information requested

Specific information is requested about personal habits (the regular use of tobacco, alcoholic beverages or non-medical drugs). The student must sign a statement which includes a commitment to,

> maintain the moral and spiritual ideals of the school, live a life of separation from worldly amusements, render due respect to the members of its faculty, and fully conform to its social, academic and spiritual regulations.

Among other written statements, students are requested to submit a one-page account of their Christian experience.

The reference forms include, besides the usual open-ended questions, a specific listing of 10 areas for which the student must be evaluated: cooperation, emotions, initiative, judgment and common sense, leadership, personality, reliability, Christian character, communication skills, and writing. For each item, one of six gradations must be checked, ranging from an outstanding feature to not observed. The continuum for "Christian character" (maturity, vitality and consistency of life) includes these gradations: outstanding as a Christian, consistently Christian, rather consistent as a

Christian, questionable at times, little or no evidence, and not observed.

Foundational Theological Seminary

The following findings relate to the program at Foundational.

Courses influencing moral development (Table 6-3)

Faculty suggested that ten courses (or series of courses) have the most influence on students' moral development. Six of those courses mentioned are required and four are elective. Five of the courses are in the classical departments and the other five courses are offered in the ministry-related department. One required course treats the subject of moral development on Parish Education (the professor teaches other elective courses, but only mentioned this course since it was a course all students must take). In dealing with the subject in the course, the professor wishes students to break down the "discrete" categories of cognitive and affective, and to see the interrelationship of these domains. Another goal is to prompt cognitive dissonance in the students--to expose alternatives in ethical decision- making. The main texts used for the course include:

Bloom's cognitive and Krathwohl's affective taxonomies.

Dykstra, C. Vision and Character: A Christian Educator's Alternative to Kohlberg. Paulist, 1981.

Triandis, H. Attitude and Attitude Change. Wiley, 1971.

Table 6-3

Courses Influencing Moral Development at Foundational
Seminary

Courses mentioned more than once:

1. Required exegetical courses, in general
   (R, C, 1st & 2nd yr, 3 cr, 1)
   Specifically, Romans [or Galatians]
   (R, C, 2nd yr, 3 cr, 1)
   Translation and interpretation of selected chapters of
   the Epistle to the Romans. Special attention is given
   to terminology and the argument and theology of the
   epistle.

2. Required doctrinal courses, in general
   (R, C, each year, 3 cr, 1)
   Specifically, the confessions of the church
   (R, C, 1st yr, 6 cr, 1)

3. Crisis Counseling (R, M, 3rd yr, 3 cr, 2)
   The concept of crisis and how to intervene creatively
   are treated in this course. The nature of crisis, its
   signs, development and effect are given consideration.
   The function of pastoral counseling as it relates to
   specific crises in the lives of people is examined.

Courses mentioned only once:

1. Christian Social Ethics (R, M, 3rd yr, 3 cr)
   The course focuses on the role and function of Christian
   ethics relative to social problems and issues that
   concern and affect Christian social responsibility.
   Special emphasis is given to abortion, birth control,
   capital punishment, homosexuality, mental "illness," and
   pollution problems.

2. Christian Faith and Life (R, C, 2nd yr, 3 cr)
   Saving faith. Conversion. Justification by faith. The
   Christian life. Perseverance in faith.

3. Required Preaching courses (R, M, each year, 3 cr)

4. Biblical Ethics: Contrast and Application (E, C, 3 cr)
   Biblical ethics understood from a distinctly [denomi-
   national] perspective, are contrasted with a variety of
   contemporary thought systems. In the context of a
   pluralistic society, the fundamental Biblical principles
   which pertain to ethics are examined and applied.

Table 6-3 (cont'd.).

5. Modern Apologetics (E, C, 3 cr)
   Focuses on how Biblical Christianity can and needs to
   be defended in a secular, scientific era. . . .

6. New course on the spiritual or devotional life and
   formation (E, M; not listed in catalog)

7. Marriage enrichment (E, M; not listed in catalog)

Course covering the subject of Moral development

1. Parish Education (R, M, 2nd yr, 3 cr)
   A foundation course which examines the principles and
   practice of Christian education at the parish level.
   Special attention is given to a [denominational]
   perspective of education, the psychology of learning,
   the art of teaching, parish education at the adult
   level, and support systems for parish education.

Legend:
      R = Required course in the M.Div. program
      E = Elective course
      C = Course offered in the Classical disciplines
      M = Course offered in the Ministry-related disciplines
      # yr = Year when required course is scheduled
      # cr = Number of credits assigned to the course
      # = Number of professors (n=4) who mentioned the course

A unit of the course is devoted to the issue of moral development.

Student participation in seminary governance

On the Academic Policies committee sit 6 faculty and 3 student representatives. Students can have an influence on the decisions made, but they do not have a vote. The effectiveness of these students depends to a large extent on how well they represent the wishes and needs of the whole student body. Besides this, there is a student legislature, and individual students may take a matter to a faculty member, officers of the school or the Board of Regents.

Feedback on students' moral development

The seminary also depends heavily on an advisor- advisee system to maintain a focus on personal aspects of student life (approximately 9 to 15 students are assigned to a faculty member). As one professor commented, the effectiveness of the system depends on each faculty; some do a better job than others. The ATS "Readiness for ministry" assessment program is used by the seminary and the advisors as one structured means to aid them in monitoring students' progress in academic, professional and personal development. During the first year, advisor and student meet on three occasions to discuss scores and evaluations resulting from the assessment procedures. The seminary also has an Associate Dean whose main responsibility is to encourage faculty advisors to maintain close relationships with students. One professor remarked that the system is not perfect, but it is

much better than when he went to seminary.

During the students' extended internship ministry, the supervising pastor provides the evaluation for the student. Students also undergo two important interviews by the placement department. One interview follows an extended term of ministry internship and the other interview comes before placement during the final year of studies. One final check-point involves the Certification committee. Students must be certified for the denomination and the committee makes recommendations on each student during the last half of the final year. Only in extreme cases are students' names brought before the whole faculty for certification.

Discussions at faculty meetings

Matters related to student problems are normally taken up by smaller faculty committees, or by the Dean and Associate Dean. The faculty has given the Certification committee the authority to certify students. This committee then sends a list of certified students to the faculty for approval. At that time, a discussion about a particular student may ensue.

Chapel services

Each day of the week chapel services are held for about 25 minutes at Foundational seminary. Attendance is voluntary and the Dean of the Chapel is responsible for the program.

Relevant application information requested

Both the application form and the reference form identify five characteristics of a pastor (with appropriate

Scripture citations) on which the applicant is evaluated.

Four of these areas relate to personal qualities: (words are

used from the book of Titus) arrogant or quick-tempered;

drunkard or violent or greedy; hospitable, one who loves

what is good; and master of himself, upright, holy and

self-controlled. Under each item there are four statements:

A) With the assistance of God the Holy Spirit, these
   behavior characteristics are not part of my
   personality.
B) I recognize the troublesome nature of such behavior
   and struggle against it, sometimes successfully and
   sometimes not.
C) I have a problem with [area]. Specify:
D) Provide your own comments on a separate sheet of
   paper if you consider them to be appropriate or
   helpful.

Heritage Theological Seminary

The following findings relate to the program at

Heritage.

Courses influencing moral development (Table 6-4)

The faculty suggested that six courses (or areas) would

influence the students' growth toward moral maturity. One

course, Church and Society, was mentioned by all faculty. Of

the six courses, three were required and three were elective.

Four of the courses are taught in the classical departments,

one is offered in the ministry-related department, and the

other one is an interdisciplinary course.

Two professors at the seminary teach the subject of

moral development in their classes. One course is required

for all students, The Teaching Ministry of the Church. The

Table 6-4

<u>Courses Influencing Moral Development at Heritage Seminary</u>

A. Courses mentioned more than once:

1. Church and Society (R, C, 2nd yr, 4)
   This course considers theological presuppositions about
   the relation-tension of Christian-world and Church-
   society and analyzes the United States' socio-economic-
   political-cultural situation as a reality in conflict.
   Students engage in a contemporary reading of the Bible
   from this perspective in order to develop paradigms for
   the Church's life and mission.

2. Seminar in Human Development (E, M, 3)
   This is a basic course which focuses on the character-
   istics and interrelationships of developmental stages,
   including stages of moral and faith development. It also
   compares and critiques some of the major theories and
   explores applications to Christian education.

3. Christ and Ethics: A Historical/Theological Approach
   (E, C, 2)
   In this course the typology developed in <u>Christ and the
   Moral Life</u> by James M. Gustafson will be used to guide
   source readings in various traditions. Students will be
   encouraged to clarify and articulate their own under-
   standing of this issue and relate it to the patterns
   typical of their own theological and ecclesiastical
   traditions.

B. Courses mentioned only once:

1. Synoptic Gospels (R, C, 1st yr)
   This course has two foci: the context, development and
   writing of the Synoptic Gospels, and their content, the
   ministry of Jesus. The first half treats the Synoptic
   problem and the question of Jesus and the Gospels. The
   second half looks at the significant events and
   teachings of Jesus' ministry from the standpoint of
   source, form and redaction studies.

2. Assessment/Colloquium courses (R, C & M, each year)
   I: The purpose of this assessment is (1) to confirm (or
   not confirm) each student's potential for pursuing a
   degree program at Heritage, and (2) to orient students
   to the overall assessment process.

Table 6-4 (cont'd.).

II. The principal function of this assessment is to diagnose students' strengths and weaknesses in their preparation for ministry, so that areas of strength might be further affirmed and appropriate remedial steps pursued in the area of weakness.

III. The primary purposes of this assessment are 1) to evaluate the students' understanding of the Christian faith, 2) to ascertain their ability to articulate that faith and 3) to assist them in their preparation for ordination.

3. any electives in ethics offered (E, C)

Courses covering the subject of moral development

1. The Teaching Ministry of the Church (R, M, 2nd yr)
   This course is a basic course which introduces the teaching ministry of the church utilizing five contemporary approaches to Christian religious education. Students learn a basic instructional method and lead a peer group in a learning experience.

2. Seminar in Human Development (E, M)
   (cited above)

3. Ministry with Youth (E, M)
   This course aims to develop the student's ministry skills with youth including: teaching, prayer, communion, advocacy and trouble making. Three settings are used for leadership development including: 1) interviews with high school students; 2) a weekend retreat; and 3) seminar leadership on a selected topic. Church and community approaches to youth will be considered.

Legend:
   R = Required course in the M.Div. program
   E = Elective course
   C = Course offered in the Classical disciplines
   M = Course offered in the Ministry-related disciplines
   # yr = Year when the required course is scheduled
   # = Number of professors (n=4) who mentioned the course

   Credit hours per course were not listed in catalog.

professor wishes students (a) to understand the developmental process, of biological, psychological and social maturation; (b) to understand that faith development is linked to psychological and social development, and that, though it may conform to a stage theory, development is not automatic; and (c) to be able to communicate with all ages of people--to communicate at the appropriate level of the person being dealt with. The major text in the course (and the Ministry with Youth elective course) is:

> Goldman, R. Religious Thinking from Childhood to Adolescence. Seabury, 1968.

The other two courses are both elective, one taught by each of the professors. In the Ministry with Youth course, students are required to interview high school students on a weekly basis with a Kohlberg-type format. The professor teaching the Seminar in Human Development attempts to help students understand the theories by doing interviews themselves. Students should be able to critique the theories of Kohlberg and others. Almost one-third of the course is devoted to the subject. Major texts or readings include:

> Dykstra, C. Vision and Character: A Christian Educator's Alternative to Kohlberg. Paulist, 1981.
>
> Fowler, J. some articles on Faith Development.
>
> Gilligan, C. In a Different Voice. Harvard, 1982.
>
> Joy, D. (Ed.) Moral Development Foundations: Judeo-Christian Alternatives to Piaget/Kohlberg. Abingdon, 1983.
>
> Kohlberg, L. some articles on moral reasoning.
>
> Moran, G. some articles on religious education.

Student participation in seminary governance

All avenues are open to students at Heritage. Students have had representatives on almost all faculty committees since the 1960's, including the important Educational Policies committee which meets weekly. Two student representatives are elected to this committee, for two year terms on a staggered basis. In addition, students pressured the seminary for a representative on the Board of Trustees. (This action prompted the faculty to follow suit.) One committee, the Academic Council (comprising the Dean and heads of the departments) has no student representative.

Students have other vehicles of expression such as the student newspaper and student government. The student government officers were recently voted out of office by the student body over concerns that the government was not responsive to the needs of all students. An ad hoc committee was set up to deal with these concerns. A Due Process committee, which has not needed to convene in two years, is available to receive grievances and arbitrate matters. Students may also approach individual faculty members or the Dean's office.

Feedback on students' moral development

Two primary vehicles were cited by faculty. Heritage also uses the ATS "Readiness for ministry" assessment tools. Students take tests, write self-assessments and these are reviewed periodically by a small committee of faculty and the student. Each year the assessment has a different focus

(see Table 6-4 under Assessment/Colloquium). These tools help a student know where he or she falls on a scale, but they don't specifically provide moral guidance.

Another means of feedback relates to the field education experience. While on the experience, evaluation is provided by the supervising pastor. If a problem arises, the student may then be called in to have a conference with the Field Education director. Heritage also uses an advisor-advisee system in which approximately 20 students are assigned to a faculty member. In addition, a faculty committee annually reviews of students' records to identify any problems. One professor raised the question concerning which insititution is ultimately responsible for evaluating the student's professional and personal competency: is it the church, or is it the seminary? There are also legal matters to consider. Does the seminary have the right to deny a degree to a student who has completed the academic requirements, but may not fulfill expectations of personal and moral maturity?

Discussions at faculty meetings

On a few occasions, situations are mentioned to faculty for their information. For example, at the end of the year, faculty are notified regarding how many students will continue in the program next year and how many were not recommended to continue; no names are usually mentioned. Usually it must be an outstanding case for the matter to be brought before the whole faculty. The faculty are hesistant to vote on dismissing a student without highly sophisticated

evidence. In the few cases when it has come to such proportions, something has usually happened to intervene and dissolve the problem (for instance, a student voluntarily leaving). In most cases, the faculty discipline committee deals with such matters.

Chapel services

Chapels are held two times a week and services last approximately 40 to 45 minutes. Attendance is voluntary and the faculty chairman of the Chapel committee is responsible for organizing the program.

Relevant application information requested

The student is requested to complete a candid autobiographical statement of 400 or more words. Six items should be included in the statement which primarily focuses on the student's sense of responsibility and commitment to the vocational role of a pastor (two questions) and why the student wants to go to seminary, specifically Heritage Seminary (two questions). Students are also asked to discuss their own Christian experience.

Reference forms request an evaluation of the applicant concerning twelve items: health and physical condition, care in financial matters, intellectual ability, initiative and perseverance (ability to see things to do and diligence in accomplishing tasks), intellectual creativity, social acceptance, leadership (check more than one if applicable), cooperation, emotional stability, Christian experience (evaluate the applicant's spiritual maturity and Christian

witness), professional promise, and marital status (if
married, additional questions follow). From two to five
categories are available for checking with each item, in
addition to an open "comments" section.

Historical Theological Seminary

The following findings relate to the program at
Historical.

Courses influencing moral development (Table 6-5)

Professors suggested six different courses: two of the
courses are required and four are elective. Four of the
courses are offered in the classical departments and the
other two are offered in the ministry-related departments.

The two courses treating the subject of moral development
are taught by the same professor, though other professors are
knowledgeable of the theory and research in moral development.
Educational Ministry of the Church is a first year required
course and the topic of moral development is taken up in two
sessions. For the elective course, the subject is treated in
five sessions. The professor has three aims in dealing with
the subject, (1) students would be aware of the literature of
moral development research, (2) students would understand that
their church members may be listening to their teaching and
sermons at different levels of understanding, and (3) students
would know something about how to help the people develop and
grow toward moral maturity. Major readings for the courses
include:

Table 6-5

Courses Influencing Moral Development at Historical Seminary

A. Courses mentioned more than once:

1. Christian Ethics (R, C, 3rd yr, 2 cr, 3)
   Biblical perspectives on contemporary ethical issues
   facing the church and the minister: divorce, abortion,
   euthanasia, genetic control, sex, war, racism, ecology,
   personal life style, and the church's social
   responsibilities.

2. Personal Development for Ministry (E, M, 2 cr, 2)
   A study encouraging self-assessment and the measuring
   of gifts for careers in ministry and covering the
   personal disciplines of piety, and of interpersonal
   relationships in light of biblical materials designed
   to focus on the leading of an exemplary Christian life
   midst the pressures of school and parish life.

3. Old Testament Ethics (E, C, 2; not listed in catalog)

4. Psychological and Sociological Foundations of Learning
   (E, M, 3 cr, 2)
   Study of the changes in human behavior by which skills,
   knowledge and attitudes are learned and a survey of the
   schools of learning theory; contemporary sociological
   problems in church developmental processes in the light
   of the development of individuals in relation to their
   socio-economic background.

B. Courses mentioned only once:

1. Latter Prophets (R, C, 2nd yr, 4 cr)
   An historical, hermeneutical and theological study of
   the major and minor prophets against the background of
   the times and the history of the divided monarchy.

2. Matthew (E, C, 3 cr) [or James; not listed in catalog]
   Discussion of the fulfillment of the Old Testament in
   the person and teachings of Jesus, the meaning of the
   Sermon on the Mount, and the teachings of Jesus about
   the Kingdom.

Table 6-5 (cont'd.).

Courses covering the subject of moral development

1. Educational Ministry of the Church (R-1st yr, M, 4 cr)
   Introduction to local church administration and
   teaching, focusing on the aims, principles, organization
   and development of a local church educational program
   and on the aims, methods, media, and evaluation of the
   teaching process.

2. Psychological and Sociological Foundations of Learning
   (E, M, 3 cr) (cited earlier)

Legend:
    R = Required course in the M.Div. program
    E = Elective course
    C = Course offered in Classical desciplines
    M = Course offered in Ministry-related disciplines
    # yr = Year when the required course is scheduled
    # cr = Number of credits assigned to the course
    # = Number of professors (n=4) who mentioned the course

213

structural vehicle for monitoring students' development. The
process is being built into the existing advisor-advisee
system, but is supervised by the Dean of Students. During
their second year, students would be recommended for continua-
tion and candidacy in the program, based on previous objective
and subjective measures.

Discussions at faculty meetings

Problems are usually dealt with by the Student Develop-
ment committee. The committee keeps the faculty appraised of
situations, but normally without identifying student names.
Faculty can then know enough about the matter to pray for
the student(s) involved.

Chapel services

Historical offers three chapel services a week. On
Tuesday and Friday chapels are 30 minutes in length and on
Thursday a service is 50 minutes in length. On Wednesday,
the time slot is given over to advisor-advisee support
groups. Attendance is voluntary and the Dean of Students is
responsible for organizing the chapel program.

Relevant application information requested

Students are requested to submit a one-page personal
statement discussing the student's past and present Christian
experience. In addition, the student must sign a statement in
which the student agrees "to comply with the rules and
regulations which may be in force during my enrollment at
Historical Theological Seminary."

On the reference form, seven general areas are listed

on which the applicant should be evaluated: industry, initiative, dependability, character, social acceptability, sociability, and quality of work. Under each item, one of five categories can be marked, ranging from an "outstanding quality" to "no opportunity to observe." The "character" item lists these categories: high moral and spiritual standards, shows growth and maturity, indifferent moral and spiritual standards, inconsistent attitudes and practices, and no opportunity to observe.

Memorial Theological Seminary

The following findings relate to the program at Memorial.

Courses influencing moral development (Table 6-6)

Professors mentioned five courses which they thought would influence the students' moral development. Two of the courses are required and both are scheduled for the first year. The other four courses are elective. All five of the classes are offered in the classical departments. One course was mentioned by all four faculty. One course at the seminary was specifically identified as dealing with the subject of moral development. The professor is concerned with helping the students apply biblical principles in moral decision-making.

Student participation in seminary governance

Since the size of the faculty is small, there are no faculty committees. Thus far, the whole faculty is able to

Table 6-6

Courses Influencing Moral Development at Memorial Seminary

A. Courses mentioned more than once:

1. Christian Life (R-1st yr, C, 3 cr, 4)
   An investigation into the meaning of biblical
   Christianity and its relationship to faith and
   practice.

2. Christian Ethics (E, C, 3 cr, 2)
   An examination of the basis and nature of Christian
   conduct. Analysis of ethical systems and related
   problems.

B. Courses mentioned only once:

1. Systematic Theology I (R-1st yr, C, 3 cr)
   A study of the nature, method, and rationale of
   theology with particular attention to the doctrines of
   God and the Scripture.

2. Christian World and Life View (E, C, 2 cr)
   An elaboration of the Christian perspective upon all of
   life and reality with emphasis upon basic matters such
   as method, being, knowing, and doing.

3. Early Apologetic Literature (E, C, 3 cr)
   A careful examination of Greek and Latin apologetics
   material from Aristedes to Lactantius to familiarize
   the student with the important heritage of the
   Christian church as reflected in the apologetic
   writings of the first four centuries.

Table 6-6 (cont'd.).

Course covering the subject of moral development

1. Total Curriculum Planning (E, M, 2 cr)
   Analysis of the total concept of curriculum dealing with
   objectives, sequencing, and evaluation. Examination of
   current concepts of curriculum development both in
   education and Christian education. The student is
   required to develop a total curriculum plan for a local
   church consistent with a Christian philosophy of
   education.

Legend:
       R = Required course in the M.Div. program
       E = Elective course
       C = Course offered in Classical disciplines
       M = Course offered in Ministry-related disciplines
       # yr = Year when the required course is scheduled
       # cr = Number of credits assigned to the course
       # = Number of professors (n=4) who mentioned the course

conduct the seminary business. Representative officers of the student senate may schedule a time to bring a matter to a faculty meeting. There is no regular student observer at the faculty meetings. Students may individually approach faculty members or the Dean regarding such matters.

Feedback on students' moral development

Students are assigned to a faculty advisor for their period of study at the seminary. In past years, there has not been a scheduled time set aside for advisees and advisors to meet. Next year, some of the regular chapel times will be set aside, periodically throughout the year, for this purpose. Once a month, the dean sends around a sheet requesting faculty to list the names of students who they feel are experiencing some difficulty which is affecting their performance. Names identified more than once are sent to the Associate Dean to initiate a conference with the student.

One checkpoint for students is their application for degree candidacy. Following the completion of 20 to 30 credits, the student submits a formal application for degree candidacy. The application process involves a formal interview with the faculty advisor in which all the student's records (such as academic records, ministry reports, and chapel attendance), are reviewed and discussed. Recommendations from the faculty advisor and the student's pastor are submitted to the faculty. Then, in one of the faculty meetings, the whole faculty will vote on whether to admit each student to degree candidacy and allow the student to

continue in the program. On occasion, degree candidacy will be postponed so that the student can deal with any problem that has arisen. In a few cases, candidacy is denied.

Discussions at faculty meetings

For the most part, discussions about the students' moral development at faculty meetings relate to students' degree candidacy, as described above. In almost every faculty meeting, faculty must vote on a few applications for degree candidacy. Otherwise, only gross violations are brought to the attention of the whole faculty. Usually the Dean or the Associate Dean is consulted on such matters.

Chapel services

Chapel services are held each day of the week are about 30 to 40 minutes long. Attendance is required if students have a class either immediately preceding or following the chapel time. The Associate Dean of Students is in charge of the program.

Relevant application information requested

In a section entitled, autobiographical information, students are requested to fill in a few lines and identify, among other things, (1) the experiences which have helped them grow in their Christian life, and (2) their "personal convictions and practices concerning such matters as the use of alcohol, tobacco, illegal drugs, attendance to movies and participation in social dancing." A lengthy statement of the standards of conduct is printed on the final page of the application form. Then, students are requested to sign a

statement in which they certify, among other things, "that I will honorably adhere to all the standards of the Seminary."

The personal reference forms list ten specific traits for which the applicant is to be assessed: teachability, dependability, judgment, initiative, accuracy, quality of work, quantity of work, attitude toward work, attitude toward peers, and attitude toward superiors. A continuum of four labeled gradations is provided for each item. An additional question asks whether the applicant has been found to be consistently honest.

Qualitative Observations

A few of the responses in the chapter merit additional comment. A diversity is apparent at seminaries in the emphasis placed on instruction in ethics. One seminary has a whole department devoted to philosophical and moral theology, while another seminary has no required courses in ethics. Though most schools have some procedure for monitoring students' personal development, the main emphasis tends to be that of identifying marginally problematic students, and not in facilitating students' development toward greater levels of moral maturity.

Summary

Most of the seminaries offer at least one course in ethics and a course covering the subject of moral development. In many seminaries, student representatives sit on almost all

faculty committees, permitting access to important information
and providing an avenue for suggesting changes. Seminaries
usually have some structure to monitor student progress. For
many, the advisor-advisee context is used as the center of the
system. Additional help is provided through assessment tools,
such as those from the ATS "Readiness for Ministry" project.
Generally, attention is given to academic criteria and "danger
signals" which may identify students experiencing problems.
Small committees are set up to deal with such problem
students. Thus faculty as a whole usually do not discuss such
matters.

Chapel services vary in frequency and last anywhere from
20 to 50 minutes in length. A few seminaries use one of the
chapel time slots to schedule meetings with advisees. Some
seminaries require chapel attendance, others make attendance
voluntary. A faculty member, school officer or faculty
committee supervises the chapel program. The information
requested on application and reference forms about students'
moral development is very general. Though some forms provide
an itemized checklist of traits to be evaluated, the brief
descriptions of the traits which could be related to moral
development are broad and ambiguous. Information is supplied
either through self-report or from references. Students now
have access to these files (a factor which may discourage
candid evaluations).

Chapter 7

CONCLUSIONS

The study examined the educational emphasis placed on
the moral development of ministerial students within the
curriculum of Protestant seminaries. In Chapter 1, the
problem was stated and three research questions were identi-
fied which guided the inquiry. Chapter 2 reviewed curriculum
analyses of theological education which gave attention to the
personal development of seminary students. In addition, the
empirical precedents for the study were cited from studies
investigating theological education and professional educa-
tion. Finally, research precedents were included which
focused on faculty perceptions in matters of moral develop-
ment from higher education and public education.

Methodology employed in the study was explained in
Chapter 3, including selection of the sample, instrument
development and the collection and analysis of the data.
Findings for the study based on personal interviews at six
seminaries were reported in Chapters 4, 5 and 6, each chapter
discussing the data related to one of the three research
questions. Chapter 4 treated the findings to the first
research question: educational tasks and moral development.

Chapter 5 discussed the data related to the second research question: faculty-student interactions and moral development. Chapter 6 dealt with the third research question: institutional influences and moral development.

In the present chapter, the findings are stated as conclusions regarding moral development as a component of seminary education, based on the perceptions of seminary faculty. In addition, a few qualitative observations from the findings are offered. The chapter concludes with a section on recommendations for curriculum improvement and a section in which recommendations are presented for further research.

Factors Influencing Students' Moral Development

The study identified six major themes of factors which faculty perceived as influencing the students' moral growth: (1) field education ministry and life experiences, (2) faculty-student relationships, (3) one's relationship to God and related worship experiences, (4) the discussion of moral issues, (5) peer interaction and group work, and (6) institutional program and structures. Each of these themes incorporates factors which facilitate or hinder the students' development toward moral maturity.

Field education ministry and life experiences

The majority of comments made by professors referred to the significant impact that field education ministries have on students. In such a real-life context, students are

confronted by people with needs and problems, and are forced
to make decisions--moral decisions. Such situations may be
prompted by a counseling appointment at the church, or a
problem at work, or a crisis facing a patient and the family
at a hospital, or the oppressive injustice being experienced
in an inner city context. Here, theory becomes applied, and
conceptions and convictions are shaped and adjusted. In some
cases, experience-oriented instructional means may be used
in the classroom to provide simulated exposures to life:
role play, analysis of case studies and the use of films.
Students are faced with reality and with choices to make.

But some experiences are more challenging than others,
and some professors wish students could have more diverse
encounters. The geographical setting of the seminary limits
such opportunities, for surburban and rural situations, but
in the urban settings, a host of varied experiences are
possible. The diversity of cultural backgrounds (or lack of
such diversity) of the student body may provide additional
exposure to differing perspectives.

Experiences which are competently supervised and
evaluated often yield greater learning, than just the
experience itself. A difficulty with field education involves
receiving candid reports from field supervisors. In addition,
some seminaries provide more intense reflection on these
experiences when students return to seminary than others
(such as a follow-up interview with the field education
director, or a written assignment in which the student

reflects on a ministry experience in light of theological perspectives).

Faculty-student relationships

An important emphasis was placed on the relationship between faculty and students. Much of a students' time at the seminary is spent in the company of the faculty, mostly in a class context, but also in the office, hallway or the faculty member's home. Many of the faculty in the study had a significant number of years in the full-time pastorate before they began a seminary teaching career. The professors take on a significant mediatorial function--academically, professionally and personally--in preparing seminarians for their future role. The professors themselves remember the encouragement and inspiration that their own seminary teachers were to them.

Professors enjoy informal discussions with students on a variety of topics relating to the students' lives or to the particular discipline of the faculty member. Few professors mentioned activities in which they do things together with students (athletics, social engagements, ministry together). Faculty responsibilities and busyness limits contacts with students. Busyness leads to a preoccupation with the task at hand and shifts attention and sensitivity from being directed toward the student as a person. Most faculty would take the initiative to seek out a student with a personal problem, but if the faculty advisor is not aware of the problem due to other factors, such efforts would not be forthcoming. In

cases of academic dishonesty, many faculty would use the occasion as one for student growth and they would work with the student to seek an appropriate solution to the matter.

Many schools have built their procedures for monitoring student development around the advisor-advisee relationship. The effectiveness of the procedures depends on individual faculty ability and availablity. Some schools schedule weekly meetings for advisees and other regular contacts between advisors and advisees (for instance, approving the class schedule each term), other schools have no such regular meeting. An additional factor affecting students involves the potential negative modeling of a faculty member as scholar and intellectual rather than as pastor and servant.

One's relationship to God

Many comments indicated, that one's morality is grounded in one's relationship to God. One's knowledge, thinking, sensitivity, values and will power grow out of an intimate devotional commitment to God. Seminaries do provide a regular formal worship experience for students as one means of fostering and nurturing such an intimacy. At some seminaries, additional emphasis is given through days of prayer and the celebration of the Eucharist. Communication with God through prayer is manifested in various locations: the classroom, the professors' office, and informal gatherings of students. This element distinguishes the seminary from other schools of professional education--its emphasis and reliance on the supernatural.

Some factors mitigate against the spirit of worship. In schools where chapel attendance is required, students may tend to fulfill the obligation for an external rather than an internal motive. For those schools in which chapel attendance is voluntary, the academic pressures may lead students to the library rather than the chapel.

The discussion of moral issues

Professors suggested three main purposes they hope to accomplish when they raise moral issues in class. They want students to think clearly, to understand the complexity of moral issues, and to be aware of the various options which one may choose. Students must also be able to identify the relevant biblical principles and issues at stake--to be able to separate the cultural from the universal. Finally, professors encourage students to make a decision, to articulate a position and to commit themselves to act accordingly.

The promotion of the acquisition of knowledge and an inattention to critical thinking skills may be precipitated by the seminary's priority for the biblical content. Almost all of the professors agreed that, of the five aspects of moral development suggested to them, students would have a high degree of learning in the area of moral knowledge. Few courses genuinely encourage students to think for themselves. Faculty teaching methods and the general classical educational system are more in harmony with a pedagogical (child-training) orientation than an andragogical (adult education) one.

<u>Peer interaction and group work</u>

Both faculty and fellow students are the main persons with whom seminarians interact on a daily basis at the seminary. Probably more personal contact is made with fellow students during the seminary years. Through various experiences together--classes, group assignments, discussions after class--students affect each other's development toward moral maturity. This influence may be intensified when relating to students of different cultural backgrounds. In such a relationship, sharper distinctions may appear between, on the one hand, what is truly biblical and moral, and, on the other hand, what is part of the American culture and one's family background.

Typical academic evaluation procedures tend to encourage individual learning and achievement. Grades are assigned to individuals; awards are given to those with the highest GPA. Pressure is placed on the individual student to perform, yet in the pastorate, it will take joint ventures and cooperative initiatives to carry on the ministry.

<u>Institutional programs and structures</u>

Most of the seminaries require students to take at least one course in ethics. Exposure to moral development theory is very limited, if at all, since courses covering this material in more detail are usually elective. Students may be introduced to the theory in some more general required course, but it may just be a passing acquaintance.

Many of the seminaries have student representatives on

almost all faculty committees. A few seminaries have no such policy. For the most part, then, access is readily available to present student opinions and suggestions for change. Some student ideas may be too unrealistic, but many ideas have great merit and are worthy of a hearing.

Procedures related to giving students feedback on their development tend to focus primarily on academic criteria and, when attention is given to personal matters, identifying the marginal problem student is usually the main purpose. Little attention is given to helping good students develop to higher levels of morality. When monitoring procedures are more informal, left to the individual faculty advisors, the effectiveness of the system depends on the ability of the faculty member, and the priority and energy devoted to developing a relationship with the student.

Admissions forms are usually very general in nature and do not highlight moral development factors, except for a statement combining moral and Christian character. Since much of the information is gleaned through self-report by the applicant, emphasis may be given to strengths more than weaknesses. Additional information is requested from references. Since students can now have access to these files, those providing references may not wish to be too candid.

Professors' comments identified some institutional factors as having an adverse affect on students' moral development (for example, the academic requirements and the

general educational orientation inherent in any educational
institution). The pressure of requirements and the pursuit
of the high GPA may skew seminarians' values and affect
their self-concept and conduct.

Educational Emphasis on Moral Development

A confusion is apparent regarding the nature of moral
development. Moral development lies somewhere in the valley
between spiritual development, on the one hand, and academic
and professional development on the other hand. Moral
development is sometimes mistaken for spiritual development
and thus is encouraged through the chapel, spiritual exhor-
tation and the like. One's relationship to God is seen as a
personal matter—one may make resources available, but
should not meddle in such affairs.

On the other, academic and professional development are
given a greater priority over other areas, including spirit-
ual development and moral development. This greater emphasis
may be due to the assumption that graduate students of a
seminary have already attained a sophisticated level of
moral maturity, requiring no major maturing. Thus, moral
development, as a specifically conscious aspect of the
seminary curriculum is barely visible, or non-existent.

Yet, the processes which influence moral development
are evident at the seminary as mentioned previously: field
education experiences, faculty modeling and relationships,
worship experiences, improving moral thinking and developing

commitments, and interaction with fellow students. The factors are evident, the influence is being made--but the process is not a <u>consciously</u> planned element of the seminary program. Thus we may conclude that moral development <u>is</u> a component of the education of ministerial students <u>and</u> moral development <u>is not</u> a component of the education of ministerial students.

Qualitative Observations

A number of anomolies were uncovered in the study and are presented here to encourage attention to these matters. The greatest aid to students' moral development is their field education ministry and related off-campus experiences. The greatest hindrance to students' moral growth is related to pressures and values precipitated by some of the academic, institutional structures of the seminary. Yet a higher value is placed on academic performance than practical experience.

One reason that little attention is directed at encouraging students' moral development in the curriculum may be due to an assumption that students are basically morally mature.

Though professors can identify and articulate a number of helpful learning experiences which do promote students' moral growth, most professors tend to assume a didactive-cognitive mode to help facilitate improvement with students' character faults. This may result from the "preacher" element resident in seminary faculty.

A majority of professors remember their own seminary professors as being the most influential element in moral growth during their days as a seminary student. Due to their busyness and responsibilities, professors may tend to neglect seeking out-of-class contacts with students and may tend to view them just as students rather than as persons.

Recommendations for Curriculum Improvement

If only one recommendation could be made, the statement would encourage theological educators to shift from a passive involvement in moral education to a more active one, from an unconscious participation to a more conscious participation in the moral development of seminary students. Due to the ever-present socialization process, the students' moral maturity is continually being affected by aspects of seminary education. The decision for theological educators is not whether seminaries should be involved in the student's moral development, but rather, the decision concerns what quality of focused attention is to be directed toward this aspect of student growth.

Pastors have a significant influence on parishioners' perspectives, decisions, actions and general lifestyle. Thus, pastoral candidates must become committed to principles of professional ethics, and should be guided in developing and growing toward greater personal maturity in matters of individual and social morality, of matters relating to both thought and conduct. Specific suggestions for theological

educators follow.

Educational orientation

A distinct difference in perspective was evident between the classical disciplines faculty, as a group, and the ministry-related disciplines faculty, as a group. The former group of professors thought that students would achieve a high degree of learning in their moral thinking and personal values from the seminary curriculum. The ministry-related faculty would only rate students' learning at a fair amount for these two categories.

A resolution of the matter may be possible by understanding the educational orientation and framework of these two groups. Results from a study (Grubbs, 1981) cited earlier in Chapter 2 indicated that ministry-related faculty tend to assume a more andragogical (adult education) mode of teaching, where learning results from the mutual interaction and participation of both student and teacher. The classical faculty largely assume a more pedagogical (child training) mode of teaching where learning is primarly directed by the teacher toward the student. The pedagogical teacher tends to evaluate education by what is presented and made available to the student. The andragogical teacher tends to evaluate education by the degree of student responsibility and initiative. Thus, depending on whether one focuses on the teacher's presentation, or the student's participation and growth, evaluations of student learning will tend to differ as was the case in the present study.

In light of the different educational orientations, faculty, both individually and collectively, should reflect on the predominant educational orientation which they adhere to, as well what is evident in the seminary curriculum. Students are mostly exposed to a pedagogical orientation, since both the majority of classes they take and the majority of seminary professors teaching at the seminary are associated with the classical disciplines. Should seminary students be treated as adolescent college students, or as graduate adult students? To what degree should seminary students be involved in designing their own education program or in participating in the governance of the seminary? Though such questions have no simple answers, they must be addressed.

Educational perspectives also pervade the classroom. Is the professor's purpose primarily to explain the biblical material and teach for the "right answers" or are students involved in the process of thinking, inquiry and learning "how to learn"? Are subjects treated in isolation by themselves within historical categories, or are students challenged toward integrative thinking by addressing contemporary issues and complex case studies? These either-or dichotomies are only used for the purpose of surfacing a few of the important issues which need serious discussion.

Institutional "reward" structures

Professors' comments indicated that some institutional structures adversely affect students' moral development. "Environmental impact studies" are prepared in conjunction

with certain major construction projects. Seminary educators may wish to study the "student impact" that each facet of the seminary has on the total life of the student--not just the academic life, but the personal, social, moral and family life, for example. Are grades and awards for high grade point averages more of a help or are they more of a hindrance to the goals of the seminary? Are the student reward structures of the seminary weighted toward academic goals, or do they also incorporate professional-ministry and personal development goals? Are the faculty reward structures (promotion, raise, awards, etc.) weighted toward scholarly publication achievements and discipline expertise, or are other activities honored as well, such as facilitating significant student learning, or having a number of out-of-class contacts with students? What is the impact of the present reward structures?

Aspects of moral development

A review of the literature identified five aspects of moral development: moral knowledge, moral thinking, moral sensitivity, personal values and will power [definitions are provided in Appendix B]. Professors highly rated students' learning of moral knowledge. For the other four aspects, professors either disagreed as to the degree of learning or rated it at a fair amount. As an evaluative tool, each of the five aspects could help focus attention to specifically facilitate students' growth toward moral maturity in the classroom, in field education ministries, in chapel and in

other seminary functions. Since much of traditional seminary
education is still classroom dependent, significant emphasis
should be given to the development of students' moral
thinking, as is already being done with students' moral
knowlege.

Student experience

Professors' comments highlighted the value of a
student's experiences as a positive factor in moral develop-
ment. But experience alone must not be glorified. Experiences
are more educative when they are competently supervised and
evaluated by others and when one reflects on and evaluates
one's own experience. Diverse settings more than homogeneous
ones can help confront the student with different and
challenging perspectives. Real life crises force students to
make moral decisions in light of previous learning and moral
commitments. Simulated encounters (through role play, for
example) can be transported to the classroom helping students
face dilemmas evident in the pastorate.

Faculty-student interaction

Most of the professors in the study identified their
own seminary professors as the most influential factor
affecting their moral development during their own seminary
education. Thus, the seminary should encourage faculty to
initiate out-of-class contacts with students (possibly by
reducing the workload, or realigning present reward struc-
tures). Faculty and students could work alongside each other
in ministry projects. Faculty could also invite students to

accompany or participate with them on ministry assignments. The seminary schedule should include a regular, weekly opportunity for students and faculty to meet in a casual context, much like the 12 disciples experienced with Jesus.

Student assessment tools and structures

Many seminaries have instituted an advisor-advisee system to divide the student body into smaller manageable groups for the purposes of monitoring student learning and growth and providing feedback to students. As a part of a faculty development program, faculty members could be encouraged to improve their ability as advisors. Tools, such as ATS's assessment procedures, should be used as objective aids in helping students in their development toward professional and personal maturity. Thought could also be given toward devising more effective ways of addressing students' identified character faults. In addition, better assessment procedures may be included in admissions practices to admit those students with greater potential for moral development. Students lacking sufficient moral maturity could be identified and then directed toward specific learning experiences in order to meet admissions criteria at a later date.

Interaction of the supernatural and the natural

And finally, mention should be made of the students' relationship with God. Within the Christian understanding of reality, morality itself is grounded in the nature and being of God. Though chapel is one seminary function given over to emphasis on one's devotion and commitment to God, we should

not dichotomize faith and learning or draw a sharp distinc-
tion between the chapel and the classroom. A sensitivity to
the Holy Spirit and to one's conscience are essential
ingredients of moral maturity. Fostering such sensitivity
may involve giving sufficient attention to the affective and
inner dimensions of students. Also, a prolonged level of
immature "natural" moral development (i.e. "the hardening of
the categories") may inhibit further natural and super-
natural development and maturing.

In sum, it is apparent that, in most instances, moral
development cannot be directly taught. Development toward
moral maturity is encouraged and facilitated in contexts
which manifest the appropriate combination of factors. The
study has suggested at least six general areas which may
influence the moral development of ministerial students. The
above recommendations illustrate guidelines and concerns
which may result from discussions of deliberate educational
planning regarding the moral development of ministerial
students.

Recommendations for Further Research

Further work could be done using the framework outlined
in the study--six major areas affecting students' moral
development. Research could be undertaken in each area to
provide greater understanding of the specific factors,
within the six areas, which either facilitate or inhibit
moral development. A variety of research designs might aid

the process: more indepth investigations of a single seminary by interviewing all of the faculty members; extensive mail-questionnaire studies to include larger samples of seminary faculty; surveys comparing the perceptions of administration, faculty and students; actual assessments of the level of moral reasoning of both faculty and students; intervention and evaluation studies investigating the effect of introducing specific factors or modifications in the program; and participant-observation studies which focus on the community life of the seminary.

Studies could also be undertaken in similar settings, such as professional graduate schools of (a) teacher education, (b) medical education and (c) legal education. Comparisons and contrasts could be made and more generalizable conclusions might result.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Moral Development Interview--Issler

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

1. Now and then, professors say they have a really good day of teaching. Could you tell me what a good day is like for you? What happens?

2. When you are remembered by your students, say, 20 years from now, what would you most like it to be for?

3. When you meet with students, that is besides in the class-room, what one or two things do you most enjoy doing with them?

   Probe: Is there anything that you hope might result from such meetings with students? Do you have some purpose?

(Present information about the definition of "moral" and the particular aspects of moral development.)

4. Let's say that someone has taken a poll of this year's senior students regarding their degree of learning, at the seminary, in each of these 5 aspects (refer to list). For each of the 5 aspects, please identify what you think stud-ents would indicate as their degree of learning: high, fair amount, or low? Now for a seminary, I would think that learning would be high in moral knowledge? (Wait for a response.) What about moral reasoning? moral sensitivity? personal values? will power?

5. Let's assume that a student is interested in further moral growth and has asked you to recommend some courses at the seminary. Now, I realize that probably all of the seminary courses will have some implications for encouraging moral growth. But, which top 2 or 3 courses would you recommend that this student be sure to take before he/she graduates?

6. Either as a part of their coursework, or as some part of their seminary experience, students are often required to do certain activities or projects which may contribute to their own moral growth. Would you happen to remember which particular activities or experiences, either in or out of the classroom, students have reported as being the most helpful to their own moral growth?

7. Let's look more closely at the aspect of moral thinking. One particular classroom activity which is useful here is the discussing of moral issues.
(Give list of moral issues). For example, here is one list of some of the major moral issues being discussed in different seminaries.

Moral Development Interview--Issler

> When you raise moral issues in the classroom, what is your
> main purpose? What do you primarily hope to accomplish?

NOTE: Use alternate question 8 for professors who teach about
matters of human development.

8. This particular aspect of moral thinking and reasoning has
   recently received some research attention in the fields of
   psychology and education. Now, I realize that this research
   may not be a part of your own discipline. Do you happen to
   be familiar with such psychological theories of moral
   reasoning and thinking?

   (If so, probe for the name of a researcher or theory,
   specifically listen for Kohlberg's name).

9. Let's look at the aspect of moral sensitivity. What do you
   think is the most effective way to help students become
   more mature in their moral sensitivity?

10. Now, I'd like to present a hypothetical situation involv-
    ing a case of academic dishonesty. Let's assume that a
    student has submitted a term paper for one of your courses.
    After grading the paper and checking your files, you notice
    that almost half of this term paper is a verbatim copy of a
    paper written by a former student 3 years ago. For the sake
    of our discussion, let's assume 2 different students do
    this: for one student, this is the first such offense; the
    other student has done similar things in a few other
    classes. How would you tend to deal with these situations?

    (Probe: A. Who would handle the matter? by self or would
    refer matter; B. What particular academic consequences; C.
    In talking to the student, what would you hope to
    accomplish?)

11. Let's assume that a professor knows that a particular
    student is experiencing some personal problems, or say that
    the professor senses that a student might need some
    personal advice. In most cases, should professors

    (a) let students take the initiative to seek out profes-
    sors, or (b) (professors) take the inititiative to seek out
    students?

    (Probe for A. reasons; and B. ways to take the initiative)

12. When students wish to suggest changes in curriculum,
    academic policies, student life, and related matters, what
    particular avenues at the seminary are available to
    accomplish this?

Moral Development Interview--Issler

13. In your exposure to the seminary students over the past few years, have you noticed any common character faults, attitudes, or problems among the students which particularly concern you? If so, could you name a few?

   (Pick one) What do you think the seminary can specifically do to help deal with this?

14. In your opinion, are there any aspects of the seminary curriculum or program which may inadvertently contribute to hindering the students' growth toward moral maturity?

15. At any time during their seminary years, do the students receive some form of feedback regarding their own personal and moral development by someone or some group from the seminary? (Probe for the specific procedures).

16. Think back to the faculty meetings this school year. Do you happen to remember if matters related to a student's personal or moral life were discussed in any meetings? (Probe for frequency; purpose of the discussion, what concerns were evident; and what implications or action points resulted from the discussion).

17. Now, please think back to your own experience of seminary as a student. What proved to be the most influential in encouraging your moral maturity?

18. If you, yourself, could change <u>one</u> thing about the way the seminary currently influences students' growth toward moral maturity, what would that be?

19. Concerning other aspects of the seminary program which may have a strong influence on students' moral maturity, can you think of any we have not covered yet?

<u>Transition</u>: Now that we are almost through with the interview, I would like to get your impression of the questions.

20. Do you happen to remember which questions, if any, were not stated clearly or were ambiguous?

21. Questions have different effects on people. Do you happen to remember which questions you think most seminary faculty would consider difficult to answer or too personal in nature?

22. If the interview was repeated, what other questions or important topics would you included?

© Klaus Issler

Moral Development Interview--Issler

For those teaching the subject of human development

ALTERNATE QUESTION 8

A. When you treat the subject of moral development in your classes, which particular theorists or theories do you cover?

B. What particular references are given to students, such as books and articles, for class reading and further study?

C. What is your purpose in dealing with the subject of moral development? What do you hope to accomplish?

D. How much time to you give in dealing with this subject in your classes?

E. What percentage of the student population do you think become acquainted with these theories through your classes?

F. Do you happen to know if any other faculty deal with this subject in their classes?

APPENDIX B

INFORMATION PRESENTED DURING THE INTERVIEW

Moral Development Interview--Issler

INTERVIEW INTRODUCTION

Thank you for your time.

Before we begin, let me make a few comments about the interview itself. The purpose is to gain a better under-standing of how seminary education contributes to the students' growth toward moral maturity. Since you've been involved in theological education for a number of years, you're in a position to describe what [insert name] seminary does and how this affects the students. I'm interested in your experiences with the program and your thoughts about those experiences. Since one professor can't know everything that is going on at the seminary, a total of four professors from differing academic emphases will be interviewed and this will provide a good representation of the total seminary program.

As you know, all interview responses will be anonymous. If you don't mind, I would like to tape record what you say so that I don't have to just rely on my notes and miss something. If there's a time you when you'd like to stop the recorder, just turn off the switch on the microphone.

While I get set up, would you please fill out this sheet for me?

[Set up recorder]

[Get sheet back; Turn on tape recorder]

As we go through the interview, if you have any questions about why I'm asking something, please feel free to ask. I'll start off with a few very general questions and then move to some that have more of a specific focus.

Any questions or comments before we begin?

Moral Development Interview--Issler   Code: _____

Demographic Information

1. _____ How many years have you been teaching at this seminary in a full-time capacity?

2. _____ In your career, how many total years have you taught at the seminary or college level in a full-time capacity?

3. a. YES   NO   Did you happen to serve in the full-time pastorate before beginning your teaching career?

   b. If yes: _____ How many years?

4. What is your particular area of specialty?

5. _____   _____ In which month and year were
     month   year   born?

Thank you.

Moral Development Interview--Issler

INTRODUCTION TO THE MORAL DOMAIN

[Following question 3]

For the next series of questions, I need to present two pieces of information. The first relates to the word, "moral." We need some common ground of understanding. I'm thinking of the word, moral, in a very general sense as a category, as in moral vs. amoral.

Regarding the particular content of the word, moral, let's consider the two great commands: "to love God" and "to love our neighbor". Sometimes we talk of this as the vertical plane, to love God (motion with hand up and down), and the horizontal plane, to love our neighbor (motion with hand between respondent and interviewer). The interview is particularly concerned with the horizontal plane, how we ought to treat our neighbor.

Here (give definition card) is a general description of the word, moral, that I would like to use as a basis for our discussion. (Let respondent read card.) Do you have any problems in using this description as a basis for our discussion? (Wait for response.)

[The MORAL domain relates to how one ought to treat others and the degree to which one takes into consideration how one's actions will affect the welfare of others.]

Next, we need to consider what actually grows or develops as we grow toward moral maturity. I'm suggesting that there are at least five major areas of growth. (Hand list to respondent.) This is one listing of such matters. So, there would be growth or change in the knowledge base, in thinking about moral issues, in moral sensitivity, in personal values and in will power. I would like to read the description of each aspect since I'll be using these aspects as specific reference points in the next series of questions. I also will give an example for each one to help clarify what I mean. (Read through the whole sheet.)

ASPECTS OF MORAL DEVELOPMENT

MORAL KNOWLEDGE--the information and comprehension one has of
(a) biblical precepts and moral principles, as well as
(b) specific moral issues

(e.g. A seminary student is aware of such principles as the
Golden Rule, Matt. 7:12; obeying the laws of the land, Rom.
13:1; and paying what is due, Rom. 13:7, and is aware of
factors related to certain moral issues such as war, civil
rights, and divorce.)

MORAL THINKING--the capability to analyze the relevant factors
of a moral issue or situation, and to make a decision or
judgment based on some logical rationale

(e.g. When the seminary student began working with the music
ministry at a small church, the student discovered that almost
all of the music sheets used by the choir were photocopies.
The student must decide what to do in this situation. Should
he/she continue this practice due to the small music budget,
or seek to establish a new policy of not photocopying music
sheets, or what?)

MORAL SENSITIVITY--the capability to empathize with others
concerning their needs and rights with a sense of compassion,
justice, and responsibility; a sensitivity to one's
conscience, and to the Holy Spirit

(e.g. The student is sensitive about the moral aspects of
photocopying certain documents, since the intention of the
copyright law is to protect the rights and royalties of
copyright owners. Photocopying documents may be legal or
illegal, depending on the document and its intended use.)

PERSONAL VALUES--the particular moral convictions, beliefs,
and responsibilities to which one is committed by a conscious
choice or those values adhered to be unconscious practice

(e.g. The student has a personal conviction that illegal
photocopying, such as photocopying music sheets, is something
he/she will not do.)

WILL POWER--the resolve and ability to act on one's moral
values in the face of countervailing forces; the ability to
resist temptation

(e.g. Despite the efforts of a few church leaders to dissuade
the student, the student begins working out a plan to convince
choir members and church leaders to establish a new policy of
not photocopying music sheets.)

© Klaus Issler

ASPECTS OF MORAL DEVELOPMENT

(Moral as a domain, as in "moral issues")

<u>MORAL KNOWLEDGE</u>--the information and comprehension one has of
      (a) biblical precepts and moral principles as well as
      (b) specific moral issues

<u>MORAL THINKING</u>--the capability to analyze the relevant factors
      of a moral issue or situation, and to make a decision or
      judgment based on some logical rationale

<u>MORAL SENSITIVITY</u>--the capability to empathize with others
      concerning their needs and rights with a sense of
      compassion, justice, and responsibility; a sensitivity to
      one's conscience, and the Holy Spirit

<u>PERSONAL VALUES</u>--the particular moral convictions, beliefs,
      and responsibilities to which one is committed by
      conscious choice or those values adhered to by
      unconscious practice

<u>WILL POWER</u>--the resolve and capability to act on one's moral
      convictions in the face of countervailing forces; the
      capability to resist temptation

Some Moral Issues Discussed in Seminary

WAR

INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

SMUGGLING BIBLES

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

ABORTION

PARENTS' RIGHTS OVER CHILDRENS' EDUCATION

NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE

PARTICULAR ISSUES OF CHRISTIAN LIBERTY

MATTERS RELATED TO A CHRISTIAN'S SOCIAL
RESPONSIBILITY TO SOCIETY

APPENDIX C

LETTER OF INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN STUDY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION AND CURRICULUM
ERICKSON HALL

EAST LANSING • MICHIGAN • 48824-1034

January 10, 1984

President

Dear President   :

I seek your cooperation and that of your faculty in an interview study in
theological education. The study is to be a descriptive analysis of the ways
theological education contributes to the seminarian's understanding of moral
development. A cross-section of mid-western denominational seminaries
representing theologically diverse heritages is to be included in the study.

Interviews are needed with the president or academic dean of the seminary and
at least three other faculty members. Each interview will take approximately
two hours. Questions on the interview will cover such matters as the views
about how growth toward moral maturity takes place, the various means through
which the seminary deliberately attempts to promote moral and ethical
development in the students during their time at the seminary and whatever
educational attention is being directed toward their capability of working
with parishioners toward deepening moral commitment. For the sake of confiden-
tiality, interview responses will be identified in the findings by codes and
fictitious names; thus, results of the study will be reported without
reference to specific seminaries or specific professors.

This research is being directed by one of our doctoral students, Klaus Issler,
a professor on leave from the International School of Theology. I will be
serving as supervisor and consultant in his efforts. Mr. Issler will be
contacting you soon to learn of your interest in this research. We are hoping
to conduct the interviews during the first part of April. Appointments for
interviews will be arranged with faculty members in early March. Upon
completion of the study, we will be happy to provide you with a synoptic
institutional report of the research.

If you have any questions, you can contact me at my office (517) 355-1737, or
you can contact Mr. Issler, phone: (517) 355-8085; home address: 933-J Cherry
Lane, East Lansing, MI 48823

Sincerely

Ted Ward
Professor of Administration
     and Curriculum

TW:gs

APPENDIX D

FAMILIES OF DENOMINATIONS

PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document
have not been filmed at the request of
the author. They are available for
consultation, however, in the author's
university library.

These consist of pages:

_____251-252_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Families of Denominations

1. Anglican-Episcopal Churches
    Anglican Church of Canada
    Episcopal Church

2. American-Canadian Baptist Family
    American Baptist Churches/USA
    Baptist Federation of Canada

3. Southern Baptists

4. Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)

5. Orthodox Churches
    Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America
    Orthodox Church in America

6. Evangelical B
    Church of God (Anderson, Indiana)
    Church of the Nazarene
    Church of the New Jerusalem (Swedenborgian)
    Churches of God (General Conference)
    Evangelical Congregational Church
    Evangelical Covenant Church of America
    Seventh Day Adventist

7. Free Church Family
    Brethren Church (Ashland, Ohio)
    Church of the Brethren
    General Conference Mennonite Church
    Mennonite Brethren Churches in North America
    Mennonite Church
    Religious Society of Friends

8. Jewish and Unitarian
    Union of American Hebrew Congregations (Reformed)
    Unitarian-Universalist Association

9. Lutheran Churches
   American Lutheran Church
   Lutheran Church in America
   Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod

10. United Methodist Church

11. Presbyterian-Reformed Family
    African Methodist Episcopal Church
    African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church
    Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church (General Synod)
    Christian Reformed Church
    Cumberland Presbyterian Church
    Moravian Church in America
    Presbyterian Church in America
    Presbyterian Church in the U.S.
    Reformed Church in America
    United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

12. Roman Catholic Church (Order)

13. Roman Catholic Church (Diocesan)

14. United Church of Christ

15. United Church of Canada

16. Evangelical A
    Baptist General Conference
    Baptist Missionary Association of America
    Conservative Baptist Association of America
    Evangelical Free Church of America
    North American Baptist Conference

17. Christian Church (Not Disciples)
    Christian Churches and Churches of Christ
    North American Christian Convention

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aleshire, D. (1980). Eleven major areas of ministry. In D.
    S. Schuller, M. L. Brekke & M. P. Strommen (Eds.),
    Ministry in America. New York: Harper & Row.

Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. Englewood
    Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Barrick, W. E. (1975). Field education in Protestant
    theological seminaries in the United States: An
    interpretation of major trends 1920 - 1970. (Doctoral
    dissertation, Columbia University, 1975). Dissertation
    Abstracts International, 36, 1341A.

Batson, C. D. & Wyckoff, D. C. (1973, Winter). An
    alternative model for ministerial education. Theological
    Education, 9(2), 100-111.

Bayer, G. (1980). The perceptions of parents and teachers
    regarding school practices related to stages of moral
    cognitive development (Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State
    University, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International,
    41, 4263A.

Beam, R. (1982). A comparative study of three categories of
    American protestant seminaries (Doctoral dissertation,
    University of Kentucky, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts
    International, 42, 3091A.

Bender, R. (1971). The people of God. Scottsdale, PA:
    Herald.

Borg, W. R. & Gall, M. D. (1979). Educational research: An
    introduction. (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.

Bradley, D. R., Bradley, T. D., McGrath, S. G. & Cutcomb, S.
    D. (1979). Type I error rate of the Chi-square test of
    independence in R X C tables that have small expected
    frequencies. Psychological Bulletin, 86(6), 1290-1297.

Bridgeman, D. (Ed.). (1983). The nature of prosocial
    development: Interdisciplinary theories and strategies.
    New York: Academic.

Bridston, K. & Culver, D. (Eds.). (1964). The making of
    ministers. Minneapolis: Augsburg.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). The ecology of human development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brown, W. A. (1934). Ministerial education in America: Summary and interpretation. Vol. I, The education of American ministers. New York: Institute of Social and Religious Research.

Brown, W. A. & May, M. A. (1934). The education of American ministers. 4 vol. New York: Institute of Social and Religious Research.

Brubacher, J. & Willis, R. (1968). Higher education in transition: A history of American colleges and universities, 1636-1968. New York: Harper and Row.

Bussis, A. M., Chittendon, E. A. & Amarel, M. (1976). Beyond surface curriculum: An interview study of teachers' understandings. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Buzzell, S. (1983). Preparation for church leadership: Trends in students' leadership orientation after one year in Dallas Theological Seminary (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1983). Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 654A.

Cardwell, S. (1978). The development of persistence scales using items of the Theological School Inventory (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1978). Dissertation Abstracts International, 39, 2987A.

Carkhuff, R. R. (1969). Helping and human relations I: Selection and training. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Cartwright, D. S. (1979). Theories and models of personality. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown.

Cicchetti, D. & Hesse, P. (Eds.). (1982). Emotional development. (New directions for child development, Vol. 16). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Coder, C. (1975). Moral judgment in adults (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 36, 1402B.

Coles, D. (1973). An exploration of current specific morals, values and beliefs of parents, students and faculty at a church-related college (Doctoral dissertation, Oregon State University, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 33, 6724A.

Combs, A. W. (1969). Florida studies in the helping professions. Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Press.

Combs, A. W., Avila, D. L. & Purkey, W. W. (1978). Helping relationships: Basic concepts for the helping professions. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Corsini, R. J. (Ed.). (1977). Current personality theories. Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock.

Cotten, C. C. (1973). The imperative leadership. St. Louis, MO: Bethany.

Curriculum Task Force. (1968, Spring). Theological curriculum for the 1970's. Theological Education, 4(3), 669-727.

Damon, W. (1983). Social and personality development. New York: Norton.

Darley, J. M. & Batson, C. D. (1973). "From Jerusalem to Jericho": A study of situational and dispositional variables in helping behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 27 (1), 100-108.

DeLamater, J. (1982). Response effects of questionnaire content. In W. Dikjkstra & J. Van der Zouwen (Eds.). Response behavior in the survey-interview. London: Academic.

Dijkstra, W. & Van der Zouwen, J. (Eds.) (1982). Introduction. In W. Dikjkstra & J. Van der Zouwen (Eds.). Response behavior in the survey-interview. London: Academic.

Draguns, J. G. (1982). Personality theory. In H. E. Mitzel (Ed.), Encyclopedia of educational research, 5th ed., Vol. 3. New York: Macmillan.

Eberhardy, J. (1983). An analysis of moral decision making with nursing students facing professional problems (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 3542A.

Eisner, E. (1979). The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of school programs. New York: Macmillan.

Eliason, L. (1983). A critique of approaches to integrating psychology and theology within selected evangelical seminaries (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University School of Theology, 1983). Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 1123A.

Elkind, D. & Weiner, B. (1978). Development of the child. New York: Wiley.

Elmer, D. H. (1981). Career data as indicators for curriculum development in theological education (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 4955A.

Epstein, J. (Ed.). (1981). Masters: Portraits of great teachers. New York: Basic.

Ernsberger, D. (1977). Intrinsic-extrinsic religious identification and level of moral development (Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 37, 6302B.

Etzioni, A. (1964). Modern organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Farley, E. (1981). The reform of theological education as a theological task. Theological education, 17, 93-117.

Feilding, C. R. (1966). Education for ministry. Dayton, OH: American Association of Theological Schools.

Ferris, R. W. (1983). The emphasis on leadership as servanthood: An analysis of curriculum commitments (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 3797A.

Flavell, J. (1977). Cognitive development. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Fletcher, J. C. (1981). The coming crisis for theological seminaries. Ministerial Formation, 14, 24-28.

Flexner, A. (1910). Medical education in the United States and Canada. Bulletin No. 4, New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Forman, G. E. & Sigel, I. E. (Ed.). (1979). Cognitive development: A life span view. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Fukuyama, Y. (1972). The ministry in transition: A case study of theological education. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University.

Geis, W. (1926). Dental education in the United States and Canada. Bulletin No. 19, New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Gerety, M. (1980). A study of the relationship between the moral judgment of the teacher and the moral atmosphere in the classroom (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University School of Education, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 1952A.

Giblin, P. T. (1981). Affective development in children: An equilibrium model. *Genetic Psychological Monograph*, *103*, 3-30.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gorden, R. L. (1980). *Interviewing: Strategy, techniques, and tactics*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.

Grant, G. (1975). Some effects of moral discussion on Clinical Pastoral Education students (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University School of Education, 1975). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *36*, 1597A.

Green, T. G. (1981). Dental student responses to moral dilemmas. *Journal of Dental Education*, *45*(3), 137-140.

Greenwald, A. G. (1975). Does the Good Samaritan parable increase helping? A comment on Darley and Batson's no-effect conclusion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *32*(4), 578-583.

Grubbs, J. (1981). A study of faculty members and students in selected midwestern schools of theology to determine whether their educational orientation is andragogical or pedagogical (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1981). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *42*, 55A.

Hadley, H. (1975). Development of an instrument to determine adult educators' orientation: andragogical or pedagogical (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University School of Education, 1975). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *35*, 7595A.

Harter, T. P. (1980). A critique of North American Protestant theological education from the perspective of Ivan Illich and Paulo Freire (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University Graduate School, 1980). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *41*, 2168A.

Hartshorne, H. & Froyd, M. C. (1944-1945). *Theological education in the Northern Baptist Convention: A survey*. Philadelphia: Judson.

Hayes, E. (1978, Autumn). Educational strategies in theological education. *Theological Education*, *15*(1), 33-47.

Hoffman, M. L. (1982) Development of prosocial motivation: Empathy and guilt. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), *The development of prosocial behavior*. New York: Academic.

Hogan, R. (1973). Moral conduct and moral character: A psychological perspective. Psychological Bulletin, 79(4), 217-232.

Hough, J. C. (1981, Spring). Reform in theological education as political task. Theological Education, 17(2), 152-166.

Isaac, S. & Michael, W. B. (1981). Handbook in research and evaluation. 2nd ed. San Diego: EdITS Publishers.

Jacquet, C. H. (1983). Yearbook of American and Canadian churches. Fifty-first issue. Nashville: Abingdon.

Johnson, C. (1976). An analysis of the predictive value of the Theological School Inventory at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary (Doctoral dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 36, 6155A.

Jones, G. (1983). An analysis of the andragogical-pedagogical orientation of selected faculty at Oklahoma State University (Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 2569A.

Kaufman, M. (1976). American medical education: The formative years 1765-1910. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Kelly, M. J. (1980). Legal ethics and legal education. New York: Hastings Center.

Kelly, R. L. (1924). Theological education in America. New York: George H. Coran.

Kinsler, F. R. (1981). The extension movement in theological education: A call to the renewal of the ministry. (Rev. ed.). Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library.

Kohlberg, L. (1981) The philosophy of moral development: Moral stages and the idea of justice. Vol. 1. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Kohlberg, L., Levine, C. & Hewer, A. (1983). Moral stages: A current formulation and a response to critics. Basel, Switzerland: Karger.

Kornfield, D. (1980). Socialization for professional competency of Protestant seminarians in Latin America (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 186A.

Krathwohl, D. R., Bloom, B. S & Masia, B. B. (1964).
Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals--Handbook II: Affective domain. New York: David McKay.

Kurtines, W. & Gewirtz, J. (Eds.). (1984). Morality, moral behavior and moral development. New York: Wiley.

Lapsley, J., Johnson, J., Moore, A. & Mills, L. (1969, Winter). Theological curriculum for the 1970's: A critique. Theological Education, 5(2), 99-102.

Lawrence, J. (1979). The component procedures of moral judgment-making (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 896B.

Learned, W. S. & Bagley, W. C. (1920). The professional preparation of teachers for American public schools. Bulletin No. 14; New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Lewis, M. & Rosenblum, L. A. (Eds.). (1978). The development of affect. New York: Plenum.

Lickona, T. (Ed.). (1976). Moral development and behavior: Theory, research and social issues. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Lindbeck, G. (1976). University divinity schools: A report on ecclesiastically independent theological education. New York: Rockefeller Foundation.

Lindskoog, D. (1973). Some life history, attitudinal, and moral development correlates of self-actualization among evangelical seminary students (Doctoral dissertation, Baylor University, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 33, 4492A.

Lockman Foundation. (1960). The new American standard Bible. La Habra, CA: Lockman Foundation.

Lortie, D. (1975) Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Lloyd, B. M. (1969, Summer). Key issues in the personal preparation of clergy. Theological Education. Supplement #1, 5(4), 420-435.

Lubomudrov, C. (1982). Case studies of relationships among level of moral cognitive development, teachers' understandings of educational issues and teaching practices (Doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 1120A.

Lutz, G. (1983). Understanding social statistics. New York: Macmillan.

Lynn, R. W. (1981, Spring). Notes toward a history: Theological encyclopedia and the evolution of Protestant seminary curriculum, 1808-1968. Theological Education, 17(2), 118-144.

Mackert, M. C. (1970). Bar examinations: Good moral character and political inquiry. Wisconsin Law Review, 471-494.

Mann, C. R. (1918). A study of engineering education. Bulletin No. 11; New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

McConahay, J. (1971, Winter). Psychological testing in evaluation and guidance of seminary students. Theological Education, 7(2), 109-120.

McCulloh, G. O. (1980). Ministerial education in the American Methodist movement. Nashville: United Methodist Board of Higher Education and Ministry.

Menges, R. J. (1975) Assessing readiness for professional practice. Review of Educational Research. 45, 173-207.

Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1984). Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Moeller, J. (1983). Teachers' implicit theories on moral education: An interview study (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 3527A.

Moore, W. (1970). The professions: Roles and rules. New York: Russell Sage.

Niebuhr, H. R. (1956). The purpose of the Church and its ministry. New York: Harper.

Niebuhr, H. R., Williams, D. D. & Gustafson, J. M. (1957). The advancement of theological education. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Overton, W. F. (Ed.). (1983). The relationship between social and cognitive development. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Paravonian, S. (1981, June). Evaluating and grading pre-service counseling students. Counselor Education and Supervision, 20(4), 276-284.

Patton, M. (1980). Qualitative evaluation methods. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Payne, S. L. (1951). The art of asking questions. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Pierson, R. (1976). A study of the effect of Protestant seminary Christian education upon the attitudes of closed mindedness, prejudice and intrinsic values (Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 36, 6577A.

Powers, C. (1980). The moral atmosphere of a just community high school: A four year longitudinal study (Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 3017A.

Prawat, R. (in press) Teacher thinking about the affective domain: An interview study.

Pritchett, H. S. (1911, October). 6th annual report of the president. New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Pusey, N. & Taylor, C. (1967). Ministry for tomorrow: Report of the Special Committee on Theological Education. New York: Seabury.

Raths, L., Harmin, M. & Simon, S. (1966). Values and teaching: Working with values in the classroom. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Redlich, J. (1914). The common law and the case method in American university law schools. Bulletin No. 8; New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Reeck, D. (1982). Ethics for the professions: A Christian perspective. Minneapolis: Augsburg.

Reed, A. F. (1928). Present-day law schools in the United States and Canada. Bulletin No. 21; New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Renaud, R. (1979). Academic dishonesty as defined and reported by students and faculty from selected colleges at Michigan State University (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 1306.

Rest, J. (1983). Morality. In J. H. Flavell & C. Markman (Eds.). Cognitive development. Vol. 3, in P. H. Mussen (Ed.), Handbook of child psychology. New York: Wiley.

Rest, J., Cooper, D., Coder, R., Masanz, J. and Anderson, D. (1974). Judging the important issues in moral dilemmas--An objective measure of moral development. Developmental Psychology, 10(4), 491-501.

Rest, J. R., Davison, M. L. & Robbins, S. (1978). Age trends in judging moral issues: A review of cross-sectional, longitudinal, and sequential studies of the Defining Issues Test. Child Development, 49(2), 263-279.

Reynolds, H. T. (1977). Analysis of nominal data. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Richards, L. O. (1975). A theology of Christian education. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Richards, L. O. & Hoeldtke, C. (1980). A theology of church leadership. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Richards, L. O. & Martin, G. (1981). A theology of personal ministry. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Rogers, C. (1958). The characteristics of a helping relationship. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 37(1), 6-16.

Rossi, P. H. & Wright, J. D. (1983). Handbook of survey research. New York: Academic.

Rowen, S. F. (1982). Curriculum foundations, experiences and outcomes: A participatory case study in theological education (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 655A.

Sandusky, F. (1964). The admissions practices and procedures to the bachelor of divinity program of studies of the accredited Protestant theological seminaries in the United States (Doctoral dissertation, Duke University, 1964). Dissertation Abstracts International, 25, 969.

Schuller, D. S., Brekke, M. L. & Strommen, M. P. (1975). Readiness for ministry--Vol. 1: Criteria. Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools.

Schuller, D. S., Brekke, M. L., Strommen, M. P. & Aleshire, D. O. (1976). Readiness for ministry--Vol. 2: Assessment. Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools.

Schuller, D. S., Strommen, M. P. & Brekke, M. (Eds.) (1980). Ministry in America: A report and analysis, based on an in-depth survey of 47 denominations in the United States and Canada, with interpretations by 18 experts. New York: Harper & Row.

Schuman, H. & Presser, S. (1981). Questions and answers in attitude surveys: Experiments on question form, wording and content. New York: Academic.

Shaffer, D. R. (1979). Social and personality development. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Shannon, D. (1975). Faculty perception of governance of serminaries of the United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., 1974-1975 (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 36, 3457A.

Sheatsley, P. (1983). Questionnaire construction and item writing. In P. H. Rossi & J. D. Wright (Eds.). Handbook of survey research. New York: Academic.

Sigel, I. E. (1981). Child development research in learning and cognition in the 1980s: Continuities and discontinuities from the 1970s. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly. 27, 347-371.

Silver, M. (1983). Moral education and teaching: An interview study of teachers (Doctoral dissertation, Washington University, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 3804A.

Smith, H. L. & Westerhoff, J. (1980). Teaching moral theology. Duke Divinity School Review, 45(3), 47-59.

Solanki, A. D. (1982). Nature and role of trustees in theological institutions (Indiana, Michigan and Ohio) (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 1381A.

Solanky, A. D. (1978). A critical evaluation of theological education in residential training. Evangelical Review of Theology, 2, 124-133.

Staub, E. (Ed.). (1980). Personality: Basic aspects and current research. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Staub, E., Bar-Tal, D., Karylowski, J. & Reykowski, J. (Eds.). (1984). Development and maintenance of prosocial behavior. New York: Plenum.

Straughan, R. (1982). Can we teach children to be good?. Londong: George Allen & Unwin.

Sudman, S. & Bradburn, N. M. (1982). Asking questions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sweeney, J. (1979). Professional competencies for church ministry as perceived by seminary faculties, church lay leaders, and seminary seniors (Doctoral dissertation, Oregon State University, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 39, 5298A.

Task Force on Spiritual Development. (1972). Voyage, vision, venture. Dayton, OH: American Association of Theological Schools.

Taylor, M. J. (Ed.) (1984). Fact book on theological education: 1983-1984. Vandalia, OH: Association of Theological Schools.

Thomas, A. (1981). Current trends in developmental theory. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 51, 580-609.

Torrance, T. F. (1979). Service in Jesus Christ. In R. S. Anderson (Ed.), Theological foundations for ministry. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Waggoner, W. (1966). The seminary: Protestant and Catholic. New York: Sheed and Ward.

Wallace, M. (1980). A survey of the attitudes of public high school teachers regarding moral education in public high schools (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 2547A.

Ward, T. (1982) Moral aspects of spiritual development, (Summer course S863). New Jersey: Princeton Theological Seminary.

Weinreich-Haste, H. & Locke, D. (Eds.). (1983). Morality in the making: Thought, action and social context. New York: Wiley.

Westerhoff, J. H. (1982, March). Theological education and models for minstry. St. Luke's Journal of Theology, 25, 153-169.

Wetherbe, L. (1982). Selected variables associated with sex role perceptions of Protestant seminary students and faculty (Doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 1051A.

Willging, T. E. & Dunn, T. G. (1981). The moral development of the law student: Theory and data on legal education. Journal of Legal Education, 31(3-5), 306-358.

Winkleman, G. (1976). Polemics, prayers, and professionalism: The American Protestant theological seminaries from 1784 to 1929 (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1975). <u>Dissertation Abstracts International</u>, <u>36</u>, 7249A.

Wixom, D. (1983). The teaching of values in the college classroom: Faculty and student perceptions at three contrasting institutions (Doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, 1982). <u>Dissertation Abstracts International</u>, <u>43</u>, 2257A.

Gorden, R. L. (1980). Interviewing: Strategy, techniques, and tactics. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.

Grant, G. (1975). Some effects of moral discussion on Clinical Pastoral Education students (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University School of Education, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 36, 1597A.

Green, T. G. (1981). Dental student responses to moral dilemmas. Journal of Dental Education, 45(3), 137-140.

Greenwald, A. G. (1975). Does the Good Samaritan parable increase helping? A comment on Darley and Batson's no-effect conclusion. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32(4), 578-583.

Grubbs, J. (1981). A study of faculty members and students in selected midwestern schools of theology to determine whether their educational orientation is andragogical or pedagogical (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42, 55A.

Hadley, H. (1975). Development of an instrument to determine adult educators' orientation: andragogical or pedagogical (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University School of Education, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 35, 7595A.

Harter, T. P. (1980). A critique of North American Protestant theological education from the perspective of Ivan Illich and Paulo Freire (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University Graduate School, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 2168A.

Hartshorne, H. & Froyd, M. C. (1945). Theological education in the Northern Baptist Convention: A survey. Philadelphia: Judson.

Hayes, E. (1978, Autumn). Educational strategies in theological education. Theological Education, 15(1), 33-47.

Hoffman, M. L. (1982) Development of prosocial motivation: Empathy and guilt. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), The development of prosocial behavior. New York: Academic.

Hogan, R. (1973). Moral conduct and moral character: A psychological perspective. Psychological Bulletin, 79(4), 217-232.

Hough, J. C. (1981, Spring). Reform in theological education as political task. Theological Education, 17(2), 152-166.