



RETURNING MATERIALS:
Place in book drop to
remove this checkout from
your record. FINES will
be charged if book is
returned after the date
stamped below.

<p>ENCLOSURE</p> <p>P 057</p> <p><u>75</u></p> <p>JUN 13 1975</p>		
--	--	--

THE EMPHASIS ON LEADERSHIP AS SERVANTHOOD:
AN ANALYSIS OF CURRICULUM COMMITMENTS

By

Robert W. Ferris

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

1982

Copyright By

ROBERT W. FERRIS
P.O. Box 513
Farmington, MI 48024

1982

ABSTRACT

THE EMPHASIS ON LEADERSHIP AS SERVANTHOOD: AN ANALYSIS OF CURRICULUM COMMITMENTS

by

Robert W. Ferris

Theological educators commonly acknowledge commitment to training for leadership as servanthood. The purpose of the study is to determine how this commitment has been implemented in the curriculum of selected seminaries. The study also explores six factors selected because of their demonstrated significance in programs of counselor training and teacher education viewed as training for "helping professions." The factors examined are trainee selection criteria, curriculum priorities, trainer modeling, sources of teaching/learning objectives, training methods, and adequacy of training in disciplines traditionally associated with ministry preparation.

The research adopts a case study approach involving four orthodox protestant seminaries in the "Reformed" tradition. Document research and a questionnaire survey of seminary faculty and students provided the data of the study.

Findings at all four institutions indicate a lack of agreement regarding curriculum elements intended to train for leadership as servanthood. Respondents also preferred informal curriculum elements when giving examples of demonstrated servant minister qualities. The study concluded that deliberate planning for servant leadership training is not evident in curricula of the participating seminaries.

Findings related to characteristics of a program of training for helping professions are mixed. The seminaries participating in the study evidence little or no attention to qualities of a servant minister in trainee selection, and assign priority in their curricula to the "Reformed" tradition. Seminary faculty develop teaching/learning objectives through analysis of course disciplines and from their own theological commitments regarding the nature of ministry. The preferred training methods include lecture, reading or research, and discussion of lecture or research. All these factors are inconsistent with the findings of research on effective programs of training for helping professions. On the other hand, data indicate theological educators do model qualities of a servant minister, and seminary programs do provide adequate training in traditional disciplines.

On the basis of findings of the study, it is recommended that theological educators re-examine and renew their commitments to training for leadership as servanthood. Pre-seminary evidence of qualities of a servant minister should be incorporated into trainee selection criteria. Training for leadership as servanthood should be adopted as the integrating focus of the seminary program. Development of course objectives should take account of students' background and experience, on-going ministry experience in field education, and students' sense of "need to know." Isolated areas of training weakness in traditional disciplines should also be strengthened. By acting on these recommendations, it is expected that theological educators can better implement curriculum commitments to training for leadership as servanthood.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There is a sense in which this study has been my own, but there are many other senses, equally valid, in which it belongs to others.

The study would never have been possible without the cooperation and assistance of the four participating seminaries. The presidents of these institutions, who must remain unnamed, have exhibited personal interest in the study, reflecting their own deep commitment to training for ministry as servanthood. I trust that the result of the study will be of immediate assistance to you in communicating this commitment to seminarians and developing in them the qualities of servant ministers. I pray God's blessing upon you.

Professor Norm Bell guided my introduction to educational research. My initial exploration of the literature of helping professions came in a seminar led by Professor Sam Corl. Professor Larry Sarbaugh challenged me to consider the cross-cultural aspects of helping. Professor Dick McLeod encouraged me in the completion of the study. These men have served as members of my guidance committee, demonstrating personal care and wise counsel throughout the years of our acquaintance. I am thankful for each of you.

Special mention is reserved for Professor Ted Ward, Chairman of my guidance committee, advisor, mentor, friend, and brother. This study took initial shape as result of a conversation in his car as we drove

to Farmington; it was continued through his encouragement by letter and phone while I was in Manila; and it was guided to completion by advice given in Tokyo. Beyond the study, however, he has affected immeasurable growth in my life and thought. I trust you will be rewarded proportionately.

Others have assisted, too. Sam Rowen, Raywin Huang, Amy Palmer, Bob and Bertha Flinn, Jeanie Gall, and Rose Marie Springer have each contributed in very different but equally important ways. I can only express my appreciation by serving others as you have served me.

My entrance into curriculum study was encouraged by my colleagues of SEND, International. Frank Severn, Frank Allen, and Terry Tiessen have had a special part in bearing me up, and have consistently demonstrated the qualities of servant leaders in their ministries to me. I am privileged, and humbled, to work beside you.

My father and mother, Fred and Inez Ferris, have given their lives to the ministry of servanthood in God's Church. Your example is always before me. My children, Rosalyn and Roger, have assisted me in data compilation, in faithful prayer, and in uncomplaining patience. Your growth in grace and truth is my greatest desire. My wife, Sue, has helped, encouraged, and supported me throughout the years of our marriage. To say this study would never have been accomplished without her is to understate my indebtedness. Your love is my staff and reward. These are the members of my family. I am a privileged man, indeed.

I was sensitized to the issue of servanthood, and have come to understand it and its centrality in Christian ministry, however, through

the life of one who said, "I have come not to be served, but to serve."
And again, "So you also, when you have done all that is commanded you,
say, 'We are unworthy servants; we have only done what is our duty.'"
That is so true. I want to be like Him.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
1	THE PROBLEM	1
	Introduction	1
	Theoretical Background	2
	Potential Limitations	3
	Research Questions	4
	Delimitation of the Study	10
	Research Bias	10
	Importance of the Study	11
	Overview	13
2	PRECEDENT RESEARCH	15
	Overview	15
	Helping Relationships and Helping Professions	16
	Characteristics of a Program to Train Counselors As Helpers	18
	Characteristics of a Program to Train Teachers As Helpers	23
	Characteristics of a Program of Training For Helping Professions	28
	Summary	32
3	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	33
	Description of Methodology	33
	Variables of Interest	35
	Instrumentation	38
	Description of Participating Institutions	50
	Selection of Subjects	53
	Research Management	54
	Data Analysis Procedures	57
	Summary	60

Chapter		Page
4	RESEARCH FINDINGS	61
	Overview	61
	Present Incorporation of Training for Servanthood	
	In Seminary Curricula	62
	Research Question 1	62
	Research Question 2	70
	Section Summary	77
	Present Incorporation of Principles Identified As	
	Effective in Training for Helping Professions	
	In Seminary Curricula	79
	Research Question 3	81
	Research Question 4	87
	Research Question 5	91
	Research Question 6	99
	Research Question 7	107
	Research Question 8	114
	Research Question 9	124
	Research Question 10	133
	Section Summary	143
	Institutional Variability in Training for Servant-	
	hood at Participating Seminaries	145
	Research Question 11	146
	Research Question 12	151
	Section Summary	157
	Summary	158
5	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	160
	Conclusions Related to Training for Leadership As	
	Servanthood at Four Seminaries	161
	Oakhill Theological Seminary	161
	William Farel School of Divinity	162
	Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary	165
	Biblical Seminary	167
	Program Recommendations for Curricular Implementa-	
	tion of Commitment to Leadership as Servanthood . .	169
	Recommendations for Further Research	176
APPENDIX A	A THEOLOGICAL GROUNDING OF SERVANTHOOD AS THE	
	NORMATIVE PATTERN OF CHURCH LEADERSHIP	179
APPENDIX B	THE SEMINARY OBJECTIVE, OAKHILL THEOLOGICAL	
	SEMINARY	181

Chapter		Page
APPENDIX C	THE PURPOSE OF THE M. DIV. PROGRAM IN TERMS OF PRODUCT, SOVEREIGN GRACE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY	182
APPENDIX D	PERSONAL QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE MINISTRY, BIBLICAL SEMINARY	185
APPENDIX E	PERSONAL QUALITIES OF A SERVANT MINISTER . . .	187
APPENDIX F	THE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE	188
REFERENCES	196

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
3:1 Personal Qualities of a Servant Minister, With Descriptors	42
3:2 Results of Survey on Sources of Teaching/Learning Objectives Used by Selected Seminary Instructors	43
3:3 Results of Survey on Teaching Methods Commonly Used in Theological Education	45
3:4 Rates of Response to Questionnaire	56
4:1 Curriculum Elements Intended to Develop Servanthood Qualities	
4:1a At Oakhill Theological Seminary	64
4:1b At William Farel School of Divinity	65
4:1c At Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary	66
4:1d At Biblical Seminary	67
4:2 Demonstration of Personal Qualities of a Servant Minister	
4:2a At Oakhill Theological Seminary	71
4:2b At William Farel School of Divinity	72
4:2c At Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary	73
4:2d At Biblical Seminary	74
4:3 Present Demonstrations of Servant Minister Qualities Through Informal Curriculum Elements at Four Seminaries	78
4:4 Present Demonstrations of Servant Minister Qualities Through Formal Curriculum Elements at Four Seminaries	79

Table		Page
4:5	Personal Qualities of a Servant Minister As Perceived Development Goals	
4:5a	At Oakhill Theological Seminary	93
4:5b	At William Farel School of Divinity	94
4:5c	At Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary	95
4:5d	At Biblical Seminary	96
4:6	Perceived Effectiveness in Developing Personal Qualities of a Servant Minister	
4:6a	At Oakhill Theological Seminary	101
4:6b	At William Farel School of Divinity	102
4:6c	At Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary	103
4:6d	At Biblical Seminary	104
4:7	Perceived Faculty Modeling of Personal Qualities Of a Servant Minister	
4:7a	At Oakhill Theological Seminary	109
4:7b	At William Farel School of Divinity	110
4:7c	At Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary	111
4:7d	At Biblical Seminary	112
4:8	Sources Commonly Used for Deriving Teaching/Learning Objectives	
4:8a	At Oakhill Theological Seminary	116
4:8b	At William Farel School of Divinity	117
4:8c	At Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary	118
4:8d	At Biblical Seminary	119
4:9	Rank Assigned by Respondents at Four Seminaries To Sources of Teaching/Learning Objectives Identified as Significant in Training for Helping Professions	123
4:10	Teaching Methods Commonly Employed	
4:10a	At Oakhill Theological Seminary	125
4:10b	At William Farel School of Divinity	126
4:10c	At Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary	127
4:10d	At Biblical Seminary	128
4:11	Rank Assigned by Respondents at Four Seminaries To Teaching Methods Identified as Significant In Training for Helping Professions	132

Table		Page
4:12	Perceived Adequacy of Training in Traditional Seminary Disciplines	
4:12a	At Oakhill Theological Seminary	135
4:12b	At William Farel School of Divinity	136
4:12c	At Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary	137
4:12d	At Biblical Seminary	138
4:13	Variation Within Faculty Related to Servant Minister Qualities at Four Seminaries	147
4:14	Pearson Product Moment Correlation of Reported Variation Within Faculty of Demonstration of Servant Minister Qualities and Standard Deviation Of Responses on Items Measuring Perceived Faculty Demonstration of Personal Qualities of a Servant Minister	150
4:15	Variation Across Time Related to Servant Minister Qualities	
4:15a	Increased Emphasis	153
4:15b	Decreased Emphasis	154

Chapter 1

THE PROBLEM

Orthodox protestant seminaries commonly endorse a theological commitment to servanthood as the normative style of leadership in the church (see Appendix A). The research conducted represents an attempt to assess the extent to which that theological commitment is reflected in the curricula of selected seminaries.

Introduction

Theological seminaries are professional training institutions which exist for the stated purpose of training men and women for ministry in the Christian church. A theological commitment to servanthood as the appropriate leadership style for ministry is typically expressed within protestant seminary faculties (Hurtado, 1975; Richards & Hoeldtke, 1980, ch. 7; Torrance, 1979). Such a commitment regarding the nature of the ministry for which the seminary trains properly constitutes a prominent concern in seminary curriculum planning. Some theological educators acknowledge, however, that present programs of training are not effective in developing servant ministers (Richards, 1975, p. 163). This acknowledgement would indicate that reconsideration and possibly re-design of seminary curricula is in order. Before

informed curriculum decisions can be made, however, theological curriculum planners need to know:

How is training for servanthood presently incorporated into seminary curricula?

Theoretical Background

Outside of theological education, data exist which are significant for seminary curriculum planning. The theoretical background for a study of training for ministry as servanthood comes from research on training for the helping professions. Two bodies of research have focused on this problem. Conclusions growing out of research on counselor training (Carkhuff, 1969b) and teacher education (Combs, Blume, Newman & Wass, 1974) concur that effective programs for training helpers include the following elements:

1. Trainees are selected on the basis of present evidence of those qualities the professional training program seeks to develop.
2. Developing the characteristics of effective helpers provides the integrating focus of the training program.
3. Trainers are functioning in the helping profession and relate to trainees as role models.
4. Learning is experiential (field based or simulated), and addressed to the individual trainee's sense of a "need to know."
5. The primary responsibility of the trainer is to direct the trainee's experience in such a way as to expand the field

of his/her "need to know" and to initiate reflection which leads to new plans of action.

6. The training program develops proficiency in the information and skills of the profession.

The research on training for helping professions suggests a second focus of inquiry related to seminary training. In order to responsibly discuss theological curricula and training for servanthood ministry, theological curriculum planners also need to know:

To what extent are principles identified as effective in training for helping professions now present in seminary curricula?

Potential Limitations

Most institutions are both variable and dynamic. In the case of seminary training programs, curriculum elements vary from professor to professor and from course to course. At the same time, both the formal curricula of the seminary and procedures of teachers are subject to change. Inasmuch as these factors can only be studied in longitudinal research designs, they pose a threat to this study. This threat will be dealt with, however, by incorporating perceptions of these factors into the research design. While a study of perceptions of variation and perceptions of change provides different information from a longitudinal study of the factors themselves, perceptions are not insignificant. A measurement of perceptions of variation and change, furthermore, provides a measure of assurance that the results of the study will not be invalidated by these factors.

Research Questions

Twelve research questions guided the inquiry. These can best be observed in relation to the various concerns of the study from which they arise.

Questions Related to Present Training for Servanthood

Two questions grow out of the first problem identified for the study, i.e., How is training for servanthood presently incorporated into seminary training?

One way to determine how training for servanthood is incorporated into seminary curricula is to observe perceptions reported by theological educators and seminarians. If respondents consistently report particular curriculum elements as intended to develop servanthood qualities, this concurrence can be accepted as evidence that deliberate planning has occurred. Identification of these curriculum elements constitutes an important data base for future curriculum planning. Lack of response, on the other hand, can be taken to indicate curriculum planning in those aspects is weak or lacking. The following research question is designed to guide inquiry with respect to training intentions:

RQ₁: What elements in the seminary curriculum are perceived by theological educators and seminarians as intended to develop qualities of servant leadership?

A second way to determine how training for servanthood is incorporated into seminary curricula is to observe factors or incidents cited as demonstrations of servant minister qualities. Frequent men-

tion by theological educators and seminarians of any element in the formal curriculum can be accepted as evidence that the seminary curriculum incorporates training for leadership as servanthood in those elements. Identification of courses or other specific elements in which servant minister qualities are focused and demonstrated will provide data needed for future curriculum development. If theological educators and seminarians fail to cite examples of demonstrated servant minister qualities, cite highly distributed examples, or cite examples drawn from nonformal curriculum elements, then lack of deliberate planning can be concluded. The following research question is designed to guide inquiry with respect to demonstration of servant minister qualities:

RQ₂: What elements in the seminary curriculum are offered by theological educators and seminarians as examples that demonstrate qualities of servant leadership?

Questions Related to Principles of Training for Helping Professions

The next eight questions grow out of the second problem identified by the study, i.e., To what extent are principles identified as effective in training for helping professions now present in seminary curricula?

Research has identified trainee selection criteria as a significant variable in programs of training for helping professions. Data on criteria employed by seminary admissions committees will permit comparison of trainee selection criteria of seminaries with those found

to facilitate training for helping professions. The following research question is designed to guide inquiry with respect to seminary trainee selection criteria:

RQ₃: What criteria are employed by the seminary admission committee in selecting students into the seminary training program?

The demonstrated significance of program priority in training for helping professions justifies an approach to data collection along three lines. First, statements pertinent to program priority which appear in seminary publications and documents constitute an important factor for consideration.

Second, a program that gives priority to training for leadership as servanthood will necessarily also assign priority to developing those qualities that, in combination, constitute the characteristics of a servant minister. If a program is recognized as intending to develop servant minister qualities, curriculum priority on training for leadership as servanthood can be concluded. Perceptions of theological educators and seminarians related to their seminary's intention to develop servant minister qualities provide an additional means to assess priority assigned to training for servant ministry.

Finally, program outcomes are assumed to reflect program priorities. If a seminary program is effective in developing qualities of a servant minister, it is reasonable to conclude that priority in curriculum planning has been assigned to this commitment. On the other hand, ineffectiveness in developing servant minister qualities indicates

lower priority accorded to training for leadership as servanthood at the point of curriculum planning and implementation, irrespective of official statements and professed intentions. Most institutions do best that which they consider most important.

Three research questions were designed to guide inquiry with respect to program priority:

RQ₄: What priority is assigned by the seminary faculty to training for servanthood as indicated by statements and documents of the seminary?

RQ₅: If presented with a list of qualities characteristic of a servant minister, will theological educators and seminarians agree that development of these qualities constitutes a stated goal of their seminary?

RQ₆: If presented with a list of qualities characteristic of a servant minister, will theological educators and seminarians agree that their seminary program effectively develops ministers who evidence these qualities?

Trainers function as role models in effective programs of training for helping professions. In order to compare seminary programs with those effective in training for helping professions, it is necessary to determine the effectiveness of seminary faculty in demonstrating (i.e., being examples of) qualities of a servant minister. The following research question is designed to guide inquiry with respect to faculty modeling of servant minister qualities:

RQ₇: If presented with a list of qualities characteristic of a servant minister, will theological educators and seminarians agree that their seminary faculty is effective in demonstrating these qualities?

Research on training for helping professions indicates programs are most effective when training objectives are based on the experiences of trainer and trainees, as well as the trainee's sense of a "need to know." In order to compare seminary programs with those effective in training for helping relationships, it is necessary to know how training objectives are derived for seminary courses. The following research question is designed to guide inquiry with respect to sources of training objectives:

RQ₈: What sources are most commonly used by theological educators for deriving teaching/learning objectives?

Teaching methods employed in effective programs of training for helping professions emphasize experiential learning, including reflection on experience and interaction regarding experiences of trainer and trainee. In order to compare seminary programs with those found to be effective in training for helping relationships, it is necessary to identify teaching methods commonly employed in seminary instruction. The following research question is designed to guide inquiry with respect to teaching methods employed in theological education:

RQ₉: What methods of teaching are most commonly used by theological educators?

Programs that effectively train for helping professions also develop proficiency in the information and skills of those professions. In order to discuss this variable with respect to training for ministry it is necessary to obtain information regarding the adequacy of seminary education. Although by no means impartial, those most familiar with a seminary's training program (and thus, best able to evaluate it) are the faculty and students of that seminary. The following research question is designed, therefore, to guide the inquiry with respect to the effectiveness of seminary training:

RQ₁₀: If presented with a list of disciplines associated with traditional training for ministry, will theological educators and seminarians agree that their seminary program provides effective training in these disciplines?

Questions Related to Potential Threats to the Study

Finally, two questions grow out of the potential limitations of the study. The first addresses the threat posed by excessive variability among seminary faculty or courses. The second, on the other hand, addresses the threat posed by excessive change within the seminary or its curriculum. The following research questions guided inquiry of these factors:

RQ₁₁: What variations within the seminary are reported by theological educators and seminarians with respect to demonstration of the qualities characteristic of a servant minister?

RQ₁₂: What trends within the seminary are reported by theological educators and seminarians with respect to emphasis on the characteristics of a servant minister?

Delimitation of the Study

The study was limited to four protestant seminaries in the "Reformed" tradition. All four seminaries are members of a consortium of seven similar institutions. Over the past five years member seminaries of the consortium have engaged in joint curriculum evaluation and development projects (Elmer, 1980; Rowen, 1981). When a proposal for the present study was circulated to presidents of seminaries in the consortium, five of the seven initially responded by expressing interest in research related to training for leadership as servanthood at their seminary. Because a servanthood approach to church leadership is recognized as normative by seminaries in the consortium, these institutions constitute appropriate cases for the study.

Research Bias

Although verbal commitment to leadership as servanthood is commonly endorsed by theological educators, it would be easy to overstate the practical concern for servanthood leadership training evidenced among orthodox protestant seminaries. Some theological educators advocate authoritarian leadership styles within the church, specifically on the basis of organizational efficiency (Richards & Getz, 1981). Other educators focus on the theoretical and academic aspects of ministry training, with little or no attention to the issue of leadership style

(Pacala, 1981). Among these theological educators, the lack of correlation between theological commitment to servanthood leadership and alumni behaviors is of little concern.

A theological commitment to leadership as servanthood is generally acknowledged, however, even when seminary curricula fail (or refuse) to take that commitment into account. Theological commitments which are not actualized in the program of the seminary and the lives of its members are mere "god words," empty of meaning. Inasmuch as servanthood is central to a Biblical concept of leadership in the church (Ward, 1978), it is impossible to treat it as meaningless without incurring considerable damage to the theology of the church and the authority of the Scriptures.

Curriculum design and curriculum evaluation are necessarily and properly value laden activities. Basic to this research is the assumption that theological educators should face squarely the issue of continuity between theological statements about leadership in the church on the one hand, and the leadership style evidenced by graduates of their seminary on the other. It is further assumed there is a utility of value in relating research on training for helping professions to seminary curricula. Curricula incorporating characteristics of a program of training for helping professions can promote the stated commitment of seminaries to training for leadership as servanthood.

Importance of the Study

The study is important for at least two reasons. Certain theological educators are cognizant of a lack of correspondence between

their theological commitments regarding ministry as servanthood and the leadership style preferred by their seminary graduates. This lack of correspondence has led to raising curriculum questions which are, as yet, unanswered. The study is designed to ascertain the means by which commitment to ministry as servanthood has determined present seminary curricula and to explore seminary curricula with respect to variables found to be significant in training for other helping professions. Theological educators seeking to alter seminary curricula toward training for servant ministry will find the conclusions of the study suggestive. Thus, the study addresses a current and perplexing curriculum question confronting some theological educators.

The study is also important with respect to larger and more long range issues in theological education. Although a few theological educators have acknowledged the failure of seminaries to train for servant ministry, the underlying problem may be more fundamental. Some have suggested that the seminary model itself is defective and that new approaches to training for ministry must be developed (Amirtham, 1979; Kinsler, 1981, ch. 1; Richards, 1975, ch. 14). While that conclusion has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of most theological educators, the need for significant change is widely acknowledged (Farley, 1981; Fletcher, 1981; Solanky, 1978). This study can be viewed as one link in a chain of curriculum research directed toward developing an approach to training for ministry which is effective in preparing ministers whose leadership style is consistent with their theological commitments.

Overview

The present chapter has presented the problem with which this research study is concerned, the problem of curricular emphasis on leadership as servanthood. A case study approach to research has been identified and specific research questions have been posed.

In Chapter 2, precedent research is reviewed. Precedent research for the study is found in the literature of training for helping professions. Findings related to training for counseling and training for teaching as helping professions are reviewed and points of concurrence noted.

In Chapter 3, research methodology employed in the study is identified. The design of the research is outlined, variables of interest are described, the procedures employed in conducting the research are reported, and procedures used in analysis of data collected are outlined.

In Chapter 4, the findings of the study are reported. Each research question is restated and data collected at each participating institution are presented.

In Chapter 5, conclusions of the study and recommendations based on the research findings are presented. Conclusions are reported for each participating seminary and program recommendations are addressed to seminary administrators. The last section of the chapter contains recommendations for future research.

In summary, the study examined curricular implementation of commitment to leadership as servanthood at four protestant seminaries in

the "Reformed" tradition. Present intention to train for leadership was studied, and specific curriculum factors with demonstrated significance in programs of training for helping professions were probed. Findings are of immediate importance to the four seminaries studied and raise questions of potential significance for theological educators in general.

Chapter 2

PRECEDENT RESEARCH

The precedent research for the study comes from the field of helping professions. In this chapter, a brief review of literature related to research on helping relationships and helping professions is followed by an examination of the most publicized studies on training counselors and teachers as helpers. A comparison of findings from the two fields of pedagogical research leads to generalized observations regarding characteristics of a program of training for helping professions.

Overview

Research literature indicates recognition and investigation of "helping professions" attained significant attention only within the past 25 years. The "helping professions" construct acknowledges a common pattern of relationships between professional and client, helper and helpee, which unifies the constellation of vocations designated by the term. Teaching, medical care, pastoral ministry, and counseling are examples of "helping professions."

Research related to the role of helpers and the nature of the helping relationship has been concentrated in the fields of psychotherapy and education. Findings supporting the usefulness of the "helping re-

lationship" construct have stimulated research on training counselors and teachers as helpers.

A review of research in training counselors and teachers as helpers indicates six common characteristics of a program of training for helping professions. These characteristics are identified as trainee selection, training program focus, trainer modeling, experiential training base, training method, and training adequacy.

Helping Relationships and Helping Professions

Certain studies in the field of psychotherapy during the decade of the 1950s examined effectiveness in counseling. In a seminal article, Rogers (1958) reviewed this research and proposed the concept of "helping" and "the helping relationship" as an integrating construct which gave meaning to the research findings. Rogers' initial definition of the helping relationship focused on intention. He wrote:

By this term I mean a relationship in which at least one of the parties has the intent of promoting the growth, development, maturity, improved functioning, improved coping with life of the other. The other, in this sense, may be one individual or a group. To put it in another way, a helping relationship might be defined as one in which one of the participants intends that there should come about, in one or both parties, more appreciation of, more expression of, more functional use of the latent inner resources of the individual (Rogers, 1958, p. 6).

In forming this construct, Rogers recognized its broad application to parenting, medical care, education, counseling and, in some cases, administration.

Rogers' article stimulated researchers to test the empirical validity of the "helping relationships" construct, as well as explore

its implications for "helping professions." Two publications in 1969 reported on research subsequent to the article by Rogers. Combs published Florida Studies in the Helping Professions, and Carkhuff published Helping and Human Relationships.

Combs reports research indicating that the perceptual frame of the helper is correlated to effectiveness in the helping relationship. Specific factors examined included 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 (Combs, 1969, pp. 70-75). Subjects of the studies reported by Combs and his associates were counselors, school teachers, college professors, student nurses, and Episcopal pastors.

Carkhuff's work focuses on research in counseling, and compliments the more broadly based statements of Combs. After a rather extensive review of research literature, Carkhuff offers the following summary.

First, there is extensive evidence to indicate that significant human encounters may have constructive or deteriorative consequences, that is, counseling and therapy may be "for better or for worse." Second, evidence indicates that all effective interpersonal processes share a common set of conditions that are conducive to facilitative human experiences. For example, clients of counselors who offer high levels of the facilitative conditions of empathy, respect, and concreteness as well as the more action- and activity-oriented conditions of genuineness and self-disclosure and confrontation and immediacy improve while those of counselors who offer low levels of these conditions deteriorate. Thus, we can account for a great part of the counselor's effectiveness independent of his orientation and technique by assessing the level of facilitative and action-oriented conditions offered by the counselor (Carkhuff, 1969b, p. 21).

Subsequent studies have continued to explore the meaning, significance, and varied applications of the "helping relationship" and "help-

ing professions" constructs (Avila, Combs & Purkey, 1977; Brammer, 1979; Carkhuff & Anthony, 1979; Combs, Avila & Purkey, 1978; Egan, 1975; Gazda, Asbury, Balzer, Childers, & Walters, 1977; Welter, 1978). The present study is primarily concerned, however, with research related to training for helping professions and possible application of findings to seminary curricula. It is Carkhuff, Combs, and their associates who have given the most attention to pedagogical implications of research in the helping professions.

Characteristics of a Program to Train Counselors as Helpers

Carkhuff is a psychotherapist and educator who has published extensively throughout most of the past two decades. Carkhuff repeatedly stresses that the responsibility of psychological counselors is to establish helping relationships. To keep this fact before his readers, Carkhuff abandons traditional and elitist role designations in favor of "helpers" and "helpees."

Carkhuff has given considerable attention to the selection and training of "helpers" in the counseling profession (1969a; 1969b; 1971; 1972). His comments on selection and training assume a rather traditional institutional setting, and much of his thought reflects a competency based perspective. Many of his remarks on training helpers are suggestive.

Carkhuff begins by asserting, "Perhaps the most critical variable in effective counselor training is the level at which the counselor-trainer is functioning on those dimensions related to constructive helpee change" (1969a, p. 238). In contrast to existing patterns in

much counselor education, Carkhuff reports learning gain among students is enhanced when the trainers are actively engaged in helping relationships. Academic pursuits and experimental research certainly have their place, but they do not compensate for low levels of helper functioning among trainers. Carkhuff's findings indicate trainers functioning at low levels have minimal or negative effect on the level of functioning of trainees (1969b, p. 156). This leads him to the further observation that the selection of the most promising trainees only makes sense if trainers themselves are functioning at the highest level (1969b, p. 262).

The basis of selection of trainees also represents a point of contrast between traditional counselor education and that proposed by Carkhuff. Traditional selection procedures have been primarily intellectual in nature (e.g., undergraduate grade-point averages, Miller analogies scores) and have shown little or no correlation to the trainee's future effectiveness in helping relationships. Carkhuff proposes the consummately reasonable proposition that "the best index of a future criterion is a previous index of that criterion" (1969b, p. 85). In terms of trainee selection, this implies that trainees should be selected on the basis of present evidence of those qualities which contribute to effective helping relationships. To test this hypothesis, Carkhuff employed a series of counseling simulations as a basis for judging potential trainees with respect to qualities the program intended to develop, such as present levels of communication, discrimination between helping and non-helping processes, and ability to handle

crises. In contrast to traditional modes of trainee selection, Carkhuff found that trainee selection of this type correlates positively with higher levels of helper functioning after training (1969b, p. 261).

In addition to trainer and trainee level of functioning, the third factor found by Carkhuff to account for differences in training outcomes is the focus of the training program. By and large, professional counselor training programs in the past have focused on preferred modes of treatment, such as psychoanalytic, behavioristic, or client-centered, and have essentially ignored the helping skills which are common to all effective counselors. It is not amazing, therefore (although still significant), that research conducted by Carkhuff and his associates indicates that "trainees in the traditional, professional training programs demonstrated no change or negative change" in helping functions (1969b, p. 149). Trainees were no more effective as helpers, and often less effective, after professional training than they were before. Without debating the appropriateness of training in preferred modes of treatment, Carkhuff's first conclusion is that training in helping relationships must be established as the primary focus of professional training (1969b, p. 160).

A second aspect of training programs found to relate significantly to trainee effectiveness is the nature of the learning experiences employed. Traditional counselor training programs tend to be either exclusively didactic and lecture oriented or exclusively experiential. Carkhuff's research indicates that the most effective programs of counselor training are those that integrate the didactic, experiential, and

modeling modes of learning (1969b, p. 151). Carkhuff defines the experiential base of the counselor training program as combining two aspects. On the one hand, the trainee experiences the personal, facilitative attention of the trainer which is the essence of the helper-helpee relationship. Beyond that, however, the training program is integrally intertwined with the experience of the trainee. Carkhuff has found this can best be accomplished in counselor education through the use of role-play.

If there is one central ingredient to the training experience it is that the trainee will be involved over and over again in these training experiences. The implementation of the helping role provides the working and work-oriented structure within which the training process takes place (1969b, p. 215).

In the context of counselor education, role-play provides the trainer with control and avoids risk to innocent helpees. Most important of all, however, it provides the trainee with an experience base which gives meaning and significance to the rest of the training program.

Carkhuff also reports that effective counselor training programs provide a rich didactic experience. Again, two factors are present. On the one hand, the "more knowing" trainer shares with the trainee lessons drawn from personal experience. Carkhuff states, "In order to be effective, helpers must combine their good intentions with helping skills; for it is the helper's skills that make the difference. Concern is clearly not enough" (1979, p. 24). As trainers instruct and share with trainees, a critical information base is acquired. On the other hand, information and experience gains meaning in the light of reflection. Thus the trainer and trainee together reflect on the experiences shared

in the context of the training program as they mutually search for more effective helping patterns (1969b, p. 201).

The third element which Carkhuff finds critical to successful counselor education is the role of trainer as model. The limited contact, highly formal, role stereotypic relationships which are traditionally preserved between instructors and students in professional counselor training programs contribute directly to the negative outcomes of such programs in terms of trainee helping functions. Carkhuff describes an experimental training model in which "the counselor-trainer not only offers high levels of facilitative and action-oriented dimensions (thus providing the trainee with the same experiential base as the helpee is to be offered) but also establishes himself as a model for a person who can sensitively share experiences with another as well as act upon these experiences, both within and without the pertinent interpersonal process" (1969a, p. 243). Carkhuff found counselor training groups using this experimental model evidenced change significantly greater than groups using traditionally structured or standard control programs. It is essential that trainers themselves are living and functioning professionally at a high level, as noted above, but it is also essential that they are accessible to their trainees in modeling relationships.

Carkhuff's research not only supports counselor education which is experienced based, didactic, and modeled, but indicates the various elements of the training program are effectively enhanced when integrated. In the counselor training program developed by Carkhuff, experience,

instruction, and modeling are inseparably combined as the trainer and trainee reflect on shared experiences and draw on the wider experience of each to formulate action plans for continued experience and learning. In such a context, trainers functioning at the highest level interact with trainees selected on the basis of pre-training helping skills to focus attention on those particular dimensions of counseling which establish and sustain productive helping relationships. By these means Carkhuff's research has led him to improved levels of post-training effectiveness among lay and professional counselors.

Characteristics of a Program to Train Teachers as Helpers

Combs is a psychologist and educator whose principal concerns lie in the area of professional teacher education. As a Professor of Education at University of Florida and, currently, at University of Northern Colorado, Combs has conducted extensive research on teacher effectiveness. Combs' findings on the characteristics of effective teachers can be usefully compared with Carkhuff's findings on effective counselors.

In The Professional Education of Teachers (1974), Combs and his colleagues have addressed directly the issues related to training teachers for helping relationships. Like Carkhuff, Combs begins by assuming an institutional setting for teacher education, but some of his conclusions demand more fundamental alterations in traditional structures than those suggested by Carkhuff. It is the similarity of their findings and the conclusions they draw from them, however, which merits the attention of this study and of all who are concerned with training for helping professions.

Research conducted by Combs and his associates has identified five aspects of teacher beliefs and perceptions as contributing directly to good teaching. Good teachers 1) are empathic, 2) have positive self-concept, 3) perceive others in positive ways, 4) embrace open and facilitating purposes, and 5) are authentically self-revealing and genuine (1978, p. 558). Like Carkhuff, Combs' research has led him to conclude the task of trainee selection is best approached in terms of present manifestation of these qualities (1974, p. 86). Theoretically, it would be possible to make almost anyone into an effective teacher, but practically this is too costly to consider. Rather than continuing to accept students into teacher education programs on the basis of self-selection and objective indexes such as grade-point averages, Combs advocates selection of potential trainees in terms of the qualities to be developed. Those who already demonstrate a considerable measure of the perceptual qualities of a good teacher should be actively recruited into the teaching profession, while those who evidence very little of these qualities should be helped to explore alternative career opportunities (1974, p. 87).

Combs also shares Carkhuff's recognition of the inadequacy of traditional programs of professional training. "In a program for becoming," Combs writes, "learning must be personal and experiential. Mere acquisition of knowledge will not do" (1978, p. 559). The inadequacy stems from the fact that graduates will not be confronted with impersonal and context-free demands for information but rather with teacher-learner relationships which will require prompt and personal

response. Combs focuses the inadequacy of traditional teacher education and suggests an alternative which is both scientifically and intuitively attractive.

There is a vast difference between developing a personal philosophy and studying philosophies. There is also a difference between understanding a given child and understanding the psychology of childhood or adolescence. From sociology, one can understand how society came to be in its current mess, but that is a far cry from being able to take an active part in changing it.

.

One does not need new information, for example to learn to respect the dignity and integrity of others; what is required is continuous exploration of the concept and clearer differentiation of what it means in one's personal economy of values. Experiential learning is subjective, phenomenological, and personal. Applied in teacher education it calls for continuous student exploration of self, others, ideas, purposes, and the student's own confrontation of problems in the classroom (Combs, 1978, p. 559-560).

Having previously reviewed Carkhuff's research indicating need for re-direction of counselor education, the elements of an alternative teacher education program proposed by Combs seem strikingly familiar. Training should be viewed as "experiential learning" which is "subjective, phenomenological, and personal." By this Combs intends "continuous student exploration" which is existentially rooted in "the student's own confrontation of problems in the classroom" and is defined and re-defined against "one's personal economy of values." Thus Combs' research in perceptual psychology and teacher education indicates need to re-orient teacher education toward student perceptions and becoming.

A training program re-oriented in this way is facilitated when the field experience component of the teacher education program is viewed in a non-traditional way. "Student teaching" is most often found near

the end of the training curriculum, and is regarded as the place where trainees practice what they have been taught at the university. Combs has recognized field experience as affording the indispensable experiential base for effective teacher education. He concludes it should be expanded, however, to provide students with personal involvement in teaching situations throughout their period of training. "In the sheltered atmosphere of supervised field experience, students are able to try their wings in the encounter with professional problems at a pace appropriate to current stages of growth" (1978, p. 560). Combs acknowledges that supervision of continuous field experience is beyond the resources of traditional teacher education institutions. To solve this problem, he suggests that teachers colleges accept the public schools into full partnership in the teacher education process.

"Colleges and public schools must share the training of teachers," Combs states, "with colleges maintaining responsibility for substantive and personal aspects of student growth and public schools assuming responsibility for field experience and supervision" (1978, p. 561).

Combs' commitment to experiential learning is rooted in the well established principle that learning proceeds best when the learner has a need to know. Traditional course organization began with the trainer's perception of what the trainee ought to know, with little account taken of the fact that students rarely are able to relate the information provided to felt needs. A program set in the context of continuous field experience and oriented toward student perceptions and becoming, possesses both the philosophical and the experiential ca-

capacity to address needs recognized by students in meaningful and facilitative ways. This is not to reduce the teacher education program to the limits of students' felt needs. Combs reminds his readers that "good teachers do more than satisfy immediate need; they also help students discover needs they never knew they had" (1978, p. 560). Thus the field of a student's "need to know" is enlarged as the trainer directs attention to previously unrecognized aspects of the student's experience. At this point the action-reflection, reflection-action pattern, as identified also by Carkhuff, becomes critical. Combs notes that in terms of the goals of teacher education, "best results are achieved when it is possible to combine observations and active involvement with children with immediate discussion" (1974, p. 77). Thus the role of the trainer is not simply that of information giver. It is one of helping the trainee expand her/his field of professional and relational awareness and of facilitating reflection based on experience--reflection which is directed toward reforming action patterns.

Not only does Combs' research indicate need for a new structural relationship between college and public schools and a new principle of instructional organization, he also observes such a program of teacher education will require a new kind of faculty. Traditionally faculty members have been experts in the various disciplines associated with teacher education. "Experiential learning," Combs notes, "calls for persons who are not so much 'teachers' as process facilitators skilled in helping others explore problems, events, themselves, and others" (1978, p. 561). These, of course, are the very characteristics which

previous research demonstrated to correlate with effectiveness in classroom teaching. Since teacher education entails both professional training in the art of teaching and specialization in one or more subject fields, Combs is concerned that students' encounters with subject matter instructors possess this same facilitative purpose. This is imperative, Combs states, "since teacher-education students learn from their own experience not only subject matter but also how to teach it" (1974, p. 58). Thus Combs recognizes, as did Carkhuff, that facilitative relationships within teacher education are important not only because they reflect the most effective mode of training, but also because they provide an important modeling function for trainees.

Introduction of the necessity of subject matter training brings into focus the final aspect of teacher education which must be noted. Combs recognizes that a good teacher must be well informed (1974, p. 46). Furthermore, he calls attention to the equally important fact that being well informed is a continuing process rather than an achievable state (1974, p. 60). Thus, subject matter training should be both experiential and thorough. In this way trainees can be equipped for a life-time of professional growth and for a career of helping others come to appreciate the importance of this subject matter for them.

Characteristics of a Program of Training for Helping Professions

The preceding sections have reviewed findings and proposals set forth by Carkhuff and Combs for training counselors and teachers. Although pursued independently, the result of their work reflects sub-

stantial concurrence regarding characteristics of a program of training for helping professions. The following summary of observations is suggestive.

Trainee selection--Trainees are best selected on the basis of present evidence of those qualities the professional training program intends to develop.

Training program focus--Trainees benefit most from a program focused on training in perceptual and human relations skills characteristic of effective helping relationships. Professional training in counseling and education traditionally focused on secondary, rather than primary, factors.

Trainer modeling--Trainee learning gains and field effectiveness are related to trainer active involvement as a practitioner in the helping profession. Combs noted the importance of trainers modeling the facilitative and helping skills which characterize good teachers, and Carkhuff emphasized that trainers must be functioning at a high level in order to realize maximum development of trainee skills.

Experiential training base--Training is most effective when it is rooted in experience. Carkhuff identifies the experience of both trainer and trainee as the base on which the counselor training program is built. Combs points out that teacher education proceeds best when the training program includes continuous field experience and is responsive to trainees' sense of a "need to know." Traditional counselor training and teacher education programs are reported to be organized on the basis of the instructors' concept of what students

ought to know, and are essentially unrelated to the trainees' experience.

Training method--Development of trainee perceptions and skills is facilitated when trainers provide direction in experiential learning and when trainers initiate reflection on experience which proceeds to new patterns of action. Carkhuff proposes that role-play be employed as the central ingredient in counselor training. Combs notes that teacher education is most effective when supervised field experience extends throughout the period of training and is enhanced through the action-reflection process. Thus, preferred training methods include supervised field experience, role-play and simulated professional encounters, reflection on trainee's experience, and such experience oriented activities as guided discovery and analysis of case studies.

Training adequacy--Effective training programs provide students with an adequate grasp of the information and skills of their profession. It was necessary for Carkhuff to note that trainees must be well grounded in basic counseling techniques, and for Combs to remind his readers that a good teacher must be well informed. Recognition that helping must be given integrative focus in the training program should not be taken to imply that content is of no importance. Indeed, a counselor may excel in helping skills but unless he/she is able to guide the counselee toward resolution of problems, helpfulness is of little benefit. Likewise, an encouraging, facilitative, but uninformed teacher can offer only limited assistance to a learner. Any program

designed to develop helpers must provide adequate training in the information and skills of the helping profession.

To date, specific research on training for helping professions has been pursued primarily by Carkhuff, Combs, and their associates. Underlying research on counselor and teacher effectiveness is much more broadly based. Conclusions would be much stronger if researchers in other helping professions directed similar attention to training for effectiveness. Nevertheless, some generalizations seem possible. Findings of research by Carkhuff and Combs support the following tentative conclusions regarding characteristics of a program of training for helping professions.

1. Trainees are selected on the basis of present evidence of those qualities the professional training program seeks to develop.
2. Developing the characteristics of effective helpers provides the integrating focus of the training program.
3. Trainers are functioning in the helping professions and relate to trainees as role models.
4. Learning is experiential (field based or simulated), and addressed to the individual trainee's sense of a "need to know."
5. The primary responsibility of the trainer is to direct the trainee's experience in such a way as to expand the field of his/her "need to know" and to initiate reflection which leads to new plans of action.

6. The training program develops proficiency in the information and skills of the profession.

Summary

The precedent research on which this study builds comes from the literature on "helping professions." Some of the most well known studies have been reviewed in this chapter.

Training for counseling and teaching as helping has received significant research attention. Carkhuff has explored implications of the "helping relationships" construct with respect to counselor effectiveness and counselor training. Combs has explored implications of "helping relationships" in the field of teacher effectiveness and teacher education. A review of findings of Carkhuff and Combs regarding training for helping in psychotherapy and education led to six observations regarding common characteristics of a program of training for helping professions.

Chapter 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study examined curricular implementation of seminary commitment to training for leadership as servanthood. Special attention was given to curriculum elements found significant in training programs for other helping professions. This chapter will relate in detail how the study was conducted. First, the methodology and design of the research will be reviewed, including identification of variables of interest. Next, instrumentation for the study will be discussed. Third, general descriptions of the four participating seminaries will be outlined. Fourth, procedures for selection of subjects and collection of research data will be summarized. Finally, procedures employed in analysis of research data will be identified.

Description of Methodology

The research conducted is best identified as descriptive research. Isaac and Michael (1971) state the purpose of descriptive research as:

- a. To collect detailed factual information that describes existing phenomena.
- b. To identify problems or justify current conditions and practices.
- c. To make comparisons and evaluations.
- d. To determine what others are doing with similar problems or situations and benefit from their experience in making future plans and decisions (Isaac & Michael, 1971, p. 18).

The primary purpose of the study corresponds to the first purpose listed by Isaac and Michael: "To collect detailed factual information that describes existing phenomena." Although the study was not designed with diagnostic or apologetic intentions, findings indicating the presence or absence of problems are reported. For this reason the study may also result in outcomes described in Isaac and Michael's second purpose: "To identify problems or justify current conditions and practices." Characteristics of a program of training for helping professions were incorporated into the research, reflecting a subsidiary concern which corresponds to Isaac and Michael's third purpose: "To make comparisons and evaluations." Finally, the fact that the research included four seminaries also allows the individual institutions to realize Isaac and Michael's fourth purpose: "To determine what others are doing with similar problems or situations and benefit from their experience in making future plans and decisions." Thus all four purposes of descriptive research identified by Isaac and Michael were served, to some extent, by the study.

The research proceeded in four steps:

1. Contact was established with four protestant seminaries in the "Reformed" tradition. The seminaries contacted constitute an appropriate sample for the study because administrators and faculty members are committed to training for leadership as servanthood and are open to examining curriculum commitments.

2. Official documents and publications of participating seminaries were examined for statements related to training for leadership as servanthood.

3. A questionnaire designed to explore attitudes and perceptions related to training for leadership as servanthood was administered to a sample of faculty and students at each participating seminary.

4. Data were analyzed and compared on all variables of interest. Each seminary was treated as a discrete case. When similar findings were obtained from two or more seminaries, this fact was noted, but no attempt was made to generalize conclusions across the four participating institutions or beyond them to "Reformed" seminaries at large.

Variables of Interest

Two sources provided the variables of interest within the study. From the need to know how training for servanthood is presently incorporated into seminary curricula, attention was directed toward:

Present Intentions--Those elements presently incorporated in the seminary program with the intent to develop servanthood patterns of ministry were designated "present intentions." Theological educators and seminarians were requested to list aspects of the seminary program intended to develop qualities of a servant minister. Responses provided were assumed to represent present intentions of their institution.

Present Demonstrations--Those ways in which the qualities of a servant minister are demonstrated in the seminary program were designated "present demonstrations." Theological educators and seminarians were requested to relate incidents when the qualities of servant ministry were demonstrated at their seminary. Examples cited were assumed to represent present demonstrations.

From the need to know to what extent principles of training for helping professions are presently represented in seminary curricula, attention is directed toward:

Curriculum Priority--That factor, or combination of factors, which provides the point of focus or integration for the seminary curriculum was designated the "curriculum priority" factor. An example of curriculum priority is provided by Carkhuff. He notes that classical training for psychological counseling has been organized about (i.e., has assigned curriculum priority to) preferred mode of treatment (Carkhuff, 1969b, p. 160). Statements appearing in seminary publications and documents regarding the focus or emphasis of the seminary program were assumed to constitute assertions of "curriculum priority." Theological educators and seminarians were requested to assess the degree to which the development of the qualities of a servant minister constitute stated goals of the seminary program and the effectiveness with which the seminary program develops those qualities. Responses provided were assumed to represent the extent to which those qualities function as curriculum priority factors.

Trainee Selection Criteria--Factors considered determinative in accepting students into the seminary program were designated "trainee selection criteria." Statements in seminary publications and documents, guidelines employed by admissions committees, and information solicited from applicants were considered indicative of trainee selection criteria.

Trainer Modeling--Faculty demonstration of the qualities of a servant minister was designated "trainer modeling." Theological educators and seminarians were requested to indicate agreement with statements asserting that faculty members effectively demonstrate the qualities of a servant minister. Responses provided were assumed to measure trainer modeling.

Training Base--The source, or sources, most commonly employed by theological educators as the basis for deriving teaching/learning objectives was designated the "training base." Theological educators and seminarians were requested to indicate sources most commonly used for deriving teaching/learning objectives. Responses provided were assumed to indicate the training base of the seminary program.

Training Method--Those teaching methods most commonly employed by theological educators in the seminary program were designated the "training method." Theological educators and seminarians were requested to indicate teaching methods most commonly used in their seminary. Responses provided were assumed to indicate the training method of the seminary program.

Training Adequacy--The effectiveness of the seminary program in imparting information and developing skills traditionally associated with theological education was designated "training adequacy." Theological educators and seminarians were requested to indicate agreement with statements asserting that the seminary program provides adequate training in disciplines associated with traditional theological education. Responses provided were assumed to indicate the training adequacy of the seminary program.

Instrumentation

The research employed a questionnaire specifically designed for use in the study. Borg and Gall state, "The first step in carrying out a satisfactory questionnaire study is to list specific objectives to be achieved by the questionnaire" (1971, p. 195). Questions to be answered by this research required a questionnaire which would achieve the following objectives:

1. The questionnaire must elicit data on respondent attitudes and perceptions of emphasis on leadership as servanthood as evidenced in:
 - A. Present intentions--What aspects of the seminary program are intended to develop qualities of a servant minister?
 - B. Present demonstrations--What examples are cited as incidents when qualities of a servant minister were demonstrated in the seminary?
 - C. Curriculum priority--To what extent do the declared goals of the seminary include developing qualities of a servant minister? Also, to what extent is the seminary program effective in developing qualities of a servant minister?
 - D. Trainer modeling--To what extent does faculty demonstrate qualities of a servant minister?
 - E. Training base--What sources are most commonly used to derive teaching/learning objectives for seminary courses?
 - F. Training method--What teaching methods are most commonly used in seminary courses?
 - G. Training adequacy--To what extent does the seminary program provide adequate training in disciplines associated with traditional theological education?
2. The questionnaire must elicit data on respondent perceptions of variability within the seminary with respect to emphasis on leadership as servanthood.

Operational Definitions

Before the instrument could be designed, four operational definitions were required.

First, it was necessary to define "leadership as servanthood" in terms of personal qualities of a servant minister. Inasmuch as the research was concerned with the seminaries' own attempts to implement commitments to "leadership as servanthood," it was important that the definition employed in the study reflect those commitments. It was not the purpose of the study to impose a definition of "leadership as servanthood" on participating institutions, but rather to explore implementation of the institutions' own curriculum commitments. The formulation of an operational definition of "leadership as servanthood" in terms of personal qualities of a servant minister was accomplished by means of a four-step process.

1. Seminary presidents were requested to supply copies of official publications and documents which address the issue of "leadership as servanthood" or "personal qualities of a servant minister."

All four seminary presidents responded to this request. Three of the seminaries provided statements addressing the issue (Appendixes B, C, and D). The fourth seminary president reported his faculty had discussed a statement from one of the other schools included in the study. His faculty affirmed general agreement with the commitments expressed in that statement.

2. The statements provided by the seminaries were analyzed and a composite statement was prepared.

Although it would have been possible to base the study on the various statements supplied by the individual seminaries, the research task would have been complicated and the value of findings would have

been diminished. Formulation of a common operational definition permitted more meaningful comparison of research findings.

3. The composite statement was submitted to the presidents of participating seminaries with a request that they confirm, in general, the appropriateness of the statement as a reflection of theological commitments held by their faculty. If appropriateness could not be affirmed, presidents were requested to amend the statement as necessary.

All four seminary presidents responded, affirming the general appropriateness of the composite statement. Only one president suggested amendments to the statement. He offered two suggestions, but stated both were made tentatively and without insistence that they be included.

4. Amendments suggested were incorporated into the statement. The researcher had indicated the entire statement would be re-submitted to the seminary presidents if amendments were substantial. The research design called for this procedure to be repeated until a list of personal qualities of a servant minister was derived which all seminary presidents could accept as adequately reflecting (at least for the purposes of this study) the commitments held at their respective institutions.

The research concern focused on obtaining preliminary assurance that the qualities of a servant minister employed in the study would not encounter wholesale rejection at any participating institution. Failure to include this precaution in the research design could have resulted in data largely meaningless in terms of the stated purpose

of the study. As a matter of fact, both suggested amendments had the effect of clarifying rather than altering the composite statement. It was possible to incorporate these suggestions without necessitating further affirmation from the other seminary presidents, since the statement remained essentially unchanged in all its major aspects. Table 3:1 presents the composite statement, as revised, with descriptors used in the study to refer to the qualities. The qualities were employed in open response items on the questionnaire to investigate present intentions and present demonstrations, and with Likert-type attitude scales to investigate curriculum priority and trainer modeling.

Second, it was necessary to formulate a list of sources used by theological educators in developing teaching/learning objectives. Borg and Gall suggest:

Perhaps the best method of determining the multiple-choice categories to use in closed questions is to ask the question in essay form of a small number of respondents, and then use their answers to develop the categories for the multiple-choice item that will be included in the final form of the questionnaire (Borg & Gall, 1971, p. 198).

The list of sources of teaching/learning objectives required by the study was generated by polling ten professors of a seminary similar to those participating in the study. The poll was conducted at a faculty meeting. Faculty members were provided blank paper on which to record their response to the question, "What factors do you consider when formulating objectives for a course?" Respondents provided 1 to 3

TABLE 3:1

Personal Qualities of a Servant Minister

With Descriptors

Quality	Descriptor
The minister loves the Triune God. He diligently studies the Scriptures and responds to them in faith and obedience because he knows that God is revealed in them.	Faith
The minister loves people. He is sensitive to the joys, hurts, and struggles of others, and responds to them in gentle affirmation and compassionate service.	Empathy
The minister values and demonstrates integrity in his relationships both in private and in professional life.	Integrity
The minister evidences growth in those virtues which are distinctively Christian, particularly love, joy, faith, humility, meekness, patience, and self-control.	Virtue
The minister is a leader. He motivates and equips others for their ministry both in the church and in the community.	Leadership
The minister gives himself to the service of God and the church without concern for his own personal gain or advantage.	Altruism
The minister is zealous for the advancement of Christ's kingdom, the proclamation of the gospel, the conversion of sinners, and the defense of Christian truth.	Zeal
The minister seeks to be informed about problems of contemporary life and society, and interacts with others to develop a Christian perspective on these problems.	Involvement
The minister is wise, discerning, and discreet in personal relationships and in dealing with major and minor issues.	Wisdom
The minister is an emotionally healthy person, confident of his ability to minister through the grace of Christ, and open to Christians of other denominations and traditions.	Self-acceptance

responses (mean = 2.2; mode = 2). When their content was analyzed, the responses indicated six sources of teaching/learning objectives, as presented in Table 3:2.

TABLE 3:2

Results of Survey on Sources of Teaching/Learning Objectives
Used by Selected Seminary Instructors
(n = 10)

<u>Sources of Teaching/Learning Objectives</u>	<u>f.</u>
Analysis of the learning task	6
Analysis of the course subject or discipline	5
Official course description or departmental consensus	4
Students' background and experience	4
Theological commitments on nature of the ministry	2
Professional research interests	1

Because factors found to contribute to effective training for helping professions were of special interest in the study, it was necessary to supplement the above list with two additional sources of teaching/learning objectives. The two sources derived from research on training for helping professions are "professional experience in ministry" and "students' sense of a 'need to know.'" Combining the six sources identified by the survey with the two derived from research in helping professions resulted in the following list of sources of teaching/learning objectives (presented in alphabetical order):

- Analysis of the course subject or discipline
- Analysis of the learning task
- Official course description or departmental consensus
- Professional experience in ministry
- Professional research interests
- Students' background and experience
- Students' sense of a "need to know"
- Theological commitments regarding the nature of ministry

The above list was employed in a ranking item on the questionnaire to investigate the training base at participating seminaries.

Third, it was necessary to formulate a list of teaching methods commonly used by theological educators. Again the procedure employed conformed to the recommendation of Borg and Gall (1971, p. 198) cited above.

The list of teaching methods required by the study was generated by polling ten seminary graduates (including, but not limited to, alumni of institutions participating in the study). Those polled were asked, "What methods of teaching were commonly used in the seminary you attended?" Respondents provided 1 to 4 responses (mean = 2.6; mode = 3). When their content was analyzed, the responses indicated six teaching methods commonly used in theological education, as presented in Table 3:3.

Because instructional methods found to contribute to effective training for helping professions were of special interest in the study, it was necessary to supplement the list obtained through the survey

TABLE 3:3
Results of Survey on Teaching Methods
Commonly Used in Theological Education
(n = 10)

<u>Teaching Method</u>	<u>f.</u>
Lecture	10
Reading or research with report	7
Discussion of lecture or research	5
Recitation or drill	2
Simulation games or role play	1
Small group discussion	1

with four additional teaching methods. The four methods derived from research on training for helping professions are "analysis of case studies," "field experience," "guided discovery," and "reflection on personal experience." Combining the six methods indicated by the survey with the four derived from research in helping professions resulted in the following list of teaching methods (presented in alphabetical order):

Analysis of case studies
Discussion of lecture or research
Field experience
Guided discovery
Lecture
Reading or research with report
Recitation or drill
Reflection on personal experience
Simulation games or role play
Small group discussion

The above list was employed in a ranking item on the questionnaire to investigate the training methods commonly used at participating seminaries.

Fourth, it was necessary to define "disciplines associated with traditional training for ministry" in terms of specific subject areas taught as part of seminary curricula. For the purpose of the study, and to assure relevance of findings to participating institutions, the Master of Divinity* curricula of the four participating seminaries were accepted as representative of traditional training for ministry. A comparison was made to identify courses of study common to the Master of Divinity curricula of all four seminaries. Fifteen courses were found common to the four Master of Divinity programs. These were accepted as comprising a list of disciplines associated with traditional training for ministry. The fifteen disciplines are listed below, arranged according to standard divisional heads.

Biblical Studies

Biblical introduction
Biblical languages
Hermeneutics
Biblical history
Biblical theology

Dogmatics

Systematic theology
Christian ethics
Apologetics

History

Church history

Practical Theology

Homiletics
Evangelism
Christian education
Pastoral care
Pastoral administration
Missions

* Master of Divinity (M.Div.) is the degree most commonly given by theological seminaries to first-level graduate practitioners.

Types of Questionnaire Items

In designing the questionnaire, four types of items were employed. Likert-type attitude scales were used for 45 items eliciting data related to respondent agreement/disagreement with a stimulus statement. Borg and Gall state, "On a Likert-type scale, the individual checks one of five possible responses to each statement: strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, strongly disagree" (Borg & Gall, 1971, p. 183). In the instrument for this study, the following numerical scale was substituted for specific attitude designations:

Strongly	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly
Agree						Disagree

Instructions printed as part of the instrument directed respondents to "indicate your agreement or disagreement with the statement given by circling the appropriate number." To minimize confusion, an example item was provided with a response marked.

Likert-type scales were selected over other attitude scales because of demonstrated effectiveness, as well as simplicity in responding and scoring. Borg and Gall report a study of the power of major attitude scales to predict behavior.

An important study concerned with this use of attitude scales was done by Tittle and Hill. They compared the effectiveness of various types of attitude scales (Likert, Guttman, Semantic Differential, Thurstone, Self-Rating) in predicting objective indices of voting behavior. The Likert scale was superior to all the other scale types; it yielded a mean correlation coefficient of .54 with the objective indices of voting behavior (Borg & Gall, 1971, p. 183).

Rank-ordering represents a second type of item used in the design of the questionnaire. Borg and Gall note, "In some types of educational research, it is easier to rank individuals than to assign quantitative scores" (Borg & Gall, 1971, p. 293). The present study required identification of most frequently employed sources of teaching/learning objectives and most frequently employed teaching methods. The most efficient type of item to elicit the required data is rank-ordering.

Ranking items designed for use in the questionnaire presented respondents with specific response arrays. From each array respondents were requested to select a limited number (3 in one case, 4 in the other) and rank the responses selected according to perceived frequency of occurrence at their seminary.

Multiple choice items were also employed in the design of the questionnaire. Borg and Gall note multiple choice questions as a type characterized by efficiency, and recommended whenever appropriate to the objective of the survey (Borg & Gall, 1971, p. 198). The three items measuring variability within institutions participating in the study were designed as multiple choice items.

Finally, 20 open response items were also included in the design of the questionnaire. Researchers are commonly warned that open response items are often difficult to interpret and analyze (Isaac & Michael, 1971, p. 92). Borg and Gall point out, however, that under certain circumstances open response items are preferred over closed response items intended to measure the same phenomena (Borg & Gall, 1971, p. 199).

Respondent Information

Although anonymity in questionnaire surveys is usually indicated only when information requested is of a highly personal or controversial nature (Isaac & Michael, 1971, p. 93), identification of respondents by name offered no perceptible advantage in the study. Instead, respondents were classified by institution according to a system of color coding and were requested to directly classify themselves by status according to the following categories:

- Administrator
- Faculty
- Advanced student (Post-M.Div. or equivalent)
- Senior student
- Middler student
- Junior student

Since data were analyzed according to a dichotomous "faculty/student" classification of respondent status, the above categories facilitated status assignment. The categories also permit sub-classification in the event further analysis of faculty or student responses is desired.

Because of potential significance for future research, faculty respondents were also requested to classify themselves according to faculty standing (full-time, part-time, visiting), committee membership (admissions, curriculum), and typical involvement in ministry (regular ministry in one congregation, frequent ministry in many congregations, occasional ministry in various congregations, rarely involved in congregational ministry). These categories were not part of the research design for this study, so data collected were not compiled and no findings will be reported.

It is customary, and highly advised, to conduct a pre-test of the research instrument prior to application in any serious study (Borg & Gall, 1971, p. 203). In this study a preliminary draft of the questionnaire, consisting of 63 items, was pre-tested with a class of seminary students representing a population similar to those of participating institutions. Minor points of confusion were noted and appropriate adjustments were made. The revised instrument, expanded to 70 items, appears in Appendix F.

Description of Participating Institutions

The four institutions participating in the study are members of a consortium of seven protestant seminaries in the "Reformed" tradition. Because a concern for training for leadership as servanthood exists within the consortium, a proposal for the present study was circulated to the presidents of member schools. Initially, five of the seven seminaries indicated an intention to participate in the study, but one seminary dropped out prior to data collection. The four remaining seminaries participated fully in the research.

As a precaution, lest findings appear critical of any seminary or its faculty, pseudonyms have been assigned in reporting findings and stating conclusions. A brief description of the four participating seminaries, identified by the assigned pseudonym, follows.

Oakhill Theological Seminary (identified as "Oakhill") is a denominational institution located in the northeastern United States. Founded early in the nineteenth century, the seminary has operated in

its present location for more than 50 years. The faculty of four men and one woman offers training toward the degree Master of Divinity and the certificates "Training in Ministry" and "Missionary Candidate" to a student body of 31 full-time and 10 part-time students. The seminary catalog notes, "About twelve denominations are represented in the student body. This offers a valuable opportunity in the setting of a denominationally controlled seminary for students to learn to appreciate their distinctive denominational contributions and to develop an understanding of the basis for Scriptural ecumenicity." As stated in the catalog, the primary purpose of the seminary is to provide "a succession of godly and able men for the Gospel ministry, by instructing candidates for the Pastoral Ministry and other special lines of Christian service."

William Farel School of Divinity (identified as "Farel") is a denominational seminary located in the mid-western United States. Founded in the mid-twentieth century, Farel was brought under control of the same ecclesiastical body as Oakhill through a merger of two denominations within the last 20 years. The purpose of Farel is described in its catalog as "the provision of a scholarly program of the highest quality to prepare men spiritually, academically, and practically for a variety of ordained ministries, primarily for [the sponsoring denomination]." The seminary is staffed by a faculty of 15 full-time faculty, 4 part-time faculty, and 2 full-time administrators. During spring semester, 1981, 139 students were enrolled at the seminary, 114 in the Master of Divinity course, 15 in Master of Arts pro-

grams, 2 in a post-graduate Master of Theology program, and 8 in other courses. Like Oakhill, the Farel catalog states that the seminary's student body "has always included a large proportion of students from outside the sponsoring denomination."

Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary (identified as "Sovereign Grace") is an independent (i.e., non-denominational) theological seminary located in the southern United States. Perceived need for a new seminary serving orthodox protestant churches in the "Reformed" tradition gave rise to opening Sovereign Grace in the mid-twentieth century. The seminary has grown rapidly, and in spring, 1981, 5 administrators and a faculty of 18 men and 1 woman served a student body of 224. About 85% of the students at Sovereign Grace were enrolled in the seminary's Master of Divinity program. Publications of the seminary repeatedly affirm the school's commitment to the Holy Scriptures, the "Reformed" theological tradition, and the evangelical mission of the church in the world.

Biblical Seminary (identified as "Biblical") is a denominational institution located in America's upper mid-west. Referring to the seminary's latter nineteenth century origins, the catalog affirms, "From its inception the primary purpose of [Biblical Seminary] has been to provide a theologically and professionally well-prepared ministry" for the sponsoring church. During winter term, 1981, a staff of 20 administrative and faculty personnel served a student body of 153. About 60% of the students were enrolled in the seminary's Master of Divinity program, about 11% in the post-graduate Master of Theology

course, and the balance were unclassified or enrolled in specialized programs.

Despite variation in size, location, and affiliation, the four seminaries that participated in the study share a common theological tradition and a common commitment to training for pastoral ministry. It is this commitment, in which a servanthood approach to church leadership is recognized as normative, that provided incentive and justification for participation of these seminaries in the study.

Selection of Subjects

For each seminary included in the study, data were collected from two populations: seminary faculty and seminary students.

For the purposes of the study, seminary faculty was defined as full-time administrators and instructors under regular appointment at the seminary (i.e., omitting part-time and visiting personnel). Because of the small size of the faculties of participating institutions, faculties were not sampled, but were polled as a population. Participation of seminary faculty in the study was necessary to obtain data on variables designated "present intentions," "training base," and "training method," as well as to establish faculty perceptions related to other variables.

Selection of subjects from among seminary student populations was handled in two ways. In the one institution with a student population less than 50 (i.e., Oakhill), no sample was drawn; students were polled as a population. In the three seminaries with larger student popula-

tions, a sample of fifty subjects was drawn. Hopkins and Glass state, "Random selection of the members of a sample prevents any selection biases and allows generalizability of the sample findings to the population with a known margin of error" (Hopkins & Glass, 1978, p. 187). The most reliable method for drawing a random sample is by use of a table of random numbers. In sampling student populations for the study, each seminary was requested to provide a full list of students enrolled during the winter or spring term, 1981. These lists were alphabetized and numbers assigned serially to the members of each population. Next a sample of 50 subjects, plus 5 alternates, was drawn using a table of random numbers (Hopkins & Glass, 1978, pp. 406-407).

Participation of seminarians in the study provided an important check on faculty responses. Usher (1969) reports a study of college teachers in which trained observers rated teachers on a list of twelve perceptual variables related to helping relationships. Attempts to correlate these ratings with ratings of faculty effectiveness based on professional activities (e.g., publication or consultation), and independent evaluations by department chairperson, dean, and students indicated that only the evaluation by students provided a significant ($p \leq .05$) correlation.

Research Management

From the time the research was originally proposed, contact with each seminary was handled through the office of the president. It was the president who received a copy of the research proposal, and it was from his office the decision to participate in the study was communi-

cated. Seminary documents and publications, and faculty and student census records were provided through each president's office. At the point of data collection, questionnaires were sent to each seminary in care of the office of the president, together with a list of faculty and students to whom they were to be distributed. In each case the president's office distributed questionnaires, collected the completed instruments, and forwarded them to the researcher. A high level of interest and cooperation was extended by the presidents of the four institutions throughout the study.

The management strategy described above was indicated by a desire to maintain full confidence of seminary administrators in the study by requesting their participation at every stage of the research. Administrator confidence and participation was considered important to assuring maximum credibility and, thus, benefit from the study at participating institutions.

The limitation inherent in the management strategy adopted is reflected in the relatively high rate of nonrespondents in some population samples. Since distribution and collection of the questionnaire was committed to the president of each seminary, the researcher could follow up with the president's office, but it was not possible to follow up directly with individual respondents. The rates of return for each institution are indicated in Table 3:4.

A significant rate of nonrespondents can constitute a serious problem in any research conducted through survey techniques. Borg and Gall state,

TABLE 3:4

Rates of Response to Questionnaire

<u>Seminary</u>	Faculty			Students				
	Pop .	Return	% Pop.	Pop.	Sample	Return	% Sample	% Pop.
Oakhill	5	5	100%	31	31	24	77%	77%
Farel	21	9	43%	139	50	33	66%	24%
Sovereign Grace	24	16	67%	224	50	36	72%	16%
Biblical	20	9	45%	153	50	19	38%	12%

If more than 20 percent [of respondents] are missing, however, it is very likely that most of the findings of the study could have been altered considerably if the nonresponding group had returned the questionnaire and had answered in a markedly different manner than the responding group. This could be the case if those people who did not respond to the questionnaire are in some measurable way different from those who did respond (Borg & Gall, 1971, p. 209).

Findings of the study are open to question at this point. Although the number of respondents in each case represents a relatively high percentage of the total population, there is no assurance that the responding sample is unbiased. No explanation has been discovered for the low rate of students' return at one of the institutions and faculty's return at two of the institutions.

If attitude patterns of nonrespondents made the questionnaire more threatening for them, for example, serious biasing would have occurred. Although respondents may have been reluctant to reveal certain attitudes measured by the survey instrument, the precaution of anonymity would

tend to neutralize any threat. Perhaps the best assumption is that the length of the instrument (70 items) deterred some respondents in the midst of heavy academic schedules. If that is the case, a higher rate of response may not have significantly altered the findings.

Data Analysis Procedures

Procedures employed in analyzing research data were determined by the method of data collection. The research project involved five types of data.

Attitude Scale Data

Means and standard deviations were computed for each population sample from data collected on attitude scales. Mean scores were interpreted according to the following range intervals:

<u>Interval Range</u>	<u>Interpretation</u>
1.00 to 1.49	Strongly agree
1.50 to 2.49	Agree
2.50 to 3.50	Ambivalent
3.51 to 4.50	Disagree
4.51 to 5.00	Strongly disagree

Faculty and student responses from each seminary were compared for the sake of interpretive insight. The appropriate test to identify significant differences is a t-test for independent samples. Results are reported at the $\alpha = .05$ level of significance. The null hypothesis for each test is:

H_0 : There is no significant difference between mean responses of theological educators and those of seminarians.

The null hypothesis and alternative hypothesis (symbolically stated), the test statistic, and the decision rule for each test were:

$$H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$$

$$H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$$

$$v = n_1 + n_2 - 2$$

$$\alpha = .05$$

$$t = \frac{(\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2) - (\mu_1 - \mu_2)}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n_1} (x_{1i} - \bar{x}_1)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} (x_{2i} - \bar{x}_2)^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2} \left(\frac{n_1 + n_2}{n_1 n_2} \right)}}$$

$$\text{Reject } H_0 \text{ if } |t| \geq t_v(\alpha=.05)$$

Findings were also totaled across items, by item stem, for each population sample.

Ranked Data

Responses to each item were tallied by stimulus (i.e., source of objectives or teaching method) and ranking assigned, with data compiled separately for each population sample. A cumulative ranking was computed by weighting frequency tallies according to the following values:

<u>Respondent Ranking</u>	<u>Weighting</u>
1	f × 4
2	f × 3
3	f × 2
4	f × 1

Faculty and student cumulative rankings from each seminary were compared for each item for the sake of interpretive insight. The ap-

propriate test to identify significant differences is a Spearman Rank Difference Correlation. Results are reported at the $\alpha = .05$ level of significance. The null hypothesis for each test is:

H_0 : There is no significant correlation between rankings assigned by theological educators and those assigned by seminarians.

The null hypothesis and alternative hypothesis (symbolically stated), the test statistic, and the decision rule for each test were:

$$H_0: \rho = 0$$

$$H_1: \rho \neq 0$$

$$\alpha = .05$$

$$z = \frac{\frac{r}{1}}{\sqrt{n-1}} \quad \text{when} \quad r = 1 - \frac{6\sum D^2}{n(n^2-1)}$$

Reject H_0 if $|z| \geq 1.96$

Multiple Choice Data

Responses for each item were tallied and percentage response calculated by stimulus (i.e., source of variability), with data compiled separately for each population sample. In relation to any source of variability, reports of variation from 25% or more of respondents in any population sample were considered significant. Faculty and student responses from each seminary were compared for each stimulus for interpretive insight.

Open Response Data

Responses to open response items were analyzed, grouped, and tallied for each population sample. Tally sheets prepared for use in classifying responses provided 15 to 19 categories developed in the

course of analysis. Findings are reported for each population sample in terms of number of responses recorded in each category. Faculty and student responses from each seminary were compared for interpretive insight.

Document Research Data

Information derived from document research was subjected to content analysis. Particular attention was given to direct statements bearing on specific research questions. Also considered significant were statements related to factors contributing to effectiveness in programs of training for helping professions. Findings were collected by institution and summarized across the four seminaries participating in the study.

Summary

The design of this curriculum research study calls for data regarding curriculum commitments of four seminaries as stated by the institutions in official publications and documents and as perceived by their faculty and students. The means by which these data were collected, including the questionnaire developed for use in the study, have been presented. A brief sketch of participating institutions is also included in this chapter. An explanation of sampling and data analysis procedures concludes Chapter 3.

Chapter 4

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Findings of the research are presented in this chapter. Each of the research questions is restated and accompanied by documentary or statistical findings. The chapter concludes with a summary of major findings.

Overview

The study intended to investigate curriculum commitment to leadership as servanthood at four protestant seminaries in the "Reformed" tradition. Focus of the study concentrated on informational needs expressed in the two questions which guided the inquiry:

How is training for servanthood presently incorporated
into seminary curricula?

To what extent are principles identified as effective
in training for helping professions now present
in seminary curricula?

A third concern arising from the research design also was considered in the study:

What sources of variability exist in participating seminaries which could affect interpretation of research findings?

The data presentation and analysis portion of this chapter will be taken up in three sections, corresponding to the questions which guided the inquiry. Each section will identify the research questions and present related findings for one of these concerns. A section summary will conclude each section of the chapter. A more comprehensive summary embracing the entire research will be provided at the conclusion of Chapter 4.

Present Incorporation of Training for Servanthood in Seminary Curricula

Two variables were identified as significant indicators of present incorporation of training for servanthood in seminary curricula. Curriculum factors identified by theological educators and seminarians as intended to develop servanthood patterns of ministry are identified as "present intentions." Those ways in which the qualities of a servant minister are demonstrated in the seminary program are designated "present demonstrations." Data related to both variables were collected through open response items on the questionnaire. Data are reported as frequency and percentage distributions, and no attempt is made to analyze data through statistical procedures.

Research Question 1

What elements in the seminary curriculum are perceived by theological educators and seminarians as intended to develop qualities of servant leadership?

Ten items on the questionnaire elicited responses related to present intentions. The stem for each item was:

What course or other aspect of our seminary's program is intended to develop this quality?

The quality referred to in the item stem was one of ten "personal qualities of a servant minister" (Appendix E). Pairing the item stem with each of the ten personal qualities of a servant minister produced the ten items included in the questionnaire.

Findings were tallied for each item by population sample, then a cumulative statement of findings was produced by combining data for each sample across the ten items sharing the stem indicated above.

Findings About Curricular Intention--Oakhill. Cumulative findings for Oakhill Theological Seminary are presented in Table 4:1a. With 100% item response from faculty subjects and 65% response from student subjects, curriculum elements perceived as intended to develop qualities of servant leadership were highly distributed. The most frequent response across all qualities was the course titled, "The Minister's Personal Life" (13% of total faculty responses; 10% of total student responses). "Field education" and "informal faculty modeling" were infrequently mentioned among intended development elements. "Faculty counseling/advising" was mentioned by 8% of faculty respondents, but by only 2% of student respondents.

Apparent lack of focus on training for servant leadership is indicated by the diffuse array of responses to questionnaire items. Only non-specific "departmental responses" and grouped responses for 24 courses exceeded 15% of total. Responses indicating lack of perceived intent to train for servant leader qualities, however, were also rare (faculty = 2%; students = 1%).

TABLE 4:1a

Curriculum Elements Intended to Develop Servanthood Qualities

At Oakhill Theological Seminary

(Faculty n=5; Student n=24)

Response	Frequency		Percentage	
	Faculty	Students	Faculty	Students
Course: Minister's Personal Life	13	27	13%	10%
Course: Pastoral Counseling	7	23	7%	8%
Course: Pastoral Care	2	14	2%	5%
24 Courses (Infrequent mention)	26	79	26%	28%
Departmental Responses	13	70	13%	25%
All Courses	0	13	0%	5%
Chapel	7	9	7%	3%
Special Lectures/Seminars	1	1	1%	0%
Field Education	4	10	4%	4%
Faculty Counseling/Advising	8	7	8%	3%
Administrative Services/Policies	3	0	3%	0%
Student Organizations	1	1	1%	0%
Informal Faculty Modeling	2	10	2%	4%
Informal Peer Associations	3	5	3%	2%
Entire Seminary Program	7	7	7%	3%
No Perceived Intent to Develop	2	4	2%	1%
Don't Know	0	1	0%	0%
Total Responses Across Stem	99	281	100%	100%

TABLE 4:1b

Curriculum Elements Intended to Develop Servanthood Qualities

At William Farel School of Divinity

(Faculty n=9; Student n=33)

Response	Frequency		Percentage	
	Faculty	Students	Faculty	Students
Course: Eschatology & Ethics	5	22	5%	7%
Course: Theology of the Ministry	0	17	0%	5%
Course: Pastoral Care & Counsel	2	9	2%	3%
12 Courses (Infrequent mention)	18	37	17%	11%
Departmental Responses	32	71	30%	21%
All Courses	14	13	13%	4%
Chapel	6	12	6%	3%
Special Lectures/Seminars	0	11	0%	3%
Field Education/"Bible & Life"	5	29	5%	9%
Faculty Counseling/Advising	3	1	3%	0%
Administrative Services/Policies	0	4	0%	1%
Student Organizations	1	6	1%	2%
Informal Faculty Modeling	6	18	6%	5%
Informal Peer Associations	1	8	1%	2%
Entire Seminary Program	3	0	3%	0%
No Perceived Intent to Develop	9	63	8%	19%
Don't Know	3	4	3%	1%
Total Responses Across Stem	108	335	100%	100%

TABLE 4:1c

Curriculum Elements Intended to Develop Servanthood Qualities

At Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary

(Faculty n=16; Student n=36)

Response	Frequency		Percentage	
	Faculty	Students	Faculty	Students
Course: Ethics & Apologetics	12	34	8%	8%
Course: Worship & Work of Church	10	15	7%	4%
Course: Pastoral Care & Counsel	5	23	3%	5%
23 Courses (Infrequent mention)	39	22	26%	5%
Departmental Responses	35	147	23%	35%
All Courses	10	36	7%	9%
Chapel	4	29	3%	7%
Special Lectures/Seminars	2	14	1%	3%
Field Education	1	10	1%	2%
Faculty Counseling/Advising	3	2	2%	0%
Administrative Services/Policies	6	4	4%	1%
Student Organizations	0	4	0%	1%
Informal Faculty Modeling	9	13	6%	3%
Informal Peer Associations	2	4	1%	1%
Entire Seminary Program	4	15	3%	4%
No Perceived Intent to Develop	3	31	2%	7%
Don't Know	6	19	4%	5%
Total Responses Across Stem	151	422	100%	100%

TABLE 4:1d

Curriculum Elements Intended to Develop Servanthood Qualities

At Biblical Seminary

(Faculty n=9; Student n=19)

Response	Frequency		Percentage	
	Faculty	Students	Faculty	Students
Course: Pastoral Care	4	16	3%	7%
Course: The Church & Ministry	5	4	4%	2%
Course: Missiology	2	9	1%	4%
16 Courses (Infrequent mention)	25	20	19%	9%
Departmental Responses	27	49	20%	22%
All Courses	11	23	8%	10%
Chapel	5	5	4%	2%
Special Lectures/Seminars	2	8	1%	4%
Field Education	15	18	11%	8%
Faculty Counseling/Advising	13	5	10%	2%
Administrative Services/Policies	3	7	2%	3%
Student Organizations	1	5	1%	2%
Informal Faculty Modeling	10	20	7%	9%
Informal Peer Associations	6	8	4%	4%
Entire Seminary Program	3	7	2%	3%
No Perceived Intent to Develop	0	18	0%	7%
Don't Know	2	2	1%	1%
Total Responses Across Stem	134	224	100%	100%

Findings About Curricular Intention--Farel. Cumulative findings for William Farel School of Divinity are presented in Table 4:1b. With 79% item response from both faculty and students, no clustering was evident among curriculum elements perceived as intended to develop qualities of servant leadership. Among faculty respondents, the most common single response was "all courses" (13% of total), substantiating the apparent lack of curriculum focus on training for servant leadership. Equally significant, 19% of student responses specifically stated a lack of perceived intent to develop servant minister qualities. The most frequently cited element across all qualities was the "field education/Bible and Life" program (faculty = 5%; students = 9%), with the course "Eschatology and Ethics" mentioned nearly as often.

Findings About Curricular Intention--Sovereign Grace. Cumulative findings for Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary are presented in Table 4:1c. The 57% rate of response among faculty was the lowest on these items in the study. Neither faculty responses nor the 80% item response from students indicated agreement regarding curriculum elements intended to develop qualities of servant leadership. High "departmental responses" (faculty = 23%; students = 35%) tend to skew data on alternative responses, but also confirm lack of clearly defined curriculum goals with respect to servant minister qualities. Seven percent (7%) of student responses indicated "no perceived intent to develop" qualities of a servant minister at Sovereign Grace.

The course most frequently mentioned by faculty and students as intended to develop qualities of servant leadership is "Ethics and

Apologetics" (faculty = 8%; students = 8%). "Informal faculty modeling" was also cited as intended to develop servant leader qualities in 6% of faculty responses, but the same was noted in only 3% of student responses. "Field education" was rarely mentioned by either faculty or students.

Findings About Curricular Intention--Biblical. Cumulative findings for Biblical Seminary are presented in Table 4:ld. With 83% item response from faculty subjects and 87% item response from student subjects, no pattern was discernable among curriculum elements perceived as intended to develop qualities of servant leadership. "Departmental responses" and grouped course responses were relatively fewer among Biblical Seminary respondents than among respondents from other seminaries in the study, while "field education" and "informal faculty modeling" were cited more often. "Faculty counseling/advising" was cited in 10% of faculty responses, but in only 2% of responses from students. This would seem to indicate higher valuation of the effectiveness of the seminary's faculty counseling program among faculty than among students. Seven percent (7%) of student responses indicated "no perceived intent to develop" servant minister qualities at Biblical.

Research Question 2

What elements in the seminary curriculum are offered by theological educators and seminarians as examples that demonstrate qualities of servant leadership?

Ten items on the questionnaire elicited responses related to present demonstrations. The stem for each item was:

What do you think of as an example from our seminary that demonstrates this quality? (Relate an incident when you were aware that this quality was being demonstrated.)

As in items designed to elicit data on present intentions, the quality mentioned in the item stem refers to one of ten "personal qualities of a servant minister." Pairing the above stem with each of the ten personal qualities of a servant minister produced the ten items on present demonstrations included in the questionnaire.

Findings were tallied for each item by population sample, then a cumulative statement of findings was produced by combining data for each sample across the ten items sharing the stem indicated above. This is the same procedure employed with data on present intentions.

Findings About Present Demonstrations--Oakhill. Cumulative findings related to present demonstrations of qualities of a servant minister at Oakhill Theological Seminary are presented in Table 4:2a. When requested to provide examples from seminary life that demonstrate servant minister qualities, 90% of the faculty sample and 59% of the student sample responded by citing various curriculum elements. Faculty respondents mentioned student demonstrations of servant minister qualities in 31% of responses, almost twice as often as any other ele-

TABLE 4:2a

Demonstration of Personal Qualities of a Servant Minister

At Oakhill Theological Seminary

(Faculty n=5; Student n=24)

Response	Frequency		Percentage	
	Faculty	Students	Faculty	Students
Classroom Instruction	1	15	2%	10%
Chapel	0	5	0%	3%
Special Lectures/Seminars	0	4	0%	3%
Field Education	3	7	6%	5%
Faculty Counseling/Advising	1	6	2%	4%
Administrative Services/Policies	5	14	10%	9%
Student Organizations	0	1	0%	1%
Informal Faculty Modeling	5	57	10%	37%
Informal Student Modeling	15	10	31%	6%
Informal Peer Associations	8	25	16%	16%
Entire Seminary Program	0	2	0%	1%
No Examples Available	0	2	0%	1%
Negative Examples Only	0	3	0%	2%
Don't Know	5	0	10%	0%
Non-curricular Response	6	5	12%	3%
Total Responses Across Stem	49	154	100%	100%

TABLE 4:2b

Demonstration of Personal Qualities of a Servant Minister

At William Farel School of Divinity

(Faculty n=9; Student n=33)

Response	Frequency		Percentage	
	Faculty	Students	Faculty	Students
Classroom Instruction	2	27	3%	12%
Chapel	7	4	11%	2%
Special Lectures/Seminars	3	8	5%	3%
Field Education	2	2	3%	1%
Faculty Counseling/Advising	3	2	5%	1%
Administrative Services/Policies	4	8	6%	3%
Student Organizations	4	2	6%	2%
Informal Faculty Modeling	18	112	27%	48%
Informal Student Modeling	3	9	5%	4%
Informal Peer Associations	9	13	14%	6%
Entire Seminary Program	0	0	0%	0%
No Examples Available	3	19	5%	8%
Negative Examples Only	0	15	0%	6%
Don't Know	0	4	0%	2%
Non-curricular Response	6	5	9%	2%
Total Responses Across Stem	66	231	100%	100%

TABLE 4:2c

Demonstration of Personal Qualities of a Servant Minister

At Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary

(Faculty n=16; Student n=36)

Response	Frequency		Percentage	
	Faculty	Students	Faculty	Students
Classroom Instruction	1	34	2%	14%
Chapel	4	14	6%	6%
Special Lectures/Seminars	0	9	0%	4%
Field Education	3	6	5%	3%
Faculty Counseling/Advising	4	4	6%	2%
Administrative Services/Policy	6	20	9%	9%
Student Organizations	2	4	3%	2%
Informal Faculty Modeling	6	72	9%	31%
Informal Student Modeling	8	9	13%	4%
Informal Peer Associations	10	28	16%	12%
Entire Seminary Program	0	2	0%	1%
No Examples Available	10	10	16%	4%
Negative Examples Only	1	13	2%	6%
Don't Know	2	3	3%	1%
Non-curricular Response	7	7	11%	3%
Total Responses Across Stem	64	235	100%	100%

TABLE 4:2d

Demonstration of Personal Qualities of a Servant Minister

At Biblical Seminary

(Faculty n=9; Student n=19)

Response	Frequency		Percentage	
	Faculty	Students	Faculty	Students
Classroom Instruction	2	20	3%	15%
Chapel	1	3	1%	2%
Special Lectures/Seminars	1	6	1%	4%
Field Education	3	2	4%	1%
Faculty Counseling/Advising	2	8	3%	6%
Administrative Services/Policy	9	8	13%	6%
Student Organizations	6	7	8%	5%
Informal Faculty Modeling	12	34	17%	25%
Informal Student Modeling	12	9	17%	7%
Informal Peer Association	18	20	25%	15%
Entire Seminary Program	0	3	0%	2%
No Examples Available	1	4	1%	3%
Negative Examples Only	0	7	0%	5%
Don't Know	0	2	0%	1%
Non-curricular Response	5	3	7%	2%
Total Responses Across Stem	72	136	100%	100%

ment of the seminary curriculum. Student respondents, on the other hand, cited faculty demonstration of servant leader qualities in 37% of responses. Among both samples, the combined responses classed as "informal faculty modeling," "informal student modeling," and "informal peer associations" accounted for nearly 3 out of 5 examples provided (faculty = 57%; students = 59%). "Field education" and "faculty counseling" programs were rarely mentioned by either faculty or student respondents. Only a few student respondents (and no faculty respondents), indicated no examples of demonstrated qualities were available (students = 1%) or cited only negative demonstrations of servant leader qualities (students = 2%).

Findings About Present Demonstrations--Farel. Cumulative findings related to present demonstrations of qualities of a servant minister at William Farel School of Divinity are presented in Table 4:2b. With 62% of faculty sample and 64% of student sample responding, the most frequently cited example of servant leader qualities was "informal faculty modeling" (faculty = 27%; students = 48%). Student modeling of servant leader qualities, on the other hand, was rarely mentioned by either faculty or students (faculty = 5%; students = 4%). Among faculty responses, 9% represented non-curricular demonstrations (i.e., historic or alumni examples not drawn from current seminary life or programs). Faculty were much more inclined to cite examples from the seminary chapel program (11%, vs. 2% among students), but students were more inclined to cite examples from classroom instruction (12%, vs. 3% among faculty). "Field education" and "faculty counseling" programs

were rarely mentioned by either faculty or student respondents. Eight percent (8%) of student responses (and 5% of faculty responses) reported no examples of demonstrated servant minister qualities exist at the seminary, while 6% of student responses (but no faculty responses) reported negative examples only.

Findings About Present Demonstrations--Sovereign Grace. Cumulative findings related to present demonstrations of qualities of a servant minister at Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary are presented in Table 4:2c. Faculty and students from Sovereign Grace apparently found it difficult to provide examples of servant minister qualities. Among institutions included in the study, respondents providing examples were fewer (faculty respondents = 38% of sample; student respondents = 59% of sample) and respondents indicating "don't know" (faculty = 3%; students = 1%) or stating "no examples available" (faculty = 16%; students = 4%) were more numerous than at other seminaries. Eleven percent (11%) of faculty responses (and 3% of student responses) also cited "non-curricular" examples. Students most often mentioned "informal faculty modeling" situations (31%), whereas faculty tended to cite "informal peer associations" within the seminary community (16%) or "informal student modeling" (13%). "Field education" and "faculty counseling" programs provided few examples of servant minister qualities. Fourteen percent (14%) of student responses (but only 2% of faculty responses) cited examples from classroom instruction situations.

Findings About Present Demonstrations--Biblical. Cumulative findings related to present demonstrations of qualities of a servant minister at

Biblical Seminary are presented in Table 4:2d. Sixty-nine percent (69%) of the faculty sample and 68% of the student sample responded by providing examples of demonstrated servant leader qualities at Biblical Seminary. Faculty examples were most frequently drawn from informal peer associations within the seminary community (25%), followed by "informal faculty modeling" (17%) and "informal student modeling" (17%). Among students, the most frequently cited source of demonstrated servant minister qualities is "informal faculty modeling" (25%), with "informal peer associations" (15%) and "classroom instruction" situations (15%) affording the next most common sources. Faculty also recognize examples of servant leader qualities in "administrative services or policies" (13%), but this is less common among students (6%). "Field education" and "faculty counseling" provide few examples of servant leader qualities. It should also be noted few respondents from Biblical indicated "no examples available" (faculty = 1%; students = 3%) or cited only negative examples of demonstrated servant leader qualities (faculty = 0%; students = 5%).

Section Summary

To investigate how training for servanthood is presently incorporated into seminary curricula, seminary faculty and students were requested to indicate their perceptions of training for servant ministry at their respective institutions. Two variables were examined. Respondents were asked what elements of the seminary program are intended to develop qualities of a servant minister (i.e., present intentions) and how those qualities are demonstrated at their seminary (i.e., present demonstrations).

Theological educators and seminarians produced an extensive list of curriculum elements when asked to identify what course or other aspect of their seminary's program is intended to develop the ten qualities defined as characteristic of a servant minister. At none of the four institutions included in the study, however, does any agreement exist. Response patterns show wide variation. Furthermore, more than 20% of faculty and student responses at all four seminaries were non-specific "departmental responses," the only exception being the Oakhill faculty which identified departmental categories in only 13% of responses.

When asked to relate examples of the demonstration of servant minister qualities, theological educators and seminarians across the four institutions tended strongly to cite informal curriculum factors (Table 4:3). Formal curriculum factors, on the other hand, were men-

TABLE 4:3
Present Demonstrations of Servant Minister Qualities
Through Informal Curriculum Elements
At Four Seminaries

Informal Curriculum Element	Oakhill		Farel		Sov. Grace		Biblical	
	Fac	Stud	Fac	Stud	Fac	Stud	Fac	Stud
Faculty Modeling	10%	37%	27%	48%	9%	31%	17%	25%
Student Modeling	31%	6%	5%	4%	13%	4%	17%	7%
Peer Associations	16%	16%	14%	6%	16%	12%	25%	15%
Student Organizations	0%	1%	6%	2%	3%	2%	8%	5%
Total Informal	57%	60%	52%	60%	41%	49%	67%	52%

tioned in fewer responses (Table 4:4). The interpretation of these data will be reserved for Chapter 5.

TABLE 4:4
Present Demonstrations of Servant Minister Qualities
Through Formal Curriculum Elements
At Four Seminaries

Formal Curriculum Element	Oakhill		Farel		Sov. Grace		Biblical	
	Fac	Stud	Fac	Stud	Fac	Stud	Fac	Stud
Classroom Instruction	2%	10%	3%	12%	2%	14%	3%	15%
Chapel	0%	3%	11%	2%	6%	6%	1%	2%
Special Lectures	0%	3%	5%	3%	0%	4%	1%	4%
Field Education	6%	5%	3%	1%	5%	3%	4%	1%
Faculty Counseling	2%	4%	5%	1%	6%	2%	3%	6%
Administrative Policy	10%	9%	6%	3%	9%	9%	13%	6%
Total Formal	20%	34%	33%	22%	28%	38%	25%	34%

Present Incorporation of Principles Identified as Effective in Training
For Helping Professions in Seminary Curricula

Precedent research reviewed in Chapter 2 indicates six variables identified as effective in training for helping professions. Trainee selection criteria employed by participating seminaries were investigated through documentary research of seminary policies and publications.

Because of its importance, three measures were taken of curriculum priority. Official statements committing the institution to training for leadership as servanthood were sought through document research.

Theological educators and seminarians were asked to agree or disagree with statements that a list of personal qualities of a servant minister constitute stated training goals of their seminary. On the assumption that performance reflects priorities, theological educators and seminarians also were requested to agree or disagree with statements that their seminary effectively develops servant minister qualities. Data on declared goals of seminaries and program effectiveness are collected on attitude scales.

Trainer modeling is also measured by responses of theological educators and seminarians on attitude scales. The training base of the seminary program refers to the sources used by seminary faculty in deriving teaching/learning objectives. A ranking item on the questionnaire elicited data related to this variable. The training methods commonly employed by theological educators were also measured by means of a ranking item.

Finally, training adequacy refers to the effectiveness of the seminary in imparting information and skills associated with fifteen disciplines traditionally included in training for ministry. Data on perceptions of training adequacy in the individual disciplines were collected on attitude scales.

Findings of document research are reported for each seminary. Attitude scale data and ranked data are also reported for each seminary, accompanied by results of appropriate statistical tests and procedures described in Chapter 3.

Research Question 3

What criteria are employed by the seminary admission committee in selecting students into the seminary training program?

Document research on trainee selection criteria at each participating institution included examination of pertinent sections of the seminary catalog, student application forms, and additional resources and statements provided by the seminaries.

Findings About Trainee Selection Criteria--Oakhill. Content analysis of documents and forms provided by Oakhill Theological Seminary identified the following application requirements:

1. An application form consisting of bio-data, a biographical sketch, and three references (minister, college professor, and layman).
2. A full academic transcript of the applicant's college record, showing that he is a graduate of a college or university with a bachelor's degree or its regular equivalent.
3. A letter of recommendation from the proper church official, stating the applicant is a member in good standing and possesses the qualifications for gospel ministry.
4. A statement from the applicant describing his personal religious experience and giving his reasons for wishing to enter the seminary and the ministry.
5. Character evaluations from three references.
6. Application prior to August 1, if entering during the fall quarter.

Criteria for evaluation of application material have not been formulated with respect to most requirements. No guidance is provided, for example, regarding "the qualifications for gospel ministry" to be addressed in the letter of recommendation from the church official, and no criteria are stated for its evaluation. Criteria for evaluating

character references are also unstated, as are those related to the applicant's statement of his/her personal religious experience.

Criteria are more specific with respect to academic requirements. The applicant must have earned a bachelor's degree. Furthermore, the college or university granting the degree must be recognized by the United States Office of Education and by the institution's regional accrediting agency. Graduates from non-accredited programs are accepted on probation, pending demonstration of the ability to do seminary work. Admission procedure states that applicants from the sponsoring denomination will be accepted if academic requirements are met.

Findings About Trainee Selection Criteria--Farel. Content analysis of documents and forms provided by William Farel School of Divinity identified the following application requirements:

1. An application form consisting of bio-data, a testimony of Christian experience, a statement of reasons for pursuing theological study at Farel, and four references (businessman, 1 or 2 professors, and 1 or 2 church friends).
2. All college and graduate transcripts, one of which shows the attainment of a Bachelor of Arts degree or the equivalent.
3. Results of the Graduate Record Examination (aptitude test).
4. A letter of recommendation from the applicant's pastor and congregational governing board.
5. Character evaluations from at least 2 of 4 references.

The following criteria for assessing an applicant's qualifications are provided in a document titled, "Guidelines for Admissions."

Criteria for assessing the applicant's qualifications:

1. His spiritual qualifications* are evaluated from his own testimony on his application, his pastor's or his church governing body's letter of recommendation, and his references. His own credible testimony, a positive recommendation from his church, and a positive statement from at least 2 of the 4 references are necessary for acceptance. Negative comments which indicate a morals deficiency or problem will be investigated further and may be cause for rejection.
2. Academic qualifications are assessed from his transcripts and GRE scores. He must have a Bachelor of Arts degree, equivalent, or expect to complete this degree prior to matriculation. (This requirement may be waived in special cases by the Admissions Committee.) His grade point average must be at least 2.5 on a 4.0 scale. Up to 10% of the entering class may be accepted on academic probation (those with GPA of less than 2.5). A GRE (Verbal) score of 500 or higher is desirable, particularly if the GPA is below 2.5.

It is clear that the administration of Farel has attempted to carefully define criteria related to application requirements. The principal lack of specificity occurs with respect to factors to be considered by the applicant's church and individual references as basis for "a positive recommendation." (In this regard, the expressed concern over "a morals deficiency or problem" may be significant.) Academic qualifications, by contrast, are specific to the point of quantification.

Findings About Trainee Selection Criteria--Sovereign Grace. Content analysis of documents and forms provided by Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary identified the following application requirements:

1. An application form consisting of bio-data, a testimony of Christian experience, statement of reasons for pursuing theological study, five questions regarding conditions which "make candidacy for ministry questionable" (physical illness, mental illness, ex-

* Underlining added for emphasis throughout the citation.

treme financial difficulties, and any other situations), and five references (pastor, officer of the applicant's church, two friends, and a college instructor).

2. A full academic transcript indicating completion of a Bachelor of Arts degree or its academic equivalent.
3. A reference form from the applicant's pastor or the governing board of his congregation. The form is designed to attest the moral character, general ability, and special fitness of the applicant to become a theological student.
4. Character evaluations from other references.

The specified criteria for evaluating an applicant's qualifications are limited to academic requirements. In addition to the requirement of a Bachelor of Arts degree (or equivalent), the seminary also specifies a grade point average of 2.6 or above as necessary for regular acceptance. (Probationary acceptance with a lower grade point average is allowed.)

Criteria not specified include those applied to the applicant's testimony of Christian experience, his reasons for pursuing theological study, responses related to conditions which make candidacy for ministry "questionable," and character evaluation statement from references. The factors to be considered by the applicant's church in judging "special fitness" for theological study are also unstated.

Findings About Trainee Selection Criteria--Biblical. Content analysis of documents and forms provided by Biblical Seminary identified the following application requirements:

1. An application form consisting of bio-data, a statement of reasons for wishing to enroll at Biblical Seminary, a brief statement of personal Christian commitment, and three references (including one college professor).
2. A certificate of good health.

3. A transcript of all academic work beyond high school.
4. A recommendation from the governing board of the applicant's church. The form provided asks, "Do you recommend the applicant for study at Biblical Seminary?"
5. A recommendation from the applicant's college counselor. The form provided requests "a candid statement" regarding the applicant's "character and personality, his/her academic performance and intellectual ability, and social sensitivity."
6. A recommendation from the department of the applicant's major area of college study. The form provided is the same as that for the college counselor.
7. Two communications evaluations, English and speech. The forms provided request "a candid statement" regarding the applicant's "general qualifications for the ministry and in particular his/her ability to communicate effectively in writing and speaking."
8. A report of a psychological evaluation to be arranged through the seminary.
9. An interview with members of the Admissions and Standards Committee.

A personal correspondence addressed to the researcher by the Academic Dean of Biblical Seminary stated the two concerns of the seminary in evaluating applicants as 1) the student's ability to do the academic work of the seminary, and 2) the student's gifts and personality to do the work of ministry. Application requirements 3 and 6, above, are used to assess the applicant's ability to do academic work of the seminary, while requirements 4, 5, and 9 are used to assess gifts and personality for ministry.

Specific criteria applied in admissions decisions are unstated except with respect to academic requirements. Applicants must possess a Bachelor of Arts degree or its equivalent from an accredited college. A grade point average of 2.67 or higher is also required. The applicant's college work must include a major area representing at least

24 semester hours' concentration, plus 80 semester hours of specified courses, as follows:

Education and/or Psychology	6 semester hours
English	12 semester hours
Greek	14 semester hours
History	12 semester hours
Natural Science	6 semester hours
Philosophy	12 semester hours
Religion (or Theology)	6 semester hours
Social Science	6 semester hours
Speech	6 semester hours

In addition, applicants are required to have completed one year of college Latin, or its equivalent, and two years of a modern foreign language.

Summary. Reviewing the above data, two criteria are recognizable in statements and application requirements of all institutions participating in the study:

1. Academic qualifications for graduate study.
2. Personal fitness for the work of ministry.

In the case of academic qualification, all institutions have specific and clearly stated standards. In the case of personal fitness for ministry, all institutions require a recommendation from the applicant's pastor and/or the governing board of the congregation of which she/he is a member. In three of the four seminaries, however, criteria to be addressed are unstated. One institution, Sovereign Grace, provides a form which identifies considerations as "moral character, general ability, emotional stability, and special fitness" to be a theological student. Except for general inquiries regarding "fitness for ministry," no evidence indicates special attention on the part of

admissions committees is given to selecting trainees who possess high levels of those qualities identified as characteristic of servant ministers.

Research Question 4

What priority is assigned by the seminary faculty to training for servanthood as indicated by statements and documents of the seminary?

Document research on curriculum priority at each participating institution included examination of pertinent sections of the seminary catalog, official statements, and publications.

Document Findings About Curriculum Priorities--Oakhill. Research of documents and publications provided by Oakhill Theological Seminary did not reveal any direct statement regarding the integrating focus of ministry training at the seminary. The theological orientation of the sponsoring denomination is frequently mentioned, however, in seminary publications. Faculty members are asserted to be "committed" to the "Reformed" tradition, and before induction into the faculty they sign the following pledge:

In the presence of God and the members of the Board of Trustees, I do solemnly profess my acceptance of the Terms of Communion of the [sponsoring denomination], and do promise that I will not teach, directly or indirectly, anything contrary thereto, or inconsistent therewith, and that I will faithfully execute the office of a professor in this Theological Seminary.

Servanthood is not directly mentioned in seminary publications, but "The Seminary Objective" (Appendix B) includes four paragraphs (1, 2, 5, and 6) which correspond to personal qualities of a servant minister examined in the study. Two other paragraphs (3 and 7) reflect

the seminary's commitment to research and scholarship. The remaining paragraph (4) addresses the minister's ability to communicate the Word of God, but also identifies "the historic Christian faith" as "summarized in the Constitution of the [sponsoring denomination]."

Document Findings About Curriculum Priority--Farel. Research of documents and publications provided by William Farel School of Divinity did not reveal any direct statement regarding the integrating focus of ministry training at the seminary. A review of the history and purpose of the seminary, contained in the catalog, identifies the origin of the founding denomination with "the issues of the doctrinal purity of the visible church" and "the historic position of the infallibility of the Scriptures." The catalog states:

The seminary continues to maintain this vigorous conservative testimony against the doctrinal declension which is so widespread in many of the larger Protestant denominations. Accepting the Scriptures as the inerrant Word of God and maintaining other such great evangelical doctrines, the school adheres to the Reformed system of doctrine as most fully embodying the teaching of the Bible. Believing that truth and practice go hand in hand, the Seminary also emphasizes the necessity of a life of prayer and consecration. The message of the Bible, being spiritual, is spiritually discerned.

Servanthood is not alluded to in seminary publications, although there is expressed concern for spiritual and ministry formation. This is seen both in the closing section of the above citation and in statements on the field education program, referred to as the "Bible and Life" or "Life and Ministry" program, where "personal spiritual growth and pastoral formation through ministry" are identified as "vital aspects of a student's seminary experience."

An additional emphasis present in the seminary program focuses on scholarship. Again, the seminary catalog states:

[William Farel School of Divinity] is a professional school of higher learning, having as its principal purpose the provision of a scholarly program of the highest quality to prepare men spiritually, academically, and practically for a variety of ordained ministries, primarily for the [sponsoring denomination].

Document Findings About Curriculum Priorities--Sovereign Grace.

Research of documents and publications provided by Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary was successful in identifying a statement which appears to specify the focus of curriculum priority at the seminary. A document titled, "Our Philosophy of Theological Education," dated March 11, 1978, includes the following statement:

Our primary purpose is to prepare students to serve as pastors in the Reformed tradition by designing their total educational experience in the light of the nature and purpose of churches in that tradition. This experience provides the context, instruction, models, evaluation, worship, and service to prepare students academically, vocationally, socially, and spiritually to serve as pastors.

Thus the "Reformed" tradition, including its theological distinctives and pattern of church government, is identified as the integrating focus of ministry training at Sovereign Grace. Although never more clearly stated, this priority is reflected repeatedly in the by-laws, catalog, and publications of the seminary. The administration and faculty of the seminary have thought carefully about the objectives of ministry training, and have defined goals with respect to knowledge, skills and competencies, personal qualities, and commitments. These are expressed in a document titled, "The Purpose of the M.Div. Program in Terms of

Product" (Appendix C). In all of these, however, the "Reformed" tradition remains the focus of integration.

Document Findings About Curriculum Priorities--Biblical. Research of documents and publications provided by Biblical Seminary did not reveal any direct statement related to curriculum priorities in the seminary's program of training for ministry. The catalog states the Master of Divinity program "seeks to integrate a classical theological curriculum with supervised field education in contemporary ministry." Another statement, perhaps more directly related to curriculum priorities, comes from a section of the seminary catalog titled "History and Standpoint."

In its theological instruction, [Biblical Seminary] is committed to the historic Reformed faith, particularly as this is expressed in the [confessions and catechisms of the "Reformed" tradition]. Biblical instruction proceeds on the basis of faith in the inspired Scriptures. A continuous effort is made to apply the Christian faith and Christian theology to the problems and opportunities of the present day.

This emphasis on the sponsoring denomination and its theological tradition reflects the seminary's "primary purpose," which is stated to be "to provide a theologically and professionally well-prepared ministry for the [sponsoring denomination]."

The faculty of Biblical Seminary has developed a comprehensive statement on "Personal Qualifications for Ministry" which evidences clear appreciation for the role of servanthood as defined in the study (Appendix D). No evidence was found to suggest, however, that this concern provides a point of integration for the seminary curriculum.

Summary. A review of the above findings indicates that curriculum priorities in all four institutions focus on the "Reformed" theological and ecclesiastical tradition of the churches served. In one seminary, Sovereign Grace, this commitment appears to be clearly stated. In the other three seminaries, this commitment is unarticulated, but nonetheless clear.

Research Question 5

If presented with a list of qualities characteristic of a servant minister, will theological educators and seminarians agree that development of these qualities constitute a stated goal of the seminary?

Perceived commitment to develop personal qualities of a servant minister as declared goals of participating seminaries was investigated by means of Likert-type attitude scales. Ten items on the questionnaire elicited data on respondent agreement/disagreement with statements related to the declared goals of the seminary. The stem for each item was:

This quality is consistent with the declared goals of our seminary.

The quality referred to in the item stem was one of ten "personal qualities of a servant minister" (Appendix E). Pairing the item stem with each of the ten personal qualities of a servant minister produced the ten items included in the questionnaire. Findings are presented as mean response and sample standard deviation for each item and population sample included in the study.

Faculty and student responses from each seminary are also compared for each item by means of a t-test for independent samples, using the following hypotheses:

Statistical hypothesis: There is no significant difference between the mean response of theological educators and that of seminarians.

Alternative hypothesis: There is significant difference between the mean response of theological educators and that of seminarians.

Findings for each comparison were reported as t-ratios, with significance noted when $p \leq .05$.

Findings About Perceived Goals--Oakhill. Findings on personal qualities of a servant minister as declared goals at Oakhill Theological Seminary are presented in Table 4:5a. Faculty "strongly agreed" * that development of nine personal qualities presented constitute declared goals of the seminary. (Five of the nine received unanimous strong agreement, reflected in mean scores of 1.000.) Faculty also "agreed" ** that the tenth personal quality ("involvement") is a declared goal of the seminary, although attitude responses reflected more variance on that item.

Student respondents strongly agreed that their seminary is committed to developing qualities of a servant minister presented in eight of ten items. They also agreed the other two personal qualities ("involvement" and "self-acceptance") are declared goals. In no case

* Mean response lies in the interval range 1.00 to 1.49 (symbolically expressed $1.00 \leq \bar{x} \leq 1.49$). Interpretive intervals appear on page 57.

** Mean response lies in the interval range 1.50 to 2.49.

TABLE 4:5a

Personal Qualities of a Servant Minister as Perceived Development Goals

At Oakhill Theological Seminary

Qualities Fac n=5 Stud n=24	Faculty		Students		t-ratio
	\bar{x}	s	\bar{x}	s	
Faith	1.000	0	1.042	.204	- .45
Empathy	1.000	0	1.292	.464	- 1.38
Integrity	1.400	.894	1.130	.894	1.00
Virtue	1.000	0	1.333	.702	- 1.05
Leadership	1.000	0	1.333	.868	- .85
Altruism	1.200	.447	1.042	.204	1.26
Zeal	1.000	0	1.125	.338	- .82
Involvement	1.800	1.304	1.708	.999	.18
Wisdom	1.400	.894	1.458	.884	- .13
Self-acceptance	1.200	.447	1.524	.814	- .85
Totals Across Stem	12.000	3.937	12.750	3.915	- .389

TABLE 4:5b

Personal Qualities of a Servant Minister as Perceived Development Goals

At William Farel School of Divinity

Qualities			Faculty		Students		t-ratio
			\bar{x}	s	\bar{x}	s	
Faith	Fac n=9	Stud n=33	1.000	0	1.212	.485	- 1.30
Empathy	Fac n=9	Stud n=33	1.222	.441	1.636	.653	- 1.79
Integrity	Fac n=9	Stud n=33	1.111	.333	1.364	.603	- 1.20
Virtue	Fac n=9	Stud n=33	1.000	0	1.576	.708	- 2.42 *
Leadership	Fac n=9	Stud n=33	1.111	.333	1.485	.619	- 1.73
Altruism	Fac n=9	Stud n=33	1.333	.707	1.636	.859	- .97
Zeal	Fac n=9	Stud n=33	1.000	0	1.212	.485	- 1.30
Involvement	Fac n=9	Stud n=31	1.889	1.054	1.903	.944	- .04
Wisdom	Fac n=9	Stud n=33	1.222	.441	1.939	1.197	- 1.75
Self-acceptance	Fac n=9	Stud n=31	1.444	.527	2.290	1.039	- 2.34 *
Totals Across Stem	Fac n=9	Stud n=33	12.333	1.936	16.000	5.437	- 1.974

* Significant at $\alpha = .05$ level.

TABLE 4:5c

Personal Qualities of a Servant Minister as Perceived Development Goals
At Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary

Qualities Fac n=16 Stud n=36	Faculty		Students		t-ratio
	\bar{x}	s	\bar{x}	s	
Faith	1.000	0	1.083	.280	- 1.18
Empathy	1.500	1.095	1.278	.615	.94
Integrity	1.563	1.094	1.222	.485	1.57
Virtue	1.625	1.258	1.417	.806	.72
Leadership	1.563	1.153	1.583	.841	- .07
Altruism	1.563	1.031	1.500	.775	.24
Zeal	1.313	1.014	1.222	.760	.36
Involvement	1.813	1.167	1.743	.950	.23
Wisdom	1.688	1.138	1.639	.867	.17
Self-acceptance	1.563	1.094	2.000	1.146	- 1.29
Totals Across Stem Fac n=16 Stud n=36	15.188	9.432	14.639	4.981	.275

TABLE 4:5d

Personal Qualities of a Servant Minister as Perceived Development Goals
At Biblical Seminary

Quality Fac n=9 Stud n=19	Faculty		Students		t-ratio
	\bar{x}	s	\bar{x}	s	
Faith Fac n=9 Stud n=19	1.000	0	1.053	.229	- .68
Empathy Fac n=9 Stud n=19	1.444	.527	1.526	.612	- .34
Integrity Fac n=9 Stud n=19	1.333	.707	1.474	.612	- .54
Virtue Fac n=9 Stud n=19	1.222	.667	1.579	.692	- 1.29
Leadership Fac n=9 Stud n=19	1.222	.441	1.421	.838	- .67
Altruism Fac n=9 Stud n=19	1.333	.500	1.579	.692	- .95
Zeal Fac n=9 Stud n=19	1.111	.333	1.158	.501	- .25
Involvement Fac n=9 Stud n=19	1.444	.527	1.947	.911	- 1.53
Wisdom Fac n=9 Stud n=19	1.778	.833	1.579	.692	.67
Self-acceptance Fac n=9 Stud n=19	1.444	.726	1.474	.697	- .10
Totals Across Stem Fac n=9 Stud n=19	13.333	3.775	14.789	3.675	- .971

was student perception of the seminary's declared goals significantly different from that of faculty respondents.

Findings About Perceived Goals--Farel. Findings on personal qualities of a servant minister as declared goals at William Farel School of Divinity are presented in Table 4:5b. Faculty strongly agreed that development of nine personal qualities presented constitute declared goals of the seminary. (Three of the nine received unanimous strong agreement.) Faculty also agreed that the tenth personal quality ("involvement") is a declared goal.

Student respondents strongly agreed that Farel's declared goals include development of only four qualities of a servant minister ("faith," "integrity," "leadership," and "zeal"). While students agreed that the other six qualities are also among their seminary's declared goals, with respect to two ("virtue" and "self-acceptance") student opinion varied significantly from that of faculty respondents.

Farel is the only institution in the study at which student agreement was weaker than that of faculty respondents on all ten items related to intent to develop qualities of a servant minister.

Findings About Perceived Goals--Sovereign Grace. Findings on personal qualities of a servant minister as declared goals at Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary are presented in Table 4:5c. Faculty respondents at Sovereign Grace indicated lower levels of agreement than faculty at any other institution related to intent to develop qualities of a servant minister. Only two qualities ("faith" and "zeal") met with strong agreement, and even with respect to "zeal," variance among

responses was relatively high. With respect to the other eight qualities, faculty respondents agreed they constitute declared training goals, but variances were among the highest in the study.

Student perception of seminary goals regarding development of servant minister qualities was less varied and reflected slightly stronger agreement with item stems than responses by faculty. In contrast to faculty attitude, students strongly agreed five qualities of a servant minister represent declared goals of the seminary ("faith," "altruism," "integrity," "virtue," and "zeal"). Students also agreed the other five qualities are declared goals of ministry training at Sovereign Grace. In no case, however, did student perception of declared goals differ significantly from faculty.

Findings About Perceived Goals--Biblical. Findings on personal qualities of a servant minister as declared goals at Biblical Seminary are presented in Table 4:5d. Faculty indicated strong agreement their seminary intends to develop nine of ten personal qualities of a servant minister. They also agree the school intends to develop the tenth quality ("wisdom").

Student attitude is slightly less inclined than faculty toward strong agreement with statements asserting intent to train for nine of ten qualities. (Students are more inclined than faculty to agree the school is committed to develop "wisdom.") Students still strongly agree the seminary intends to develop five qualities, and agree the other five are also declared goals. In no case do student and faculty perceptions of the seminary's declared goals differ significantly.

Summary. A review of findings related to Research Question 5 indicates theological educators and seminarians either "agree" or "strongly agree" that the ten personal qualities of a servant minister examined in the study constitute stated goals of their seminaries. Student perceptions varied significantly from those of theological educators at only one of four institutions, and with respect to only two of ten items presented. Mean student responses reflected less perceived commitment to training for servant minister qualities than mean responses of theological educators in 29 of 40 measurements (Oakhill--7 of 10; Farel--10 of 10; Sovereign Grace--3 of 10; Biblical--9 of 10), although most differences are minimal and statistically insignificant.

Research Question 6

If presented with a list of qualities characteristic of a servant minister, will theological educators and seminarians agree that their seminary program effectively develops ministers who evidence these qualities?

Perceived effectiveness of seminary programs in developing personal qualities of a servant minister was investigated by means of Likert-type attitude scales. Ten items on the questionnaire elicited data on respondent agreement/disagreement with statements related to effectiveness in developing servant minister qualities. The stem for each item was:

Our seminary program effectively develops ministers who evidence this quality.

The quality referred to in the item stem was one of ten "personal qualities of a servant minister" (Appendix E). Pairing the item stem with

each of the ten personal qualities of a servant minister produced the ten items included in the questionnaire. Findings are presented as mean response and sample standard deviation for each item and population sample included in the study.

As with Research Question 5, faculty and student responses from each seminary are also compared for each item by means of a t-test for independent samples, using the following hypotheses:

Statistical hypothesis: There is no significant difference between the mean response of theological educators and that of seminarians.

Alternative hypothesis: There is significant difference between the mean response of theological educators and that of seminarians.

Findings for each comparison are reported as t-ratios, with significance noted when $p \leq .05$.

Findings About Program Effectiveness--Oakhill. Findings on program effectiveness in developing qualities of a servant minister at Oakhill Theological Seminary are presented in Table 4:6a. Both faculty and seminarians agree the program of training for ministry at Oakhill is effective across all ten qualities examined.

Findings About Program Effectiveness--Farel. Findings on program effectiveness in developing qualities of a servant minister at William Farel School of Divinity are presented in Table 4:6b. Theological educators agree that the seminary is effective in developing nine of ten qualities examined, but seminarians perceive effectiveness in training for five of ten qualities only. Seminarians indicate "ambivalence" *

* Mean response lies in the interval range 2.50 to 3.50.

TABLE 4:6a

Perceived Effectiveness In Developing
Personal Qualities of a Servant Minister
At Oakhill Theological Seminary

Quality	Faculty		Students		t-ratio
	\bar{x}	s	\bar{x}	s	
Faith Fac n=5 Stud n=23	1.600	.548	1.609	.839	- .02
Empathy Fac n=5 Stud n=24	2.200	.477	2.292	.751	- .26
Integrity Fac n=5 Stud n=23	2.000	.707	1.696	.822	.77
Virtue Fac n=5 Stud n=24	2.000	0	2.083	.830	- .20
Leadership Fac n=5 Stud n=24	2.200	.447	2.208	.977	- .02
Altruism Fac n=5 Stud n=24	2.000	0	2.000	.722	0
Zeal Fac n=5 Stud n=24	1.600	.854	1.875	.900	- .62
Involvement Fac n=5 Stud n=24	2.000	.707	2.417	1.176	- .76
Wisdom Fac n=5 Stud n=24	2.400	.548	2.458	1.103	- .11
Self-acceptance Fac n=5 Stud n=21	2.000	0	2.333	1.065	- .69
Totals Across Stem Fac n=5 Stud n=24	19.600	2.510	20.542	6.698	- .306

TABLE 4:6b
Perceived Effectiveness In Developing
Personal Qualities of a Servant Minister
At William Farel School of Divinity

Quality	Faculty		Students		t-ratio
	\bar{x}	s	\bar{x}	s	
Faith Fac n=9 Stud n=32	1.667	.707	1.781	.751	- .41
Empathy Fac n=9 Stud n=33	2.333	.866	2.909	.980	- 1.60
Integrity Fac n=9 Stud n=33	1.889	.782	2.091	.843	- .65
Virtue Fac n=9 Stud n=33	2.444	.726	2.697	1.075	- .66
Leadership Fac n=9 Stud n=33	2.667	1.000	2.455	.711	.73
Altruism Fac n=9 Stud n=32	2.333	1.225	2.281	.958	.14
Zeal Fac n=9 Stud n=33	1.778	.667	2.273	1.126	- 1.25
Involvement Fac n=9 Stud n=32	2.333	.707	2.625	1.040	- .79
Wisdom Fac n=9 Stud n=33	2.222	.667	2.758	1.001	- 1.51
Self-acceptance Fac n=9 Stud n=31	2.333	.866	3.194	.910	- 2.52 *
Totals Across Stem Fac n=9 Stud n=33	22.000	5.679	24.667	5.764	- 1.234

* Significant at $\alpha = .05$ level.

TABLE 4:6c
 Perceived Effectiveness In Developing
 Personal Qualities of a Servant Minister
 At Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary

Quality	Faculty		Students		t-ratio
	\bar{x}	s	\bar{x}	s	
Faith Fac n=16 Stud n=35	1.750	.856	2.057	.802	- 1.24
Empathy Fac n=16 Stud n=35	2.625	.806	2.686	.867	- .24
Integrity Fac n=16 Stud n=35	2.063	.854	2.171	.891	- .41
Virtue Fac n=16 Stud n=35	2.500	1.095	3.000	.970	- 1.64
Leadership Fac n=16 Stud n=35	2.313	.873	2.800	.964	- 1.72
Altruism Fac n=16 Stud n=35	2.188	.918	2.600	1.035	- 1.34
Zeal Fac n=16 Stud n=35	1.813	.834	2.371	1.087	- 1.82
Involvement Fac n=16 Stud n=34	2.375	1.025	2.529	1.134	- .46
Wisdom Fac n=16 Stud n=35	2.625	.885	2.943	.938	- 1.14
Self-acceptance Fac n=16 Stud n=35	2.438	.964	3.143	1.033	- 2.31 *
Totals Across Stem Fac n=16 Stud n=36	22.688	7.481	25.500	7.970	- 1.196

* Significant at $\alpha = .05$ level.

TABLE 4:6d
 Perceived Effectiveness In Developing
 Personal Qualities of a Servant Minister
 At Biblical Seminary

Quality	Faculty		Students		t-ratio
	\bar{x}	s	\bar{x}	s	
Faith Fac n=9 Stud n=19	1.778	.667	1.684	.582	.38
Empathy Fac n=9 Stud n=19	2.111	.601	2.684	.946	- 1.66
Integrity Fac n=9 Stud n=19	2.444	.726	2.526	.772	- .27
Virtue Fac n=9 Stud n=19	2.444	.882	2.790	.787	- 1.04
Leadership Fac n=9 Stud n=19	2.222	.441	2.526	1.020	- .85
Altruism Fac n=9 Stud n=19	2.556	.726	2.684	.946	- .36
Zeal Fac n=9 Stud n=19	2.222	.441	2.053	.970	.50
Involvement Fac n=9 Stud n=19	2.222	.667	2.474	1.264	- .56
Wisdom Fac n=9 Stud n=19	2.444	.527	2.632	.684	- .72
Self-acceptance Fac n=9 Stud n=19	2.222	.667	2.526	.905	- .90
Totals Across Stem Fac n=9 Stud n=19	22.667	4.143	24.579	5.670	- .900

regarding the effectiveness of ministry training at Farel in developing the other five qualities ("empathy," "virtue," "involvement," "wisdom," and "self-acceptance"). Faculty were "ambivalent" regarding effectiveness of training only with respect to "leadership." Difference between faculty and student perceptions are generally minimal, but are significant ($\alpha \leq .05$) regarding effectiveness of training for "self-acceptance." Theological educators agree the seminary program is effective in training for "self-acceptance," but seminarians are thoroughly ambivalent.

Findings About Program Effectiveness--Sovereign Grace. Findings on program effectiveness in developing qualities of a servant minister at Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary are presented in Table 4:6c. Theological educators agree that the seminary is effective in training for seven of ten qualities, but seminarians agree their program of training effectively develops only three qualities examined. With respect to seven of ten qualities included in the study, seminarians are ambivalent regarding the effectiveness of training at Sovereign Grace. Both faculty and students indicate ambivalence regarding the effectiveness of training for "empathy," "virtue," and "wisdom."

Differences between faculty and student perceptions are generally minimal, but are significant ($\alpha \leq .05$) regarding effectiveness of training for "self-acceptance." Theological educators agree the seminary program is effective in training for "self-acceptance," but seminarians are thoroughly ambivalent.

Findings About Program Effectiveness--Biblical. Findings on program effectiveness in developing qualities of a servant minister at

Biblical Seminary are presented in Table 4:6d. Theological educators agree the seminary is effective in training for nine of ten qualities of a servant minister, but seminarians agree for only three of ten. With regard to the other seven qualities, seminarians indicate ambivalence over the effectiveness of their seminary at developing servant minister characteristics. Both faculty and students indicate ambivalence regarding the effectiveness of training to develop "altruism." Differences between perceptions indicated by theological educators and seminarians are minimal and statistically insignificant.

Summary. A review of findings related to Research Question 6 indicates theological educators and seminarians either agree or are ambivalent regarding the effectiveness of training programs at their seminary for developing ministers who evidence the qualities characteristic of servanthood examined in the study. Mean student responses in all four institutions indicated less perceived effectiveness in developing qualities of a servant minister than indicated by faculty in 34 of 40 measurements (Oakhill--8 of 10; Farel--8 of 10; Sovereign Grace--10 of 10; Biblical--8 of 10). In all but two measurements, however, differences are statistically insignificant. It is interesting to note that seminarians at three institutions (Farel, Sovereign Grace, and Biblical) indicated ambivalence regarding effectiveness of their seminary programs for developing four of the qualities of a servant minister examined in the study ("empathy," "virtue," "wisdom," and "self-acceptance").

Research Question 7

If presented with a list of qualities characteristic of a servant minister, will theological educators and seminarians agree that their seminary faculty is effective in demonstrating these qualities?

Perceived demonstration by seminary faculty of personal qualities of a servant minister was investigated by means of Likert-type attitude scales. Ten items on the questionnaire elicited data on respondent agreement/disagreement with statements related to faculty demonstration of servant minister qualities. The stem for each item was:

The faculty of our seminary is effective in demonstrating this quality.

The quality referred to in the item stem was one of ten "personal qualities of a servant minister" (Appendix E). Pairing the item stem with each of the ten personal qualities of a servant minister produced the ten items included in the questionnaire. Findings are presented as mean response and sample standard deviation for each item and population sample included in the study.

Faculty and student responses from each seminary are also compared for each item by means of a t-test for independent samples, using the following hypotheses:

Statistical hypothesis: There is no significant difference between the mean response of theological educators and that of seminarians.

Alternative hypothesis: There is significant difference between the mean response of theological educators and that of seminarians.

Findings for each comparison are reported as t-ratios, with significance noted when $p \leq .05$. This is the same procedure used for reporting findings related to Research Questions 5 and 6.

Findings About Trainer Modeling--Oakhill. Findings on faculty demonstration of servant minister qualities at Oakhill Theological Seminary are presented in Table 4:7a. Faculty respondents strongly agreed that they and their colleagues demonstrate six of ten qualities of a servant minister, and also agreed they demonstrate the other four qualities. Student respondents indicated strong agreement regarding seven of ten qualities, with agreement (bordering on "strongly agree") indicated regarding faculty demonstration of the other three servant minister qualities. The most restrained assessment of faculty demonstration of any quality was observed in faculty response to the item designated "zeal" ($\bar{x} = 1.800$). Variance among faculty respondents also was highest on that item. No significant differences were evident between perceptions of theological educators at Oakhill and those of seminarians.

Findings About Trainer Modeling--Farel. Findings on faculty demonstration of servant minister qualities at William Farel School of Divinity are presented in Table 4:7b. Faculty respondents strongly agreed they and their colleagues demonstrate two of ten qualities of a servant minister ("faith" and "integrity"). With respect to the other eight qualities, they also agree the qualities are demonstrated but level of agreement varies from borderline "strongly agree" (in the case of "zeal") to near ambivalence (in the case of "self-acceptance").

TABLE 4:7a

Perceived Faculty Modeling of Personal Qualities of a Servant Minister
At Oakhill Theological Seminary

Quality	Faculty		Students		t-ratio
	\bar{x}	s	\bar{x}	s	
Faith Fac n=5 Stud n=24	1.000	0	1.042	.200	- .45
Empathy Fac n=5 Stud n=24	1.600	.548	1.292	.464	1.31
Integrity Fac n=5 Stud n=23	1.400	.527	1.500	.622	- .24
Virtue Fac n=5 Stud n=24	1.200	.447	1.250	.532	- .20
Leadership Fac n=5 Stud n=24	1.600	.548	1.417	.584	.64
Altruism Fac n=5 Stud n=24	1.200	.447	1.083	.282	.76
Zeal Fac n=5 Stud n=23	1.800	1.304	1.391	.583	.73
Involvement Fac n=5 Stud n=24	1.600	.548	1.667	.868	- .16
Wisdom Fac n=5 Stud n=24	1.200	.447	1.292	.464	- .41
Self-acceptance Fac n=5 Stud n=22	1.200	.447	1.545	.796	- .93
Totals Across Stem Fac n=5 Stud n=24	13.600	3.362	12.875	3.588	.415

TABLE 4:7b

Perceived Faculty Modeling of Personal Qualities of a Servant Minister

At William Farel School of Divinity

Quality Fac n Stud n	Faculty		Students		t-ratio
	\bar{x}	s	\bar{x}	s	
Faith Fac n=9 Stud n=31	1.222	.441	1.516	.962	- .88
Empathy Fac n=9 Stud n=33	2.222	.972	2.515	.939	- .82
Integrity Fac n=9 Stud n=32	1.444	.527	1.500	.622	- .24
Virtue Fac n=8 Stud n=33	1.875	.835	1.909	.879	- .10
Leadership Fac n=7 Stud n=32	2.000	1.000	1.938	.759	.19
Altruism Fac n=8 Stud n=33	1.750	.886	1.636	.962	.30
Zeal Fac n=9 Stud n=33	1.556	.527	1.879	1.023	- .91
Involvement Fac n=9 Stud n=32	2.111	.782	2.031	1.062	.21
Wisdom Fac n=8 Stud n=33	1.750	.707	2.030	1.015	- .74
Self-acceptance Fac n=8 Stud n=30	2.250	.886	2.267	1.015	- .04
Totals Across Stem Fac n=9 Stud n=33	16.889	5.395	18.758	4.331	- 1.089

TABLE 4:7c

Perceived Faculty Modeling of Personal Qualities of a Servant Minister
At Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary

Quality	Faculty		Students		t-ratio
	\bar{x}	s	\bar{x}	s	
Faith Fac n=15 Stud n=35	1.533	.743	1.686	1.022	- .52
Empathy Fac n=16 Stud n=36	2.438	.964	2.250	.874	.69
Integrity Fac n=16 Stud n=36	1.875	.957	1.861	.833	.05
Virtue Fac n=16 Stud n=36	2.188	.655	2.417	.967	- .86
Leadership Fac n=16 Stud n=36	2.375	.885	2.444	1.107	- .22
Altruism Fac n=16 Stud n=35	2.375	.957	2.229	1.140	.45
Zeal Fac n=16 Stud n=36	1.875	.957	2.194	1.167	- .96
Involvement Fac n=16 Stud n=36	2.125	1.088	2.306	1.037	- .57
Wisdom Fac n=16 Stud n=35	2.438	.892	2.257	.950	.64
Self-acceptance Fac n=16 Stud n=36	2.438	.964	2.667	1.014	- .76
Totals Across Stem Fac n=16 Stud n=36	21.563	7.447	22.139	6.970	- .270

TABLE 4:7d

Perceived Faculty Modeling of Personal Qualities of a Servant Minister
At Biblical Seminary

Quality	Faculty		Students		t-ratio
	\bar{x}	s	\bar{x}	s	
Faith Fac n=8 Stud n=18	1.250	.463	1.167	.383	.48
Empathy Fac n=9 Stud n=19	1.667	.500	2.316	1.157	- 1.60
Integrity Fac n=9 Stud n=19	1.556	.726	1.842	.898	- .83
Virtue Fac n=9 Stud n=19	1.778	.441	2.105	.937	- .99
Leadership Fac n=9 Stud n=19	2.222	.441	2.316	.885	- .30
Altruism Fac n=9 Stud n=19	1.778	.667	2.000	1.106	- .55
Zeal Fac n=9 Stud n=19	1.889	.333	1.790	.855	.33
Involvement Fac n=9 Stud n=19	1.778	.667	2.211	1.228	- .98
Wisdom Fac n=9 Stud n=19	1.778	.441	2.368	1.012	- 1.64
Self-acceptance Fac n=9 Stud n=18	1.889	.601	1.944	.639	- .22
Totals Across Stem Fac n=9 Stud n=19	17.444	2.506	19.895	6.091	- 1.153

Student respondents agree their faculty demonstrate nine of ten qualities of a servant minister. Students are ambivalent, however, regarding faculty demonstration of "empathy." Differences between faculty and student responses are minimal, however, and statistically insignificant.

Findings About Trainer Modeling--Sovereign Grace. Findings on faculty demonstration of servant minister qualities at Sovereign Grace Theological Stminary are presented in Table 4:7c. Faculty respondents agree they and their colleagues demonstrate all ten personal qualities of a servant minister. Student respondents concurred with respect to nine of ten qualities. Seminarians indicated ambivalence, however, regarding their faculty's demonstration of "self-acceptance." Comparison of faculty and student perceptions of faculty demonstration of servant minister qualities showed all differences to be minimal and statistically insignificant.

Findings About Trainer Modeling--Biblical. Findings on faculty demonstration of servant minister qualities at Biblical Seminary are presented in Table 4:7d. Faculty respondents agree they and their colleagues demonstrate nine of ten personal qualities of a servant minister. They strongly agree ($\bar{x} = 1.250$) with the statement that they demonstrate "faith." Although somewhat more moderate in their agreement with most items, student responses fell within the same interpretive range as faculty responses regarding all ten qualities.

Summary. A review of findings related to faculty demonstration of servant minister qualities at four seminaries shows theological educators and seminarians generally "strongly agree" or "agree" that the

ten servant minister qualities examined in the study are demonstrated by their seminary faculty. In two cases only are students ambivalent regarding faculty demonstration of servant minister qualities. Students at Farel are ambivalent regarding faculty demonstration of "empathy," and students at Sovereign Grace are ambivalent regarding faculty demonstration of "self-acceptance." It is interesting to note that the least difference between faculty and student samples (as indicated by t-ratios of total responses across the item stem) occurred at the two institutions where faculty demonstration of servant minister qualities were most strongly affirmed (Oakhill) and most nearly ambivalent (Sovereign Grace).

Research Question 8

What sources are most commonly used by theological educators for deriving teaching/learning objectives.

Information regarding the training base employed at each of the four seminaries participating in the study was elicited by means of a ranking item on the questionnaire. Respondents were requested to select the three most common sources of teaching/learning objectives from a list of eight, and rank the three selected in order of frequency considered or used by seminary faculty. Findings are presented for each population sample as frequency tallies, then converted to weighted scores to yield a cumulative ranking for each alternative source of objectives presented.

Faculty and student cumulative rankings from each seminary are compared by means of a Spearman test of Rank Difference Correlation, using the following hypotheses:

Statistical hypothesis: There is no significant correlation between cumulative ranking provided by theological educators and that of seminarians.

Alternative hypothesis: There is significant correlation between cumulative ranking provided by theological educators and that of seminarians.

Findings for each comparison are reported as correlation coefficients (r) with significance noted when $p \leq .05$.

It should be noted that the Spearman test is a test of correlation, in contrast to the t-test which is a test of difference. Correlation and difference are contradictory concepts; to affirm correlation is to deny difference, and vice versa. Thus, to accept the "statistical (null) hypothesis" regarding correlation is to affirm significant difference between rankings compared. By the same token, to reject the null hypothesis regarding correlation is to deny significant difference between two sets of rankings.

Findings About the Training Base--Oakhill. Findings on the training base employed at Oakhill Theological Seminary are presented in Table 4:8a. Theological educators indicated most frequently employed considerations when formulating teaching/learning objectives are (1) "analysis of the course subject or discipline," (2) "theological commitments regarding the nature of ministry," and (3) "professional experience in ministry." Student perceptions correspond to faculty ranking of the first two sources, but students perceive "official course

TABLE 4:8a
Sources Commonly Used for Deriving Teaching/Learning Objectives
At Oakhill Theological Seminary

Source of Teaching/Learning Objectives	Faculty (n=5)					Students (n=21)					Cumulative Rank Difference *
	f. of Ranking			Wt'd Score	Cum. Rank	f. of Ranking			Wt'd Score	Cum. Rank	
	1	2	3			1	2	3			
Analysis of subject	3	2	0	13	1	6	9	1	37	1	0
Analysis of learning task	0	0	0	0	6.5	0	2	2	6	6.5	0
Official course description	0	0	0	0	6.5	5	2	1	20	3	3.5
Professional experience In ministry	1	1	2	7	3	1	2	11	18	4	- 1
Professional research Interests	0	0	0	0	6.5	1	1	1	6	6.5	0
Students' background and Experience	0	0	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	8	- 4
Students' "need to know"	0	0	0	0	6.5	1	2	1	8	5	1.5
Theological commitments re: Nature of the ministry	1	2	1	8	2	7	3	4	31	2	0

* $r = .625$; do not reject H_0 : $\rho = 0$.

TABLE 4:8b

Sources Commonly Used for Deriving Teaching/Learning Objectives

At William Farel School of Divinity

Source of Teaching/Learning Objectives	Faculty (n=9)					Students (n=33)					Cumulative Rank Difference *
	f. of Ranking			Wt'd Score	Cum. Rank	f. of Ranking			Wt'd Score	Cum. Rank	
	1	2	3			1	2	3			
Analysis of subject	4	3	0	18	2	16	8	4	68	1	1
Analysis of learning task	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	1	1	7.5	.5
Official course description	0	0	2	2	5.5	4	8	6	34	3	2.5
Professional experience In ministry	0	1	5	7	3	1	3	6	15	4.5	-1.5
Professional research Interests	0	2	0	4	4	1	2	8	15	4.5	- .5
Students' background and Experience	0	0	1	1	7	0	0	1	1	7.5	- .5
Students' "need to know"	0	1	0	2	5.5	0	3	1	7	6	- .5
Theological commitments re: Nature of the ministry	5	2	1	20	1	10	8	6	52	2	- 1

* $r = .863$; significant at the $\alpha = .05$ level. Reject $H_0: \rho = 0$.

TABLE 4:8c
Sources Commonly Used for Deriving Teaching/Learning Objectives
At Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary

Sources of Teaching/Learning Objectives	Faculty (n=13)						Students (n=34)						Cumulative Rank Difference *
	f. of Ranking			Wt'd Score	Cum. Rank	f. of Ranking			Wt'd Score	Cum. Rank			
	1	2	3			1	2	3					
Analysis of subject	5	4	1	22	1.5	12	9	5	59	1		.5	
Analysis of learning task	0	1	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	8		- 2	
Official course description	1	4	1	12	4	7	9	3	42	3		1	
Professional experience In ministry	1	4	2	13	3	1	9	4	25	4		- 1	
Professional research Interests	0	0	4	4	5	1	3	5	14	5		0	
Students' background and Experience	0	0	0	0	7.5	0	1	0	2	7		.5	
Students' "need to know"	0	0	0	0	7.5	0	1	7	9	6		1.5	
Theological commitments re: Nature of the ministry	6	0	4	22	1.5	13	3	9	54	2		- .5	

* $r = .893$; significant at the $\alpha = .05$ level. Reject $H_0: \rho = 0$.

TABLE 4:8d
Sources Commonly Used for Deriving Teaching/Learning Objectives
At Biblical Seminary

Source of Teaching/Learning Objectives	Faculty (n=9)				Cum. Rank	Students (n=19)				Cumulative Rank Difference *	
	f. of Ranking			Wt'd Score		f. of Ranking			Wt'd Score		
	1	2	3			1	2	3			
Analysis of subject	5	2	1	20	1	11	3	3	42	1	0
Analysis of learning task	0	0	1	1	5.5	0	1	4	6	5	.5
Official course description	0	2	2	6	4	2	6	4	22	3	1.0
Professional experience In ministry	1	1	3	8	3	0	0	1	1	8	-5.0
Professional research Interests	0	0	0	0	7.5	0	0	3	3	6.5	1.0
Students' background and Experience	0	0	0	0	7.5	1	0	0	3	6.5	1.0
Students' "need to know"	0	0	1	1	5.5	1	2	1	8	4	1.5
Theological commitments re: Nature of the ministry	3	4	1	18	2	4	7	3	29	2	0

* $r = .637$; do not reject $H_0: \rho = 0$.

description or departmental consensus" a more prominent source of teaching/learning objectives than "professional experience in ministry." Comparison of cumulative rankings did not permit rejection of the null hypothesis, indicating lack of correlation (thus, affirming significant difference) between rankings of theological educators and seminarians.

Findings About the Training Base--Farel. Findings on the training base employed at William Farel School of Divinity are presented in Table 4:8b. Theological educators indicated most frequently employed considerations when formulating teaching/learning objectives are (1) "theological commitments regarding the nature of ministry," (2) "analysis of the course subject or discipline," and (3) "professional experience in ministry." Student perceptions concur on the first two sources indicated by faculty respondents, but in student responses the order is reversed. Furthermore, students perceive "official course description or departmental consensus" as the third most prominent source of teaching/learning objectives at Farel. "Professional experience in ministry" was identified as a significant consideration by only ten students (vs. 18 who mentioned "Official course description"), yielding a cumulative rank of 4.5. Comparison of cumulative rankings indicated significant correlation between faculty and student responses.

Findings About the Training Base--Sovereign Grace. Findings on the training base employed at Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary are presented in Table 4:8c. Theological educators reported two sources tied as most common when formulating teaching/learning objectives for courses taught at Sovereign Grace. Although "theological commitments

regarding the nature of ministry" was most often ranked "1," "analysis of the course subject or discipline" was ranked "2" or "3" with sufficient frequency to yield the same weighted score. Two other alternative sources accounted for most of the remaining responses. "Professional experience in ministry" was indicated by faculty to be the third most common source of objectives, while "official course description or departmental consensus" ran a close fourth.

Student respondents at Sovereign Grace perceive "analysis of the course subject or discipline" as a source of teaching/learning objectives slightly preferred over "theological commitments regarding the nature of ministry." Likewise, students identify "official course description or departmental consensus" as a source of objectives preferred over "professional experience in ministry," thus also reversing the order of ranking assigned by theological educators to those two. Comparison of cumulative rankings, however, indicates significant correlation between faculty and student responses.

Findings About the Training Base--Biblical. Findings on the training base employed at Biblical Seminary are presented in Table 4:8d. Theological educators indicated most frequently employed considerations when formulating teaching/learning objectives are (1) "analysis of course subject or discipline," (2) "theological commitments regarding the nature of ministry," and (3) "professional experience in ministry." Student perceptions correspond to faculty ranking of the first two sources, but students perceive "official course description or departmental consensus" as the third most prominent source of teaching/learn-

ing objectives. "Professional experience in ministry," ranked third by faculty respondents, was ranked by students as eighth out of eight sources of objectives examined in the questionnaire. Comparison of responses of theological educators and seminarians at Biblical did not permit rejection of the null hypothesis, indicating lack of correlation between rankings provided by theological educators and seminarians.

Summary. A review of findings related to the training base employed across the four institutions participating in the study indicates theological educators consistently ranked "analysis of course subject or discipline" and "theological commitments regarding the nature of ministry" as the most common sources of teaching/learning objectives, although priority between the two tended to vary. Third most common source of teaching/learning objectives indicated by faculty in all four institutions was reported to be "professional experience in ministry."

Students in all four institutions recognized the sources ranked "1" and "2" by faculty to be the most common sources of objectives in seminary courses, although "analysis of course subject or discipline" was consistently perceived by students to be a more prominent source than "theological commitments regarding the nature of ministry." Students also perceive "official course description or departmental consensus" as the third most common source of teaching/learning objectives in all seminaries.

Faculty and student rankings across four institutions related to the sources of objectives identified as significant in training for helping professions are presented in Table 4:9. As noted above, "pro-

TABLE 4:9

Rank Assigned by Respondents at Four Seminaries
To Sources of Teaching/Learning Objectives
Identified as Significant in Training for Helping Professions

Institution	Ranking by Faculty	Ranking by Students
"Professional experience in ministry"		
Oakhill	3 of 8	4 of 8
Farel	3 of 8	4.5 of 8
Sovereign Grace	3 of 8	4 of 8
Biblical	3 of 8	8 of 8 *
"Students' background and experience"		
Oakhill	4 of 8	8 of 8 *
Farel	7 of 8	7.5 of 8 *
Sovereign Grace	7.5 of 8 *	7 of 8
Biblical	7.5 of 8 *	6.5 of 8
"Students' sense of a 'need to know'"		
Oakhill	6.5 of 8 *	5 of 8
Farel	5.5 of 8	6 of 8
Sovereign Grace	7.5 of 8 *	6 of 8
Biblical	5.5 of 8	4 of 8

* Lowest rank assigned.

Professional experience in ministry" is ranked third of eight by all faculty respondents, but is consistently ranked lower by seminarians. The other two sources of teaching/learning objectives found to be significant in training for helping professions ("students' background and experience" and "students' sense of a 'need to know'") are never ranked higher than four of eight, and in six of 16 measurements received the lowest ranking assigned.

Research Question 9

What methods of teaching are most commonly used by theological educators?

Information regarding the methods of teaching employed at each of the four seminaries participating in the study was elicited by means of a ranking item on the questionnaire. Respondents were requested to select the four most common teaching methods from a list of ten, and rank the four selected in order of frequency used by seminary faculty. Findings are presented for each population sample as frequency tallies, then converted to weighted scores to yield a cumulative ranking for each alternative teaching method presented.

Faculty and student cumulative rankings from each seminary are compared by means of a Spearman test of Rank Difference Correlation, using the following hypotheses:

Statistical hypothesis: There is no significant correlation between cumulative ranking provided by theological educators and that of seminarians.

Alternative hypothesis: There is significant correlation between cumulative ranking provided by theological educators and that of seminarians.

Findings for each comparison are reported as correlation coefficients (r) with significance noted when $p \leq .05$. This is the same procedure as was used with Research Question 8.

Findings About Training Method--Oakhill. Findings on teaching methods commonly employed at Oakhill Theological Seminary are presented in Table 4:10a. Theological educators reported the method most frequently employed at Oakhill is "lecture." The two next most common teaching methods, sharing the same cumulative rank of 2.5, are "dis-

TABLE 4:10a

Teaching Methods Commonly Employed
At Oakhill Theological Seminary

Teaching Method	Faculty (n=5)						Students (n=23)						Cumulative Rank Difference *
	f. of Ranking				Wt'd Score	Cum. Rank	f. of Ranking				Wt'd Score	Cum. Rank	
	1	2	3	4			1	2	3	4			
Analysis of case studies	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	1	9	- 1.0	
Discussion of lecture	1	1	3	0	13	2.5	0	4	14	0	3	- .5	
Field experience	0	0	0	2	2	4.5	0	0	1	9	4	.5	
Guided discovery	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	10	- 2.0	
Lecture	4	1	0	0	19	1	22	1	0	0	1	0	
Reading/research & report	0	3	2	0	13	2.5	1	16	6	0	2	.5	
Recitation or drill	0	0	0	2	2	4.5	0	1	1	5	5	- .5	
Reflection on experience	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	5	7	1.0	
Simulations or role play	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	2	8	0	
Small group discussion	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	1	1	1	6	2.0	

* $r = .933$; significant at the $\alpha = .05$ level. Reject $H_0: \rho = 0$.

TABLE 4:10b
Teaching Methods Commonly Employed
At William Farel School of Divinity

Teaching Method	Faculty (n=9)					Students (n=32)					Cumulative Rank Difference *		
	f. of Ranking				Wt'd Score	Cum. Rank	f. of Ranking					Wt'd Score	Cum. Rank
	1	2	3	4			1	2	3	4			
Analysis of case studies	0	0	0	0	0	9.5	0	2	1	4	12	5.5	4.0
Discussion of lecture	1	4	1	1	19	2	0	13	8	2	47	3	-1.0
Field experience	0	0	0	1	1	7	0	0	0	2	2	9	-2.0
Guided discovery	0	0	0	1	1	7	0	2	2	1	11	7.5	- .5
Lecture	8	1	0	0	35	1	32	0	0	0	128	1	0
Reading/research & report	0	1	6	1	16	3	0	11	9	6	57	2	1.0
Recitation or drill	0	2	2	3	13	4	0	4	3	7	25	4	0
Reflection on experience	0	0	0	1	1	7	0	0	5	2	12	5.5	1.5
Simulations or role play	0	0	0	0	0	9.5	0	0	0	0	0	10	- .5
Small group discussion	0	1	0	0	3	5	0	0	3	5	11	7.5	-2.5

* $r = .812$; significant at the $\alpha = .05$ level. Reject H_0 : $\rho = 0$.

TABLE 4:10c

Teaching Methods Commonly Employed
At Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary

Teaching Method	Faculty (n=13)					Students (n=35)					Cumulative Rank Difference *		
	f. of Ranking				Wt'd Score	Cum. Rank	f. of Ranking					Wt'd Score	Cum. Rank
	1	2	3	4			1	2	3	4			
Analysis of case studies	0	0	1	4	6	4	0	0	2	8	12	6	- 2.0
Discussion of lecture	0	8	3	1	31	2	0	11	14	3	64	3	- 1.0
Field experience	0	0	1	1	3	6.5	0	0	1	5	7	7	- .5
Guided discovery	0	0	0	1	1	9	0	1	0	0	3	9	0
Lecture	13	0	0	0	52	1	35	0	0	0	140	1	0
Reading/research & report	0	5	5	2	27	3	0	19	12	4	85	2	1.0
Recitation or drill	0	0	1	1	3	6.5	0	3	3	4	19	4	2.5
Reflection on experience	0	0	2	1	5	5	0	1	3	4	13	5	0
Simulations or role play	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	10	0
Small group discussion	0	0	0	2	2	8	0	0	0	4	4	8	0

* $r = .924$; significant at the $\alpha = .05$ level. Reject $H_0: \rho = 0$.

TABLE 4:10d
Teaching Methods Commonly Employed
At Biblical Seminary

Teaching Method	Faculty (n=9)					Students (n=19)					Cumulative Rank Difference *		
	f. of Ranking				Wt'd Score	Cum. Rank	f. of Ranking					Wt'd Score	Cum. Rank
	1	2	3	4			1	2	3	4			
Analysis of case studies	0	0	1	0	2	8	1	0	2	3	11	5	3.0
Discussion of lecture	1	2	1	2	14	3	0	7	5	3	34	3	0
Field experience	0	0	2	4	8	4	0	1	4	3	14	4	0
Guided discovery	1	0	0	0	4	6.5	0	1	2	2	9	6	.5
Lecture	6	1	0	1	28	1	16	1	0	0	67	1	0
Reading/research & report	1	6	1	0	24	2	2	8	5	1	43	2	0
Recitation or drill	0	0	0	0	0	9.5	0	1	0	1	4	7.5	2.0
Reflection on experience	0	0	2	0	4	6.5	0	0	0	3	3	9	-2.5
Simulations or role play	0	0	0	0	0	9.5	0	0	0	0	0	10	- .5
Small group discussion	0	0	2	2	6	5	0	0	1	2	4	7.5	-2.5

* $r = .842$; significant at the $\alpha = .05$ level. Reject $H_0: \rho = 0$.

cussion of lecture or research" and "reading or research with report." Students concur that "lecture" is the most common teaching method at their seminary, and also rank "reading or research with report" and "discussion of lecture or research" as second and third most common, in that order. In addition to the three teaching methods already mentioned, only "field experience" and "recitation or drill" were ranked by faculty, a perception shared by seminarians who ranked the same methods as fourth and fifth most common.

Findings About Training Method--Farel. Findings on teaching methods commonly employed at William Farel School of Divinity are presented in Table 4:10b. Theological educators at Farel indicated the most common teaching methods employed at their institution are (1) "lecture," (2) "discussion of lecture or research," (3) "reading or research with report," and (4) "recitation or drill." Out of 36 faculty responses on the ranking item, 32 were assigned to these four teaching methods. At Farel, student responses also coincided with those of faculty. "Lecture" was designated most common teaching method by all 32 student respondents, and "recitation or drill" was clearly indicated as fourth most common. "Reading or research with report" received a cumulative ranking higher than "discussion of lecture or research," but more students ranked "discussion" as second most common among teaching methods used.

Findings About Training Method--Sovereign Grace. Findings on teaching methods commonly employed at Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary are presented in Table 4:10c. Theological educators report the

most common methods of instruction at Sovereign Grace are (1) "lecture," (2) "discussion of lecture or research," and (3) "reading or research with report." The strong predominance of "lecture" as the preferred method of instruction was affirmed by every faculty and student respondent. Students also agreed with their faculty that "discussion of lecture or research" and "reading or research with report" are the next most common methods used in classes at Sovereign Grace, although students ranked "reading or research" as more common than "discussion."

Findings About Training Method--Biblical. Findings on teaching methods commonly employed at Biblical Seminary are presented in Table 4:10d. Theological educators reported the most common teaching methods at their seminary are (1) "lecture," (2) "reading or research with report," and (3) "discussion of lecture or research." Student respondents concurred with the rankings assigned by faculty to all three instructional methods. Both faculty and students also reported the fourth most common method used at Biblical is "field experience."

Summary. A review of findings related to teaching methods commonly employed at the four participating seminaries indicates substantial agreement between reports from theological educators and students, and high continuity across the four institutions. Theological educators at all four seminaries included in the study consistently ranked "lecture" as the most common teaching method at their school. ("Lecture" was ranked "1" by 4 of 5 faculty at Oakhill, 8 of 9 at Farel, 13 of 13 at Sovereign Grace, and 6 of 9 at Biblical.) "Discussion of lecture or research" and "reading or research with report" were also ranked second

and third most common at all seminaries, although cumulative rank for the two was the same at one school (Oakhill) and rank order was reversed at another (Biblical).

Student ranking strongly confirmed "lecture" as the most common teaching method in all four seminaries. Students also concurred with faculty ranking of the next most common methods, but failed to support the inter-institutional differences indicated by faculty respondents. "Reading or research with report" was ranked second most common, and "discussion of lecture or research" was ranked third most common by student respondents at all four seminaries.

Faculty and student ranking of teaching methods identified as significant in training for helping professions is summarized in Table 4:11. "Analysis of case studies" and "reflection on personal experience" were reported more common at Sovereign Grace than at the other participating seminaries, although most rankings were low. "Simulation games or role play" was ranked least common by all four faculty samples and by three of four student samples. "Guided discovery" also ranked among the least common teaching methods in all institutions. Only "field experience," among teaching methods of interest, was ranked among the more common instructional methods at two or more institutions. Faculty and students of both Oakhill and Biblical seminaries indicated "field experience" is the fourth most common method of instruction at their schools. Overall, the five methods of interest were assigned the five lowest ranks in 32 out of 40 measurements.

TABLE 4:11

Rank Assigned by Respondents at Four Seminaries
 To Teaching Methods Identified as Significant
 In Training for Helping Professions

Institution	Ranking by Faculty	Ranking by Students
"Analysis of case studies"		
Oakhill	8 of 10 *	9 of 10
Farel	9.5 of 10 *	5.5 of 10
Sovereign Grace	4 of 10	6 of 10
Biblical	8 of 10	5 of 10
"Field experience"		
Oakhill	4.5 of 10	4 of 10
Farel	7 of 10	9 of 10
Sovereign Grace	6.5 of 10	7 of 10
Biblical	4 of 10	4 of 10
"Guided discovery"		
Oakhill	8 of 10 *	10 of 10 *
Farel	7 of 10	7.5 of 10
Sovereign Grace	9 of 10	9 of 10
Biblical	6.5 of 10	6 of 10
"Reflection on personal experience"		
Oakhill	8 of 10 *	7 of 10
Farel	7 of 10	5.5 of 10
Sovereign Grace	5 of 10	5 of 10
Biblical	6.5 of 10	9 of 10
"Simulation games or role play"		
Oakhill	8 of 10 *	6 of 10
Farel	9.5 of 10 *	10 of 10 *
Sovereign Grace	10 of 10 *	10 of 10 *
Biblical	9.5 of 10 *	10 of 10 *

* Lowest rank assigned.

Research Question 10

If presented with a list of disciplines associated with traditional training for ministry, will theological educators and seminarians agree that their seminary program provides effective training in these disciplines?

Perceived training adequacy of seminary programs with respect to disciplines traditionally associated with training for ministry was investigated by means of Likert-type attitude scales. Fifteen items on the questionnaire elicited data on respondent agreement/disagreement with statements related to training adequacy. The stem for each item was:

Our seminary program provides effective training in;_____.

Completing the item was one of 15 disciplines associated with traditional training for ministry (page 46). Pairing the item stem with the 15 disciplines produced the 15 items included in the questionnaire. Findings are presented as mean response and sample standard deviation for each item and population sample included in the study.

Faculty and student responses from each seminary are also compared for each item by means of a t-test for independent samples, using the following hypotheses:

Statistical hypothesis: There is no significant difference between the mean response of theological educators and that of seminarians.

Alternative hypothesis: There is significant difference between the mean response of theological educators and that of seminarians.

Findings for each comparison are reported as t-ratios, with significance noted when $p \leq .05$. This procedure was also employed with attitude scale data presented previously in the study.

Findings About Training Adequacy--Oakhill. Findings on training adequacy at Oakhill Theological Seminary are presented in Table 4:12a. Theological educators rate training effectiveness exceptionally high at Oakhill, indicating strong agreement ($1.00 \leq \bar{x} \leq 1.49$) with assertions of effectiveness of training in nine of 15 disciplines. Faculty also agree ($1.50 \leq \bar{x} \leq 2.49$) that the remaining six disciplines are taught effectively at Oakhill.

For the most part, students at Oakhill concurred with their faculty regarding the adequacy of training in traditional seminary disciplines. Although students were ambivalent ($2.50 \leq \bar{x} \leq 3.50$) about the effectiveness of training in three disciplines, two of the three ("evangelism" and "missions") also evoked the lowest level of agreement from faculty. As a result, differences between faculty and student opinion regarding training in those disciplines is not statistically significant.

Differences between faculty and student opinion are statistically significant ($\alpha \leq .05$) with respect to two other disciplines. Faculty strongly agree ($\bar{x} = 1.2$) that the seminary provides effective training in "hermeneutics," but although students also agree ($\bar{x} = 2.125$), their level of agreement is considerably moderated. Faculty also strongly agree ($\bar{x} = 1.4$) that the seminary provides effective training in "Christian education," but in this case student opinion is ambivalent ($\bar{x} = 2.522$).

TABLE 4:12a

Perceived Adequacy of Training in Traditional Seminary Disciplines

At Oakhill Theological Seminary

Discipline	Faculty		Students		t-ratio
	\bar{x}	s	\bar{x}	s	
Biblical Introduction Fac n=5 Stud n=24	1.200	.447	1.708	.806	- 1.35
Biblical Languages Fac n=5 Stud n=24	1.200	.447	1.375	.824	- .46
Hermeneutics Fac n=5 Stud n=24	1.200	.447	2.125	.900	- 2.22 *
Biblical History Fac n=5 Stud n=24	1.200	.447	1.625	.770	- 1.18
Biblical Theology Fac n=5 Stud n=24	1.600	.548	1.333	.702	.80
Systematic Theology Fac n=5 Stud n=23	1.400	.548	1.261	.449	.61
Christian Ethics Fac n=5 Stud n=22	1.800	.837	2.136	.941	- .73
Apologetics Fac n=5 Stud n=23	1.600	.548	2.130	.968	- 1.17
Church History Fac n=5 Stud n=23	1.400	.548	1.652	.714	- .74
Homiletics Fac n=5 Stud n=24	1.800	.837	2.042	.859	- .57
Evangelism Fac n=5 Stud n=23	2.400	1.140	2.522	1.082	- .23
Christian Education Fac n=5 Stud n=23	1.400	.548	2.522	1.082	- 2.23 *
Pastoral Care Fac n=5 Stud n=21	1.200	.447	2.000	.894	- 1.92
Pastoral Administration Fac n=5 Stud n=21	1.200	.447	2.143	1.062	- 1.92
Missions Fac n=5 Stud n=23	2.200	.837	3.217	1.278	- 1.69
Totals Across Stem Fac n=5 Stud n=24	22.800	6.140	28.542	9.170	- 1.33

* Significant at $\alpha = .05$ level.

TABLE 4:12b

Perceived Adequacy of Training in Traditional Seminary Disciplines

At William Farel School of Divinity

Disciplines	Faculty		Students		t-ratio
	\bar{x}	s	\bar{x}	s	
Biblical Introduction Fac n=9 Stud n=31	1.667	1.323	2.129	.885	- 1.23
Biblical Languages Fac n=9 Stud n=32	1.000	0	1.813	.998	- 2.42 *
Hermeneutics Fac n=9 Stud n=30	2.000	.866	2.167	1.053	- .43
Biblical History Fac n=9 Stud n=32	1.556	.527	2.094	.734	- 2.05 *
Biblical Theology Fac n=9 Stud n=29	1.889	.928	2.069	1.033	- .47
Systematic Theology Fac n=9 Stud n=31	1.222	.441	1.387	.558	- .81
Christian Ethics Fac n=9 Stud n=25	1.778	.833	2.440	.870	- 1.98
Apologetics Fac n=9 Stud n=26	1.778	.667	2.615	1.061	- 2.21 *
Church History Fac n=9 Stud n=23	1.400	.548	1.652	.714	- .74
Homiletics Fac n=9 Stud n=30	1.000	0	1.933	1.015	- 2.73 *
Evangelism Fac n=9 Stud n=28	2.000	.707	3.321	.905	- 3.99 *
Christian Education Fac n=9 Stud n=26	2.556	1.333	3.077	1.055	- 1.19
Pastoral Care Fac n=9 Stud n=28	2.222	.667	3.571	1.136	- 3.36 *
Pastoral Administration Fac n=9 Stud n=26	2.778	1.302	3.615	.898	- 2.14 *
Missions Fac n=9 Stud n=30	2.222	1.394	3.067	1.081	- 1.92
Totals Across Stem Fac n=9 Stud n=33	27.111	7.769	31.697	12.141	- 1.07

* Significant at $\alpha = .05$ level.

TABLE 4:12c

Perceived Adequacy of Training in Traditional Seminary Disciplines
At Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary

Discipline	Faculty		Students		t-ratio
	\bar{x}	s	\bar{x}	s	
Biblical Introduction Fac n=16 Stud n=35	1.500	.816	2.000	1.057	- 1.67
Biblical Languages Fac n=16 Stud n=35	1.313	.793	1.686	1.051	- 1.26
Hermeneutics Fac n=16 Stud n=34	1.750	.856	2.294	.970	- 1.92
Biblical History Fac n=16 Stud n=35	2.250	1.125	2.029	.891	.76
Biblical Theology Fac n=16 Stud n=35	2.000	1.265	1.886	.993	.35
Systematic Theology Fac n=16 Stud n=35	1.563	.892	1.400	.736	.68
Christian Ethics Fac n=16 Stud n=34	1.938	.929	2.000	.816	- .24
Apologetics Fac n=16 Stud n=34	2.125	.957	2.588	1.131	- 1.41
Church History Fac n=16 Stud n=35	2.750	1.438	3.257	1.502	- 1.13
Homiletics Fac n=16 Stud n=34	2.063	1.063	2.059	.983	.01
Evangelism Fac n=16 Stud n=34	2.625	.957	3.529	1.107	- 2.81 *
Christian Education Fac n=16 Stud n=34	1.438	1.031	1.706	1.088	- .83
Pastoral Care Fac n=16 Stud n=36	1.813	.750	2.250	.996	- 1.57
Pastoral Administration Fac n=16 Stud n=33	2.500	1.033	3.424	1.032	- 2.94 *
Missions Fac n=16 Stud n=34	2.938	1.181	3.148	1.329	- .54
Totals Across Stem Fac n=16 Stud n=36	30.563	11.622	33.667	9.940	- .99

* Significant at $\alpha = .05$ level.

TABLE 4:12d

Perceived Adequacy of Training in Traditional Seminary Disciplines

At Biblical Seminary

Discipline	Faculty		Students		t-ratio
	\bar{x}	s	\bar{x}	s	
Biblical Introduction Fac n=9 Stud n=19	1.444	.527	1.947	.848	- 1.63
Biblical Languages Fac n=9 Stud n=19	1.111	.333	1.211	.419	- .62
Hermeneutics Fac n=9 Stud n=19	1.667	.707	1.895	.809	- .72
Biblical History Fac n=9 Stud n=19	2.333	.500	2.158	.898	.54
Biblical Theology Fac n=9 Stud n=19	1.444	.527	1.263	.452	.94
Systematic Theology Fac n=9 Stud n=19	1.444	.726	1.474	.841	- .09
Christian Ethics Fac n=9 Stud n=19	1.667	.500	2.211	.855	- 1.76
Apologetics Fac n=9 Stud n=19	2.333	1.000	2.579	1.071	- .58
Church History Fac n=9 Stud n=19	1.556	.726	1.474	.772	.27
Homiletics Fac n=9 Stud n=19	1.889	.601	2.529	1.231	- 1.46
Evangelism Fac n=9 Stud n=19	2.667	.707	3.263	.933	- 1.69
Christian Education Fac n=9 Stud n=18	1.556	.726	2.167	1.043	- 1.57
Pastoral Care Fac n=9 Stud n=18	1.222	.441	2.111	.900	- 2.78 *
Pastoral Administration Fac n=9 Stud n=18	1.889	.782	2.667	1.138	- 1.84
Missions Fac n=9 Stud n=19	1.667	.500	1.947	.848	- .91
Totals Across Stem Fac n=9 Stud n=19	25.889	4.986	30.263	6.479	- 1.78

* Significant at $\alpha = .05$ level.

Findings About Training Adequacy--Farel. Findings on training adequacy at William Farel School of Divinity are presented in Table 4:12b. Theological educators agree that training in traditional disciplines at Farel is effective, with mean scores falling in that range for nine of 15 disciplines. Of the remaining six disciplines, four evoke a faculty response of "strongly agree," while two ("Christian education" and "pastoral administration") are met with ambivalence.

Despite this moderate evaluation of training effectiveness on the part of faculty at Farel, student ratings are lower than faculty ratings with respect to all 15 disciplines, and significantly lower (at $\alpha = .05$) with respect to seven of the 15.

In relation to three of the seven disciplines ("Biblical languages," "Biblical history," and "homiletics"), although student attitudes are significantly different from faculty, mean student scores still lie within the range indicating agreement that training is effective. In relation to two disciplines ("apologetics" and "missions"), faculty agree that training is effective, but students are ambivalent. In relation to one discipline ("pastoral administration"), faculty is ambivalent ($\bar{x} = 2.778$) regarding the effectiveness of training, but students "disagree" * ($\bar{x} = 3.615$) with the proposed statement that training is adequate. In relation to one other discipline ("pastoral care"), faculty agree ($\bar{x} = 2.222$) that training is effective, but students disagree ($\bar{x} = 3.571$) with the same statement.

* Mean response lies within the interval range 3.51 to 4.50.

It is noteworthy that the only discipline with respect to which students strongly agree the seminary provides effective training is "systematic theology." Students are ambivalent or disagree regarding the adequacy of training in "apologetics," "evangelism," "Christian education," "pastoral care," "pastoral administration," and "missions"--a list which includes the entire complement of practical theology disciplines.

Findings About Training Adequacy--Sovereign Grace. Findings on training adequacy at Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary are presented in Table 4:12c. Theological educators agree that training in traditional disciplines is effective at Sovereign Grace, with mean response falling in that range for nine of 15 disciplines. Of the remaining six disciplines, two ("Biblical languages" and "Christian education") evoke a response of strong agreement, while four ("church history," "evangelism," "pastoral administration," and "missions") are evaluated with ambivalence.

Although total student response across the item stem is lower than faculty total (a pattern which prevails throughout the study), students were more positive than faculty in their evaluation of four of 15 disciplines ("Biblical history," "systematic theology," "Christian ethics," and "homiletics"). While this pattern was not observed at other institutions, differences between faculty and student opinions related to these subjects is small and statistically insignificant.

Students expressed ambivalence or disagreement with statements that training is effective in five of 15 disciplines. Regarding four of the

five ("church history," "evangelism," "pastoral administration," and "missions"), faculty also indicated ambivalence over the effectiveness of training. In the fifth case ("apologetics"), difference between faculty and student opinion was not large enough to be significant.

Difference between faculty and student opinion is significant (at $\alpha = .05$) with respect to two disciplines. In relation to "pastoral administration," both faculty and student mean responses fell within the range of ambivalence, but faculty opinion ($\bar{x} = 2.5$) coincided with the upper limit of that range while student opinion ($\bar{x} = 3.424$) approached the lower limit. Regarding the adequacy of training in "evangelism," faculty indicated ambivalence ($\bar{x} = 2.625$), while students disagreed ($\bar{x} = 3.529$) that training is effective.

Total faculty response across the item stem is lower at Sovereign Grace than at the other seminaries included in the study. Judging from student responses, this may reflect a realistic assessment of specific weaknesses, coupled with a tendency on the part of faculty to undervalue the effectiveness of training in some disciplines.

Findings About Training Adequacy--Biblical. Findings on training adequacy at Biblical Seminary are presented in Table 4:12d. Theological educators strongly agree that training is effective in five of 15 disciplines associated with traditional training for ministry, and agree that training is effective in nine other disciplines. With respect to only one discipline ("evangelism") did faculty register ambivalence regarding the effectiveness of training.

For the most part, students concurred with their faculty regarding the adequacy of training at Biblical. While ambivalence was indicated by students regarding training effectiveness in four disciplines ("apologetics," "homiletics," "evangelism," and "pastoral administration"), differences between faculty and student opinion was not significant with respect to any of these disciplines.

Difference between faculty and student opinion was significant (at $\alpha = .05$) with respect to "pastoral care." Faculty mean response ($\bar{x} = 1.222$) was second highest of all disciplines examined in the study, but student mean response ($\bar{x} = 2.111$), while agreeing that training is effective, was comparatively restrained.

Summary. A review of findings on adequacy of training at the four seminaries indicates faculty and students generally agree that their institutions provide adequate training in disciplines traditionally associated with training for ministry. At all four seminaries, faculty strongly agree their program provides adequate training in "Biblical languages," and at three of four seminaries faculty also strongly agree they provide effective training in "systematic theology."

It is interesting to note that students in all four seminaries indicate strong agreement that their seminary provides adequate training in "systematic theology," and in two of four they strongly agree "Biblical languages" are also taught effectively. (In the other two seminaries--Farel and Sovereign Grace--adequacy of instruction in "Biblical languages" was among the most strongly affirmed assertions, even though the mean student response lay outside the range of strong agreement.)

Out of 60 measurements (attitude toward adequacy of training in 15 disciplines at each of four institutions), faculty indicate ambivalence regarding the effectiveness of training in only seven measurements. Students, on the other hand, indicate ambivalence in 15 measurements, and disagree with statements their seminary provides effective training in three other measurements. The 18 measurements in which students indicate ambivalence or disagreement regarding the adequacy of training are "apologetics" (3 seminaries), "church history" (1 seminary), "homiletics" (1 seminary), "evangelism" (4 seminaries), "Christian education" (2 seminaries), "pastoral care" (1 seminary), "pastoral administration" (3 seminaries), and "missions" (3 seminaries). Predominance of courses from the division of practical theology in this list is striking.

Section Summary.

To investigate the extent to which seminary programs presently incorporate characteristics of a program of training for helping professions, several types of research were undertaken.

Trainee selection procedures at four seminaries were studied through document research. Findings indicate consideration in trainee selection is focused on academic qualification for graduate study and personal fitness for the work of ministry. Criteria for academic assessment are well defined, but criteria for assessment of fitness for the work of ministry are unstated in three seminaries and generally stated in one. No evidence indicated attention is given to selecting trainees who possess qualities characteristic of a servant minister.

Curriculum priorities at four seminaries were investigated through research of seminary publications and documents and through attitude scales measuring perceptions of theological educators and seminarians related to institutional goals and training outcomes. Respondents strongly affirmed their seminaries intend to develop personal qualities of a servant minister, but bordered on ambivalence regarding effectiveness of seminary programs in realizing this goal. Document research indicated curriculum priorities tend to focus on the theological and ecclesiastical traditions of the churches served. (This finding is supported by another: Faculty at three of four seminaries and students at all four seminaries strongly agree their seminary provides adequate training in "systematic theology." No other aspect of the seminary curricula examined in the study shared that consensus.)

Faculty modeling at four seminaries was investigated by means of an attitude scale of faculty and student perceptions. Theological educators and seminarians affirmed that servant minister qualities are demonstrated by faculty of their schools.

The training base at four seminaries was investigated by requesting theological educators and seminarians to identify and rank sources of teaching/learning objectives most commonly considered in designing seminary courses. Findings indicate training programs are most commonly built on objectives derived through analysis of the course subject or discipline and theological commitments regarding the nature of ministry. Among "experiential" bases identified as significant in a program of training for helping professions, only the instructor's professional

experience in ministry was included among the more common sources of teaching/learning objectives.

Training methods at four seminaries were also investigated by requesting theological educators and seminarians to identify and rank teaching methods commonly used at their seminary. Findings indicate a strong preference for "lecture," "reading and research," and "discussion of lecture or research." Among teaching methods identified as significant in training for helping professions, only "field experience" was ranked as high as four of ten, and only at two of four institutions. Although some variation exists, the other teaching methods derived from research on training for helping professions were reported to be among the least common at all four seminaries.

Training adequacy at four seminaries was investigated by means of attitude scales. Findings indicate faculty and students generally agree their seminary provides effective training in disciplines traditionally associated with training for ministry. Highest evaluation was given to training in "systematic theology" and "Biblical languages," while areas of reservation tended to focus on practical theology disciplines.

Institutional Variability in Training for Servanthood at Participating Seminaries

Threat to the study was recognized in variability from two sources: variation between professors and variation over time. Information related to these factors was gathered by means of three items on the questionnaire. Respondents were presented with a list of ten personal qualities of a servant minister and requested to identify areas of per-

ceived variation along the two dimensions mentioned. Data are reported as frequency distributions and as equivalent percentage of the indicated sample. Findings are noted as significant whenever 25% or more of the sample indicated variance in any factor.

Research Question 11

What variations within the seminary are reported by theological educators and seminarians with respect to demonstration of the qualities of a servant minister?

Information related to variation within faculty with respect to demonstration of servant minister qualities was gathered by means of a multiple choice item on the questionnaire. The item stem included a brief explanation to set the context for the question. The full item stem read:

In completing Part 1 of this questionnaire you probably found that some items which inquired about faculty demonstration were relatively difficult to respond to, inasmuch as demonstration varies widely from professor to professor and from course to course.

Circle two or three letters corresponding to those qualities in which you find the widest variation of demonstration within our faculty.

The possible responses consisted of the ten personal qualities of a servant minister examined in the study.

Findings were tallied for each quality of a servant minister by population, and are reported in Table 13 as frequency distributions and equivalent percentage. Responses are noted as significant if 25% or more respondents in any sample indicated wide variation with respect to any quality.

TABLE 4:13
Variation Within Faculty Related to Servant Minister Qualities
At Four Seminaries

Quality	Oakhill				Farel				Sovereign Grace				Biblical			
	Faculty (n=5)		Students (n=24)		Faculty (n=9)		Students (n=33)		Faculty (n=16)		Students (n=36)		Faculty (n=9)		Students (n=19)	
	f.	%	f.	%	f.	%	f.	%	f.	%	f.	%	f.	%	f.	%
Faith			4	17%			4	12%			6	17%	1	11%	1	5%
Empathy	1	20%	* 10	42%	* 4	44%	* 19	58%	3	19%	* 12	33%	* 4	44%	* 11	58%
Integrity			3	13%							2	6%			3	16%
Virtue			2	8%	1	11%	4	12%	* 4	25%	* 11	31%			* 5	26%
Leadership	* 2	40%	4	17%	* 3	33%	* 14	42%	* 5	31%	* 13	36%	2	22%	* 9	47%
Altruism			1	4%	1	11%	5	15%	1	6%	2	6%	* 3	33%		
Zeal			3	13%	1	11%	2	6%	3	19%	* 12	33%	1	11%	2	11%
Involvement	1	20%	* 6	25%	* 4	44%	8	24%	* 7	44%	* 13	36%	* 3	33%	4	21%
Wisdom			2	8%			6	18%	* 4	25%	6	17%	2	22%	2	11%
Self-acceptance			2	8%	* 3	33%	* 9	27%	* 5	31%	8	22%	1	11%	4	21%

* Significant at the 25% level of response.

Findings About Variation Within Faculty--Oakhill. Variation

within faculty was least at Oakhill Theological Seminary of the four seminaries participating in the study. Faculty reported variation at the 25% level only in demonstration of "leadership," while 25% or more of students indicated significant variation only in demonstration of "empathy" and "involvement."

Findings About Variation Within Faculty--Farel. Faculty at

William Farel School of Divinity acknowledged significant variation of demonstration of "empathy," "leadership," "involvement," and "self-acceptance." Students concurred on all points except "involvement."

Findings About Variation Within Faculty--Sovereign Grace. The

most variation reported among the four institutions was present at Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary. Faculty reported wide variation in demonstration of "virtue," "leadership," "involvement," "wisdom," and "self-acceptance." A significant percentage of student respondents confirmed faculty reports of variation in demonstration of "virtue," "leadership," and "involvement," but also noted variation in demonstration of "empathy" and "zeal."

Findings About Variation Within Faculty--Biblical. Faculty re-

spondents at Biblical Seminary reported wide variation in demonstration of "empathy," "altruism," and "involvement." Of the three qualities named by faculty, student respondents concurred only regarding "empathy," but also reported variation in faculty demonstration of "virtue" and "leadership."

Summary. Variation in faculty demonstration of servant minister qualities was reported by at least 25% of respondents at all four seminaries participating in the study. Three qualities ("empathy," "leadership," and "involvement") were identified as a source of variation by respondents from one or both populations sampled at all four institutions. "Virtue" was reported as a source of variation by both faculty and students at Sovereign Grace and by students only at Biblical. "Self-acceptance" was reported a significant source of variation by both faculty and students at Farel and by faculty only at Sovereign Grace. Three qualities ("altruism," "zeal," and "wisdom") were each identified as a source of wide variation by respondents from only one sample. Two qualities ("faith" and "integrity") were not reported to be a significant source of variation within faculty at any seminary. The 26 reports of variation in demonstration perceived by 25% or more of respondents were distributed irregularly across the four institutions (Oakhill--3; Farel--7; Sovereign Grace--10; Biblical--6).

Inquiry into perceived variation within faculty in demonstrating servant leader qualities was incorporated into the research design as a result of concern that significant variation could pose a threat to findings related to trainer modeling. High variation in faculty demonstration of servant minister qualities could easily produce correspondingly high variance in responses related to trainer modeling. This would result if respondents tended to focus on different faculty models or if respondents were confused by varying levels of demonstration.

To determine the effect of variation within faculty on responses to items related to trainer modeling, data on variation were compared with standard deviations of corresponding item responses from RQ₇. Pearson's Product Moment formula was employed to test for correlation, and lack of correlation was hypothesized for statistical purposes ($H_0: \rho = 0$). Findings presented in Table 4:14 indicate that correlation is significant (at $\alpha = .05$) in only one comparison. In the other seven comparisons, the null hypothesis can be rejected only by increasing the α -level to the range of .4 to .9. It would seem clear that the variation within faculty indicated in data collected for RQ₁₁ did not constitute a problem for respondents on items related to RQ₇.

TABLE 4:14

Pearson Product Moment Correlation
Of
Reported Variation Within Faculty
Of Demonstration of Servant Minister Qualities
And
Standard Deviation of Responses on Items Measuring
Perceived Faculty Demonstration Of
Personal Qualities of a Servant Minister

Sample	Oakhill	Farel	Sov. Grace	Biblical
Faculty	.043	.708 *	.301	.121
Students	.104	.116	.223	.299

* Significant at $\alpha = .05$.

Research Question 12

What trends within the seminary are reported by theological educators and seminarians with respect to emphasis on the characteristics of a servant minister?

Information related to variation over time with respect to emphasis on qualities of a servant minister was gathered by means of two multiple choice items on the questionnaire. The first draft of the questionnaire attempted to elicit responses to both increasing and decreasing emphasis in one item, but the field test indicated that respondents found this confusing. Two items were then constructed to separate the directional divergence of possible variation over time. One item was designed to elicit responses regarding perceived increase of emphasis at the seminaries participating in the study. The stem of that item read:

Are there any of the qualities listed above which have been increasingly emphasized in our seminary within the last year or two? If so, please circle the corresponding letters.

The second item was designed to elicit responses regarding perceived decrease of emphasis on qualities of a servant minister. The stem of that item read:

Are there any of the qualities listed above which have been increasingly de-emphasized in our seminary within the last year or two? If so, please circle the corresponding letters.

In each case the possible responses consisted of the ten personal qualities of a servant minister examined in the study.

Findings were tallied for each quality of a servant minister by population sample, and are reported as frequency distributions and

equivalent percentage. Responses are noted as significant if 25% or more respondents in any sample indicated perceived trends within the seminary with respect to any quality. Findings related to increased emphasis are presented in Table 15a, and those related to decreased emphasis are presented in Table 15b.

Findings About Variation Over Time--Oakhill. Theological educators at Oakhill Theological Seminary reported increased emphasis within the past two years on "zeal." Student perceptions confirmed this emphasis, but also reported increased emphasis on "faith," "empathy," and "involvement." No de-emphasis of servant minister qualities was reported by faculty, and student reports of de-emphasis were well below the 25% response level. Oakhill is the only institution in the study at which students reported increased emphasis on more qualities of a servant minister than were reported by faculty (four qualities reported by students vs. only one reported by faculty). It would appear the faculty is placing a positive emphasis on servant minister qualities, even though there may be no deliberate plan to do so.

Findings About Variation Over Time--Farel. Theological educators at William Farel School of Divinity reported increased emphasis on "empathy" and "involvement," but 25% or more of students only recognized increased emphasis on "involvement." While no servant leader qualities were reported as increasingly de-emphasized by 25% of respondents from either population, 24% of student respondents did perceive de-emphasis of "self-acceptance."

TABLE 4:15a

Variation Across Time Related to Servant Minister Qualities at Four Seminaries

Increased Emphasis

Quality	Oakhill				Farel				Sovereign Grace				Biblical			
	Faculty (n=5)		Students (n=24)		Faculty (n=9)		Students (n=33)		Faculty (n=16)		Students (n=36)		Faculty (n=9)		Students (n=19)	
	f.	%	f.	%	f.	%	f.	%	f.	%	f.	%	f.	%	f.	%
Faith			8*	33%			2	6%	4*	25%	6	17%			2	11%
Empathy	1	20%	8*	33%	3*	33%	6	18%	4*	25%	7	19%	4*	44%	3	16%
Integrity			3	13%			4	12%	1	6%	3	8%	1	11%	2	11%
Virtue	1	20%	4	17%	1	11%	3	9%			4	11%	1	11%	1	5%
Leadership			5	21%			5	15%	1	6%	5	14%	3*	33%	3	16%
Altruism			2	8%			3	9%								
Zeal	2*	40%	8*	33%	1	11%	3	9%	3	19%	8	22%	1	11%	2	11%
Involvement	1	20%	6*	25%	4*	44%	13*	39%	6*	38%	8	22%	2	22%	4	21%
Wisdom			2	8%					1	6%	1	3%	1	11%		
Self-acceptance			3	13%			2	6%	3	19%	5	14%	2	22%	5*	26%

* Significant at the 25% level of response.

TABLE 4:15b

Variation Across Time Related to Servant Minister Qualities at Four Seminaries

Decreased Emphasis

Quality	Oakhill				Farel				Sovereign Grace				Biblical			
	Faculty (n=5)		Students (n=24)		Faculty (n=9)		Students (n=33)		Faculty (n=16)		Students (n=36)		Faculty (n=9)		Students (n=19)	
	f.	%	f.	%	f.	%	f.	%	f.	%	f.	%	f.	%	f.	%
Faith			1	4%			2	6%			2	6%				
Empathy			1	4%			5	15%	1	6%	3	8%			1	5%
Integrity			1	4%							4	11%				
Virtue			1	4%			2	6%	1	6%	1	3%			1	5%
Leadership			1	4%			1	3%	2	13%	5	14%			3	16%
Altruism			1	4%	1	11%			1	6%	4	11%			2	11%
Zeal			1	4%			1	3%	2	13%	6	17%	1	11%		
Involvement			2	8%			1	3%	2	13%	1	3%			1	5%
Wisdom			1	4%	1	11%	2	6%	1	6%	2	6%	2	22%	1	5%
Self-acceptance			4	17%			8	24%	1	6%	5	14%				

Findings About Variation Over Time--Sovereign Grace. Theological educators at Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary reported increased emphasis on "faith," "empathy," and "involvement," but these trends were not confirmed by student respondents. Reports of de-emphasis of servant minister qualities ranged from 0 to 17%, all well below the 25% threshold set for significance.

Findings About Variation Over Time--Biblical. Theological educators at Biblical Seminary reported increased emphasis on "faith" and "leadership," although neither emphasis was recognized by student respondents. Students, on the other hand, perceived increased emphasis on "self-acceptance," an emphasis confirmed by 22% (but not 25%) of faculty respondents. Reported de-emphasis of servant minister qualities was minimal.

Summary. Perhaps the most significant finding across the four institutions is that no reported de-emphasis of servant minister qualities reached the 25% level at any seminary participating in the study. Increased emphasis on one or more servant minister qualities, on the other hand, was reported by 25% or more of faculty and student respondents at all four seminaries. These findings confirm the professed concern for training for servant ministry observed at these seminaries, and indicate an improving environment for servant minister development at all participating institutions.

The most commonly reported increased emphasis related to "empathy," although this was noted only by faculty at three seminaries (Farel, Sovereign Grace, and Biblical), only by students at one seminary (Oak-

hill), and by both faculty and students at none. If faculty responses reflect intention, these findings are encouraging. If student perceptions reflect realization of those intentions, however, additional attention to strategies for emphasizing "empathy" is indicated.

Increased emphasis on "involvement" is reported by 25% or more of respondents at three seminaries, with faculty and student reports concurring at one (Farel), increased emphasis perceived only by students at one (Oakhill), and perceived only by faculty at the third (Sovereign Grace).

Increased emphasis on "faith" is reported at two seminaries, once by faculty only (Sovereign Grace), and once by students only (Oakhill). An increased emphasis on "zeal" is reported by both faculty and students at one seminary (Oakhill). At another institution (Biblical), faculty reported an increased emphasis on "leadership" which was unrecognized by students, and students perceived an increased emphasis on "self-acceptance" which was unconfirmed by faculty.

Among servant minister qualities, "integrity," "virtue," "altruism," and "wisdom" were not reported to have received increased emphasis by 25% or more of respondents from any population in the study.

Inquiry into perceived variation over time was included in the research design as a result of sensitivity to the study's vulnerability as a one-shot case study. Significance of findings from such a study would be questionable if the institutions participating in the research were highly dynamic. Findings on perceived trends related to training for leadership as servanthood at the four seminaries show this is not

the case. Moderate variation over time is indicated, but only to an extent and in a direction consistent with the seminaries' stated commitment to training for leadership as servanthood. Indeed, limited reports of trends toward increasing emphasis on characteristics of a servant minister indicate need for increased attention to this curriculum commitment.

Section Summary.

To investigate potential threats to the study, seminary faculty and students were requested to indicate perceived variations within their seminary related to training for servant ministry.. Two sources of variation were examined. Respondents were asked to identify servant minister qualities which vary widely in level of demonstration within their faculty. Respondents were also asked to identify servant minister qualities which appear to have received increasing emphasis or de-emphasis at the seminary within the past two years.

Theological educators and seminarians reported wide variation in demonstration of servant minister qualities at all four seminaries participating in the study. Attempts to correlate these findings with response variability on items measuring perceived trainer modeling of the same qualities failed to yield significant coefficients in seven of eight comparisons.

Trends perceived over time with respect to emphasis on servant minister qualities were also examined. No perceived de-emphasis of servant minister qualities was reported by 25% or more of respondents from any of the four participating institutions. Indeed, an increasing

emphasis on one or more personal qualities of a servant minister was observed by 25% or more of all faculty and student samples. Overall reports of trends within the seminaries were sufficiently moderate, however, to justify more careful attention to implementation of the commitment to train for leadership as servanthood.

Both sets of data provide bases for confidence in the previously presented findings of the study. Although wide variation within faculty is reported for some qualities examined, the data available indicate that variation did not distract respondents or distort findings. Reports of variation over time indicate a positive climate, but also highlight need for added attention to servant minister training at all seminaries. The study's apparent freedom from threats based on institutional variability increase its importance for curriculum evaluation and curriculum planning.

Summary

A review of the study indicates the present state of training for leadership as servanthood in participating seminaries and the level to which characteristics of a program of training for helping professions have been incorporated into ministerial training. Findings are not encouraging regarding present attempts to implement commitment to train for servant ministry. No consensus was observed related to curriculum elements intended to develop qualities of a servant minister. Demonstration of servant minister qualities in present seminary curricula, furthermore, exists primarily in unstructured, informal elements.

Examination of the six program characteristics identified as significant in training for helping professions indicated seminaries have incorporated few of these elements. Seminary trainee selection focuses on academic qualification and (a largely undefined) "fitness for ministry." Curriculum priorities are assigned to theological and ecclesiastical traditions. Training objectives are usually derived through analysis of the course subject or discipline and on the basis of theological commitments regarding the nature of ministry. Seminary training most commonly makes use of lecture, reading and research, or discussion of lectures or research as preferred teaching methods. On the other hand, theological educators and seminarians agree their institutions provide adequate training in disciplines traditionally associated with training for ministry. Furthermore, respondents at all four seminaries confirmed that faculty of their seminary do model personal qualities of a servant minister.

Data collected on variation within the four seminaries indicated the findings of the study are not threatened by intra-institutional variability or dynamism. Variation within the faculty did not affect responses to related items on the questionnaire, and reported trends related to emphasis on servant minister qualities were positive but limited.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study examined curriculum commitments to leadership as servanthood at four protestant seminaries in the "Reformed" tradition. In Chapter 1 the problem was stated and expressed in terms of a series of questions which are open to investigation through research. Chapter 2 reviewed research and findings related to training for helping professions, the precedent research on which the study seeks to build. Methodology employed in the study is explicated in Chapter 3, including instrumentation, sample selection, and procedures employed in data analysis. Findings of the research were presented in Chapter 4. Each research question was taken up in order and data collected from each of the four participating seminaries were identified and interpreted. In the present chapter, findings will be stated as conclusions relative to training for leadership as servanthood at each of the four seminaries. Program recommendations will also be addressed to the administrators of the institutions studied. The chapter closes with recommendations for further research.

Conclusions Related to Training for Leadership as Servanthood at Four Seminaries

A review of findings presented in Chapter 4 supports several conclusions regarding training for leadership as servanthood at participating seminaries.

Research Conclusions--Oakhill

Faculty and administrators at Oakhill Theological Seminary are committed to developing in seminarians the personal qualities of a servant minister examined in the study. Implementation of this commitment has not been deliberately incorporated into the formal curriculum, however, as evidenced by lack of consensus regarding present intentions and preference for informal curriculum factors when illustrating demonstration of servant minister qualities at the seminary.

Comparing the Master of Divinity program at Oakhill with characteristics of a program of training for helping professions leads to the following observations.

1. Preseminary evidence of personal qualities of a servant minister is given no demonstrable priority in selecting trainees into the Master of Divinity program at Oakhill.
2. Training for leadership as servanthood is assigned little priority in the seminary's formal curriculum. Personal commitment and modeling evidenced by the faculty and administrators, combined with the intimacy afforded by the seminary's small student body, however, permits positive

development of servant minister qualities through the informal curriculum.

3. Objectives for the seminary's courses are largely developed from analysis of course content and the instructor's own theological commitments regarding the nature of ministry. Although instructors draw, to some extent, on their own ministry experience when developing course objectives, little attention is given to the background and experience of students or to students' sense of "need to know."
4. Training is largely conducted through lectures, reading, research, and discussion. Field education has been employed as a teaching method, to some extent, but little if any use is made of case studies, role play, discovery learning, or reflection on personal experience in ministry.
5. Training in disciplines traditionally associated with seminary education is generally considered adequate.

Research Conclusions--Farel

Faculty and administrators at William Farel School of Divinity profess high commitment to training for leadership as servanthood. Unfortunately, however, this commitment is only partially recognized by students, and is imperfectly evidenced in development of servant minister qualities in seminarians. The "Bible and Life" program (an integrated field education and theological reflection program) appears to

be a useful initiative in the direction of formalizing curriculum commitments to training for leadership as servanthood. The "Bible and Life" program is less frequently identified as a point of demonstration of servant minister qualities, however, than informal elements in the curriculum at Farel. Thus, the seminary's most visible attempt to plan for servant ministry training still is less effective than unplanned, informal factors.

Comparing the Master of Divinity program at Farel with characteristics of a program of training for helping professions leads to the following observations.

1. Pre-seminary evidence of personal qualities of a servant minister is given little demonstrable priority in selecting trainees into the Master of Divinity program at Farel. Identification of "criteria for assessing the applicant's qualifications" is of positive value, although personal and "spiritual" criteria are undefined, and no mention is made of personal qualities of a servant minister.
2. The "Bible and Life" program constitutes a positive step toward implementation of servant minister training at Farel. The marginal role of the program precludes any temptation to cite it as evidence of curriculum priorities assigned to training for leadership as servanthood, however, much less suggest that this provides the integrating focus of the seminary program. The "Reformed" theological orientation of the seminary, and commitment to provide

"a scholarly program of highest quality," are best viewed as the integrating foci of the present Master of Divinity curriculum.

3. Theological educators and seminarians generally affirm that the seminary's faculty models servant minister qualities, although students are ambivalent regarding faculty demonstration of "empathy."
4. Objectives for seminary courses are commonly derived from the instructor's own theological commitments regarding ministry and from analysis of the course discipline. Although instructors draw, to some extent, on their own experience in ministry when developing teaching objectives, little attention is given to students' background and experience or to students' sense of "need to know."
5. Training at Farel depends heavily on lectures, discussion, and reading or research with reports as methods used to achieve the seminary's objectives. The five training methods identified as significant in programs of training for helping professions are the methods reported by faculty and students to be least common at Farel.
6. Training in systematic theology and Biblical languages is reported to be highly adequate at Farel, but diminished adequacy is observed with respect to other disciplines, especially in the area of practical theology.

Research Conclusions--Sovereign Grace

Faculty and administrators at Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary are committed to training for leadership as servanthood, although the level of commitment is indicated as lowest among seminaries participating in the study. This may account for the relatively high percentage of respondents who were unable to identify examples of servant minister qualities at Sovereign Grace, or who chose not to respond to items requesting them to do so. Lack of strong commitment to developing servant minister qualities also accounts for considerable ambivalence regarding the effectiveness of the seminary's program in this respect. Nevertheless, examples of demonstrated servant minister qualities provided by faculty respondents most frequently cite "informal peer associations," while those provided by students most commonly identify "informal faculty modeling." To the extent the seminary is committed to training for leadership as servanthood, it has not yet deliberately incorporated that commitment into its Master of Divinity curriculum.

Comparing the Master of Divinity program at Sovereign Grace with characteristics of a program of training for helping professions leads to the following observations.

1. Pre-seminary evidence of personal qualities of a servant minister is given no demonstrable priority in selecting trainees into the Master of Divinity program at Sovereign Grace.

2. Training for leadership as servanthood is given little priority in the seminary's curriculum. Program focus is assigned to the "Reformed" ecclesiastical tradition, including its theological distinctives and pattern of church government.
3. Theological educators and seminarians generally affirm that the seminary's faculty models personal qualities of a servant minister, although students are ambivalent regarding modeling of "self-acceptance." Overall evidence of faculty modeling of servant minister qualities was lowest in the study.
4. In developing objectives for seminary courses, instructors most commonly consider their own theological commitments regarding the nature of ministry and their analysis of the course subject or discipline. Although instructors also draw on their own professional experience in ministry when developing course objectives, no attention is reported to be given to students' background and experience or to students' sense of "need to know."
5. As at the other seminaries in the study, the most common training methods at Sovereign Grace are lecture, discussion of lecture or research, and reading or research with report. Although teaching methods identified as significant in programs of training for helping professions were generally among the least common at other seminaries in

the study, analysis of case studies and reflection on personal experience were reported to be more common at Sovereign Grace.

6. Adequacy of training in disciplines traditionally associated with seminary education is generally affirmed, although both faculty and students register ambivalence regarding training in four or five of the 15 disciplines examined.

Research Conclusions--Biblical

Faculty and administrators at Biblical Seminary are highly committed to developing in seminarians the personal qualities of a servant minister examined in the study. Implementation of this commitment has not been deliberately incorporated into the formal curriculum, however, as evidenced by lack of consensus regarding present intentions and preference for informal curriculum factors when illustrating demonstration of servant minister qualities at the seminary.

Comparing the Master of Divinity program at Biblical with characteristics of a program of training for helping professions leads to the following observations.

1. Trainee selection at Biblical Seminary is undertaken with relatively extensive data in hand (i.e., application requirements are more numerous at Biblical than at other seminaries participating in the study), but instructions and requests on application and reference forms tend to exhibit low specificity. Pre-seminary evidence of servant

minister qualities is given little demonstrable attention in selecting students into the Master of Divinity program at Biblical.

2. Training for leadership as servanthood is assigned little priority in the seminary's formal curriculum. Positive initiatives which deserve recognition include the field education program and the program of faculty counseling. Both field education and faculty counseling are valued less highly by students than by faculty, however, indicating need to review the effectiveness of these programs. High ambivalence among seminarians related to effectiveness of the seminary program in developing servant minister qualities also reflects lack of specific priority on this commitment.
3. Modeling of servant minister qualities by the faculty is affirmed by both theological educators and seminarians, but apparently informal modeling alone is inadequate to realize training commitments to leadership as servanthood at Biblical.
4. Objectives for courses taught at Biblical are commonly developed through analysis of the course subject, or from the instructor's theological commitments regarding the nature of ministry. The experiential bases found significant in training for helping professions are subject to mixed reports from respondents at Biblical. Theological

educators claim to draw on professional experience in ministry as they develop teaching/learning objectives, but students perceive little evidence to support the claim. On the other hand, seminarians recognize more sensitivity to students' sense of "need to know" at Biblical than was reported at other seminaries.

5. Instructional methods common at Biblical are lecture, reading or research, and discussion of lecture or research. Training methods found to be significant in training for helping professions comprise four of the five least commonly reported methods among responses from Biblical. Field education, the exception, was reported fourth most common (following the three listed above) by both faculty and student respondents.
6. Training in disciplines traditionally associated with seminary education is generally strongly affirmed to be adequate, although both faculty and students are ambivalent regarding the adequacy of training in "evangelism."

Program Recommendations for Curricular Implementation of Commitment To Leadership as Servanthood

The findings and conclusions of the study clearly indicate unsatisfactory implementation of commitments to leadership as servanthood at participating seminaries. Comparison of seminary programs with programs found to be effective in training for helping professions has identified several points of dissimilarity. These dissimilarities suggest possible

adjustments in seminary curricula which may reasonably be expected to enhance effectiveness in training for servanthood ministry. Differences among institutions participating in the study indicate that some recommendations may be more applicable at one or two seminaries than to the others. Implementation of recommendations will certainly vary from institution to institution. Nevertheless, specific suggestions are offered for consideration by seminary administrators.

1. The administration and faculty should specifically state the seminary's commitment to training for leadership as servanthood and should adopt that goal, institutionally and individually, as the integrating focus of the various courses, functions, and activities which comprise the Master of Divinity program.

Among the seminaries participating in the study, priority in the curriculum was assigned to the "Reformed" ecclesiastical tradition and its characteristic approach to Christian theology. This situation is reminiscent of Carkhuff's remark that counselor training programs have traditionally given priority to their preferred mode of treatment.

Thorough grounding in Biblical and theological truth is important in programs of training for ministry. Apart from the power of God mediated through the inscripturated Word, the Christian pastor is limited to the human resources of logic and psychology in ministering to hurting and questioning women and men. While Biblical and theological training are necessary for effectiveness in ministry, however, they are not sufficient. Some ministers are theologically astute, but ineffective in meeting the needs of parishioners. Theological educators should identify their training task as developing the full complement of qualities and

skills that characterize the servant minister. The shared commitment to training for leadership as servanthood can provide the integrating focus of such a program.

In some seminaries, faculty and administrators can well begin with statements and documents which exist. A review and re-affirmation of these statements may provide adequate background for adoption of servant ministry as the integrating focus of the seminary training program. In other seminaries, faculty and administrators need to articulate their commitments to leadership as servanthood and the complement of qualities and skills denoted. Experience in training for other helping professions suggests that focusing training for servant ministry will attribute increased meaning and import to the study of theoretical and practical disciplines and will enhance effectiveness of seminary graduates in ministry.

2. The administration should call faculty and students to renewed commitment to develop and demonstrate the qualities of a servant minister examined in this study.

Training for servant ministry can best occur in a community where servant minister qualities are continuously demonstrated. Findings of the study provide bases for encouragement regarding demonstration of servant minister qualities among faculty and (to a lesser extent) students of participating seminaries. Yet students are ambivalent regarding faculty demonstration of certain servant minister qualities. In all institutions there is room for improvement. Specific attention to personal development and modeling is an important precondition to subsequent

steps toward developing a program of training for leadership as servant-hood.

At least two reasons exist why training for servant ministry best occurs in the context of a modeling community. First, one effect of servant leadership is the development of servanthood qualities in those who are served (Greenleaf, 1977). As seminarians experience servant leadership in the seminary community, they are encouraged and enabled to become servant leaders themselves.

A second reason why training for servant ministry best occurs in community is related to the nature of the qualities to be developed. Although designated "personal" qualities, some are distinctly social in nature. Recognition of this fact also clarifies the need to expand the context of training beyond the limited confines of the seminary community to the larger community of the church. Development of some servant minister qualities is facilitated as seminarians are guided in reflecting on ministry experiences shared with seminary faculty in the context of a local congregation. Congregational experience is necessary to develop the social qualities of a servant minister. Continuous demonstration of servant leadership in that context also is necessary to assure that the desired qualities, and not others, are developed.

3. The admissions committee should be requested to formalize consideration of an applicant's personal qualities, with preference given to applicants who evidence higher levels of the qualities of a servant minister.

Combs noted that efficiency demands that students be accepted into a program of training teachers as helpers on the basis of prior evidence

of the qualities the program seeks to develop. To attempt to develop helping teachers from applicants without these qualities, he asserted, is too expensive to consider. The implications of this concept for theological education should not be minimized.

To implement the above recommendation, admissions committees will need to review instructions and forms distributed to applicants and their references to assure an adequate data base related to demonstrated servant minister qualities. In some cases operational definitions and evaluation criteria or guidelines are needed to assure meaningful information from respondents. Furthermore, admissions committees will need to review their own procedures and decision criteria to provide for appropriate consideration of each applicant's evidence of servant minister qualities. Acceptance of students who evidence some development of servant minister qualities can contribute significantly to realization of seminary goals.

4. The curriculum committee should be requested to review the Master of Divinity curriculum in light of the seminary's commitment to training for leadership as servanthood.

Orientation of the seminary program to training for servant ministry will demand careful attention of the curriculum committee. Specific questions to be included may include: How can the Master of Divinity program be adjusted to enhance the training effect of the field education program? How can the field education program be expanded to better assist seminarians "to think theologically about practice and practically about theology"? How can interaction between field experience and class-

room learning be facilitated? How can course descriptions be revised to identify development of servant minister qualities as specific learning goals? How can faculty counseling and chapel programs be modified to more effectively utilize the training effect of these programs for developing servant ministers? In a word, how can the entire instructional program of the seminary be integrated about the commitment to leadership as servanthood?

5. The administration should explore alternative means of sensitizing faculty to the developmental value of an experience oriented training base.

It should not be amazing that theoretically oriented training curricula effectively develop able theoreticians. Nor is it surprising that new graduates with little exposure to professional practice find it difficult to make the transition from the demands of graduate education to those of parish ministry. Carkhuff and Combs were responding to parallel crises within their own professions when they proposed that counselor training and teacher education programs be re-structured on more experiential bases. A similar re-orientation of seminary courses can be expected to contribute significantly to graduates' effectiveness in ministry. Through faculty workshops and discussions, using skills and insights present in the faculty and available through resource personnel, faculty can be encouraged and enabled to develop teaching/learning objectives which take into account student experience prior to seminary, on-going experience in field education settings, and students' sense of "need to know."

6. The administration should also explore means of developing the faculty's repertoire of teaching methods, with special attention given to those methods which have demonstrated value in training for helping professions.

The predominant use of lecture, reading, and research in the seminaries studied indicates that significant improvement toward training for servant ministry must include a diversification of teaching methods. Well established patterns are familiar and comfortable, but instructors committed to training for leadership as servanthood can change. As in the case of preparing experience oriented objectives, through a combination of workshops and consultations, drawing on resident and external resource personnel, perhaps strengthened by a pattern of peer conferencing, theological educators can develop more effective strategies for training servant ministers.

7. The administration should give appropriate attention to disciplines reported in the study as characterized by low or ambivalent reports of training adequacy.

It should be noted that training for ministry as servanthood can only be achieved when seminarians are equipped with the information and skills required in ministry. The recommended role of commitment to leadership as servanthood is to provide focus and integration in the seminary's curriculum. Areas of weakness in the instructional program are a threat to all training for ministry.

The above recommendations are offered humbly and with deep appreciation for the faith and professionalism evidenced by the administrators and faculty at each of the four institutions which participated in

the study. Their commitment to training for leadership as servanthood is well documented in data collected. The recommendations offered above are intended to suggest ways this commitment can be even more fully implemented and even more satisfactorily realized.

Recommendations for Further Research

Research is orderly inquiry. Inquiry is an activity which usually serves some purpose. Curriculum research is often conducted to improve curriculum decision making. The present study was proposed and undertaken for the purpose of improving curriculum decision making at four selected seminaries. The study sought to provide curriculum decision makers with data which will enable them to assess the significance of commitment to leadership as servanthood as a determinant of present seminary curricula. The study also sought to provide curriculum decision makers with specific data related to elements of their ministry training curriculum which correspond to characteristics found to contribute positively to programs of training for helping professions.

The precedent research on which this study is based constitutes a promising resource for future curriculum research in the field of theological education. This study marks a very limited beginning in exploring the curricular implications of theological education viewed as training for a helping profession. There is much that remains to be done. Important areas needing further research include:

1. Replication of this research in other seminaries to test the appropriateness of projecting inferences from this study to other seminaries or to theological education in general.

The present study was designed, conducted, and reported as a set of four descriptive case studies. Similarity of findings among the four seminaries raises intriguing questions. Are the apparent similarities merely coincidental, or the effect of observer bias? Are the similarities, if real, unique to the particular seminaries in the study, or characteristic only of seminaries sharing the "Reformed" tradition? These and other questions can be answered only as the study is replicated by other researchers and in other seminaries.

Those replicating the study should modify the research management strategy to assure control of respondent follow-up. Direct access to non-responding subjects will permit the researcher to determine the causes and significance of low rates of response and, perhaps, avoid a problem encountered in this study.

2. Descriptive studies of alternative programs of theological education to identify additional curriculum factors or non-traditional educational modes of potential significance in the task of designing theological education programs which effectively train for leadership as servanthood.

In recent years, theological educators have experimented widely with alternative programs of training for ministry (Ferris, 1979; Ferris & Ward, 1980). Many experimental programs have been short-lived, but some, such as the doctor of ministries program (Carroll, et al., 1980) and theological education by extension (Kinsler, 1981), have been

widely accepted and applied. The value of these and other alternative approaches to training for leadership as servanthood needs to be documented before implications for traditional ministry training programs can be addressed.

3. Experimental studies which compare traditional and alternative programs of training for ministry to identify training factors most closely associated with effective development of ministers who function as servant leaders.

As hypotheses are generated through descriptive studies, the task of testing those hypotheses will demand experimentally controlled research. Only as the results of experimental studies become available will theological educators be able to develop theory that enables them to confidently design curricula to implement commitment to training for leadership as servanthood.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

A THEOLOGICAL GROUNDING OF SERVANTHOOD AS THE NORMATIVE PATTERN OF CHURCH LEADERSHIP

A Theological Grounding of Servanthood

As the Normative Pattern of Church Leadership

Leadership as servanthood is an integral part of a Biblical theology of the church. The concept has its roots in the Old Testament representation of spiritual and national leaders as servants of the Lord (Num 12:7; Job 2:3; Ps 78:70), but reaches its pre-Christian climax in four "Servant Songs" of Isaiah. Although the referent of the songs shifts from the Jewish nation to the promised Messiah, the role of the servant is consistently identified as self-giving ministry. He quietly, gently, but unfailingly establishes a truly just society (Is 42:1-4). He brings salvation to all people (Is 49:1-6). He sustains the weary and accepts persecution without retribution (Is 50:4-9). And he gives his life for God's people (Is 52:13-53:12).

The concept of leadership as servanthood is brought to its fullest development, however, in the New Testament, and specifically in the ministry and teachings of Jesus. Jesus was clearly familiar with the latter chapters of Isaiah's prophecy (Lk 4:16-21), and it is probable that he recognized in the "Servant Songs" a prophetic description of his own mission and the circumstances of his death (cf. Lk 18:31-33 and Is 50:6; Mt 27:13-14 and Is 53:7; Lk 22:37 and Is 53:12).

Jesus accepted the role of a servant. The most dramatic demonstration of Jesus' servanthood occurred on the eve of his crucifixion. He wrapped a towel around his waist and washed the disciples' feet (Jn 13:3-11). In this symbolic act he portrayed both humility and service. His enjoinder to his disciples to do as he had done (Jn 13:12-17) applies most directly to the consistent exhibition of those qualities in leadership.

When Paul instructed the Philippian Christians to give priority to the interests of others, he cited Jesus' life and death as a model (Phil 2:3-5). Although Jesus was God, Paul asserted, he did not cling to his divine prerogatives. He accepted the limitations of humanness and servanthood, humbly and obediently stooping to the point of death as a common criminal (Phil 2:6-8). His death for others culminated a life for others. Indeed, Jesus has aptly been described as "the Man for others."

In his teaching, Jesus drew frequently from the daily occupations of Jewish society. Often he employed the metaphor of shepherding.

Jesus portrayed himself as the shepherd who "calls his own sheep by name" (Jn 10:3--implying intimacy of knowledge and care) and who "goes before them" (Jn 10:4--indicating provision and protection, as well as leadership). Jesus stated, "I am the good shepherd. The good shepherd lays down his life for the sheep" (Jn 10:11). Through these metaphors in which Jesus describes his relationship to his disciples, a clear model of caring, self-sacrificing leadership is established for the church. That Jesus intended this model should be perpetuated in the church can be seen in his return to the metaphor in his post-resurrection charge to Peter (Jn 21:15-17). Peter, in turn, drew on the same figure when instructing leaders of young churches regarding attitudes and behaviors appropriate to church leadership. They are to "tend the flock," Peter admonishes, not motivated by duty or greed, and with no hint of authoritarianism or a domineering spirit. By contrast, they are to serve the Church willingly, eagerly, and by example (1 Pt 5:2-3). This model of humble, self-giving, and exemplary leadership underlies the Church's use of the title "pastor" (Eph 4:11--literally, "shepherd").

On another occasion, however, Jesus addressed directly the issue of appropriate patterns of leadership among his followers, and in doing so provided the most explicit instruction in the New Testament bearing on church leadership. Matthew indicates the occasion was provided by a self-serving grab for power, prestige, and influence by two otherwise outstanding disciples (Mt 20:20-23). Jesus captured the teaching opportunity by addressing the rest of the disciples (and, indeed, the Church in each succeeding generation) in the following words:

You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great men exercise authority over them. It shall not be so among you; but whoever would be great among you must be your servant, and whoever would be the first among you must be your slave; even as the Son of man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many (Mt 20:25b-28).

It is servanthood, not ascendancy, that is the qualification for leadership in the Church. Authoritarian power strategies may be the accepted way of getting things done in secular society, but "it shall not be so among you"! It is self-giving, not self-seeking, which characterized the life of Jesus--he came "not to be served, but to serve"--and which remains the standard of Christian ministry for all time. To lead is to serve; to serve is to die. Self preservation and the pursuit of one's own agenda of priorities is basically inconsistent with the leadership pattern demonstrated and mandated by Christ. Servanthood, alone, constitutes a theologically justifiable pattern of leadership in the Church.

APPENDIX B

THE SEMINARY OBJECTIVE
OAKHILL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE SEMINARY OBJECTIVE

In accordance with its primary purpose of providing "a succession of godly and able men for the Gospel Ministry," by instructing candidates for the Pastoral Ministry and other special lines of Christian service, the total program of the Seminary is designed to produce graduates with the following qualities:

- (1) A personal response of faith and obedience to God as He is revealed in the Scriptures.
- (2) A clear sense of mission as one called by God to minister in the church, and a humble confidence in himself as qualified by the gifts of the Spirit, the accompanying grace of God, and competent academic and practical preparation.
- (3) The ability to study and understand the Christian Scriptures in the Hebrew and Greek languages.
- (4) The ability to communicate the Word of God, both formally and informally, in accord with the historic Christian faith, summarized in the [constitution of the sponsoring denomination].
- (5) A growing sensitivity to the needs of people, demonstrated in his attitudes and habits, and characterized by compassion and service.
- (6) The ability to motivate and equip others for their ministry, both in the church and in the community which the church seeks to serve.
- (7) The ability and motivation to continue research and writing that contributes to the understanding and application of the Word of God.

APPENDIX C

THE PURPOSE OF THE M. DIV. PROGRAM IN TERMS OF PRODUCT
SOVEREIGN GRACE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE PURPOSE OF THE M.DIV. PROGRAM IN TERMS OF PRODUCT

[Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary] is an academic community of evangelical Christians of Reformed persuasion from a variety of denominations mainly in the Presbyterian and Reformed tradition. It is the purpose of [Sovereign Grace Theological Seminary] in its Master of Divinity degree program, by common worship and fellowship, mutual learning and witness, to train candidates primarily for the pastoral ministry and to contribute to the formation of their character, so that they can constructively serve Jesus Christ and his Church in today's world. Ministering in this modern world, the Seminary seeks to form pastors of conviction and compassion who will serve the Church and the world with a sense of urgency, bringing the Word of God to bear upon the issues of contemporary culture and theology and to meet personal and corporate needs. The goals in view are that the Church may be enlarged, brought increasingly into subjection to Christ, and edified with all his spiritual gifts and blessings, and that the structures and societies of this world may be renewed and transformed according to the will of God.

The Seminary conceives of the responsibilities of pastors, according to the Scriptures, and also the standards of the denominations served by the Seminary and the expectations of the laity, as including: (1) preaching the Gospel to persons of all classes and conditions, (2) teaching and applying the Word of God to people with all sorts of need, unconscious and perceived, (3) defending the faith against error, (4) engaging in and promoting the work of evangelism and the ministry of compassion and social concern, (5) exercising pastoral care of a congregation in partnership with other officers, (6) visiting the members, praying with and for them, and counseling those with special needs and those in crisis situations, devoting particular attention to the poor, the sick, the afflicted, and the dying, (7) leading the congregation in worship, administering the sacraments, and officiating at weddings and funerals, (8) providing for the instruction of youth and new converts, (9) training officers, teachers, and others to share in the ministry of the Church, (10) participating in the administration, government and discipline of the congregation and of the higher assemblies with other representatives, and (11) setting a Christian example in personal, family and public life.

Training for ministry in terms of the pastoral responsibilities listed above (a) should equip Christians with knowledge in areas in which they will be examined by ordaining church bodies and which are requisite

for the fulfillment of their pastoral duties, (b) should develop skills and competencies suitable to ministry, (c) should cultivate personal qualities appropriate to ministry, and (d) should prepare students to make appropriate commitments, Therefore:

- A. The Master of Divinity degree program, building upon a commitment to Christ as one's Lord and Savior and an adequate pre-seminary education, aims for competency in all areas of theological knowledge (biblical, historical, doctrinal, and practical) and in the use of the tools and procedures appropriate to each theological area. These are necessary in order to minister in the contemporary situation in the churches, in the realm of modern thought and culture, and in the world at large.
- B. Skills and competencies to be developed include the following: (1) to interpret the Word of God accurately, to proclaim it faithfully, and to apply it specifically, (2) to teach the Bible, Church doctrine, and Christian behavior, (3) to discern and defend the truth of the Word of God, (4) to achieve clarity of thought and expression, (5) to lead in worship and public prayer, (6) to train officers, leaders, teachers, disciples, and converts, (7) to build the Church into a loving, trusting community of believers who are discovering their gifts and abilities and developing them through ministry to one another and the world, (8) to develop and to lead in a program of evangelism, (9) to persuade people to come to Christ, (10) to relate to persons, to accept and treat them as persons, and to understand their needs, (11) to receive and give counsel and advice, (12) to encourage generosity and to involve people in the program and mission of the Church, (13) to encourage and promote Christian growth in the people, (14) to be a sensitive instrument of change and reconciliation, assisting individuals, families, the Church, and the world in being transformed according to the Word of God, and (15) to practice sound administrative leadership and to provide management principles for the Church.
- C. Personal qualities to be cultivated include the following: (1) love of God and man, (2) soundness in the faith, (3) eagerness to teach, preach, interpret, and apply the Word of God, (4) good moral character and reputation, (5) spiritual maturity and genuine piety, given to prayer, (6) wisdom, discernment, discretion, common courtesy, and good manners, (7) zeal for the advance of Christ's kingdom, the proclamation of the gospel, the conversion of sinners, and the defense of Christian truth, (8) appreciation of the Christian faith and its practices, (9) sense of responsibility in all family and societal relationships, (10) faithfulness in financial and other obligations and diligence in all official and private duties, (11) stability,

unselfishness, humility, hope, gentleness, patience, compassion, and joy, (12) ability to be conciliatory, cooperative, available, and approachable, (13) willingness to maintain a modest lifestyle, ready to sacrifice, not given to greed, (14) firmness of convictions with broadness of spirit, ability to learn from others, to improve knowledge and skills, and to acknowledge readily one's mistakes and limitations, (15) loyalty to one's denomination and traditions, openness toward other Christian denominations and traditions, and appreciation for Christians of other ages and places, (16) acknowledgement of the gifts of ministers and others engaged in the life and work of the congregation, the denomination, and the whole Christian enterprise and willingness to work with them in the cause and kingdom of Christ, and (17) a sense of urgency to serve in the present age.

- D. After the period of training, the candidate for ministry should understand and be able to make such commitments as the following: (1) to acknowledge the lordship and authority of Christ over one's life and ministry, (2) to be bound in conscience to the written Word of God as the only infallible rule of faith and life, (3) to acknowledge and adopt the fundamentals of Christian faith as defined by one's denominational standards, (4) to approve the government and discipline of one's denomination, (5) to promise due submission to the proper governing authority in one's denomination, (6) to direct one's ministry by love of God and a desire to promote the Gospel of his Son, (7) to be zealous and faithful in maintaining the truths of the Gospel and the purity and peace of the Church, even in the face of persecution or opposition, (8) to be faithful in the discharge of all one's duties as a Christian and as a minister of the Gospel, and (9) to love Christ and to gather, feed, and care for his people.

The seminary has adequately prepared the ministerial candidate for the ministry envisioned above only when the candidate has come to five realizations:

- (1) That only God and His Word are absolute and unchanging;
- (2) That man is not infallible in the understanding of God's Word;
- (3) That one must continue to seek new light from the Word of God which may require the revision and correction of what has previously been accepted;
- (4) That disciplines learned in the seminary must be developed through continued study and use; and
- (5) That seminary education must be regarded as only one important stage in a life of continued learning and growth.

APPENDIX D

PERSONAL QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE MINISTRY

BIBLICAL SEMINARY

PERSONAL QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE MINISTRY

1. Religious Commitment

The minister must be a person who shows in his life a deep commitment to Christ and to the Word of God which reveals Him.

2. Discipline and Self-control

The minister is a self-controlled person who leads a disciplined life. His efforts must be steady instead of sporadic. His style of labor must be characterized by promptness rather than procrastination. He must be faithful to his varied responsibilities. He must use his time in a way which best serves God and the Church.

3. Affirming of Others

The minister must be a person who has respect for the feelings, viewpoints, and abilities of others. He must not treat them as puppets or pawns to accomplish his aims but as fellow workers with him. Instead of conveying the impression that he's the only one who counts, he affirms other people by making them feel that they count as well.

4. Loving toward Others

The minister must be a person who demonstrates love, patience, and kindness in all his relationships, not as determined primarily by the qualities in the person toward whom they are directed, but by his own person. He must be sensitive to the hurts and struggles of others, value those who are not valued by society, and deny himself for their sake.

5. Honesty

The minister must show integrity in his relationships both in his private and in his professional life. He must honor commitments despite pressure to compromise, and evidence a critical affirmation for the church, its mission, policies, and programs.

6. Service without Regard for Gain

The minister must possess and exhibit a willingness to give himself to the service of God and the church, and a devotion that is not conditioned by a concern for his own personal gain or advantage.

7. Leadership Qualities

In view of the responsible and highly visible nature of pastoral leadership, the minister must possess and exhibit qualities such as confidence, initiative, flexibility, independence, courage, persistence, decisiveness and creativity that will equip him to give leadership in the church as a corporate entity, and in large and small groups within the church and its community.

8. Wisdom

The minister is a person who shows good judgment and common sense. His behavior is rational, not foolish. His counsel is built on realistic possibilities, and not around unattainable ideals. The minister integrates his knowledge to suggest policies which have both short-term and long-range beneficial results.

9. Emotional Health

The minister must have demonstrated his emotional well-being and shown that he is not hampered by unresolved traumatic episodes from his past. He should be generally happy and sincere, patient and persistent, and able to laugh at himself. He ought not to be impulsive or experience extreme mood swings.

APPENDIX E

PERSONAL QUALITIES OF A SERVANT MINISTER

PERSONAL QUALITIES OF A SERVANT MINISTER *

The minister loves the Triune God. He diligently studies the scriptures and responds to them in faith and obedience because he knows that God is revealed in them.

The minister loves people. He is sensitive to the joys, hurts, and struggles of others, and responds to them in gentle affirmation and compassionate service.

The minister values and demonstrates integrity in his relationships, both in private and in professional life.

The minister evidences growth in those virtues which are distinctively Christian, particularly love, joy, faith, humility, meekness, patience, and self-control.

The minister is a leader. He motivates and equips others for their ministry both in the church and in the community.

The minister gives himself to the service of God and the church without concern for his own personal gain or advantage.

The minister is zealous for the advancement of Christ's kingdom, the proclamation of the gospel, the conversion of sinners, and the defense of Christian truth.

The minister seeks to be informed about problems of contemporary life and society, and interacts with others to develop a Christian perspective on these problems.

The minister is wise, discerning, and discreet in personal relationships and in dealing with major and minor issues.

The minister is an emotionally healthy person, confident of his ability to minister through the grace of Christ, and open to Christians of other denominations and traditions.

* This statement was developed for use in the study. It is intended to synthesize the value commitments expressed in statements provided by the participating seminaries.

APPENDIX F

THE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH PROJECT

Our seminary is engaged in research designed to assist in developing our ministry training curriculum. Your careful completion of this questionnaire would be much appreciated. Please return the questionnaire, with your responses, to the President's Office within the next two weeks. Thank you.

Respondent classification:

- ☐ Administrator
☐ Faculty
☐ Advanced Student *
☐ Senior Student
☐ Middler Student
☐ Junior Student

* Post-M.Div. or equivalent

Faculty please indicate—

- | | |
|------------------------|---|
| Nature of appointment. | Committee assignments held within the past two years. |
| ___ Full-time faculty | ___ Admissions |
| ___ Part-time faculty | ___ Curriculum |
| ___ Visiting faculty | |

Current or typical involvement in ministry.

- Regular pastoral ministry in one congregation
- Frequent ministry in many congregations
- Occasional ministry in various congregation
- Rarely involved in congregational ministries

PART I: Personal Qualities of a Minister

Instructions: Please respond to each item. When agreement scales are provided, indicate your agreement or disagreement with the statement given by circling the appropriate number.

Example of the use of agreement scales:

The Bible is the inspired word of God.

Strongly Agree ① 2 3 4 5 Strongly Disagree

STATEMENT A: The minister loves the Triune God. He diligently studies the scriptures and responds to them in faith and obedience because he knows that God is revealed in them.

1. This quality is consistent with the declared goals of our seminary.

Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Disagree
-----------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	--------------------------

2. Our seminary program effectively develops ministers who evidence this quality.

Strongly						Strongly
Agree	1	2	3	4	5	Disagree

3. The faculty of our seminary is effective in demonstrating this quality.

Strongly Agree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------------------

4. What course or other aspect of our seminary's program is intended to develop this quality?

5. What do you think of as an example from our seminary that demonstrates this quality? (Relate an incident when you were aware that this quality was being demonstrated.)

STATEMENT B: The minister loves people. He is sensitive to the joys, hurts, and struggles of others, and responds to them in gentle affirmation and compassionate service.

6. This quality is consistent with the declared goals of our seminary.

Strongly							Strongly
Agree	1	2	3	4	5		Disagree

7. Our seminary program effectively develops ministers who evidence this quality.

Strongly							Strongly
Agree	1	2	3	4	5		Disagree

8. The faculty of our seminary is effective in demonstrating this quality.

Strongly							Strongly
Agree	1	2	3	4	5		Disagree

9. What course or other aspect of our seminary's program is intended to develop this quality?

10. What do you think of as an example from our seminary that demonstrates this quality?

STATEMENT C: The minister values and demonstrates integrity in his relationships both in private and in professional life.

11. This quality is consistent with the declared goals of our seminary.

Strongly							Strongly
Agree	1	2	3	4	5		Disagree

12. Our seminary program effectively develops ministers who evidence this quality.

Strongly							Strongly
Agree	1	2	3	4	5		Disagree

13. The faculty of our seminary is effective in demonstrating this quality.

Strongly							Strongly
Agree	1	2	3	4	5		Disagree

14. What course or other aspect of our seminary's program is intended to develop this quality?

15. What do you think of as an example from our seminary that demonstrates this quality?

STATEMENT D: The minister evidences growth in those virtues which are distinctively Christian, particularly love, joy, faith, humility, meekness, patience, and self-control.

16. This quality is consistent with the declared goals of our seminary.

Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------------

17. Our seminary program effectively develops ministers who evidence this quality.

Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------------

18. The faculty of our seminary is effective in demonstrating this quality.

Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------------

19. What course or other aspect of our seminary's program is intended to develop this quality?

20. What do you think of as an example from our seminary that demonstrates this quality?

STATEMENT E: The minister is a leader. He motivates and equips others for their ministry both in the church and in the community.

21. This quality is consistent with the declared goals of our seminary.

Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------------

22. Our seminary program effectively develops ministers who evidence this quality.

Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------------

23. The faculty of our seminary is effective in demonstrating this quality.

Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------------

24. What course or other aspect of our seminary's program is intended to develop this quality?

25. What do you think of as an example from our seminary that demonstrates this quality?

STATEMENT F: The minister gives himself to the service of God and the church without concern for his own personal gain or advantage.

26. This quality is consistent with the declared goals of our seminary.

Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------------

27. Our seminary program effectively develops ministers who evidence this quality.

Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------------

28. The faculty of our seminary is effective in demonstrating this quality.

Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------------

29. What course or other aspect of our seminary's program is intended to develop this quality?

30. What do you think of as an example from our seminary that demonstrates this quality?

STATEMENT G: The minister is zealous for the advancement of Christ's kingdom, the proclamation of the gospel, the conversion of sinners, and the defense of Christian truth.

31. This quality is consistent with the declared goals of our seminary.

Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------------

32. Our seminary program effectively develops ministers who evidence this quality.

Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------------

33. The faculty of our seminary is effective in demonstrating this quality.

Strongly Agree	1	2	3	4	5	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----------------------

34. What course or other aspect of our seminary's program is intended to develop this quality?

35. What do you think of as an example from our seminary that demonstrates this quality?

STATEMENT H: The minister seeks to be informed about problems of contemporary life and society, and interacts with others to develop a Christian perspective on these problems.

36. This quality is consistent with the declared goals of our seminary.

Strongly						Strongly
Agree	1	2	3	4	5	Disagree

37. Our seminary program effectively develops ministers who evidence this quality.

Strongly						Strongly
Agree	1	2	3	4	5	Disagree

38. The faculty of our seminary is effective in demonstrating this quality.

Strongly						Strongly
Agree	1	2	3	4	5	Disagree

39. What course or other aspect of our seminary's program is intended to develop this quality?

40. What do you think of as an example from our seminary that demonstrates this quality?

STATEMENT I: The minister is wise, discerning, and discrete in personal relationships and in dealing with major and minor issues.

41. This quality is consistent with the declared goals of our seminary.

Strongly						Strongly
Agree	1	2	3	4	5	Disagree

42. Our seminary program effectively develops ministers who evidence this quality.

Strongly						Strongly
Agree	1	2	3	4	5	Disagree

43. The faculty of our seminary is effective in demonstrating this quality.

Strongly						Strongly
Agree	1	2	3	4	5	Disagree

44. What course or other aspect of our seminary's program is intended to develop this quality?

45. What do you think of as an example from our seminary that demonstrates this quality?

STATEMENT J: The minister is an emotionally healthy person, confident of his ability to minister through the grace of Christ, and open to Christians of other denominations and traditions.

46. This quality is consistent with the declared goals of our seminary.

Strongly								Strongly
Agree	1	2	3	4	5			Disagree

47. Our seminary program effectively develops ministers who evidence this quality.

Strongly								Strongly
Agree	1	2	3	4	5			Disagree

48. The faculty of our seminary is effective in demonstrating this quality.

Strongly								Strongly
Agree	1	2	3	4	5			Disagree

49. What course or other aspect of our seminary's program is intended to develop this quality?

50. What do you think of as an example from our seminary that demonstrates this quality?

PART II: Aspects of Our Seminary Program

Instructions: Listed below are eight sources sometimes used by theological educators for deriving teaching/learning objectives. Select the three sources of objectives most commonly employed by the faculty of our seminary and rank those sources as follows:

- 1 - Most frequently employed
- 2 - Second most frequently employed
- 3 - Third most frequently employed

Select and rank three sources only. Sources not selected may be left blank.

51. Three sources most commonly used for deriving teaching/learning objectives by the faculty of our seminary:

- ☐ Analysis of the course subject or discipline
- ☐ Analysis of the learning task
- ☐ Official course description or departmental consensus
- ☐ Professional experience in ministry
- ☐ Professional research interests
- ☐ Students' background and experience
- ☐ Students' sense of a "need to know"
- ☐ Theological commitments regarding the nature of ministry

Instructions: Listed below are ten teaching methods sometimes used by theological educators. Select the four teaching methods most commonly used by the faculty of our seminary and rank those teaching methods as follows:

- 1 - Most frequently used
- 2 - Second most frequently used
- 3 - Third most frequently used
- 4 - Fourth most frequently used

Select and rank four teaching methods only.

52. Four teaching methods most commonly used by the faculty of our seminary:

- ☐ Analysis of case studies
- ☐ Discussion of lecture or research
- ☐ Field experience
- ☐ Guided discovery
- ☐ Lecture
- ☐ Reading or research, with report
- ☐ Recitation or drill
- ☐ Reflection on personal experience
- ☐ Simulation games or role play
- ☐ Small group discussion

Instructions: Listed below are fifteen disciplines associated with training for ministry. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statement by circling the appropriate number on the agreement scale provided beside each discipline.

STATEMENT: Our seminary program provides effective training in:

53. Biblical introduction	Strongly Agree	1 2 3 4 5	Strongly Disagree
54. Biblical languages	Strongly Agree	1 2 3 4 5	Strongly Disagree
55. Hermeneutics	Strongly Agree	1 2 3 4 5	Strongly Disagree
56. Biblical history	Strongly Agree	1 2 3 4 5	Strongly Disagree
57. Biblical theology	Strongly Agree	1 2 3 4 5	Strongly Disagree
58. Systematic theology	Strongly Agree	1 2 3 4 5	Strongly Disagree
59. Christian ethics	Strongly Agree	1 2 3 4 5	Strongly Disagree
60. Apologetics	Strongly Agree	1 2 3 4 5	Strongly Disagree
61. Church history	Strongly Agree	1 2 3 4 5	Strongly Disagree
62. Homiletics	Strongly Agree	1 2 3 4 5	Strongly Disagree
63. Evangelism	Strongly Agree	1 2 3 4 5	Strongly Disagree
64. Christian education	Strongly Agree	1 2 3 4 5	Strongly Disagree
65. Pastoral care	Strongly Agree	1 2 3 4 5	Strongly Disagree
66. Pastoral administration	Strongly Agree	1 2 3 4 5	Strongly Disagree
67. Missions	Strongly Agree	1 2 3 4 5	Strongly Disagree

Instructions: Listed below are ten personal qualities of a minister. Three questions related to these qualities follow.

- A. The minister loves the Triune God. He diligently studies the scriptures and responds to them in faith and obedience because he knows that God is revealed in them.
- B. The minister loves people. He is sensitive to the joys, hurts, and struggles of others, and responds to them in gentle affirmation and compassionate service.
- C. The minister values and demonstrates integrity in his relationships both in private and in professional life.
- D. The minister evidences growth in those virtues which are distinctively Christian, particularly love, joy, faith, humility, meekness, patience, and self-control.
- E. The minister is a leader. He motivates and equips others for their ministry both in the church and in the community.
- F. The minister gives himself to the service of God and the church without concern for his own personal gain or advantage.
- G. The minister is zealous for the advancement of Christ's kingdom, the proclamation of the gospel, the conversion of sinners, and the defense of Christian truth.
- H. The minister seeks to be informed about problems of contemporary life and society, and interacts with others to develop a Christian perspective on these problems.
- I. The minister is wise, discerning, and discrete in personal relationships and in dealing with major and minor issues.
- J. The minister is an emotionally healthy person, confident of his ability to minister through the grace of Christ, and open to Christian of other denominations and traditions.

68. In completing Part I of this questionnaire you probably found that some items which inquired about faculty demonstration were relatively difficult to respond to, inasmuch as demonstration varies widely from professor to professor and from course to course. Circle two or three letters corresponding to those qualities in which you find the widest variation of demonstration within our faculty.

A B C D E F G H I J

69. Are there any of the qualities listed above which have been increasingly emphasized in our seminary within the last year or two? If so, please circle the corresponding letters.

A B C D E F G H I J

70. Are there any of the qualities listed above which have been increasingly de-emphasized in our seminary within the last year or two? If so, please circle the corresponding letters.

A B C D E F G H I J

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Amirtham, S.

- 1979 New styles in theological education. Evangelical Review of Theology, 3(1), 119-127.

Anderson, R.S. (Ed.)

- 1979 Theological foundations for ministry. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Avila, D.L., Combs, A.W., & Purkey, W.W. (Eds.)

- 1977 The helping relationship sourcebook (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Borg, W.R., & Gall, M.D.

- 1971 Educational research: An introduction (2nd ed.). New York: David McKay.

Brammer, L.M.

- 1979 The helping relationship: Process and skills (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Carkhuff, R.R.

- 1969a Critical variables in effective counselor training. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 16, 238-245.
- 1969b Helping and human relations I: Selection and training. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- 1971 Training as a necessary pre-condition of education: The development and generalization of a systematic resource training model. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 4 (winter), 3-16.

Carkhuff, R.R. (cont.)

- 1972 New directions in training for the helping professions: Toward a technology for human and community resource development. Counseling Psychologist, 3(3), 12-30.

Carkhuff, R.R., & Anthony, W.A.

- 1979 The skills of helping. Amherst, MA: Human Resource Development Press.

Carroll, J.W., Evans, R.A., Johnson, R.W., Lewis, G.D., Lummis, A., McNeel, B.T., Roozen, D.A., Sundquist, R.R., & Wink, W.

- 1980 Pastor and parish as colearners in the doctor of ministry program: An experiment in theological education. Theological Education, 16(2), 179-252.

Combs, A.W.

- 1969 Florida studies in the helping professions. Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Press.

- 1972 Some basic concepts for teacher education. The Journal of Teacher Education, 23(3), 286-290.

- 1978 Teacher education: The person in the process. Educational Leadership, 35(7), 558-561.

Combs, A.W., Avila, D.L., & Purkey, W.W.

- 1978 Helping relationships: Basic concepts for the helping professions (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Combs, A.W., Blumen, R.A., Newman, A.J., & Wass, H.L.

- 1974 The professional education of teachers: A humanistic approach to teacher preparation (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Egan, G.

- 1975 The skilled helper: A model for systematic helping and interpersonal relating. Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole.

Elmer, D.H.

- 1980 Career data as indicators for curriculum development in theological education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University.

Farley, E.

- 1981 The reform of theological education as a theological task. Theological Education, 17, 93-117.

Ferris, R.

- 1979 Currents in theological education reform. PAFTEE Bulletin, 5(3), 5-7; 5(4), 3-5.

Ferris, R., & Ward, T.

- 1980 Selected bibliography on reform of theological education. Unpublished manuscript, Michigan State University.

Fletcher, J.C.

- 1981 The coming crisis for theological seminaries. Ministerial Formation, 14, 24-28.

Gazda, G.M., Asbury, F.R., Balzer, F.J., Childers, W.C., & Walters, R.P.

- 1977 Human relations development: A manual for educators (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Greenleaf, R.K.

- 1977 Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness. New York: Paulist Press.

Hopkins, K.D., & Glass, G.V.

- 1978 Basic statistics for the behavioral sciences. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hurtado, L.W.

- 1975 The ministry as servanthood. The Trinity Journal, 4(spring), 67-70.

Isaac, S., & Michael, W.B.

- 1971 Handbook in research and evaluation. San Diego, CA: EdITS.

Kinsler, F.R.

- 1981 The extension movement in theological education (2nd ed.). Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library.

Pacala, L.

- 1981 Reflection on the state of theological education in the 1980s. Theological Education, 18, 2-43.

Richards, L.O.

- 1975 A theology of Christian education. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Richards, L.O., & Getz, G.A.

- 1981 A Biblical style of leadership? Leadership, 2(2), 68-78.

Richards, L.O., & Hoeldtke, C.

- 1980 A theology of church leadership. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Rogers, C.R.

- 1958 The characteristics of a helping relationship. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 37(1), 6-16.

Rowen, S.F.

- 1981 Curriculum foundations, experiences and outcomes: A participatory case study in theological education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University.

Solansky, A.D.

- 1978 A critical evaluation of theological education in residential training. Evangelical Review of Theology, 2, 124-133.

Torrance, T.F.

- 1979 Service in Jesus Christ. In R.S. Anderson (Ed.), Theological foundations for ministry. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Usher, R.H.

- 1969 Perceptual characteristics of effective college teachers. In A.W. Combs, Florida studies in the helping professions. Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Press.

Ward, T.

- 1978 Servants, leaders and tyrants. A paper presented to the faculty and students of Calvin Theological Seminary, Grand Rapids, MI, March 29, 1978.

Wass, H.L., & Combs, A.W.

1974 Humanizing the education of teachers. Theory Into Practice,
13(2), 123-129.

Welter, P.

1978 How to help a friend. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House.