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Abstract

The Impact of Instructional Intervention on Profiles of Ministry Scores of Nazarene Theological Seminary Students.

E. Dee Freeborn

In response to the challenge of preparing persons for ministry in the seminary, and at Nazarene Theological Seminary in particular, this study addresses the question, "Can a classroom approach help prepare students wholistically for ministry?" The wholistic paradigm of persons presented by Gary Harbaugh in Pastor As Person was used as a foundation for the two hour semester course.

The first chapter develops the problem and need for the study. The second chapter reviews selected literature which informed the project. The third chapter describes the experimental field study methodology. Significant to the work was the use of the Profiles of Ministry-Stage I instrument. Developed by the Association of Theological Schools, it was administered both as a pretest and a posttest.

Statistical investigation plus written responses from the students leads the author to conclude that indeed the need for such an approach to ministry preparation, as developed in the study, is well-founded. In summation, several areas of concern are presented as possibilities for further study and research.
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CHAPTER 1
Introduction

Significance Of This Study

Why are ministers leaving the ministry in alarming numbers? A review of the literature seems to indicate that the seminaries need to bear some responsibility in the matter. Writers such as Henri Nouwen, Larry Richards, Gary Harbaugh, and others, have pointed out ways in which the seminary itself may tend to contribute to the students’ inability to prepare adequately for the challenges of ministry.

This study has potential value first to the ministry of Nazarene Theological Seminary (hereafter NTS). If it can be shown that issues of personhood are important enough to be dealt with directly in the classroom, it will be a service to the students and later to the churches they will serve. Second, it could well have an impact on the curricular design, the teaching methodologies used by the faculty, and the institutional outlook of NTS toward its students and their future. Third, it could have an impact on the denomination as a whole, since NTS is the only graduate school of theology for the Church of the Nazarene.

Statement Of The Problem

It is rather common for seminary graduates, after a year or two in ministry, to reflect on and evaluate certain
areas of their theological education. This questioning is most likely to center on two broad areas of concern: the ministerial skills taught in the seminary and/or the person of the graduate and his/her ability to cope with the challenges of the pastoral profession.

It is the latter with which this project/dissertation is concerned. If the mission of the seminary is to prepare persons for ministry, how can it address the personhood of its students in a way that will better equip them for their chosen profession?

Gary Harbaugh, in *Pastor As Person* (1984), discusses the pastor as a physical, thinking, feeling, relating, and choosing being, and that all these areas have bearing on the coping ability of the ministering person. Nazarene Theological Seminary does well at the thinking level. Can NTS provide some means by which a student can come to grips with what it means to be a whole person in ministry?

**Formulation Of The Hypothesis**

On the basis of the instrument, *Profiles of Ministry*, published by the Association of Theological Schools (hereafter ATS) and a classroom approach to preparation for ministry, I formulated the following hypothesis: A classroom course can produce significant changes in student attitudes toward ministry which will be reflected in the difference in scores of a pre-test and post-test using the *Profiles of Ministry*. The null hypothesis is stated as
follows: Students completing the classroom course will show no significant differences in the pre-test and post-test scores using the Profiles of Ministry.

The scope of this study will be the student body of Nazarene Theological Seminary, in particular, the Junior, or incoming, class of September 1988. This study is limited to the effects of a one-semester course based upon the paradigm of the whole person as presented by Gary Harbaugh in Pastor As Person (1984). The research will be limited to the categories of this paradigm and will not explore other ways of describing personhood.

Background To The Study

As he sat in my office, he poured out his story of hurt and frustration. I had asked the simple question, "What do you plan to do after graduation?" With tear-glistened eyes, he told me of his struggle to clarify his call to the ministry. Successful in business, loved by his local church family, he sold his business and enrolled in seminary. Now, after three years, his struggle centered in the realization that he knew no one on a personal basis and no one seemed to care.

What did this student's story signal? How is theological education to be most effectively carried out? What is the relationship between theological education and personhood?
Nazarene Theological Seminary came into existence in 1945. Its student body numbers in the range of 375 to 400, all of whom live off campus and commute to school. The seminary offers the Master of Divinity, Master of Religious Education, Master of Arts in Missions and the Doctor of Ministry graduate professional degrees. The catalog statement of institutional goals and objectives asserts:

Practically, academic disciplines, professional experiences, and devotional exercises are designed to contribute to the spiritual formation of each member of the seminary community and to guide the seminary community in developing proficiency in service to Christ’s Church and to the world in Christ’s name through His Church.¹

When one begins to ponder the implications of efforts in this area, one needs to discern present patterns and conditions. Is the seminary community and curriculum conducive to spiritual formation? Not living on campus, the students are forced to adjust to strenuous class, study and work schedules. How does this impact the obvious fact that the spiritual journey calls for time, time to listen, meditate, read and worship. Spiritual formation happens by intention and design. As Iris Cully says so pointedly:

A pattern of spiritual discipline and growth forms after a person has reviewed his or her life style and deliberately made time for spiritual development. One needs time alone to become aware of the presence of God in silence, time for biblical and other reading through which other’s experiences can enrich life, and regular

¹Nazarene Theological Seminary, Catalog (Kansas City: no publisher, 1989-90), 18-19.
participation in a worshipping community that will balance the personal devotional life with corporate praise and intercession.\(^\text{1}\)

Yet there seems to be so little time for spiritual formation. In many cases, if not most, spouses work, ministries are assumed in their churches, they see too little of each other and on it goes.

What about the corporate worship of chapels, the seminary prayer life, and the influence of professors? Nelson Thayer reminds us:

Spiritual formation has to do with solitude, corporate liturgy, and proclamation. For it is in prayer and in corporate liturgy that we focus our attentiveness on receptivity and response to the active, present Spirit.\(^\text{1}\)

At NTS there are three chapels per week throughout the school year. Such services can help promote a sense of corporate community yet one notes that only about 32% or less of the students attend regularly. (Statistics from 1988-89) At least this opportunity is available, though its effectiveness could be questioned.

When it comes to prayer, the President sponsors an early morning prayer meeting once a week. There is little else in the way of an ongoing corporate prayer pattern for the students. This is intriguing in light of the catalog


statement which asserts, "devotional exercises are designed to contribute to the spiritual formation of each member..."

There are, of course, occasions when prayer meetings are announced but not usually as an integrated part of theological education for the student.

Concerned persons are beginning to wonder if maybe the seminaries have been affected by some secular sources more than they realize. For instance, to what extent has the pastoral counseling movement of recent decades, coupled with a growing interest in a sociological explanation of the church, impacted the seminary community? In quoting Tilden Edwards, Thayer warns:

. . . we have been influenced by clinical Pastoral Education and psychosocial methods and structures of interpretation with their skepticism about "piety." We opted for psychological and sociological practices which we rationalized in Christian structures of understanding.‘

Harold Warlick, Jr., while acknowledging some of the helpfulness in these developments, also pinpoints what he sees to be resulting harm. He contends:

Another major impediment to spiritual development among ministers has been the rise of psychological schools of understanding. . . . For example, clinical pastoral education began in pathology. It attempts to uncover the pathologies inherent in the "living human documents" with which it works. Yet not every human being is encased in pathology. One of the crying needs in our time is for pastoral education that begins with the premise of normalcy within the "living human

documents" with which it works. Yet religious leaders in the church have been almost totally dependent on secular models of human growth.5

How subtly secularization can happen and may not even appear until senior oral comprehensives, when one hears answers that are more pragmatically defended than theologically and/or spiritually grounded.

Another question arises in the relationship of professor and student. If the theological school is working with more than just academic data, (i.e. affective and behavioral considerations) then modeling, relationships and lifestyle must be considered. When spiritual growth is the issue, how is this evidenced in the lives of the school’s teachers? There is more going on in the classrooms than just transmission of curriculum content. Lawrence Richards maintains:

Part of the difficulty experienced by men moving into local church ministry grows out of the fact that example leadership does reproduce itself. Seminaries train as well as teach. The "hidden curriculum" of the learning setting has a greater impact on the learner than the "content" curriculum which is being taught in the instruction.6

It could be that we (professors and students) in the seminary community have an understanding of academic pursuits that tends to inhibit spiritual formation as an

5Harold Warlick, Jr., How To Be A Minister and a Human Being. (Valley Forge: Judson Press, 1982), 58.

6Lawrence O. Richards, A Theology of Christian Education. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975), 159.
element in theological education. Such an understanding creates the ongoing battle and makes difficult the connecting of the classroom with life and ministry. In contrast to such a separation, Patricia Jung asserts a strong organic relationship between scholarship and faith when she reminds us:

For Christians within the larger academic community spiritual formation involves disciplines and exercises that push the individual Christian’s capacity for scholarship to its upper limit. Theorizing is spiritual activity itself. What happens in the classroom is not left behind in faith; on the contrary, it is part of the spiritual mission of the Christian community within the academy. This is not a new or revolutionary conception of spirituality.'

It seems there are an increasing number of voices calling for a reconsideration of the long assumed war between intellect and emotions, the mind and the spirit. As Tilden Edwards puts it:

This seems a ripe and important historical moment for overcoming the schizophrenia present at least since the Middle Ages in our approaches to the knowledge of God and maturation of the Christian life. What historically has been divided and warring can now be seen in their mutually correcting and enriching complementarity: the complementarity of theology and spirituality, or more precisely, of intellect, affect, intuition, volition, and embodiment. The church’s mission and effectiveness is weakened insofar as this full complement of gifted human resources is devalued or ignored in the formation process.8


This movement of concern for theological education is expressed eloquently by Henri Nouwen in a rather lengthy but pointed observation from *The Way of the Heart*.

Let us focus for a moment on the theological education. What else is the goal of theological education than to bring us closer to the Lord our God so that we may be more faithful to the great commandment to love him with all our heart, with all our soul, and with all our mind, and our neighbor as ourselves (Matthew 22:37)? Seminaries and divinity schools must lead theology students into an ever-growing communion with God, with each other, and with their fellow human beings. Theological education is meant to form our whole person toward an increasing conformity with the mind of Christ so that our way of praying and our way of believing will be one.

But is this what takes place? Often it seems that we who study or teach theology find ourselves entangled in such a complex network of discussions, debates, and arguments about God and "God-issues" that a simple conversation with God or a simple presence to God has become practically impossible. Our heightened verbal ability, which enables us to make many distinctions, has sometimes become a poor substitute for a single-minded commitment to the Word who is life. If there is a crisis of the word. This is not to say that critical intellectual work and the subtle distinctions it requires have no longer a reflection of the divine Word in and through whom the world has been created and redeemed, they lose their grounding and become as seductive and misleading as the words used to sell Geritol.

*Some Reflections on Theological Education*

According to Kereszty, the first great disfunction between spirituality and theology found its origin with the onset of Scholasticism. He asserts:

In Scholastic theology the direct goal of theologizing is no longer a sapiential communion with God (characterized by both sapor--taste, experience--and scientia--knowledge of God), but only the perfection of

---

the intellect, to be achieved through a strictly and merely intellectual operation. The Scholastic method still presupposes faith insofar as the first principles of theology (conceived of as science according to the Aristotelian model) become known only in faith. But its conclusions are deduced from revealed principles (or/and philosophical truths) by way of formal logic, a strictly rational operation. Prayer, moral purification, experiential knowledge of God are no longer an integral part of the theological method itself.¹⁰

Slowly but surely the two, theology and spirituality or spiritual formation, have drifted apart. At NTS some have been heard to declare the maturing of the student’s spiritual life is really the business of the local church and not the seminary. In a sense there is a kernel of truth contained in the husk of the argument, but whether or not it is all the truth is another matter. The dangerous outcome has been an assumed separation of the two. But as Leech points out:

Theology is an encounter with the living God, not an uncommitted academic exercise. This encounter cannot survive if its only locus is the lecture theater or the library. It needs the nourishment of sacramental worship, of solitude, of pastoral care and the cure of souls. Theology must arise out of and be constantly related to a living situation.¹¹

Theology must be seen as central, integral and vital to a true spirituality. The two must embrace for the sake of each. Spirituality becomes mature, informed and adequate as


it builds on a mature, informed, adequate theology. In turn, theology is saved from ineffectiveness and misuse by a committed spiritual viewpoint and life. Leech warns:

The gulf between 'academic' theology and the exercise of pastoral care and spiritual guidance has been disastrous for all concerned. We are often told that the gulf is exaggerated, or that it does not exist at all, but these assurances are unconvincing. The study of theology, or at least of Christian theology, cannot survive in a healthy state apart from the life of prayer and the search for holiness. The theologian is essentially a man of prayer.\(^{12}\)

Leech goes on to say, quoting Karl Barth,

'Theological work does not merely begin with prayer and is not merely accompanied by it; in its totality it is peculiar and characteristic of theology that it can be performed only in the act of prayer.' There is then the closest possible link between doctrine and spirituality. Spirituality is applied doctrine: false spirituality is applied false doctrine.\(^{13}\)

There are some who would propose a renewed interest in spiritual or mystical theology as a way back toward reintegration of theology and the spiritual life. It seems to me that in some evangelical circles such as the Church of the Nazarene, there has been a concerted move away from the mystical and, as interpreted by some, the irrational. However, Tilden Edwards defines it by saying:

**Spiritual theology** is the frequently neglected theoretical base for the spiritual life. It is the concrete, critical application of theological/scriptural interpretation and of the empirical ascetical/mystical practice and experience of Christian spiritual proficients, to the unique development of a person or group in Christian

\(^{12}\)Ibid., 35.

\(^{13}\)Ibid., 36.
community. Its interdisciplinary nature can draw upon the arts, humanities, and sciences, as well as theology and scripture."

One notes in his comment a move toward unification and wholeness of approach. Kereszty, speaking of spiritual theology, states:

Briefly, then, we may define the object of spiritual theology as a twofold, interrelated dynamism: that of God’s activity directed to the perfecting of man; and that of the Christian faith striving toward an ever more perfect conformity with Christ in the Spirit. This dynamism lies, not on the periphery of revelation, but at its very center. Consequently, it should not be excluded from dogmatics or relegated to a secondary place within it. Yet this coincidence of the object of spiritual theology with a central concern of dogmatics does not preclude the necessity for developing spiritual theology as a distinct theological discipline. It must be done for practical purposes: to locate in one treatise the considerations which would be scattered throughout the whole body of dogmatics and to deal at length with the topics such as spiritual exercises and the various states and degrees of the experience of God whose detailed analysis does indeed not belong to either dogmatics or moral theology.¹⁵

Again there is the evident call to the importance of theology or doctrine to the life of spirituality. This is to be done for the benefit of a more informed spirituality.

Finally, in relation to the present discussion, Leech points out that there is more to the understanding of the relationship of theology and spirituality than merely a pragmatic one. He says:

So there should be no conflict between theology and spirituality, still less should theology be seen as a

¹⁴Edwards, 11.

¹⁵Kereszty, 323-324.
mere theoretical framework for spiritual life. Rather, all theology is contemplative, a concentrated looking upon God as revealed in Christ, and manifested in lives which are hidden with Christ in God.\textsuperscript{16}

Theology which informs our spirituality begins with the belief that we are created in the image of God, that the image was nearly shattered by sin, and thus we are sinners needing a rescue from God. Nicholls, in his helpful article on spiritual formation, succinctly develops this background to theology in the following manner:

We will develop our understanding from three theological perspectives. First, mankind was created in the image of God in order to worship and serve Him forever. In creation we share, in a derived and dependent sense, the attributes of God. Man is eternally personal, with a selfhood which is both one and individual, and yet a shared relational self inseparable from others . . . . Secondly, we know from Scripture and our own experience that this image is marred, defaced and all but destroyed. We are sinners in rebellion against God, using our creative gifts for idolatrous purposes and then becoming slaves of our own creations. We are under the judgment and the wrath of God. We live in the realm of evil and the demonic, knowing that Satan is the ruler of this world. Therefore true spirituality means a true response in heart, mind and body to this fallen world. . . . Thirdly, spirituality is experiencing the redeeming work of Christ and the recruiting power of the Holy Spirit. As new men and women in Christ we experience the divine shalom, the health and wholeness that God purposes for his people (Romans 5, 2 Corinthians 5). Spirituality is harmony in relationship to our Saviour God in worship, love and submission, in relationship to God’s people, in witness and servanthood in the world, and stewardship in relationship to nature.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{16}Leech, 36-7.

\textsuperscript{17}Bruce J. Nicholls, "Role of Spiritual Development in Theological Education."\textit{ Evangelical Review of Theology.} Vol. 8, No. 1, (April, 1984): 128.
Nicholls' presentation calls us to think seriously about the interplay of our belief system and our lifestyle. If he is right, then true spirituality is more than increasing what one is already doing (Bible reading, prayer, giving, etc.) but has also to do with the quality of that doing and in what manner it is related to the living, redeeming and empowering Christ.

Theologizing and spiritual formation bring into sharp focus our beliefs concerning the person and work of the Holy Spirit. A discussion of the centrality of the Spirit should be carried out with the understanding that it is not the Spirit we worship but the risen Christ. With that in mind, Kereszty reminds us:

The Holy Spirit himself is the source and summary of all the gifts of Jesus and the one whom all the visible structures of the Church should serve and communicate. In his divine transcendence the Holy Spirit is not a foreign element extrinsic to our spirit, but rather something that renews and transforms it from within so that Christ himself may dwell in our spirit as a principle of new life and activity in the world. The indwelling of the Holy Spirit is a dynamic reality. It cannot be accomplished in one act and peacefully possessed ever after. "

The Holy Spirit, the spirit of Jesus, indwells the believer in a dynamic relationship. This may impact the folk theology some students bring to seminary. A folk theology which takes for granted that the whole of the ministry of the Holy Spirit is enacted at an altar of prayer

---

"Kereszty, 316."
and thus the Christian journey turns into a parade of "works righteous­ness."

The spiritual journey is of the Spirit. As Scheunemann explains:

The spirits yield to the Spirit. The coming of the Spirit in the world and into the realm of the spirits signals the outbreak of the kingdom of God. This coming and this outbreak happened in Jesus. He is the bringer of the Spirit as well as of the kingdom of God. Without being intimately related to this dimension of the spirit, without living in it we are authorityless and powerless, even lifeless. We do not at all belong to, but stand outside of, the kingdom of God."¹⁹

The implications of the unification of spirituality and theology are far reaching. The call to integration and wholeness seems to be increasing. Scheunemann declares:

Where there is no vision the people perish (Proverbs 29:18). We must go back to a theological education which is informed by the spiritual God-given world view and to a corresponding teaching and witness in this world. Pure scientific work is poor. It does not stand against the demonic fall of our time.²⁰

To continue to assume that in Christian ministerial formation, academic achievement can be pursued without intentionality concerning the spiritual life is dangerous. The coming age will more and more demand a spiritual understanding that can interpret life for a technological world community. Kereszty sums it up by saying:


²⁰Ibid., 211.
But just as spiritual experience within the Church may ignore a theological interpretation only at the risk of losing or distorting its transcendent object, so theology may refuse the study of spiritual life only at the risk of losing its own center: the personal appropriation of and growth in the Spirit of Christ. Both theology and spirituality call for reintegration."

In light of the discussion thus far, some implications begin to present themselves for consideration. William Willimon contends:

I am convinced that the spiritual formation of the pastor must be sacramental, corporate, ecclesial. Pastors are at the mercy of the Spirit, not for personal gain but rather to enable them better to serve the church. Prayer, Bible reading, meditation, devotional exercises are as essential for pastors as for other Christians but the ultimate goal of ministerial devotional life must be to yoke me more fully to the body."

The call upon the present day minister is a heavy one. Some church leaders may still feel that ministerial skills are of the most crucial importance but when life presents its darkest challenges parishioners want more than a good technician. Edwards seems to reinforce this perception when he says:

... the ordained leader is called upon increasingly to be in his/her own right an authentic person of God, a mature spiritual leader, a person/parson whose leadership depends, beyond the sum of his/her objective skills and knowledge, on a discerning faith, an interior sensibility to the things of God."

---

21 Kereszty, 315.


23 Edwards, 22.
In light of the need for spiritual formation and wholeness in the theological school, some tentative observations can be made at this point in the discussion. First, it would seem that spiritual formation cannot and should not be left to happenstance. Concluding a discussion on faith development, Daniels asserts:

The crucial question for the seminary focuses on its responsibility for that development at the stage or level students bring to their theological education."

In other words, there will need to be studied effort at developing spiritual formation as part of the life of the seminary just as there is for academic and practical courses. The level of student spiritual development will be one consideration but is indicative of the care needed in making it "happen." Nicholls sees it as a pervasive issue when he asserts:

... it is evident that spiritual development cannot be merely a subject within theological education, separate from other subjects. Rather it must be a perspective affecting the whole educative process."

So crucial is this perspective, the integration of academics with spirituality that Henri Nouwen pleads:

In no way am I trying to minimize or even to criticize the importance of training for the ministry. I am simply suggesting that this training will bear more fruit when it occurs in the context of a spirituality, a way of life in which we are primarily concerned, not to be with people but to be with God, not to walk in

---


Nicholls, 129.
the presence of anyone who asks for our attention but to walk in the presence of God—a spirituality, in short, which helps us to distinguish service from our need to be liked, praised, or respected.26

A second observation that might be made is that faculty and students will need to be involved in spiritual formation together. Though it may have to begin with only one or two professors, it must not be relegated to a special few. It does mean that professors will be called upon to risk and be vulnerable. But there is no other way. Edwards states emphatically:

The spiritual formation and development of seminary students begins with, and is dependent upon, the spiritual formation and development of the faculty.27

In the study by Dick Daniels, he reports:

... the most important people in the faith formation of our sample beyond early home life were seminary professors...28

And Palmer, in his stimulating book, To Know As We Are Known, goes a bit deeper into the issue by observing:

The true professor is not one who controls facts and theories and techniques. The true professor is one who affirms a transcendent center of truth, a center that lies beyond our contriving, that enters history through the lives of those who profess it and brings us into community with each other and the world. If professors are to create a space in which obedience to truth is


27Edwards, 8.

28Daniels, 13.
practiced, we must become "professors" again. To do so, we must cultivate personal experience of that which we need to profess."

Thus we are called upon to teach what we know and what we are. It demands relationships, knowing one another. "In humility we allow ourselves to know and be known in relationship, and in that allowing we draw our students into the community of truth".

Not only will professors need to be open to relationships that help lead students to truth but the way the subjects themselves are taught will need to be examined.

Spiritual development will depend on the way the subjects are taught and studied and on the kind of contextualized reflections. In each subject there must be an attempt to relate the subject to personal lifestyle and daily behavior.

A final implication draws attention to the need for Christian community that is intentional and essential for spiritual formation and wholeness. It cannot be left to the local church nor to the hope that it will happen "somehow." It will demand commitment on the part of the students and faculty to the objectives of the seminary and to each other. It will not be easy. As Daniels observes:

The task of theological education is much easier if we merely limit the seminary’s responsibility to the cognitive acquisition of theological insight and ministry skills. The accountability of the seminary to

---

30 Parker J. Palmer, To Know As We Are Known. (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1983), 113.

30 Ibid., 109.

30 Nicholls, 130.
the church demands a broader focus. These years can stifle or foster the spiritual growth of students."

Success will be in proportion to the breadth of acceptance of the vision. When the community is viewed beyond that of a "school" then something significant can happen.

The extent to which a residential theological school is a community for discipleship training determines the potential for spiritual development to take place. Seen as a community of faith, such a school is able to bring the whole of its corporate life to a disciplined lifestyle that reflects the nature of the church itself.\

The intentionality of spiritual formation is also based on an awareness of how powerfully the seminary contributes to the students' understanding of who they are in personal identity. Thayer challenges a common perception of the seminary at this point when he says:

Inevitably, seminary is a locus for the formation of personal identity. For faculty as well as students, any traditional academic or professional skill-teaching which is implicitly or explicitly based on a model of either teacher or student as an information processing device is simply ignorant of the human actuality called theological seminary.\

What model can help guide such an endeavor as spiritual formation and wholeness in the seminary? Such is the content of the following discussion. What follows is a short discussion of such a model of the person which was

\[^3\]Daniels, 14.

\[^3\]Nicholls, 131.

\[^3\]Thayer, 2-3.
adopted for this project. Further discussion will be presented later.

Toward A Helpful Paradigm of the Person

My concept of the person began to take shape when, as a fledgling youth pastor in 1964, I attended a Youth For Christ training workshop and learned of "The Balanced Life." Jay Kessler taught us from a diagram as in Figure 1. It needs to be acknowledged here, that diagrams are all limited as they do not possess the dynamic qualities of a life lived, but they can serve as useful symbols to facilitate communication.

![Figure 1](Youth For Christ Model)

Figure 1
Youth For Christ Model
As we planned and programmed our youth ministries we were to remember the key was "balance," nothing overdone to the detriment of some other facet of development. Thus began the idea of the compartmentalized life, though at times one knew something did not quite ring true, but it was difficult to know what it was.

This segmented concept was reinforced when in later years I read in youth developmental materials that the categories were mental, physical, social, emotional and spiritual. A new category was added and the spiritual was still seen as something one could understand in its own right. An example is Figure 2.

![Figure 2](image-url)

"Developmental" Model
An attempt at integration of these various aspects of the person is presented by Dr. Keith Olson. His diagram is as follows:

![Diagram of Olson Model]

Figure 3

Olson Model

It is an attempt to show that all the spheres interact in such a way that an experience in one will, in some ways, impact the others. However, it is not clear in Olson's paradigm to what extent the spheres interact and it seems to indicate areas remaining that do not impact one another or only one other area.

---

In my opinion, Kirwan moves a step closer to showing an integrative understanding by developing the following diagram.  

![Diagram of Kirwan Model]

Figure 4
Kirwan Model

Here the three aspects of the person are seen as a whole. Kirwan explains, "The person must always be studied as a whole, that is, as a bio-psycho-spiritual being. A change in one dimension will usually have ramifications in the other dimensions."  

---


3Ibid., 33.
The problem with Kirwan’s diagram is its simplicity, though in fairness one must acknowledge the generous use of illustrations and figures throughout his book. Nonetheless, the paradigm does not highlight the importance of relationships that Kirwan goes on to discuss in the text. An approach to integration and wholeness that seems to be helpful and more adequate than those presented thus far is found in *Pastor As Person* by Gary L. Harbaugh.

An approach to integration and wholeness that seems to be helpful and more adequate than those presented thus far is found in *Pastor As Person* by Gary L. Harbaugh.  

---

3Ibid., 37ff.

This model attempts not only to describe the elements of the emotional, physical, mental and social but to suggest that personal history and situations play significantly into human interaction. However, these are not deterministic but can be changed, integrated, healed by our choices, as illustrated through the center of the diagram.

And finally, the spiritual is signified by the letter "L" connecting the four aspects of the physical, emotional, mental and social. Using the "L" as a mnemonic device for the Hebrew "El" for God, Harbaugh explains,

The spiritual is not represented as one dimension among others, but as the integration of each and all of the dimensions, symbolized by the center "L". It is my conviction that there is a God-question implicit in every experience of the pastor as a bodily, thinking, and feeling person and a God-question implicit in every interpersonal encounter."

I have moved, over the years, from a compartmentalized model of the person to an understanding best portrayed by the paradigm of Harbaugh. In a world of increasing fragmentation and isolation, a wholistic understanding of the person needing help, and seminary students in particular, is essential to healing and wholeness.

**Viewing Persons Wholistically**

Too frequently in Protestant Evangelical circles, it has not at all been clear that the Bible portrays persons as whole and only as such. We acknowledge that the person is a

---
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unity but in practice the Greek concept of a soul distinct from the body lingers on. Recently, it has become more accepted to view persons wholistically in medical and psychological circles as well as in the Church. In 1959, Seward Hiltner was on track when he stated:

The other conviction or intuition of the New Testament about healing is seen positively - that real healing is of the "spirit," when spirit is understood to mean very much the same thing that we mean today when we speak of a whole person. A person may become ill or impaired at any level, all the way from the cells of his body to his relationship to God. True healing embraces all levels."

The Scriptures do more than indicate wholeness, they help guide our psychological understandings of persons. One of the great scriptural truths is, we are created for relationships. William Kirwan summarizes his discussion of Genesis 2-3 and Romans 1 with the following observations:

1. God has created us with spiritual and social needs.
2. Good interpersonal relationships (with God and with other people) are necessary to fulfill those needs.
3. If our needs are not met by good interpersonal relationships, then, like Adam, we will tend to become spiritually, psychologically, and emotionally disoriented."

He goes on to delineate what he sees to be the biblical understanding of human personality. It is capsulized in the three concepts, knowing, being and doing. Building on the Greek word epignosis in contrast to gnosis, knowing is seen

---
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as going beyond the grasp of factual data and involving the person in internalization and personal action."

The concept of being is understood in the light of a study of the biblical term "heart." Though Kirwan’s discussion is quite lengthy, the heart is the key concept in the Bible understanding of the Christian life."

Doing, related to the human will, is seen in relationship to God. Kirwan points out:

In summary, although "doing" is stressed throughout the Bible, it is always presented in conjunction with relationship to God. It never stands alone to designate a duty or service to be performed apart from encounter with God and others."

In a bit broader but more brief treatment, Harbaugh discusses the Biblical understanding of persons in three categories, the whole person, that person in relationship and the whole person and God. A study of the Hebrew word nephesh, and the Greek words sarx and soma lead Harbaugh to summarize the first category by saying:

In the Bible a person is understood to be whole and indivisible, a psychophysical unity. While a person may be addressed in terms of his or her body, mind, emotions, or in a variety of other ways, when God or the believing community speaks, the appropriate response is that of the whole person with all our heart, soul, mind, and strength (Mark 12:29ff)."
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The Bible, according to Harbaugh, goes on to teach that a whole person is a person in relationship. The community becomes paramount in contrast to individualism. One who is in right relationship with oneself is in right relationship with the community."

And finally, to know and have life, a whole person is not only in right relationship with others but also with one's God. At this point that Harbaugh makes a distinction between a secular understanding of wholeness and a Christian one. While the secularist acknowledges wholeness in terms of the physical, emotional, mental and social aspects, the Christian declares that beyond these is a center. Thus Harbaugh states: "For a Christian to be a whole person is to be a believing person, a person in Christ.""

The discussion of both Kirwan and Harbaugh are markedly similar in their emphasis upon the importance of relationships. This would seem to be a crucial insight to a society gone amuck with individualism and relational disintegration.

As I worked my way through a wholistic understanding of the person, coupled with a belief that spirituality and wholeness are a part of the mission and curriculum of the seminary, I began to wonder if something could be done in

"Ibid., 19.

"Ibid., 23."
the classroom to address these issues. Thus was formed the motivation for this study and the research hypothesis that indeed something of substance could be accomplished in the classroom to help prepare students wholistically for ministry.
CHAPTER 2

Review of Selected Literature

As one might expect in a broad project such as this, many kinds of literature have had an impact on the shaping and content of the study. In this chapter the discussion will center only on those works that have made enough of a contribution to be singled out and mentioned. Some sources were of minimal help in terms of direct application to the project, though they have provided a needed element of breadth of awareness. Nevertheless, for sake of space, these are not included in this discussion. The literature is grouped into three categories, (1) Studies concerning the person in ministry, (2) development and growth of the minister, and (3) problems in seminary and the ministry.

Studies Concerning the Person in Ministry

The studies in this section have to do mainly with problems faced in ministry and with coping and stress in particular. They are representative of a growing body of such studies which attempt in some orderly and/or scientific manner to delineate ministerial problem areas which, for many, are experienced but only vaguely understood. While most of us can identify with the problems of the ministry, researchers are attempting to provide data with which possible solutions may be found.
A limited study was conducted by John J. Gleason, Jr. during a clergy workshop on stress.\(^1\) It was found that there was some common agreement as to types of stress but there was not the expected concurrence as to the sources of that stress. Gleason hypothesized that the clergy would see the stress as centered in their church and work while the spouses would be more aware of stress in relation to their personal lives and families. This did not appear conclusive.\(^2\) What did become clear was that these clergy and their spouses were, at least, in touch with the stressors of their lives and could identify them. Gleason's research hypothesis, that of attempting to define what it is that causes enough emotional strain to immobilize and defeat many clergy, is getting at the causes in order to find a solution. Though limited in scope, it is suggestive for further study.

While Gleason was looking to define stressors, Edgar W. Mills and John P. Koval were also studying stress in the ministry on a much broader scale. In their work Stress In Ministry, they determined what they believed to be surges or peaks of stress in the life of the ministry. They report:

The six to eight year periodicity of stress peaks in the ministry must remain a tentative conclusion until confirmed by further study, but it fits well with the


\(^2\)Ibid., 251.
reported experience of ministers and those who work with them. Crisis points are often mentioned in "the first five years" and "about twelve years out of seminary." We rarely hear of a "17-20 year crisis," although for most ministers that would come in their late forties, long reputed to be a time of personal stress. It appears to us, therefore, that the tenth and eleventh years show a definite upsurge in incidents of stress periods and that the first, second and third years are the points of greatest stress in the ministry.'

More helpful to this project was the pin-pointing of a model for stress, attributed to Scott and Howard, and elaborated by Mills and Koval. It is described as follows:

(1) Deliberate tension-creating activity, as in dangerous sports or training programs or briefly experienced difficulties, falls at the problem-solving level of the model. (2) When routine problem-solving methods fail, however, necessitating an unusually high investment of energy to manage the situation, Scott and Howard speak of first order stress, marked by continuing but controlled high tension levels. (3) Only if one is unable either to solve or to manage the problem and begins to consider withdrawal from the tension-producing situation is second order stress indicated. The distinction between first and second order stress is thus one of coping (perhaps just barely) versus withdrawal or panic.'

Where some descriptions of stress may tend to be simplistic and thus too easily ignored or dismissed, this three level model is helpful at least in getting at the kinds of stress one may be dealing with and how close one is to losing the ability to cope. The authors are then led to conclude:

We believe that most occupational stress springs from a breakdown in problem-solving rather than from sin, disease or pathogenic conditions. If so, an


*Ibid., 2.
individual's effort will thus ordinarily be directed to
the reduction of stress to the problem-solving level
where he can remove its causes.

The idea of removing the causes of stress at the
problem-solving level is a fairly common one in the
literature on stress management as will be seen later in the
discussion. It seems like a fairly straight forward answer
to the problem. Find out what is causing the stress, and
change it. Thus we have a plethora of stress management
techniques proposed by innumerable authors.

Two studies by Gary L. Harbaugh began to expand my
understanding of the complexity of the problem and the place
of the seminary both in the possible causes for stress and
burnout and the possibilities for help within that
institution.

In 1980, Dr. Harbaugh began a study of the student body
of Trinity Lutheran Seminary concerning stress, anxiety and
other related categories. It was not till after I had
decided upon the model for this project that I found the
course on the personhood of the minister to be one of his
suggestions resulting from the "Pace" study. His work was
most illuminating concerning the role of the seminary in
preparation for ministry and the students' ability to cope.

'Ibid., 2.

'Gary L. Harbaugh, "Pace In Learning and Life: Prelude to
Pastoral Burnout," Seminar and Congregation: Integrating
Association of Professional Education for Ministry, 87ff.
He asserts:

My research would indicate that pastoral burnout, which seems first to appear in helping professionals about the fifth year of professional life, may as well be attributed to the failure of the seminary (and other helping professional schools) to accurately identify the presence of significant levels of stress, the failure to adequately respond to seminarians for whom stress is becoming a way of life, and the failure to challenge seminarians to integrate their faith and life in pastoral self-care without which long-term and effective ministry is compromised.7

His emphasis upon a theological understanding of the whole person also leads him to evaluate present stress management approaches as appropriate but inadequate. An adequate response, in his view, is one that gives attention to all aspects of the person and to seeing the person responding to stress in a wholistic manner.8 Yet, it is the seminary that may be perpetuating the difficulties for students in these areas, Harbaugh says pointedly:

Based on the Pace Studies and my interpretation of their significance, my thesis is that the seminary may unwittingly reinforce the attitudes, orientations, and behaviors that lead to professional burnout. The seminary does this by building upon, rather than challenging, the approach to learning and life that the student encountered in college (or in the business world, given the increasing number of second career students).9

He sees problems not only in the physical but the feeling level as well. Where the rational element may be

7Ibid., 86.
8Ibid., 86.
9Ibid., 96.
overemphasized, subjective feeling experiences can be relegated to an inferior position. Thus the seminarian has difficulty personally and theologically integrating the emotional and physical with the cognitive.\textsuperscript{10}

A later study by Harbaugh involved the use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. This was of particular interest since the instrument has been regularly used at NTS in a course on spiritual formation and one in church administration since 1983. The investigation highlights the helpful use of the MBTI in pin-pointing such potential problems as depression. It was found that a high percentage of introverts (I’s) find their way to a seminary for training in a career that is perceived in great measure as an extroverted activity. Harbaugh reports:

Much more common was the incidence of depression (Harbaugh, 1981, 1982). In the present study, the I’s were most likely to be depressed, even more notably the high I’s. High J’s were also highly correlated with depression, and J’s generally were more prone to depression. When N is joined to I and/or J, the combination is associated with depression (IN, IJ, NJ, INFJ). However, N itself is not the key factor, as the combination EN is negatively correlated with depression . . . . The high percentage of introverts in the seminary, coupled with their poor health habits and greater propensity for physical symptoms of distress is a cause for concern. Inadequate self-care has been associated with pastoral burnout, and the failure of the seminary to address this problem has been documented (Oswald, 1980; Harbaugh, 1981, 1982; Rassieur, 1982).\textsuperscript{11}

\textsuperscript{10}Ibid., 89.

And finally, his observation of the link between college and seminary success and subsequent ministry achievement is thought provoking. In summary remarks concerning performance, he says:

The most remarkable feature of the performance data is the way in which the seminary attracts the kind of student who does well in college, but who might have some real difficulty in the parish, especially the highly introverted. If the person is also a judging type, the chances are very good that seminary grades will also be reinforcing. Yet the IJ is not likely to be affirmed by the faculty as an unusually good prospect for parish ministry. An earlier study, which did not use the MBTI, suggested that seminaries seem to reinforce the attitudes, orientations, and behaviors that lead to later problems in ministry, and the MBTI correlations seem to confirm this (Harbaugh, 1982)."  

One other study needs to be mentioned in this section. Kobasa, Maddi and Kahn in a 1982 study of middle and upper-level managers, viewed the ability to cope with stress as more likely to have to do with the hardiness of certain personalities as it does with stress reducing techniques. Their research seemed to affirm the hypothesis that the three characteristics of commitment, control and challenge work to decrease the symptoms of illness in stress-filled situations.  


---
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Development and Growth of the Minister

Several sources having to do with the "seasons" and "stages" of a person's life were explored in preparation for the course to be taught and as a background to the work of Harbaugh, especially as found in his Pastor As Person. Daniel Levinson's The Seasons of a Man's Life and Gail Sheehy's Passages provided material known to many.

In terms of direct helpfulness or influence on the project, Sheehy's work had less to offer than that of Levinson, except possibly the value of being acquainted with another point of view. However, her work does provide insight into elements of the paradigm of wholeness chosen for the project. Of particular interest is her view of change. She says:

If I've been convinced by one idea in the course of collecting all the life stories that inform the book, it is this: Times of crisis, of disruption or constructive change, are not only predictable but desirable. They mean growth.14

In a paragraph that seems particularly apropos to the pressures faced by seminarians Sheehy points out:

One of the terrifying aspects of the twenties is the conviction that the choices we make are irrevocable. If we choose a graduate school or join a firm, get married or don't marry, move to the suburbs or forego travel abroad, decide against children or against a career, we fear in our marrow that we might have to live with that choice forever. It is largely a false fear. Change is not only possible; some alteration of our original choices is probably inevitable. But since in our twenties we're new at making major life choices,

we cannot imaging that possibilities for a better integration will occur to us later on, when some inner growth has taken place.\textsuperscript{15}

Levinson provides an insightful paradigm of stages or "seasons" of development. In concluding observations, he identifies three sets of tasks he believes to be essential to early and middle adulthood, which includes the time span of seminarians. Those three sets are "Building and Modifying the Life Structure," "Working on Single Components of the Life Structure," and "Becoming More Individuated." Within the second set are five aspects that seem particularly helpful: forming and modifying a dream, forming and modifying an occupation, love, marriage and family and forming mentoring relationships.\textsuperscript{16}

In a work similar in topic to Levinson and Sheehy, Cecil R. Paul discusses the impact of the stages of life on the work of the minister. In a pertinent discussion concerning stress, he says:\textsuperscript{17}

There are two areas crucial to our understanding of the nature of stress and stress management in ministry. The first of these involves the psychosocial history of the pastor. What unresolved crises and tasks continue to influence his perceptions, expectations, and

\textsuperscript{15}Ibid., 123.


\textsuperscript{17}Though various works are quoted as printed, I am deeply committed to the use of inclusive language and do not support sexist forms of expression.
responses in ministry? The second relates to the normal and current tasks appropriate to the young adult stage of living."

The power of our history to impact our present day living is often overlooked or not understood in terms of preparation for ministry. Paul reminds us:

The young pastor may come into the ministry without an awareness of his own psychosocial history and its continuing impact upon his needs and responses. He may be unaware of the degree to which these figure into his reception and understanding of the call to ministry. He may also enter the young adult years, and the degree to which these connect with the quality of his ministry. If a man is not freed from bondage to unresolved crises out of the past and unfulfilled needs in the present, his ministry as well as his own health and growth may be jeopardized."

James Fowler has made a major contribution to the work of integrating developmental theories and the life of faith. This kind of research and study is continually needed to inform and enlighten theories of development, especially those which do not take into account the power of faith, imagination and religion (e.g. Levinson and Sheehy). Beyond his well-known stages of faith, Fowler has been helpful in highlighting the importance of life histories in understanding the life of faith. He states with precision:

A structural-developmental theory of faith must be a theory of personal knowing and acting. This means neither an individualistic theory, nor one that gives up the commitment to generalizability. Rather, it means a commitment to take seriously that our previous decisions and actions shape our character, as do the "

---
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stories and images by which we live. It means a commitment to take seriously the fact that we are formed in social communities and that our ways of seeing the world are profoundly shaped by the shared images and constructions of our group or class. It means, further, a commitment to relate structural stages of faith to the predictable crises and challenges of developmental eras and to take life histories seriously in its study.\footnote{James Fowler, \textit{Stages of Faith} (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1981), 105.}

When working with seminary students, especially with an interest in equipping them to meet the challenges of ministry in the twenty-first century, the continuing impact of their life histories becomes evident. Another challenge for them is the increase of relativism, pluralism and/or secularism. Sometimes students are not even aware of how their thinking has changed. Fowler speaks of this as a shift in the cultural understanding and says incisively:

Termed variously as "secularization", "religious disenchantment" or "modernism", this movement has given rise to an essentially new form of consciousness. It has construed knowledge as empirically demonstrable facts; it has subordinated ethics and aesthetics to what works or is workable; it has reduced intimacy to sexuality and inflated sexuality to a fetishism. It has come to see faith as belief or a belief system and, in what passes for tolerance or "understanding", maintains a dogmatic attitude of relativism regarding the truth or appropriateness of all such "systems of belief."\footnote{Ibid., 13.}

In his later work, \textit{Becoming Adult, Becoming Christian}, Fowler discusses the concept of "vocation" with clarity and depth. It is of interest to the project, for the concept is
certainly understood differently by most students at NTS. For many of them vocation is a job, it is what one does to make a living. Thus when a student must take a job, along with pastoring, which is not uncommon in their first charge, it is known as being "bi-vocational." This understanding by the student is reinforced by the official sanction of the denomination in the use of such terminology. Fowler’s concept has to do with a total life perspective, it is wholistic. By definition, he says:

Vocation is the response a person makes with his or her total self to the address of God and to the calling to partnership. The shaping of vocation as total response of the self to the address of God involves the orchestration of our leisure, our relationships, our work, our private life, our public life, and of the resources we steward, so as to put it all at the disposal of God’s purposes in the services of God and the neighbor.  

His further comprehensive discussion of vocation is illuminating and helpful.  

In terms of personal development and the use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, four books were especially helpful. David Kiersey and Marilyn Bates have written one of the most widely read works on the MBTI entitled Please Understand Me. It is replete with descriptions of the

---
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sixteen types plus discussions of the impact of type in family, children and the workplace.

A more comprehensive treatment is found in Gifts Differing by Isabel Briggs Myers.25 Myers, who with her mother Katherine C. Briggs, was instrumental in the development of the MBTI, discusses the underlying theory based on the work of Carl Jung, the sixteen types, implications of type in marriage, learning and occupation, and the development of type. It is "must" reading for anyone using the MBTI.

Chester P. Michael and Marie C. Norrisey provide insightful material on the MBTI and prayer patterns in their book Prayer And Temperament.26 Also in the area of the MBTI and religious life, Personality Type and Religious Leadership by Roy M. Oswald and Otto Kroeger provides one of the first attempts at a comprehensive investigation of the impact of temperament type (as delineated by the MBTI) on styles and problems of ministerial leadership.27 Their research and discussion cover topics of pastoral role, the


27Roy M. Oswald and Otto Kroeger, Personality Type and Religious Leadership (New York: Alban Institute, 1988).
pastor's functions, spirituality and prayer, and problem areas associated with type.

Problems in Seminary and the Ministry

The growing interest in the psychological and behavioral sciences, combined with spiritual formation and other concerns related to the preparation of ministers, has produced a fairly extensive body of literature. This project will be limited to (1) anger and conflict management, (2) depression and burnout, and (3) stress and stress management.

Anger and Conflict Management

In counseling seminarians, one finds more often than not, a connection between self-image, their concept of God and anger. This anger may be inappropriately acted out or so inwardly contained that it has become frozen rage. James Hamilton points out:

My experience as a counseling psychologist has led me to this conclusion: There is a significant correlation between a negative view of God and low self-concept. Caution and training tell me to use the word often when referring to this correlation, but experience permits me to be more pervasive in my assessment. Almost without exception I find that persons who have negative views of God also have negative views of themselves."

Similarly, in his article "Perfectionism: Fraught With Fruits of Self-Destruction," David Seamands suggests that perfectionism can best be described by six symptoms, (1)

\footnote{James D. Hamilton, \textit{The Faces of God} (Kansas City: Beacon Hill, 1984), 27.}
tyranny of the ought, (2) self-depreciation, (3) anxiety, (4) legalism, (5) anger, and (6) possible denial.

Concerning this denial he says:

Too often the anger is never faced. Instead it is denied. The mixture of bad theology, legalism, sanctification by performance becomes frozen. Deep emotional problems set in. Mood changes are so great and so terrible that the person feels as if he is two different people.36

With respect to anger, two insightful books are Anger and Assertiveness in Pastoral Care by David W. Augsburger and Coping With Your Anger by Andrew D. Lester. In addressing the confusion of many Christians in regards to anger, Augsburger asserts:

The central issue, then, is not whether one experiences negative emotions, but how; not if one dare become angry, but in what way. To be fully aware of one’s anger or hate, and to be free to integrate it in ways that are both powerful and respectful, is to be vitally alive. To be truly alert to effective ways of channeling these emotions creatively is to be authentically present with others and prizing of the self. There are no good or bad feelings; feelings simply are. Moral choice begins not with the experiencing of feelings, but with their expression.36

Lester concurs by declaring:

The truth is that every human being experiences anger! Yes, even Christians. No one can live throughout life


without frequently experiencing this emotion. Why? Because anger is a part of our human nature. God has created us this way!*

Both authors provide similar insights into the issue of anger with slightly different emphases at various points. Augsburger seems to approach the problem more from a cognitive viewpoint, and thus speaks of "positive channeling" and "anger management." Lester is helpful in relating to the anger issue from a biblical perspective and when speaking of sin, points out:

The Bible also recognizes that people sin with their anger. No one is excused for expressing anger in destructive ways. Yes, you and I sin with our anger, but that does not mean we have sinned every time we feel this emotion. To feel anger is not the same as sinning with it. It is what we do with our anger that raises the moral questions of good and evil.*

Not only is anger an issue for many seminarians, but the broader issue of conflict management is of keen interest. If not while a student, it certainly becomes one after a short time in the first pastorate! Many sources are now available for help with understanding conflict and its resolution. Two that have contributed to this project are *Church Fights: Managing Conflict In The Local Church* by Speed Leas and Paul Kitlaus,*" and *How To Manage Conflict In*
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The Church, by Norman Shawchuck." The materials by Shawchuck, two volumes and a cassette tape, are quite helpful. Presented in workbook format, it covers an array of conflict management topics involving the reader directly in the learning process.

Depression and Burnout

Depression and burnout are of major concern in the discussion of problems of the ministry. Though not recognized as a problem for seminarians until recently, depression in the ministry is being researched with increased frequency. Henri Nouwen, as early as 1969, observed,

And whereas we tended to think of the seminary as a place with joyful, self-confident people, now a visitor might find it to be a place with troubled, doubting people, pervaded with a general atmosphere of depression. Although we are stereotyping and therefore simplifying, we cannot avoid the growing conviction that depression is one of the most surprising symptoms in our seminary communities.35

It has been "surprising" at NTS at least. For the last six years, an informal survey of students enrolled in a spiritual formation course reveals not only a depth of acquaintance with the symptoms of depression but with depression itself.


Closely akin to depression is burnout. It is usually thought of as occurring after several years into pastoral ministry, but it is a crucial issue for many seminarians as well. Harbaugh and Rogers, after two years of clinical research with seminarians, believe the problem must not only be addressed from a behavioral point of view but that any adequate answer will need to take into account the whole person. Being more specific, they assert:

It appears that pace is a persistent problem. Not only are students highly stressed upon entrance into the seminary environment, but they appear to remain stressed during seminary and through at least the first three years in the parish. Other studies suggest that the first four or five years after ordination are among the most difficult for ministers. Some have attributed this to the idealism of new pastors. It is certainly true that frustrated idealism is a factor in burnout. However, based on the high stress levels among seminarians, pastoral burnout in the early years of professional life may also be attributed to the failure of the seminary accurately to identify the presence of significant levels of stress, the failure adequately to respond to seminarians for whom stress is becoming a way of life, and the failure to challenge seminarians to integrate their faith and life.

One of the most exhaustive treatments to be found was the workbook/cassette combination written by Roy M. Oswald entitled Clergy Burnout. The author not only provides extensive information concerning burnout but involves the reader in the self-care process through the workbook and
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tapes. Oswald also examines the role of the seminary in ministerial preparation.

In training people for ministry we share some of the same shortcomings as those who train personnel for other helping professions (i.e. nurses, social workers, police, poverty lawyers). There are five common faults in these professional training programs:
1. We tend to create unrealistic expectations.
2. We often are not practical, thorough or relevant enough.
3. We don’t provide sufficient interpersonal skills training.
4. We do not provide adequate knowledge of the nature of bureaucratic organizations or of ways to function effectively within those constraints.
5. We don’t train professionals on how to cope with uncertainty, change, conflict, stress, and burnout.  

Lloyd Rediger contributes a great deal of insight into burnout in his book, *Coping With Clergy Burnout*. His comprehensive presentation covers such topics as characteristics, stages of burnout, causes, and a model for coping with burnout and stress. In terms of possible burnout at different stages in life, he observes:

Along with the information about typical pressure for clergy, we should note that there are stages in the pastor’s life when the stress seems more severe and therefore is more likely to lead to burnout. Young pastors may burn themselves out when they arrive in their first or second parish and are unable to adjust the zeal of their idealism and their need to effect changes in the parish to the realities of their situation. There are at least two other typical times of deep anxiety for clergy. About ten to fifteen years into his or her career when energy is less and idealistic zeal has moderated, the pastor often feels a

---


nagging question, "Is this the way I want to spend the rest of my professional life?" Then about ten to five years before retirement, a pastor wonders with considerable anxiety whether his or her career is all downhill now, and may continue to worry until nothing worthwhile is left."

**Stress and Stress Management**

Much has been written on stress since Hans Selye's monumental work, *The Stress of Life* in 1956. In the late seventies and early eighties there appeared such works as Gary Collins' popularized *You Can Profit From Stress* and Keith Sehnert's *Stress/Unstress.* About the same time, Alan Reuter, writing in *Currents In Theology and Ministry,* suggested a graphed model for stress management for ministers based upon prioritized goal-setting. A year later, 1982, Charles Rassieur wrote *Stress Management For Ministers,* an enlightening and thought-provoking treatment, emphasizing the need for ministers to accept and practice "self-care." Speaking to the influence of the seminary Rassieur believes:

"Ibid., 41.


Most seminary educators are aware of the passive-dependent outlook that seminary education can encourage in students. If seminaries will consciously emphasize the high spiritual priority for self-care, a beginning step will be made in diminishing the dependency and the passivity that students learn from academic structures."

In the mid-eighties, Richard E. Ecker entered the ongoing discussion with the publication of The Stress Myth."

Ecker centered his discussion on the power of perception in the stress problem. That is to say, he believes the events are not what cause stress, but how they are perceived. The year following, Gary Harbaugh in The Faith Hardy Christian, discussed the characteristics of the faith-hardy personality and provided a reminder:

While faith-hardy stress management requires that we do something that will reduce stress in each "part" of our life, it is important to remember that not all stress is to be managed. Sometimes the fact that we are being stressed is a painful reminder that our life is badly out of balance because God is not at the center. At those times the challenge is not simply to reduce our stress to a manageable level but to learn from it. The best faith-hardy stress prevention is to remember what it means that we are whole persons called to live our life in responsible relation to God and others."

A more recent college level textbook is Phillip C. Rice's Stress And Health: Principles and Practice for Coping

---

"Charles A. Rassieur, Stress Management For Ministers (Philadelphia: Westminister Press, 1982).


"His contribution is his attempt to bridge the gap between highly technical material and the more popularly written works available today.

This chapter has been an attempt to review selected literature from a vast field of sources that have impacted this project in some meaningful way. The resources available for the study of preparing persons wholistically for ministry are increasing at a rapid rate and present a challenge for on-going inquiry into possible methods and solutions to help those charged with the task of such preparation.

CHAPTER 3
Methodology and Report of Data

Methodology

Project Design

The purpose of this project was to measure the effect of classroom instruction in preparing NTS students for ministry. An experimental field design was chosen. In September, all students registering for the first time at NTS, were given a pretest. These instruments were sent away for computer scoring and interpretation of the results were made available to the students before the end of the first semester.

The experimental group was selected from the original pool (designated here as Group 1) to enroll in a new course, designed and taught by the writer, entitled "Minister As Person." At the end of the second semester, Group 1 and a control group from the original pool (designated here at Group 2) were administered a posttest, using the identical pretest instrument. The resulting scores were then to be compared for statistical significance to affirm the hypothesis: "A classroom course can produce significant changes in student attitudes toward ministry which will be reflected in the difference in scores of a pretest and posttest." The null hypothesis was: "Students completing the classroom course will show no significant differences in
their pretest and posttest scores." This project was begun September, 1988 and concluded in May, 1989.

Description of Course

The course was designed as an overview of various aspects of being a whole person in ministry. The text used was *Pastor As Person* by Gary Harbaugh. Harbaugh illustrates his understanding of the whole person by use of a paradigm (see Figure 5). The paradigm and the chapters of the book provided the framework for the syllabus and semester’s learning agenda. The chapter titles (which became the major themes for class investigation and discussion) were The Pastor As Person: A (W)holistic Model, The Pastor as a Physical Person, a Thinking Person, a Feeling Person, a Relating Person and a Choosing Person.

The paradigm, (p. 25), includes the familiar categories of mental, emotional, social and physical. Within the quadrants are bodily being, thinking, feeling and relating aspects of the person. Harbaugh also believes an understanding of a person should take into account that person’s history. Thus, at the top of the paradigm is placed the phrase "I am my history." His theory is built strongly on Erik Erikson’s stages of psychosocial development and calls for the need to recognize the impact of that history on the present life of the minister.¹

¹Gary L. Harbaugh, *Pastor As Person*. (Minneapolis: Grand Rapids, 1984), 22-32.
Not only are we our histories but we also are our "situations." Harbaugh means to say that not only are we our life histories but our life situations impact us daily in significant and forceful ways. In the midst of all this (and shown through the center of the diagram) we are reminded that we are choosing persons. Our choices reveal our goals, values and direction.

Further, Harbaugh believes that in almost any life situation and choice, there will be a God question. The significance of the spiritual dimension is indicated in the center of the diagram by the letter "L". It is used as a mnemonic device to remind one of "El", one of the Hebrew names for God. He points out that the spiritual aspect of the person affects and is affected by the others and therefore does not stand as a separate category.

Significant as our histories and life situations may be, it is our choices that tell us who we really are and who we will become, Harbaugh contends. He sums up his discussion of the paradigm by saying,

Christian anthropology helps us to appreciate the significance of a person’s history, his or her story. That anthropology also requires us to reflect on the relevance of an individual’s life situation. Above all, a biblical anthropology alerts us to the integrative nature of a person’s choices in the midst of life’s challenges.

'Ibid., 37.
The course, entitled "Minister As Person," was organized to cover the six chapters of the text in a fifteen week semester. Approximately two to three weeks were given to each chapter, with some flexibility built in for particular interests of the class. That is to say, it was understood that if the class wished to stay with a topic for more than the allotted time, it was taken as part of the learning process and took precedence over the syllabus calendar schedule.

Course requirements included the keeping of a journal, participation in a support group formed within the class, outside reading in parallel with the topics being discussed in class and an integrative paper at the end of the semester. The journal was to record the student's reactions, thoughts and reflections in response to the reading of the text and collateral choices. The support groups were formed at random by the instructor, with five students in a group.

Since it was the first year in seminary for these students, it was believed that a small support group would be helpful. Leadership was rotated within each group and general directions and goals were provided by the instructor. Control by the professor was minimal to allow each group to develop their own direction and processes.

The fifteen students, which included four women and eleven men, and the instructor sat in a circle rather than
Each session began with a short Bible study based on the day's topic. Other methodologies included general classroom discussion, discussion of particular portions of the text, guest lecturers, lectures by the instructor, writing exercises (such as profiles, values interventions and self-awareness exercises) on such topics as stress management, conflict resolution and temperament types.

Method of Selection

During Orientation and Registration Day, 67 students, registering as first time juniors, were administered the casebook portion of the Profiles of Ministry Stage I. When completed, each student was given a sealed copy of the Interview script, with instructions as to how to complete the interview and the deadline for returning the materials.

It was determined ahead of time to eliminate Profiles from students who registered for six credit hours or less, were auditing, cross-registered with other seminaries or special classifications.

Table 1

Summary of Fall Testing

51 - Useable Profiles
8 - Six credit hours or less
2 - Audit
3 - Dropped out
2 - Cross registration
1 - Special

67 - Total
Fifty-one completed Profiles were useable and became the pool for selection of class members (Group 1) and the control (Group 2). After reflecting on the smaller than expected number of useable Profiles, it was determined the groups should be fifteen in number. It had been hoped a year earlier that the groups would be thirty in size but the incoming pool of juniors turned out to be fewer than anticipated.

For selection into the class, the population of fifty-one persons was alphabetized and given a number from one to fifty-one. They were then selected using a table of random numbers. The first fifteen students were sent an invitation to enroll in the class. (see Appendix A) When a student response was negative, the next name in order was sent the same invitation until fifteen confirmations were received.

Using the same procedure, the control group of fifteen was selected from the remaining thirty-six students, sending an invitation letter until fifteen confirmations were received. (see Appendix B)

Adoption of the Test Instrument

The instrument chosen for the pretest and posttest was the Profiles of Ministry Stage I (hereafter referred to as POM-I) developed by the Association of Theological Schools. (Stage II is an exit instrument). There were several reasons for this decision. For one, the instrument provided scales directed toward characteristics of ministry that were
in accord with the objectives of this project. Secondly, the POM-I, begun in 1973 as the Readiness For Ministry program, is reliability and validity tested and continues to be evaluated (see Appendix C). Third, the ATS was willing to provide numerics necessary for the statistical analysis. And finally, it was an opportunity to test the instrument for possible use by NTS.

Report of the Data

In discussing the scales of POM-I, the abbreviations, which appear on the profile (see Appendix D) will be used rather than the lengthy titles. The reader is encouraged to refer to Appendix E for further definition and interpretation.

It had been thought that a sign test would be a logical approach in looking for statistically significant differences between the two groups. It was hypothesized that the experimental group would demonstrate a statistically significant higher score in at least one of the thirty two scales on the POM-I. Of particular interest was the set of scales labeled "Personal Characteristics" which was hypothesized to be the most affected by the course intervention. The complete results were as follows:
Table 2

SIGN TEST
2-tailed probability

"Personal Characteristics"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.4240</td>
<td>FIDL</td>
<td>.2668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>RESP</td>
<td>.2668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>LIMT</td>
<td>.0074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3877</td>
<td>FLEX</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.7744</td>
<td>ICAR</td>
<td>.3018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>PRCO</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.7266</td>
<td>FAML</td>
<td>.7539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2891</td>
<td>MNOF</td>
<td>.5078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.4240</td>
<td>PIET</td>
<td>.1185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.7905</td>
<td>PROV</td>
<td>.5811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5488</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>.1460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3018</td>
<td>PADV</td>
<td>.6072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>PRTC</td>
<td>.7744</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Perceptions of Ministry"

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.2891</td>
<td>DNOM</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>LITG</td>
<td>.4240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5811</td>
<td>EVAN C</td>
<td>.3877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>EVAN I</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.4240</td>
<td>GOAL</td>
<td>.6072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3018</td>
<td>CONG</td>
<td>.6072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.7905</td>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>.4240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5811</td>
<td>THCO</td>
<td>.1796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.6072</td>
<td>PLIT C</td>
<td>.7905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>PLIT I</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5811</td>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>.2266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.7744</td>
<td>OPEN</td>
<td>.1796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1796</td>
<td>SERV</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>YUTH</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.1185</td>
<td>OPRS</td>
<td>.4240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.0574</td>
<td>MISN</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.7266</td>
<td>MSBL</td>
<td>.5811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.4240</td>
<td>BLDG</td>
<td>.7744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.8511</td>
<td>CNFL</td>
<td>.1460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If we are looking for statistical significance at the $p = 0.05$ level, there is only one occurrence in this particular test. It appears for LIMT but for group 2; not the experimental group. Thus, based on the analysis performed, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

**Examination of Failure to Reject**

In reflecting on the research process, I began to wonder if maybe all the assumptions of a sign test could actually be met. As it turns out, one could say by having the right of refusal, the students actually "chose themselves." The only way it could properly be said the two groups were the same when they began, would be if they had been randomly sampled and *required* to take the course and in addition, all were *required* to take the posttest. Since this was not possible, it was determined to be more appropriate to use other kinds of measures.

If the two groups were not the same, how different were they? Could those differences account in some way for the lack of statistical significance? Did the process and characteristics of this course become important in these differences? In other words, what kind of persons tend to "select" themselves for such a course, having only the description in the invitation letter to go by. And what "types" of persons might not select themselves for such a course? With these thoughts in mind we looked at the data
again using a t-test of the group scores rather than individual scores and concentrated on the means ($\bar{X}$), standard deviations (SD) and probabilities (significance), of the pretest only.

What we are looking for in this discussion is the range of differences in mean, standard deviation and probability (significance) scores between group 1 and group 2 at the beginning of the project. The wider the differences, the more valid it will be to say that the two groups were not the same from the very start.
### Table 3

T-Test (Groups)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Char.</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIDL</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.46</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>43.60</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESP</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.40</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>30.26</td>
<td>7.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINT</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.40</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>37.26</td>
<td>6.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLEX</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.93</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>34.85</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.46</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>40.73</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRCO</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.13</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>34.33</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAML</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.80</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>41.36</td>
<td>7.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNOF</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.60</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>25.60</td>
<td>9.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIET</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>35.73</td>
<td>8.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROV</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.13</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>30.46</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.46</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>24.53</td>
<td>7.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PADV</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.93</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>27.46</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.40</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>22.93</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions Min.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DNOM</td>
<td></td>
<td>45.86</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>45.73</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITG</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.06</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVAN C</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>41.33</td>
<td>5.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVAN 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.33</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>8.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.06</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>29.66</td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONG</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.60</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>31.80</td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.86</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>32.66</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THCO</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.07</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>37.26</td>
<td>7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLIT C</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.86</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>31.73</td>
<td>6.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLIT I</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.80</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>15.60</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.93</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>27.60</td>
<td>6.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEN</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.46</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>31.46</td>
<td>8.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERV</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.66</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>36.80</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUTH</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.86</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>33.60</td>
<td>6.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPRS</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>29.26</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISN</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>39.20</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSBL</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.80</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>41.53</td>
<td>7.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLDG</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.40</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>34.40</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNFL</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.60</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>34.80</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the probabilities (significance column) were examined in Table 3, I assumed that a probability factor of .100 or lower could be viewed as of some statistical significance (p=.10). That is to say, at the .10 level, it could be stated that there is a 90% chance or better that the two groups were significantly different on that particular scale of the pretest. If this were so, it would provide possible evidence that one of the basic assumptions of significance testing (the two groups being the same), was violated.

It turns out that four such instances did occur. It will be noted that PIET had a probability of .039, SELF a probability of .087, PRTC scored .041 and OPRS posted a probability of .075. Two other scales were very close, PLIT C at .110 and PLIT I at .113.

When the means and standard deviations of the Group T-test were analyzed, the evidence for dissimilarity of the two groups seemed even more convincing. Under the category of "Personal Characteristics" (Table 3), it will be noted that RESP indicates a difference in the means (32.40, 30.26) and also a rather significant difference in the standard deviations (4.91, 7.59). This is also the case with FLEX ($\bar{X} = 31.93, 34.85$ and SD = 8.05, 6.04). Another variation seems to appear in PRCO, not so much in the $\bar{X}$ as the SD (5.84, 7.00). Again, a difference is noticed in FAML in
both the $\bar{X}$ (43.80, 41.36) and the SD (4.66, 7.28). A rather sharp difference thus far, and the SD is (6.34, 8.42).

And finally in this category, it is to be noted that two of the three "Potential Negative" scales indicate very interesting differences. In SELF, group 1 scored a $\bar{X}$ and SD of (29.46, 7.34), fairly high scores, while group 2 indicated a $\bar{X}$ and SD of (24.53, 7.88). Variability (SD) of the two groups seems fairly close but there is a difference in the mean scores of nearly five. In the scale of PRTC there is even more divergence. Group 1 scored a $\bar{X}$ and SD of (28.40, 8.21) while group 2 registered a $\bar{X}$ and SD of (22.93, 5.39). Again, these are rather surprising differences in both the mean scores and the standard deviations.

Further examination of the data for the category "Perceptions of Ministry" seemed to indicate a similar pattern of differences. Though the two groups were nearly the same on their $\bar{X}$ scores for EVAN I (29.33, 29.06) their SD scores were quite interesting, not only different but rather high (10.34, 8.38). Again we see the occurrence of differences in CONG where group 1 scored (30.60, 8.14) as compared to group 2's (31.80, 6.43). It is to be remembered this is how the two groups compared on the pretest, at the very beginning of the study.

It is in the group of scales titled "Social Justice Ministry" that divergence seems to appear quite clearly. For example, in PLIT C the scores are (35.86, 6.74) and
(31.73, 6.96), nearly the same in variability (SD), but different in \(\bar{X}\) scores by 4.13. In PLIT I, not only are the \(\bar{X}\) scores different (17.80, 15.60) but the SDs become further apart (4.22, 2.99). This is also true for CAUS where group 1 scored (24.93, 8.30) and group 2 (27.60, 6.63). And similarly for OPEN in which group 1 registered (33.46, 9.23) and group 2 (31.46, 8.40). This is the only set of sub-scales (Social Justice Ministry) in the POM-I in which \(\bar{X}\) scores and/or SD are different enough on every scale to raise some further questions about such variability between the two groups.

The scales grouped as "Community and Congregational Ministry" also yield some interesting variances. Under OPRS, group 1 scored a \(\bar{X}\) and SD of (33.00, 5.21) while group 2 was (29.26, 5.82), nearly the same in variability but almost four points different in mean scores. In BLDG, not only are the \(\bar{X}\) scores different (37.40, 34.40) but the SD also (4.62, 2.94). Finally, a striking difference is found in CNFL where the \(\bar{X}\) are (36.60, 34.80) nearly a 2 point difference and the SD are (4.13, 1.82)!

After such a survey we found that of 32 scales in the POM-I, Group 1 is different from Group 2 rather substantially either in \(\bar{X}\) scores or SD on 15 of those scales, nearly half. In every sub-set of scales, (e.g. "Responsible and Caring," "Family Perspective," etc.) at least one or more indicate the possibility of significant
differences between the groups. This becomes highly illustrated in the sub-set "Social Justice Ministry" where all the scales seem to display evidence of differences.

To further explore the possibility that the two groups might have been quite different from each other at the very start of the study, plot diagrams were generated displaying the pretest scores along the horizontal axis and posttest scores on the vertical axis. The number "1" indicates group 1 individual scores, as does number "2" for group 2 scores. The asterisk indicates multiple scores in that particular location but does not differentiate whether those scores are from group 1 or 2 or both, nor does it tell how many scores are plotted at that point. Though plots were done for all the scales only five will be discussed due to space but they should prove helpful in illustrating the point above.

It should be pointed out that our main interest centers on the spread of the scores for the pretest, which means paying particular attention to how the scores spread out from left to right and not so much from top to bottom of the chart. A plot chart provides a "visual" perspective in the search for differences between the two groups and can also help to pinpoint certain scores for further follow-up, as will be discussed later.
One of the first plots to catch our attention was PIET.

When it is realized that one of the major concerns in the intervention course (Minister As Person) was the spiritual development of the students, this chart is quite interesting. It can be seen that most scores cluster toward the upper right hand corner indicating high scores for the most part, in both pre and posttests. However, there are some scores that started out low on the pretest (compared to the others) and ended high on the posttest. They are all "2"s, all from the control group, located in the upper corner. As the researcher, it would have been better for my hypothesis if those would have been ones instead of twos!
Two charts from the "Potential Negative" grouping proved interesting. First was PADV.

The "2" scores seem to congregate toward the center of the chart, as one might expect with a SD of 3.94. The "1" scores are more scattered and seem to "guard" the perimeter of the chart, starting at the lower left, appearing across the top and down the right side. Group one shows quite a bit of difference here from group two.

The $\bar{x}$ and SD differences are more pronounced in the third chart, PRTC, and makes for an interesting pattern.
It seems that one might draw an oval toward the center of the cluster that would include virtually every "2" score, but not so with the "1"s. They again seem to have surrounded the center for the most part, with plots along the top, right side and bottom of the graph. Again, the two groups are quite different.

The chart, PLIT C from the "Social Justice Ministry" scale provided some interesting data for consideration.
What we notice in Figure 9 is the isolated group of "1" scores in the upper right hand corner. It is interesting to add here that for this scale, the sign tests indicated for both groups a majority went down in their scores, nine in group 1 and 8 with 1 tie in group 2.
The last chart for consideration is CNFL.

**CONFLICT UTILIZATION**

Notice the tightly clustered "2" scores in the center, except for the "stray" to the far left of the group. This is not surprising given a group 2 SD of 1.82, the most homogeneous of all their standard deviation scores. The "1" scores again are scattered. However we can see somewhat of a cluster in the upper right hand corner, indicating strong scores for this category. There are however two interesting isolates, one at the bottom and the other at the left edge. This is illustrative of the group 1 SD of 4.13. The difference between the two groups is quite pronounced in this chart.
What we have attempted to present is data from non-parametric measures that may indicate some important information that was not available by just using the paired t-test for statistical significance. What those possibilities might be will be discussed in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 4

Conclusion

Discussion

The sign test probability factors have been examined for statistical significance and none has been found. The t-test means, standard deviations, and possibilities of the pre-test between group 1 and group 2, were compared and it was here that we noticed fifteen of thirty-two scales to be quite different. It is to be remembered that we were examining data from the pretest, the very beginning of the project.

Further examination of the data, as shown in the plot charts, seemed to reinforce the possibility that the two groups were not alike when the project began and therefore one of the assumptions for statistical significance, and especially the paired t-test, was probably violated.

Given the data and observations reported, it seems reasonable to suspect that the experimental group (Group 1) was different from the control group in some interesting and possibly significant ways. For example, let it be assumed that a score of 34 or higher is a strong score and on the profile report forms would be indicated by an "x" in the "LIKELY" range or higher (to the right of the scale). Upon examination, Group 1 has ten of fifteen students who had at

[1] See appendix D.
least one or more scores in this range on the "Potentially Negative" sub-set of scales. In contrast, Group 2 had only two cases in which one or more scores were this high. Or to put it another way, Group 1 had 5 times as many high scores in the "Potentially Negative" scales as did Group 2.

One wonders why this sharp disparity. Did the students in Group 1 have felt needs in this category and saw a chance to "select" themselves into an environment that promised help? Did students in Group 2 not experience such felt needs and therefore did not choose to take the class? We do not know at this point. It does need to be said that many reasons are possible for students choosing not to take the course. Some possibilities might have been (1) not enough hours in their class load for an "elective" course, (2) since the class met in the afternoon, work schedules might have been a factor and/or (3) not enough information concerning the course.

Nevertheless, the preponderance of "Potentially Negative" characteristics for ministry found in Group 1 as compared to Group 2 certainly give cause for concern and for further investigation. It could point toward the necessity for further follow up with these students, such as interviews and discussions concerning their Profile scores.

See appendix E for interpretation of scales.
Possible follow up is also indicated from the plot charts. One is especially drawn to the isolate scores and in particular those scores that might indicate need for counseling and help in sorting out whatever issues might be present in the student's life as suggested by the Profile results.

For example, the plot for DNOM is illustrative of data that might raise questions for further follow up.

Noticeable are the two Group 1 isolate scores, one at the bottom right and the other at the top left corner. It would be interesting to know more about those two. What caused the lower student to score 46 in the pretest and drop to
around 34 in the posttest? It would seem to indicate a rather significant change in the student's perceived comfort level with his or her denomination. Why? What happened?

Likewise one could ask the same kinds of questions of the score to the top left. Why was there such a positive move in the score, from 34 to 48?

Another interesting plot chart is that of GOAL.

**PRECEDENCE OF EVANGELISTIC GOALS**

![Graph of GOAL](image)

Again, two isolates stand out, the "1" scores which are circled. The top one raises the question, what inspired this student to go from a fairly low score of 24 to a high of 38? And conversely, the other "1" score went from 16 to 20, both scores quite low. Is this score and others in the low range reflective of a shift in view in terms of
concentration on the congregation over efforts to better the world, as indicated in the definition? And when it is remembered that the Evangelical family of denominations, of which these students identify, considers this category "Somewhat Important" to "Somewhat Detrimental" in their ministers, then their cluster of scores to the right become quite interesting.' Is this a group of students preparing to minister in churches they think want them to concentrate on the congregation when these churches may not see it as so important at all? We don't know but it would seem worthy of further investigation.

The final plot to be considered in this discussion is that of LAW.

'See Appendix F for Denominational Family Preferences.
The same kinds of questions we have been working with up to now apply also to this scale. Of particular interest are the students who scored high on the pretest and dropped significantly on the posttest. Starting out with a law orientation to problem solving, what precipitated such a change? Follow up interviews might prove both interesting and helpful to the faculty and administration of NTS.

This particular study has pointed out the need for random sampling if one is to rely on statistical significance testing. Whereas we began thinking in those terms, it turned out that because of various factors
inherent in the school, true random sampling was not achieved. At this stage in a student’s academic career and age level, it would be difficult to force or require any student to enroll in an experimental course, especially when it does not "count" toward required courses. As we found out, one cannot even be sure of one hundred percent participation in the testing/selection process. Some students did not appear for the original administration of the POM-I and would not participate after a personal contact by the writer. In addition, some students who sat for the written portion of the POM-I later refused to turn in the cassette interview, though also contacted personally.

Furthermore, there were a number of students who delayed responding to the invitation letter to join the class and the invitation letter to take the posttest forming Group 2. These delays caused other students to be contacted on the list thus helping to disrupt the randomness of the process. This delay in response and refusal to participate was a surprise. It suggests some further investigation into the mind set and professional habits of students who have arrived at this level of education and maturity.

What causes a student to procrastinate an answer to a letter of invitation when it could be returned to the sender by walking twenty feet and putting it in a mail slot? Why do some students appear unable to grasp the necessity of responsibility in responding when others are depending on
their response? What caused the students, who took the written portion, to refuse to return the cassette interview? Why did students refuse to take the POM-I at all? Are they weary of being "tested?" Is it more difficult than they thought to face themselves and especially their approach to ministry? It is a challenging task in theological education to encourage and equip students to participate in self-reflection and evaluation. Many are the ministers who find such self-evaluation difficult and even impossible, and to that extent, cripple their ministries.

As one reflects on the standard deviations of Group 1, it seems to point to the possibility that they were much more variable and less homogeneous than Group 2. In some cases it may raise the question of classroom procedure and methodology. For example, were these changes precipitated by an environment in which the student was faced with major life and ministry issues such as stress, importance of family, role expectations, death and grief, relationships, increased self-awareness and life histories? Especially when that environment encouraged participation and sitting in a circle, there was no place to hide. Could it be that the posttest scores were lower in many cases because they were more honest or true and had been reflected upon and wrestled with, whereas the pretest scores were what they were "expected" to be? Again, we do not know without further investigation.
Possible Implications

1. NTS should consider the possibility of more extensive testing of incoming juniors and the feasibility of initiating the POM-Stage II exit instrument during the middler year.

   Given the vast amount of useful data generated by the initial use of POM-I, it would seem prudent to continue its use as the faculty and administration endeavor to prepare persons wholistically for ministry. It would call for faculty participation in initial feedback of the results and in follow up procedures.

2. From the data collected from POM-I, and comments of students in the class both informally and in their integrative papers, consideration needs to be given to other tests and profiles that would be helpful in furthering student self-understanding and providing the faculty with pertinent and helpful information for guidance and counseling. If this were done, faculty and administration themselves should consider taking whatever tests and profiles are requested of the students.

   Two profiles could be used immediately and with minimal cost. One is the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, an instrument already being used with success in two current NTS courses, Spiritual Formation and Church Administration. The MBTI has become a reliable and prominent instrument in many professional areas of concern. It is inexpensive, easy to
administrate and is a positive approach to self-understanding of temperament type. The educational and spiritual implications of the MBTI are being increasingly documented in research literature.‘

The second profile could be either the Taylor-Johnson, the FIRO-B, or a similar instrument. After the research and reading entailed in this project, it is more apparent than ever to me the immense importance of social and relational skills for success in the ministry. At present, NTS uses no instrument that would help students become aware of the extent of these skills in their lives.

3. The course "Minister As Person" or one like it, should continue to be taught. It would seem appropriate for students to encounter studies, the kinds of expectations persons have of their ministers, as presented in the POM-I. The course should be early in the student’s seminary career. This could help in self-awareness for ministry and to provide a baseline for further self-reflection and goal setting for the remainder of their academic career.

The integrative papers provided comments as to the effectiveness of the course as it applied to the students personally. One student commented:

From taking this course I really feel like I have gained a better understanding of my personal strengths and weaknesses. It is my goal to continue journaling and going through the course material in order to

‘For example, The Journal of Psychological Type, Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, Mississippi.
become a more faith-hardy, less stressed, and healthier person. I want to start incorporating self-care habits, stress reduction mechanisms, and conflict management techniques into my lifestyle. I am thankful for the person God made me and am sure that my weaknesses will make me better able to identify with the weaknesses of others. It is beautiful that according to God's order of things, "His strength is made perfect in my weakness."

Another student put it:

Minister As Person class has helped me to know that I am not a freak. That it is not just me who has some fears, some anxiety, some struggles that come to ministers. I am glad to have had the opportunity to be a part of this class. My grossly innocent eyes have been opened in a new way to what ministering is really like . . . .

One other response may be illustrative:

Actually, I have only begun to say all that has run through my head this semester. The discussions on roles brought much help to me. The discussions about death did me good as I still am dealing with the death of my parents in 1984. I have much to learn about dealing with stress and conflict. Thank God I now have a starting place for dealing with the issues that I avoided when I was pastoring. I found more proof about who I am, that I knew before, but had never had it pointed out so plainly. I found renewed interest in journaling although I am still dealing with being faithful to it. And I have been reminded that the ones to whom Christ has sent me, are persons just like me, with the same feelings and emotions, with many like characteristics. And all are reachable if I will insist on being me. The PERSON that God has made me into. That's what I want to be.

4. Studies should continue in examining the impact of various class methodologies and processes. The tests for statistical significance, whether paired t-tests or analysis of co-variance, ought not to be the only indicator of significance, if at all. Rather, as indicated by writers
such as Ronald Carver, more attention should be paid to the descriptive statistics when doing classroom research.\(^5\)

Also these studies should probably concentrate on what is possible in terms of replication in order to build a more sizable and convincing store of data. This study, for example, can only indicate possible directions at best since the group sizes were rather small compared to what is needed. And, being a field study, it would be difficult to replicate.

5. From the comments by the students, both informally and in their integrative papers, the possibility of examining the "hidden curriculum" of the seminary seems needful. One wonders what lies behind comments such as the following from four of the students.

(1) The support groups was an added dimension to this class. It brought several of us closer together. It was a good feeling to be able to share something we were dealing with. I especially appreciated the closeness felt between several of the people in my support group. The closeness made me feel like I was a part of something. Having left California and all those that I have known for years left a kind of void in my life. When I would feel a need to talk to someone it was easy to call or just to go over to a friends house and share. We would talk, and pray together as needed. Moving out here made that difficult. The phone calls would be expensive and lets face it you can’t drive over to 35th St. West in Lancaster, California in ten minutes. I miss that. Even when I was in San Diego going to Pt. Loma Nazarene College I could just get in the car and drive back to Lancaster in two to three hours. But being out here I can’t do that. So the support group became a great asset to me this semester. We would not only meet and

share with our group during our assigned meeting times, but we would stop in the hall and before or after classes and see how things were. There seemed to be a bond between us that was growing. It was also good to know that someone was praying for us as we went through the tough times in life.

(2) I have thoroughly enjoyed coming to this class. It has been a refreshing part of my day. From that I have learned that I need to take time to be reflective and quiet and still. My goal is to set aside a portion of time each day besides my devotion time to do some exercises like we’ve been doing in our class time....

I think the biggest thing I’ve learned from this class is that I need to concentrate on being, not doing. I need to take time to dream, play, and be crazy. I haven’t always been free to do these things but I plan to change that. I know that when we’ve taken time to do these things in class I have left feeling less of a burden on my shoulders. I want this to be a regular pattern.

(3) This class has not been like any I have previously experienced. It has been relaxing compared to the high anxiety that other classes involve. One thing that I like is that we were not so caught up in taking notes that we were unable to think about what was being discussed.

I have really appreciated the times of sharing that we have had in class. Though I have not always shared my thoughts, it has really been helpful to me the times that I have. When I had the time to share the good things that were happening in my life then I was filled with a sense of rejoicing. As I shared, it felt so real to me. This was even the case as we looked back at things in our childhood.

(4) The class Minister As Person avails the student of a wealth of resources in order to recognize and understand his place in God’s kingdom. It helps the student to arrive at attitudes which will help him not only to survive, but thrive in the ministry that person chooses. The instruments, speakers, small group, and books read in the course has effected my views about ministry and myself immeasurably. Below is just a sample of the changes, help, and thoughts which were
reframed and reaffirmed during the course of Minister As Person.

There are several questions that might be worthy of research. To what extent do student’s feel helped and encouraged toward completion of their programs by the faculty, administration and staff? What is the seminary’s "hidden curriculum" and how does it impact the students’ preparation for ministry? How strongly do students perceive the institution as operating in an adversarial role? These are just a few possibilities and certainly not exhaustive.

This study started out with the hypothesis: A classroom course can produce significant changes in student attitudes toward ministry which will be reflected in the difference in scores of a pretest and posttest using the Profiles of Ministry. The null hypothesis was not rejected and there were no indications of statistically significant changes for Group 1. However, as Carver points out, statistically significant changes can at times be "trivial" rather than significant.¹ If the group t-test means, standard deviations and probabilities, the plot charts, and the student responses are considered, then there seems reason to believe the research hypothesis can be accepted. Though more research is needed with larger numbers, there is no research reason at this point to reject the hypothesis. The study has produced an admirable amount of useable data for

¹Ibid., 397.
further reflection, study and implementation for the benefit of students attending Nazarene Theological Seminary. Group 1 had 5 times as many "high" scores in the "Potentially Negative" scales as did group 2.

I personally found the study gratifying in several respects. The POM-I provided a large amount of data which can prove useful in assisting students toward their ministry goals. The study also made me more keenly aware of stresses and problematic situations that students bring with them to the seminary experience. And finally, as a faculty person, I see in a new perspective, the responsibility the seminary has to create an environment of growth toward wholeness for its students. It is hoped that this effort will encourage further study of how the seminary can best prepare persons wholistically for Christian ministry.
Appendix A

INVITATION LETTER
October 27, 1988

Dear Paul:

You have been selected for an invitation to enroll this Spring in the course "Minister As Person". As you will probably recall, this is part of a year-long doctoral study of how NTS can better prepare students for ministry, which began with the taking of "Profiles of Ministry".

The course, which will meet Period VI, is designed to investigate the impact of a life of ministry, with its pressures and challenges, upon the minister and his/her family. It attempts to address two questions: "What are the effects of ministerial stress on the whole person" and, "How can I not only survive, but thrive, in ministry?" There will be direct application to your present situation as a seminary student.

Since enrollment is limited and by invitation only, we need to know as soon as possible if you plan to pre-enroll in the course. Please check at the bottom and put back in my box as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

E. Dee Freeborn

EDF/so

☐ Yes, I plan to pre-enroll in the course.
☐ No, I will not be taking the course.

P.S. Just to be sure, we have mailed a copy to you and put one in your box.
Appendix B

POSTTEST LETTER
May 2, 1989

Dear William:

You have been selected to participate in the final phase of our study of this Fall's in-coming junior class. You may recall last September when everyone was taking the Profiles of Ministry. I mentioned some would be chosen to take the Profile again the Spring. Participants will have 7-10 days to complete and return the Profile after we put them in the mail boxes. Taped interviews will be by appointment here on campus so students won't have to try to find someone to give it to them.

We are excited about the potential impact of this study on the improvement of curriculum and services to students as they prepare for ministry. YOUR participation is vital and we hope you will help in this effort.

Please indicate your response at the bottom of this letter and put back in my box today, (if not yesterday !!!) We will then get back in touch with you, and thanks!!

With Appreciation,

Prof. Freeborn

[ ] YES, I will participate.  [ ] NO

P.S. We mailed one to your home just in case!
Appendix C

THE PROFILES OF MINISTRY PROGRAM
and
FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS
Profiles of Ministry (POM) is a program of clergy assessment begun in 1973 as the Readiness for Ministry program. It was developed at the request of the Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada (ATS), which maintains program ownership and management. This chapter summarizes the program and describes its resources and instruments both in terms of their developmental history and present characteristics. Profiles of Ministry includes: (1) an extensive, empirically derived summary of criteria; (2) assessment instruments for entering seminary students, and necessary interpretive resources for evaluating student scores (POM Stage 1); and (3) a group of instruments for graduating seminary students and career ministers, along with interpretative resources appropriate for these individuals (POM Stage 2).

TWO QUESTIONS FOR CLERGY ASSESSMENT

The information and resources that are part of the Profiles of Ministry program reflect an on-going response to two fundamental questions regarding clergy assessment: "What should be assessed?" and "How should the assessment be made?" While these are simple questions, they can require surprisingly complex answers—at least in the context of clergy assessment.

The first question forces the investigator to determine which criteria are important, even crucial, for the practice of ministry. The difficulty in defining meaningful criteria sometimes contributes to a reductionistic error. Since measurement is most reliably made by discrete, univariate scales, the criteria are sometimes artificially reduced to measurable proportions. The result can be good measurement of criteria that are so limited in their focus that the resulting assessment still provides little valuable information about an individual's practice of ministry.

The second question points to the need to determine effective methods of measurement that are congruent with the content of the criteria to be assessed. It requires both empirical and theological sensitivities, and the response to this question sometimes leads to an obscurantist error. Since the criteria are both many and complex, it can be argued that methods do not exist to assess them reliably. The result of this reasoning can be that a good perception of important criteria is obscured by subjective and idiosyncratic assessment approaches.

1This section is a chapter from R. Hunt, J. Hinkle and N. Malony (Eds). Advances in Clergy Assessment (Nashville: Abingdon Press) 1989. This is a prepublication copy. Advances also has chapters on assessment for personal variables, psychological evaluation, assessment of motivations for ministry as well as theoretical articles on the value and proper role of assessment for clergy.
Profiles of Ministry can best be described by the responses it has made to these questions. The two major research agenda in the POM program have involved: (1) the identification of criteria and determination of importance assigned to them; and (2) the development and subsequent revision of assessment instruments to measure important criterion characteristics.

DEFINING CRITERIA FOR CLERGY ASSESSMENT

The process of identifying appropriate criteria may be the most distinctive feature of the Profiles of Ministry program. The beginning of the program involved an extensive, interactive search to define criterion areas and to assess the degree of importance assigned to each. As the research began, two major assumptions were made about areas of exploration and the proper use of criteria identified by the process.

It was first of all considered important to address the theological and theoretical concerns of ministry, in addition to psychological and professional skill concerns. This assumption was alluded to in the first major report of the early research to ATS:

From the beginning of the project's design, the research team has been sensitive to this danger of reducing ministry to its human dimension, of highlighting sociological and psychological issues while slighting the more elusive theological dimensions. Therefore, while deliberately pressing to describe the work of the ministry as concretely and specifically as possible, we eagerly invited biblical, theological, and historical input to assure the description of contemporary ministries that would stand the test of theological critique (Schuller, Strommen, Brekke, 1975, pp. 1-2).

The second major assumption was to identify significant criteria while avoiding an imposed prescription of what constituted "good" ministry. Since ATS member schools relate to no fewer than 49 different denominations; and, since these denominations differ with each other in their perceptions of desirable and detrimental ministry practice; the criterion identification phase sought to provide descriptive information about criteria. Individual church bodies or seminaries would thus have a resource—a vocabulary or taxonomy of criteria—which they could use for more prescriptive concepts of ministry. The introduction to the initial program of criteria and assessment instruments states:

"Best practice grows from one's theology and faith stance. Since this will vary among schools and their denominational constituencies, the definition of the best pastoral approach in a given situation must be made by them" (Schuller, Brekke, Strommen and Aleshine, 1976).

In terms of the introductory question concerning what should be assessed, POM decided early that it would attempt to define characteristics in an inclusive and non-reductionist perspective. It sought to identify the theological, psychological, spiritual and professional skill criteria that could provide both an inclusive perspective of ministry and multiple characteristics for assessment. It also attempted to avoid the
determinations which translate descriptive information about ministry practice into prescriptive definitions of positive and negative ministry.

The process of identifying and monitoring criteria can be divided into two major research efforts. The first was the most extensive, and involved two years of work in the early 1970's. It involved a rather comprehensive research approach, and attempted to reflect the major assumptions noted above. The second effort was conducted in the late 1980's, and involved the readministration of the criterion survey originally administered in 1974. This second survey study was designed primarily to assess possible changes in the ratings of importance in criteria.

The 1973-1974 Research to Identify Criterion Characteristics

Given the range of concerns and issues underlying the research, it was hypothesized that criteria could best be identified through a major survey of constituencies related to ATS member schools. This phase of research included the development and administration of a survey of laity and clergy which requested respondents to rate a variety of behaviors, attitudes, and sensitivities in terms of their importance for the practice of ministry.

Initial survey development. Since the survey was to be the primary means by which criteria would be determined, the procedure for its development was gradual, inclusive and deliberate. An initial pool of candidate items was generated from two sources: the existing literature on ministry and a rather extensive process of evaluating accounts of critical incidents in ministry practice (Schuller, Strommen and Brekke, 1980, p. 14ff). A total of 2000 potential items were identified from these sources.

The 2000 items were evaluated, edited, and reduced to a set of 834 that were used in a field test version of the survey. This preliminary version was completed by over 2,000 clergy and laity who were drawn from one of five evaluator groups: seminary professors, seminary seniors, alumni/a, denominational executives, and laity. The resulting data were used to test the analytic strategies intended for the final survey data and to revise the survey into its final form (Brekke, in Schuller, Strommen and Brekke, 1980, pp.529-537).

1974 Survey Sample and Administration. The revised version of the criterion identification instrument consisted of 440 items, each a statement of a ministry behavior, attitude, skill or sensitivity. The sample was drawn using a stratified random stage sampling procedure in which: (1) ATS member schools were drawn, (2) who then randomly selected faculty, seniors and recent alumni/a according to sampling instructions for each group; and finally (3) the alumni/a were given instructions for sampling members of the congregations or persons served in the ministry settings where the alumnus/a was working. Denominational executives were drawn into the sample by a separate process. A total of 5,169 people responded to the survey, representing 45% of the number drawn into the sample. This response rate was not as high as desirable, but for several reasons, multiple stage samples may not yield the same response rate as single stage samples (Brekke, in Schuller, Strommen and Brekke, 1975,
Analysis and Findings of the 1974 Survey. The first, and most crucial, analytic task was the identification of criteria. Once criteria were empirically identified, subsequent analyses explored the variations in ratings of importance assigned the criteria by laity and clergy respondents across the various denominational families. Criterion characteristics were derived from a series of factor and cluster analyses, performed separately on laity and clergy responses. These analyses resulted in the identification of 64 criterion characteristics. The most highly rated characteristic consists of the following items: "Serves others willingly with or without public acclaim;" "Recognizes own emotional and physical limitations;" "Laughs easily even at self;" and "Believes the gospel she/he preaches." As this characteristic illustrates, criteria are comprised of empirically derived sets of survey items. They convey a logic of perception about either persons who minister or the nature of ministry, and reflect the variety of theological, psychological, spiritual and professional criteria the project had hoped to identify.

As the POM program has emerged over time, the focus has been on 36 criterion characteristics for which assessment scales have been developed. These scales (as distinguished from the criteria themselves) have been factored, and a structure suggested by the factor analysis of students' scores on assessment scales has provided a pattern for grouping the criterion characteristics (Aleshire, 1985).

The ratings of importance of the characteristics obtained in the 1974 survey were derived from the responses of the entire ecumenical sample. The data were weighted so that each denominational family had equal voice, as did laity and clergy. The data indicate a significant overall variation across North American denominational families on virtually every criterion characteristic. Laity and clergy were observed to agree with each other on some areas but not others. Laity tended to ascribe less importance than clergy to criteria like "Aggressive Political Leadership" and "Support of Unpopular Causes." Clergy rated criteria like "Clarity of Thought and Communication" more highly than laity (Strommen, in Schuller, Strommen and Brekke, 1980, pp. 70-79).

The various analyses to identify sources of variance in these data did not provide much helpful information. For most criterion areas, denominational and laity/clergy differences accounted for virtually all of the variance that was accounted for. Exploring the variance in terms of ministry context raters had in mind, the region of country in which they lived, their gender, their level of education, frequency of church attendance, the size of the parish they attended, their age, or their income yielded little additional explanation about the variance (Aleshire, Chapter 4, in Schuller, Strommen and Brekke, 1980).

The 1987 Criterion Survey

As the program of assessment was used through the late 1970's and the early 1980's, the question was increasingly being raised about the possible datedness of the criterion ratings. In response to this question, a
version of the criterion rating survey was readministered in 1987. This
more recent version was shorter, and included those items that comprised
criteria measured by the various POM instruments, and a few newly composed
items.

Survey Administration. The method for the survey readministration
paralleled the sampling frame and administration procedures employed in
1974, in an attempt to replicate the earlier study. The respondents
represented the same five evaluator groups (seminary professors, seminary
seniors, alumni/a, laity and denominational executives); and the sampling
frame involved the same staging sequence, using virtually the same
protocols for drawing school and congregational samples. The 1987 survey
drew a sample of 5,776 individuals, of whom 2607 returned answer sheets.
This represents a 45% rate of response, almost identical to the 1974
survey.

Analysis and Findings. The data were analyzed in ways to provide
answers for four questions: (1) How stable are the criteria themselves? (2)
How have ratings of importance of criteria changed from 1974 to 1987? (3)
How do denominational families vary in their ratings of criteria? and (4)
What new criterion areas appear to be a part of thinking about ministry in
the late 1980's?

To explore the issue of stability, each criterion characteristic was
evaluated in terms of its internal consistency reliability and the
replicability of the factor structure that led to the initial
identification of criteria. Preliminary analyses suggested: (1) that the
factor structure of items was relatively stable across the two survey
administrations, and (2) that the criteria defined as sets of individual
items in 1974 could be reliably defined by the same item sets in the 1987
data.

The most consistent finding about the ratings of importance was that
little change was evident between the 1974 and 1987 ratings. The criterion
rating scales have a range of 1.00 to 7.00; and of 36 criteria surveyed in
both studies, 20 had variations from 1974 to 1987 of less than 0.10. Of
the 15 that varied by more than 0.10, none varied by more than 0.24. In
effect, the greatest change in score reflected less than 5% of the logical
scale range, and most criterion scales varied by less than 2% of the
logical scale range. Two different samples, drawn from the same
population, separated in time by thirteen years, typically differ from each
other in their ratings of these criterion characteristics by 0.10 of a
point. These criteria appear not to be trendy, time-bound perceptions of
ministry. They point to enduring perceptions of ministers/priests and of
ministry itself.

When responses were compared by clergy/laity status, and by
denominational family, the findings approximated the same patterns of
variance that occurred in the 1974 data (Strommen, in Schuller, Strommen
and Brekke, 1980, pp. 79-87). A notable difference in the 1987 data was
the greater degree of agreement between clergy and laity and among
denominational families. The variance in the 1987 responses suggests that
North American denominations have considerable agreement about personal
characteristics judged negatively, some agreement about personal
characteristics judged important for ministry, and minimal agreement about the importance of different approaches to ministry. Agreement on criteria that define the kind of person doing ministry is more evident than agreement about the tasks of ministry that person should be doing.

Finally, the 1987 survey included over 40 new items which were thought to relate to emphases that have emerged since the early 1970's which currently influence perception of ministry. Seven criterion areas were identified from these items, and deal with issues such as women and the church, peace and justice issues, and moral-political concerns such as abortion.

Summary

This lengthy discussion of the process of criterion identification underscores the importance ascribed to the definition and monitoring of criteria in the POM program. The research reflects the position that a characteristic becomes a criterion characteristic when (1) it reflects an empirically derived structure--suggesting a common image among denominational constituencies; (2) it is rated as important or detrimental to ministry--suggesting that it deals with something crucial to the understanding and practice of ministry; and (3) it has a biblical and theological basis, in addition to its empirical one.

PROFILES OF MINISTRY ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS

The POM assessment resources exist in two stages. The first includes instruments and interpretative resources for entering seminary students, and the second includes instruments and interpretative resources for graduating seminarians or ministers/priests in practice. The most unique feature of these assessment instruments is their criterion referencing.

Criterion Referencing

The POM clergy assessment resources have been developed as criterion-referenced instruments. Their intent is to focus a student's or minister's attention to the criteria that have been rated as important or detrimental to ministry. The POM profile of scores presents no average scores; and while it is derived from numerical scores, it does not emphasize them. These assessment instruments report the degree of evidence or likelihood with which an individual exhibits some attitude, sensitivity or skill in ministry. Then, the individual is referred to the relative importance ascribed to each criterion characteristic. By contrast, most instruments are referenced to some comparison group. An individual's numeric score is typically compared to the average score of some defined group. The individual is able to interpret his or her score by noting whether it is higher, lower, or the same as the average score of the group. POM instruments are not designed this way.

This criterion referencing feature creates a different interpretive frame. Instead of statements like: "I am higher than average on 'Fidelity to Tasks and Persons';" the POM instrumentation leads to statements like: "I am very likely to exhibit 'Fidelity to Tasks and Persons' (determined
from assessment instruments) and this criterion characteristic is considered highly important (determined from the criterion characteristics survey)." The results may confront an individual by suggesting that he/she is unlikely to do something considered absolutely essential; or very likely to minister in a way judged to be detrimental. The individual is referenced not to a group of peers but to a best estimate of the criteria that exist in the context of ministry. While the instruments do not reflect all that is sometimes assumed by criterion-referenced instruments, they represent an intentional effort to provide assessment instrumentation anchored to criteria judged important to the practice of ministry (Brekke, 1984).

PROFILES OF MINISTRY--STAGE I

Assessment for Entering Students. Profiles of Ministry uses two instruments for assessment with entering students. The first is the Casebook (Brekke, Schuller, Williams, Aleshire, 1986). It consists of 24 brief cases which present some problem, issue or circumstance that calls for some ministry response. The case is followed by questions which, in one way or another, ask respondents what they think they would do, and what rationale undergirds their choice of action. The focus questions are followed by statements which reflect various options and reasons. Students are requested to respond to each statement in terms of how likely or unlikely they would be to act or think in the manner described by the statement. All total, an individual responds to 484 of these statements related to the focus questions for the 24 cases. Casebook items are combined into scales, producing scores for 22 different criterion characteristics. The second assessment tool is the Interview (Brekke and Williams, 1986). This instrument consists of a series of questions which are both asked and responded to orally. The interviewer is required to abide by scripted questions during the assessment phase of the interview, and to tape record the responses. These responses are later scored by trained coders according to established decision rules. The interview provides scores for nine ministry characteristics. Altogether, Stage I of the Profiles assessment program measures 29 different characteristics.

The Stage I Profile and Interpretative Manual. A computer-generated profile summarizes the scores from both instruments. The Profile groups scores into two broad categories, reflecting the structure of scores suggested by factor analytic studies of several years of student responses (Aleshire, 1985).

The left side of the profile reports scores which relate to personal characteristics. These are not so much personality or psychological characteristics, as they are ways in which personal tendencies manifest themselves in ministry practice. For example, FIDL is the abbreviation for a scale measuring "Fidelity to Tasks and Persons," and FLEX for "Flexibility of Spirit." While these are not personality traits, they do identify areas where personal tendencies to keep commitments, care for others, act responsibly, make adjustments as necessary, and exhibit flexibility can influence one's practice of ministry. The left side also includes scores related to the individual's perceptions of faith and family. The final group of scores on this side of the profile provide indicators about the presence or absence of characteristics that have been

The right side of the profile reports scores related to the individual's perceptions of ministry, as grouped by a fourfold pattern. Each of these groups of scores reflects a particular vision or perception of ministry. For some, the focus of ministry efforts is on converting people to Christian faith; while for others, the focus is more directly related to changing social structures according to a Christian understanding of justice. Other perceptions of ministry focus on ecclesial life, and ministry as effective service to the community and the people of a congregation. Since the instruments do not force respondents to choose one over the other, variations in scores can be helpful indicators of the vision of ministry a student would seek to implement in ministry practice.

The profile is interpreted with the use of the Interpretative Manual (Aleshire, Brekke and Williams, 1988). It includes introductory material about the Profiles of Ministry program, instructions for reading the profile, and a careful description of the meaning of each of the scales. The manual also suggests ways in which combinations of scores characterize approaches or attitudes about ministry. Following some of the original assumptions of this program of clergy assessment, the manual tries to avoid prescriptive definitions of "good" and "bad" ministry. Rather, it provides necessary resources for the individual, hopefully with the help of an interpreter, to evaluate his or her own perceptions of ministry and construct a prescription for good ministry practice that is reflective of the practice and theology of the student's own tradition.

Uses of Scores. POM Stage I scores have been used in several ways. The most frequent usage pattern involves individual or group interpretation sessions with entering seminary students. Students have an opportunity seriously to evaluate themselves in the context of ministry. The practice of ministry has been an abstract goal for many first year students, and the POM assessment approach confronts them with very concrete realities. A profile of an entire entering class can help seminary faculty assess the ministry perceptions and sensitivities which class members bring to their seminary studies. POM scores and interpretive resources provide the occasion not only for disciplined discourse about the practice of ministry, but also some evaluation of attitudes, tendencies or sensitivities in students that should either be reinforced or changed during seminary study.

PROFILES OF MINISTRY--STAGE II

Assessment Instruments. Stage II assessment involves the use of three instruments: the Casebook, (Brecke, Williams, Schuller and Aleshire, 1988) the Interview, (Brecke and Williams, 1986) and the Field Observation Form (Aleshire, Brekke, Schuller, 1988). The interview for Stage II is identical to the one administered in Stage I. The other two instruments, however, are different. The Casebook includes some of the cases and response possibilities that are used in the Stage I instrument, but it uses several different cases and measures several different characteristics. The Stage II Casebook has a total of 23 cases with 529 items to which the
individual responds. The Casebook for Stage II, like Stage I, includes cases identifying some problem or issue in ministry, followed by several focus questions, which are then followed by statements describing possible actions and reasons for those actions. It provides scores for 23 different criterion characteristics.

The Field Observation Form is unique to Stage II assessment, and is entirely different from the other two instruments. It is completed by persons who have had opportunity to observe an individual function in some ministry setting. The observer rates the student or minister on 116 statements such as: "In leading worship, helps people to experience a sense of God's presence," "Evidences a clear vision of what spirituality involves," and "Involves lay people in making decisions about the long-term future of the congregation." Observers rate individuals in terms of how likely or unlikely they think the individual would be to exhibit the kinds of attitudes or behaviors described by the items. The ratings for items are grouped into 15 different scale scores. The scoring process allows for as many as 5 observers to rate the individual, and these multiple ratings are then averaged together for the score reported in the profile.

The three instruments used for Stage II assessment provide a rather comprehensive measurement package. They reflect variety in measurement strategy: one is a paper and pencil, closed-ended, self-administered instrument; another is a structured interview which elicits open-ended responses that can be coded and reported as scores; and another instrument that asks observers to rate the student or clergy. They provide comprehensive assessment: measuring a total of 41 different characteristics of considerable importance in the practice of ministry. They are capable of use with a variety of individuals: they have been designed so that both graduating students and in-career ministers/priests can obtain meaningful information about perceptions of and characteristic approaches toward the practice of ministry.

Profile and Interpretative Resources. The Stage II profile is designed in basically the same way as the Stage I profile, but because so many additional characteristics are assessed in Stage II, a two page profile is required. The first page includes scores related to personal characteristics—both those valued as positive and necessary and those seen as potentially negative. The second page reports scores related to perceptions of ministry. The ministry perception scores are grouped into the four categories that are used in the Stage I profile. An Interpretative Manual provides an introduction to the Profiles of Ministry program, instructions for reading the profile, and separate descriptions for each of the 43 scale scores. The manual describes the differences between the three instruments used for Stage II assessment, and how scores generated by each are best interpreted.
Uses of Scores. Stage II is designed so that it can be used either with seminary students preparing for graduation or ministers/priests already in ministry. The results provide an extensive summary of attitudes and behaviors related to ministry practice. They provide the occasion for serious reflection about individual commitments in the context of congregational and churchly expectations. They can help individuals assess: likely areas of tension, appropriate areas for personal and professional growth, and areas of strength. The nature and number of scores provide the opportunity for a comprehensive and synthetic evaluation of an individual's practice of ministry.
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PROFILES OF MINISTRY:
FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS

Based on Analyses of the 1987 Survey of Expectations
and Students' Scores on Assessment Instruments,
1984-1987

This summary serves as a brief, initial answer to the question: "What have we learned from our research and analyses to date about contemporary perceptions of ministry?" Between 1984 and 1988, research has been conducted which has led to: (1) the revision of assessment instruments for entering students; (2) the re-administration of a Survey of Expectations of Ministers; and (3) the revision of assessment instruments for exiting students. Each of these three areas of research contributes to the answer of our basic question. The following statements draw most heavily from the analysis (still in process) of the 1987 Survey of Ministerial Expectations. They are informed at several points, however, by the analysis of entering and exiting student scores on scales that are part of the Profiles of Ministry Assessment program.

1. Fundamental patterns of ministerial expectations persist over time even while popular styles and other manifestations of cultural shifts suggest that significant changes have occurred. A submarine moves through waters governed by different forces from those that control the surface. A danger for theological educators is to focus exclusive attention on societal changes and needs of churches seeking to respond to cultural shifts but fail to appreciate the continuities that persist over time.

Our analysis of 35 ministerial characteristics--composed of 266 items and surveyed in 1973 and 1987--demonstrates a remarkable consistency in responses between the two periods of time. On a seven-point scale, well over half of the characteristics differed by less than one-tenth of a point; in only three cases did people's evaluations of characteristics change by as much as one-fifth of a point. Each of these three changes report an increasing conservatism: more importance ascribed to religious piety and more harsh judgment of self-serving characteristics in a minister. Though the researchers had expected the patterns of expectations to remain relatively constant, they had not expected them to remain as stable as these data convey. The first finding is, therefore, that expectations of beginning ministers on characteristics related both to the person and role of the minister have changed very little between the early seventies and the late eighties.

2. A major set of expectations concern the person of the minister. A preliminary study of the scores of over 5,000 students in the Readiness for Ministry Programs corroborated our earlier findings that many of the major ministerial expectations concern the person of the minister. When student scores were analyzed, the scales could be grouped into two large categories. One describing personal qualities of the minister and the other describing four orientations to ministry. Laity and clergy, across denominations, demonstrate some of their greatest agreement about ministers in their ratings of these various personal qualities.
Some theologians express concern about a focus on the person of the minister, fearing a confusion of popularity with faithfulness or a substitution of cultural expectations for biblical imperatives. The data dispelled such concerns. The valuations or judgments that the people of God make concerning spiritual leaders reflect fundamental issues; they blend biblical remembrance with a sense of contemporary needs in Western society. At its heart people ask for an ordained leader who is more than a religious functionary or one who has received a theological degree; they are looking for someone who personally has experience with God and is able to act in love toward others.

3. Characterological expectations related to issues of responsibility and caring remain important and consistent. Ranking high in both the 1973 and 1987 surveys are characteristics related to (a) Fidelity to Tasks and Persons - showing competence and responsibility by completing tasks, relating warmly to persons, and handling differences of opinion without attacking others; (b) Personal Responsibility - maintaining integrity and honoring commitments by carrying out promises despite pressures to compromise; and (c) Acknowledgement of Limitations - acknowledging mistakes, personal limits of knowledge or competence, and recognizing the need for continued growth and learning. Laity and ministers alike thus confirmed their conviction that ministry cannot be carried out apart from the influence of the personal characteristics individual ministers embody. They form a filter through which the words and actions of ministry are perceived.

4. Judgments regarding negative personal characteristics have intensified during the recent period. Four characteristics perceived as detrimental to ministry were examined in the two surveys. All four were viewed more negatively in 1987, and three of these four registered the greatest degree of change in ratings for any of the characteristics. In decreasing order of concern, the following were perceived as the greatest hindrances to ministry: (a) Self-Serving Behavior - avoiding intimacy and repelling people by a critical, demeaning, and insensitive attitude; (b) Self-Protecting Behavior - being cold and impersonal, worrying excessively about what others think of him/her, rejecting criticism as disrespect for the ministerial office; and (c) Pursuit of Personal Advantage - reflecting personal insecurity expressed in grandiose ideas and manipulative efforts to gain personal advantage.

To what degree this more severe judgment regarding self-seeking and manipulation reflects the immediate period in which the second survey was completed we cannot answer. The study did coincide with the period in which the moral failings of some television evangelists were being highly publicized.

5. Four primary orientations to ministry—differing goals or objectives of ministry—emerge from the analysis. The analysis of student scores sharpened a set of orientations to ministry that began to emerge from our earlier research. The analysis identified four different visions or
purposes for ministry, namely: ecclesial ministry, conversionist ministry, social justice ministry, and community and congregational ministry. Interestingly this analysis of ministry reflects to a remarkable degree the four goals of congregational mission discerned by Roozen, McKinney and Carroll in their study of churches in Hartford, described in Varieties of Religious Presence. In each case it appears that one theme is dominant in one's orientation even while elements of the others may be present as well. We shall briefly examine the characteristics related to each of the ministry orientations that people judged to be most important.

6. **The primary focus of ecclesial ministry is on the church—gathered for worship of God and preaching—as the context for relating faith to modern life.** Ranking of highest importance is a characteristic described as Theocentric-Biblical Ministry, which involves leading worship so it is seen as focusing on God, and using biblical insights to aid people in their daily lives. This combines with concern for clarity of thought and communication, demonstrated in a thoughtful and reflective interpretation of the faith by a minister who balances thinking and doing. Closely related is a characteristic that describes a minister's ability to relate faith to contemporary life. Its highest ranked element: "Presents the Gospel in terms understandable to the modern mind."

7. **Those who perceive a conversionist ministry as primary emphasize the precedence of evangelistic goals.** The primary mission of the church, this second orientation holds, is to share the Gospel so that people might come to a saving relationship through Jesus Christ. It perceives sin in clear terms, calls for individual repentance, and encourages people to use the resources of the Scriptures and prayer to deal with the crisis of daily life. While laity and clergy in a given church body tend to value these elements of ministry in a similar fashion, great variations exist from conservative to liberal denominations.

8. **A social justice ministry represents a third perception of the basic mission of the church.** As with the conversionist orientation, the responses of laity and clergy to the elements which empirically composed this approach differ sharply on the basis of ecclesiological stance. The primary mission of the church is perceived as the creation of a more just and humane society by addressing the unjust structures of the world with the redemptive claims of the Gospel. The strategies for this approach include aggressive political action—organizing groups, pressuring public officials, speaking from the pulpit about political issues—and the support of unpopular causes. This orientation to ministry emphasizes justice and works on behalf of oppressed groups and persons.

9. **Representing a centrist position, the final orientation describes ministry addressed to community and congregation.** While the posture of the social justice ministry is set in opposition to the dominant economic and political structures of society, in this orientation ministry is comfortable with the basic structures of society and is willing to work
within them. Ministry is to provide the events and services that will nurture the life of the congregation and provide the surrounding community with the services it needs. Thus the key ingredients describe the active nurturing of a sense of community within the congregation; the sharing of congregational leadership with laity, regardless of sex; understanding conflict and using it to air differences while stressing concern; and extending pastoral service to all people with needs.

10. While denominations tend to agree on basic characterological issues related to ministry, church bodies vary greatly regarding orientations to, or objectives of, ministry. There is broad consensus among denominations as to personal qualities of the person who will serve in ministry. Thus on characteristics such as Fidelity to Tasks and Persons, and Flexibility of Spirit or Self-Protecting Behavior, no differences appear as a function of denominational affiliation or lay/clergy status. However, the goal or purpose of ministry - as described in the four orientations - attracts great differences among denominational families. Thus denominations which ranked high on the precedence of evangelistic goals and assertive evangelism contrasted sharply with those who ranked Aggressive Political Leadership and Active Concern for the Oppressed as important elements of ministry.

In moving from the role of conversionist emphasis to that of social justice the denominational families typically arrayed themselves in the following fashion:

High Conversionist: Christian (Non-Disciple), Southern Baptist, Evangelical B (Church of God, Nazarene, Evangelical Covenant), Evangelical A (Baptist General Conference, Conservative Baptist Association, Evangelical Free Church)

Middle: American and Canadian Baptist, Disciples, Lutheran, Presbyterian/Reformed

High Social Action: United Church of Canada, United Church of Christ, Free churches, United Methodist, Roman Catholic, Anglican/Episcopal

11. The sharp dichotomy present on the North American religious scene is demonstrated in a new characteristic that assesses public advocacy and issues such as abortion, homosexuality, and the teaching of Christian values in public schools. In 1974 a simple "This Worldly" "Other Worldly" dichotomy characterized churches in North America. The former group approached the world as an important arena for religiously motivated service and action. The latter group tended to see the present world as evil, and thus used its energy to save people through the
preaching of the Gospel. Social involvement was restricted to liberal churches that sought to establish God's Kingdom on earth in the form of a more just social order. In the interim conservative churches have entered the public arena in behalf of religious and moral issues they deem of great significance.

David S. Schuller
Daniel O. Aleshire

June, 1988
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PROFILES OF MINISTRY

The Program

The information in this manual and your profile of scores is part of the Profiles of Ministry Program of the Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada. The program is a revision of the Readiness for Ministry program which began in the early 1970's and addressed questions such as: What are the characteristics and abilities most needed for competent expressions of ministry? What sensitivities, characteristic approaches and concepts of ministry are considered most important? What evidences of these characteristics are present in seminary students as they enter their theological training?

The profile of scores which you receive reflects measurement on a variety of issues—including your personal approach to personal faith. All of these are important components in the practice of ministry.

This Interpretive Manual provides the information necessary to interpret the scores on your profile.

Foundational Issues

There are several foundational issues which have guided this program of research and assessment.

Seminary training does not equip ministers with everything that they will ever need to minister effectively. The most one should expect of good theological education is that it will foster the skills, knowledge, and sensitivities necessary to begin ministry, and enhance the capacity to acquire new knowledge and other skills as they become necessary. Profiles of Ministry involves both of these. The profile gives indications of concepts, intentions, approaches, concerns, beliefs, attitudes, and skills which comprise the gifts you bring to your ministry. It will also indicate areas where future growth and change may be desirable.

The theological concepts of ministry from which Profiles of Ministry instrumentation has emerged is interactive. On the one hand, the judgments of people who receive ministry and the expectations they hold of ministers have been taken seriously. On the other hand, ministry has never been assumed to be a consumer-oriented task. It has a prophetic, change-agent responsibility, and there will be times when expectations should be challenged. Thus, the minister or priest must listen to the people of God, and the people must listen to the minister.

The empirical concept of assessment underlying this program includes the assumption that numeric information can contribute to understanding about an individual. Good instrument development involves several complex statistical procedures. The scores reported in your profile reflect appropriate statistical safeguards on measurement. Although numbers can be over interpreted and abused, they can provide meaningful estimates and images which deserve consideration. The process of serious consideration, careful interpretation, and discussion with other people is what constitutes assessment.

The philosophical concept of education on which this program rests is that theological education has as its agenda both instruction in knowledge (e.g., church history, language, theology, biblical studies, church and society) and instruction in process and personhood for integrating that knowledge with judgment and action (e.g., how one administers a parish, utilizes conflict, leads groups, or is sensitive to needs and anxieties). Seminaries have had more resources for assessing knowledge than for evaluating integrative ministry abilities. Profiles of Ministry has sought to develop instruments which relate to the aspects of ministry more difficult to assess. While it does not examine every characteristic related to ministry, it does seek to provide information for personal reflection and provide a basis for growth.
**INTERPRETING PROFILES OF MINISTRY SCORES**

The Profiles of Ministry scores give you an estimate of how likely you are to express various characteristics or approaches in the practice of ministry. Each score has been derived from your responses either to the Interview or Casebook.

The left side of the profile has scores related to your personal tendencies in dealing with other people, attitudes about family relationships, personal faith, and potentially negative behaviors. The scores on the right side of the profile relate to four orientations or prevailing concepts of ministry. Within each side, scores are grouped together either because there is a strong empirical indication that they belong together, or because logic suggests that it is beneficial to examine some scores in the context of others.

Your scores are not presented in relationship to any norm or group standard of reference. They are best interpreted as your individual tendencies or approaches, and do not show whether you have greater or lesser amounts of these traits than other students have.

Reading the Profile. Your profile presents your scores on specific characteristics, each score indicated by a computer-printed “X”. The logical meanings of the scores range from “Very Unlikely” or “Little Evidence” to “Very Likely” or “Much Evidence” and are indicated by the words at the top of the columns. Scores to the far left indicate little evidence or likelihood you exhibit the characteristic measured. Scores to the right, conversely, suggest you do show evidence or likelihood of the characteristic’s presence. Each characteristic is designated along the left side by a four-letter abbreviation. The Interpretive Manual gives the full name of the characteristic and a description of each score’s meaning. In some cases, the computer may generate a symbol (# or *) on the line where a score is printed. These symbols are used to indicate that something has happened which influences the scale’s ability to measure accurately. For example, there may have been missing or unreadable responses. When a special symbol is printed on the profile, there is an explanation in the box on the lower left side labeled “I.D. and Message Information.”

Reading the Manual. It is important that you limit your interpretation of scales to the narrative descriptions. Each description reflects answers or responses characteristic of a high likelihood or evidence score. Some descriptions will also suggest meaning for mid-range or low evidence or likelihood scores. However, the measurement provided by Profiles of Ministry makes it difficult to explain the meaning of “unlikely” or “low evidence.” “Unlikely” means you would not be inclined to exhibit the characteristic measured, but it does not identify the contrasting characteristics which may typify you. While the name of characteristics being measured may imply broader meanings, statistical procedures limit measurement to a particular focus. As you interpret your scores, you should avoid reading more into a score than is actually present. You should also avoid reading less into the score. These characteristics have implications for the practice of ministry that should be explored.

Additional Information. The characteristics measured by the Profiles of Ministry scales have been rated by a national sample of clergy and laity in terms of their importance for the practice of ministry. After you have examined your scores, you may want to evaluate those ratings of importance, which are available from your school.
PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Ministry is one of those human endeavors where personal qualities are so mingled with the performance of tasks that it is frequently difficult to separate personal tendencies from ministerial skills. Whether leading a congregation, or counseling a parishioner, or preaching a sermon, personal qualities influence how the task is performed. The scales reported in this section are not measures of personality characteristics. However, they do indicate ways in which personal tendencies may influence approaches to ministry. Measures include your typical approach to relationships with others, perspectives on faith, and orientation to family relationships.

RESPONSIBLE AND CARING... These six scores group together, as indicated by responses of students. While each individual's scores will vary on the different scales, there is a tendency for them to group together in one general area of the profile. As a whole, they represent a responsible and caring approach to tasks and people.

FIDL — Fidelity to Tasks and Persons
(High likelihood — Case) You give evidence that respect for persons is a high priority with you. You believe that all persons have value, that their ideas and wishes should be heard and taken into account, and that they should be conscious of each others' needs. You believe that people should be informed and included in decision-making or guideline-setting that affects them. Honest communication between persons is important to you. A score in the high likelihood range also suggests that you are responsible both to tasks and persons, and consider the implications for both in decision-making. You do not see tasks, decisions, or improvements as ends in themselves, but view them primarily in terms of what they will do to or for people.

RESP — Personal Responsibility
(High likelihood — Case) You try to keep commitments, whether they are related to schedules, or promises to other people, or to your own inner convictions. Where a previous commitment of your time comes in conflict with some newly-discovered need, you will tend to keep your prior commitment. In the face of two important but conflicting ministry responsibilities, you tend to make your decision on the basis of your original commitment.

LIMT — Acknowledgment of Limitations
(High likelihood — Case) You accept responsibility for mistakes—whether in judgment or behavior. You are not likely to attempt to shift responsibility for your mistakes to other persons or outside circumstances. You readily apologize for mistakes, and actively seek to make amends. You affirm the importance of humility and confession.
FLEX — Flexibility of Spirit
(High evidence — Interview) A high evidence score suggests that you prefer to govern your behavior more by the present than by the past. You adapt to what is required by the unique character of the situation. You sometimes take things seriously, sometimes lightly. You appear willing to explore what is new, to be able to cope with the unexpected, and to modify your plans to meet new situations. You are willing to forget about the past negative experiences withpersons and start afresh. While you like to plan ahead, you willingly alter your plans if the situation changes.

A note on FIDL, RESP, LIMT and FLEX
The presence of these four characteristics is usually seen as an asset for ministry. Persons who show little likelihood of these characteristics may be judged negatively by others. But it may be possible that high likelihood scores could reflect some problems. For example, a person with a score far to the right on “Fidelity to Tasks and Persons” could have a slavish need to please other people or compulsively complete tasks. When high likelihood scores reflect those tendencies, their meaning for ministry practice takes on a different texture. In a similar way, “Personal Responsibility” is an essentially positive ministry approach which, when exaggerated, may become less positive. This characteristic has the potential for showing inflexibility or inappropriate exercise of control. A minister who takes this characteristic to the extreme could be perceived as stubborn, rigid or inflexible. A high likelihood of “Acknowledgement of limitations” could identify persons who apologize for everything, even when they have done nothing wrong. Accepting blame for transgressions a minister did not commit is not a virtue. The same is true for “Flexibility of Spirit.” A healthy degree of flexibility can, at times, give way to an unhealthy inability to make decisions or keep commitments.

In each of these examples, a score cannot identify your reasons for a response. The scores estimate how likely you are to exhibit certain approaches or sensitivities. You will need to determine the meaning of high likelihood scores. Do you possess the positive aspects of these characteristics or do you have problems that masquerade within these characteristics?

ICAR — Involvement in Caring
(High likelihood — Case) A score far to the right indicates that you aid people with problems by helping them explore and evaluate their alternatives, make their own decisions, and act on those decisions. You help persons express their feelings in tragic or stressful situations, and encourage them to seek the help of others who have been through similar experiences. You are likely to assist people who face problems by facilitating their movement through the resolutions they have chosen.

PRCO — Perceptive Counseling
(High likelihood — Case) You are sensitive to the needs and feelings of people with whom you talk, and try to be a good listener. You encourage persons dealing with feelings of failure to share their problems. You are accepting, affirming and reassuring to people who doubt their worth or value. You seek to be ready to minister to others when their comments or concerns suggest they are in need of your care.

FAMILY PERSPECTIVE...Married ministers must deal with the issues that emerge from work which requires a significant amount of time and emotional energy and families who also need time and emotional energy. These two realities sometimes tug at a minister in conflicting directions. The scales in this section reflect two ways of dealing with this tension.

FAML — Mutual Family Commitment
(High likelihood — Case) You show respect for and appreciation for your family. You value good family relationships, know their importance to an effective ministry, and therefore protect time set aside for maintaining those good relationships. You are committed to keeping commitments both in your ministry and to your family. You appear to be sensitive to your family’s needs and attempt to give as careful attention to them as to the demands of your profession.
MINISTRY PRECEDENCE OVER FAMILY

(High likelihood—Case) You believe that your responsibilities in ministry take precedence over all other commitments, including your commitment to spouse and family. You believe that your family should be understanding of the disruptions of family plans that your responsibilities in ministry create. You perceive your priorities of responsibility as first to God, then to church, then to family.

THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN FAMILY SCORES

On most profiles one of these two scores will be more toward the right. However, there are other possibilities that may occur, and they merit some additional consideration. If both scores are high, the implication is that you hold some impossible expectations of your own behavior—that you will be both unfailingly devoted to family and unfailingly devoted to the interests of the congregation. The other possibilities, that both scores are in the middle range or low, may be a sign of indecision in this matter or of a tendency to avoid confronting the inevitable conflicts that are likely to emerge.

PERSONAL FAITH. There are a variety of expressions of personal faith. The scores in this section do not reflect all the richness or diversity that exists in authentic Christian spirituality, but they do represent the degree to which some approaches to personal faith may characterize you. These scales, unlike the ones in the “Responsible and Caring” section, do not group empirically, and your scores will likely be very different on all three. If your personal style of faith is different from anything reflected in these measures, all your scores may cluster in the low evidence region of the profile.

PIET—Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety

(High evidence—Interview) A score toward the far right indicates that you believe that the Church’s primary message is not so much one of guidance for human behavior, as it is God’s action in love toward humanity. You are conscious of God’s loving and sustaining presence at work in the Church, your life, and the lives of others today. You show sensitivity to the activity of the Holy Spirit in contemporary life, and to the human need for forgiveness. You do not hesitate to share these convictions with others, especially when they give evidence of doubting. Even when things look bleak, you trust in God’s Providence, and are likely to express this conviction.

PROV—Belief in a Provident God

(High evidence—Interview) A score in the high likelihood region reflects your understanding that God loves humankind, and offers the gift of life and hope. You repudiate the assumption that God operates by human rules, or within the limitations of human understanding or beliefs. Rather, you believe that God’s being and actions are at times beyond human comprehension. You believe that God works, loves, and judges humankind with divine mercy and brings people to a saving knowledge.

ACLM—Service without Need for Acclaim

(High evidence—Interview) A high evidence score reflects a trusting attitude toward others; a disinclination to seek acclaim for one’s own work or to take one’s self too seriously; and a readiness to admit failure and apologize when your actions may have hurt others. These qualities emerge from your sense of the Gospel, and the way it leads people to live their faith. You affirm your dependence on the support and help of others. This characteristic could have been grouped with some other sections in the profile. There is the quality in this score, however, that one’s views of self, others and ministry are rooted in a perspective of faith.
POTENTIALLY NEGATIVE TENDENCIES... The three scores in this section deal with characteristics which are frequently construed negatively. In some cases, the scores indicate plainly negative behaviors in the context of the community of faith. In other cases, the scores identify behaviors which the individual does not mean to be negative, but are nevertheless perceived that way by others. As you interpret your scores in each of these areas, you will need to consider not only your actions, but also how they may be experienced by others.

SELF — Self Serving Behavior

(High likelihood — Case) A score toward the right indicates that you have high respect for the office of ministry/priesthood, and that you expect others to have a similar high regard. This expectation of respect may reflect a tendency to assume that others will regard you highly on the basis of your position. It reflects a need to be in control of situations, and the willingness to use the authority of the ministerial/priestly office to achieve that control. It is self-serving in that others’ needs or desires are rejected, and your preferences implemented.

PADV — Pursuit of Personal Advantage

(High likelihood — Case) A score in the very likely region means you may have a tendency to try to get other people to do what you would like them to do without directly asking them to do it. You resort to indirect approaches that can be manipulative of other people. A score to the right may also reflect a tendency to want administrative structures to meet your needs, rather than being willing to do things that best meet the administrative needs of an institution or organization.

PRTC — Self Protecting Behavior

(High evidence — Interview) You give evidence of a pessimistic view of your own abilities that causes you to be uncomfortable in unfamiliar or ambiguous situations. You tend to feel tense or nervous when being watched as you work. You want to avoid making mistakes and you worry about mastering tasks. You may have a tendency to be disorganized. You appear vulnerable to the disapproval of others and anxious enough to do well that your worry and anxiety sometimes defeat your good intentions. A score to the right may indicate a kind of insecurity about yourself or your performance which creates the need for you to be guarded and protective.
ORIENTATIONS TOWARD MINISTRY

The scores on the right side of the profile relate to various approaches to the tasks of ministry. The scores within each of the four sets cluster both empirically and logically. Although there will be variations, people tend to score in similar ways on scales within a set. Each of the four groups of scores represents an orientation to the overall task of ministry. A person may emphasize one, none, or all of these orientations. There is evidence, however, that many persons who tend to be strong on some may tend to reject other orientations.

### CONVERSIONIST
This orientation holds that a primary mission of the Church is sharing the Gospel that people might come to a saving relationship through Christ. It perceives sin in clear terms, calls for individual repentance, and encourages people to use the resources of their faith to deal with crises and life needs. It is an orientation which contends there are spiritual laws that call people to right living, engender accountability, and reflect the judgment of God when ignored.

**Evan—Assertive Individual Evangelism**

(High likelihood—Case) You espouse a conversion theology and, in talking with a member of another world religion, would not hesitate to speak of God’s action in Christ in the hope that the person would be converted to belief in Christ.

(High likelihood—Interview) You are committed to the idea that it is the task of every Christian to share the Christian message with all persons. You accept such witness as your personal responsibility, and support others who aggressively share their faith. You sometimes initiate conversation with people about their faith or relationship with Christ.

The Interview score represents a more aggressive, intentional evangelism by going to others to tell them about Christ. The Casebook score reflects a willingness to share faith during a conversation with an individual who has come to you to talk about faith issues.

### GOAL—Precedence of Evangelistic Goals

(High likelihood—Case) A score to the far right reflects a belief that the Church can make its primary contribution by ministering to persons’ spiritual needs, rather than an emphasis on physical needs. If forced to choose between spiritually-oriented and physically-oriented ministry, you would choose the former. If forced to choose between evangelism and social justice, you would choose evangelism as the more important task of Christian people.
CONG—Total Concentration on Congregational Concerns
(High likelihood—Case) A score in the high likelihood range indicates a belief that the Church ought to content itself with making its unique spiritual contribution to community life and not take corporate stands on social or political issues. It indicates that you would have no inclination to mobilize a congregation for political action or to encourage the church to support what some would consider questionable causes or issues where there is no one “right” Christian course of action. This attitude is likely based on a theology that suggests the church should view itself as a spiritual community, and not a political action group.

LAW—Law Orientation to Ethical Issues
(High likelihood—Case) You affirm God’s moral law and the personal consequences of breaking those laws. You believe that the Scriptures are the only dependable guide to God’s intentions for life and that obedience is a Christian discipline that needs more emphasis. Because persons will not be saved apart from Jesus Christ, you feel the urgency of bringing the gospel message to persons lost in sin. You think that people should have their erroneous beliefs and wrongdoing called to their attention, and be reminded of God’s judgment in hopes that they will repent and change their lives.

THCO—Theologically Oriented Counseling
(High likelihood—Case) A score in the high likelihood region indicates that, at least in some situations, you help people deal with personal problems or decisions by explicitly encouraging them to be sensitive to God’s purpose in their lives and to use the resources of Scripture and faith in dealing with problems. It suggests that you communicate to others the value of prayer, faith, Scripture, and the church community as resources in times of personal crisis or distress. It also implies that you make use of specific faith-related terminology in counseling situations.

SOCIAL JUSTICE...The measures in this group reflect an orientation in which the mission of the Church is to address the unjust structures of the world with the redemptive claims of the Gospel. The strategies for this approach include aggressive political action and, as needed, the support of unpopular causes. It is an orientation to ministry which emphasizes justice, and works on behalf of oppressed groups and persons.

PLIT—Aggressive Political Leadership
(High likelihood—Case) A high likelihood score implies a belief that leadership in political activity is a rightful responsibility even when that activity may cause controversy. It suggests a willingness both to be involved in political activity yourself, and to encourage members of the congregation to become responsibly involved in the political process. Political activity is seen as one way a minister can put faith into action, represent Christ’s love to people, and take a meaningful stand in the community.

(High evidence—Interview) A high evidence score says that you have not only been involved in political life but that you also expect to continue to be involved politically. You may be willing to use political power to change social wrongs, even at considerable expense to yourself, because you see political life as an area in which you should make your Christian witness.

CAUS—Support of Unpopular Causes
(High evidence—Interview) A score showing much evidence describes a person who becomes overtly and vigorously involved in unpopular or controversial causes and issues, taking public stands and actions in an effort to right specific wrongs.
OPEN—Openness to Pluralism
(High evidence — Interview) A high evidence score suggests that you respect and want to hear others’ opinions and views. You have an interest in what others believe, what they are thinking, what motivates them, and how they go about making decisions or value judgments. A score to the right also implies that you are hesitant to force your own beliefs, motivations, or religious position on others, and think it a good thing for persons in your congregation sometimes to be exposed to opinions very divergent from your own. Your approach to those whose beliefs and methods differ from your own is cooperative rather than competitive. Like the qualities described in “Responsible and Caring,” this characteristic can change its meaning when exaggerated. “Openness,” for some people, could drift into a valueless approach to faith in which no personal convictions are held.

ECCLESIASTICAL... The two scales in this group are not bound by the same empirical strength that characterizes scales in the other three. Each scale, in its own way, reflects an approach in ministry that centers around the denominational or liturgical aspects of ministry.

DNOM — Denominational Collegiality
(High evidence — Interview) A high evidence score indicates that you feel at home in your denomination, that you consider ministers in your church body to be sympathetic with you and your ministry, and that you believe you can work comfortably and easily within staff relationships and denominational structures. This characteristic emphasizes a feeling of belonging, both in one’s local church and in broader church settings. It suggests that you are neither disenchanted nor carrying on an active “lover’s quarrel” with the church structure and organization.

LITG — Sacramental-Liturgical Ministry
(High evidence — Interview) A score showing much evidence implies sensitivity to the sacramental nature of ministry. You would tend to emphasize the liturgical aspect of worship over the preaching or fellowship aspects, follow prescribed liturgical forms, and be sensitive to the symbolic value of vestments worn in worship.

COMMUNITY AND CONGREGATIONAL... The scores in this group present an orientation in which the primary tasks of ministry are to provide the events and services that will nurture the life of the congregation and give the community the programs and ministry it needs. The scales, as a group, reflect a vision of church as good citizen to its community, and as nurturing guide to its own members.

SERV — Pastoral Service to All
(High likelihood — Case) A score in the high likelihood region indicates a tendency to extend pastoral service and church programming to all people. It suggests you would personally offer or urge the church to offer practical aid to non-members (e.g., assistance with food or shelter to vagrants, minority groups or the poor of a community) as readily as to a member of your own church.
YUTH — Relating Well to Youth

(High likelihood — Case) This score centers more on ministry with youth than to children. A high likelihood score implies that you take an advocacy position toward youth and a ministry that meets their needs and problems. When youth are being criticized, you are likely to speak up in their defense, and to urge others to see them more positively. The score does not indicate your level of skill in working with youth nor your attractiveness to them; it speaks only of your attitude about the church’s responsibility to meet their special needs.

OPRS — Active concern for the Oppressed

(High likelihood — Case) You consider it important to help people understand the realities which confront oppressed people (e.g., citizens of Third World countries and Native Americans) and urge the Christian community to deal with these social and economic needs. If it is necessary to make a choice, you would prefer that persons’ social and economic needs be met first, and that conversation about the Christian faith come later. The measure gives evidence of your attitude and intention of aiding oppressed people and educating others concerning their needs, but gives no evidence of your actual real-life experience in this area.

MISN — Encouragement of World Missions

(High likelihood — Case) You show a high level of personal interest and motivation to encourage congregations to support worldwide missions of the church. Your sense of mission on behalf of people near and far arises not only from your perception of their needs, but from your own belief about how Christ would respond to them. You are especially likely to advocate missions involvement with those who are in poverty and in need of material assistance.

MSBL — Balanced Approach to World Missions

(High likelihood — Case) A score in this high likelihood region suggests you refused to choose between evangelistic witness and meeting physical needs as the better form of missions involvement. You feel that evangelism and the search for justice should not be separated, and dualistic approaches should be avoided.

BLDG — Building Congregational Community

(High likelihood — Case) Your score indicates that you emphasize fellowship and a sense of community as meaningful goals for a congregation or group. When decisions are to be made, one significant element in your thinking is whether the decision will help or hinder the sense of community within the church. You value people more than programs, are more fellowship-oriented than task-oriented, and believe in investing significantly in building trust and rapport within a congregation. You would be likely to foster activities in the congregation that are purely for the sake of community or fellowship.

CNFL — Conflict Utilization

(High likelihood — Case) A high likelihood score indicates that you understand conflict not as an event to be avoided, or even played down, but as an inevitable part of group life that has the potential for good in it. Your consistent approach to conflict situations is to have all sides expressed and heard. You believe buried conflict is destructive and will reject proposals to avoid or discourage discussion of controversial issues by the congregation. Rather, you feel responsible for helping the congregation to learn how to resolve disagreements, or at least to express them without destroying community.
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Appendix F

DENOMINATIONAL FAMILY PREFERENCES
RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE OF CHARACTERISTICS
MEASURED IN THE PROFILES OF MINISTRY INSTRUMENTS

In 1987 over 2,500 clergy and laity responded to an extensive survey in which they were asked to rate the degree of importance of almost 300 different statements about ministers. For example, people rated how important or detrimental it was for ministers to “Believe the gospel he/she preaches,” or “Help the church stay in touch with disinterested youth,” or “Laugh easily, even at self.”

The 1987 survey followed a similar more extensive study conducted in 1973. The responses in that earlier survey were used to identify the ways in which people grouped these individual items into larger sets which reflect a common theme. The 1987 study confirmed the validity of continuing to view these groups of items as meaningful. The groups of items define various characteristics in ministry, and this summary provides the average rating of importance ascribed to each characteristic in the 1987 survey.

The clergy and laity in the sample used a seven point scale for their ratings. While the adjectives used to anchor each of the seven points varied to fit different statements, most can be summarized as follows:

- Highly Important, essential or mandatory: 7
- Quite Important, a major asset: 6
- Somewhat Important, a minor asset: 5
- Undesirable or Somewhat Detrimental: 4
- Quite Detrimental, major hindrance: 3
- Highly Detrimental, potentially disqualifying: 2
- Reject this item, does not apply: 1

The summaries on the following pages show the average ratings for the characteristics measured by the Profiles of Ministry Casebook or Interview.

The average (mean) rating is given at the end of the titles and is also graphed to the right as a small vertical line ( ). The meanings for the rating categories are shown at the top of each column. The horizontal line that extends to the right and left of the average (---) shows where approximately 67% of the ratings fall. The letter (e.g., “M” for United Methodists) represents the mean for your denominational family; the line of horizontal dots (.....) shows where 67% of the ratings within your denomination fall. It is important to remember that these averages are not the average scores of persons who have completed Profiles for Ministry scales. These ratings identify how essential or detrimental each ministry characteristic has been judged by a sample of 2,500 clergy and laity.

As you examine the ratings, you may wish to consider:

1. The rating of importance you, yourself, would assign to each of the characteristics. Do you think the ecumenical sample has over-rated or under-rated the importance of some of the characteristics?
2. What ratings reflect faulty perceptions about ministry and define areas where you want to be an agent for change?
3. What ratings identify areas of ministry that you consider essential?
4. Do the scores on your Profile show high evidence or high likelihood of your exhibiting the characteristics that you consider most important? Do your scores suggest that you are likely to do the things that the sample of clergy and laity consider most important? Are your scores in the likelihood region for any of the characteristics rated as detrimental?

Ministry, of course, is not the process of finding out which characteristics people like and learning how to demonstrate them in your ministry. However, it does involve seriously considering the judgments of others about what is essential or disqualifying in ministry.

This information is provided as part of the Profiles of Ministry program of The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada. © 1988.
PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Responsible & Caring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Highly Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Undesirable</th>
<th>Highly Detrimental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>FIDL Fidelity to Tasks and Persons (6.30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Showing competence and responsibility by completing tasks, relating warmly to persons, handling differences of opinion, and growing in skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>RESP Personal Responsibility (6.49)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honoring commitments by carrying out promises despite pressures to compromise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>LIMT Acknowledgment of Limitations (6.44)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledging limitations and mistakes, and recognizing the need for continued growth and learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>FLEX Flexibility of Spirit (6.14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adaptability, balance, free sharing of views and welcoming of new possibilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>ICAR Involvement in Caring (5.81)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Becoming personally involved in the mutual exchange among persons who seek to learn through suffering.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>PRCO Perceptive Counseling (6.35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reaching out to persons under stress with a perception, sensitivity, and warmth that is freeing and supportive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Family Perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Highly Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Undesirable</th>
<th>Highly Detrimental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>FAML Mutual Family Commitment (5.98)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreement in the minister's commitment to family and the family's commitment to his/her vocation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personal Faith

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Highly Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Undesirable</th>
<th>Highly Detrimental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>PIET Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety (6.42)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Profound consciousness of God's redeeming activity in life, living out a sense of call to Christ's mission with freedom and courage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>SPRT Christian Spirituality (6.46)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leading others toward a meaningful spiritual life in addition to own life reflecting an authentic Christian spirituality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potentially Negative Tendencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Highly Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Undesirable</th>
<th>Highly Detrimental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>SELF Self-Serving Behavior (2.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The attempt to have own needs served, to control, to dominate with critical, demeaning, insensitive behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>PADV Pursuit of Personal Advantage (3.18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal insecurity expressed in grandiose ideas and manipulative efforts to gain personal advantages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>PRTC Self-Protecting Behavior (2.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concentration on desired personal image, and actions that create a feeling of separation or distance from others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>DMNA Intuitive Domination of Decision-Making (3.62)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bypassing the disciplined task of planning, and deciding for the congregation what decisions should be made.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PERCEPTIONS OF MINISTRY**

### Ecclesial Ministry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09 LITG</td>
<td>Sacramental-Liturgical Ministry (5.00)</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 RELT</td>
<td>Relating Faith to Modern World (6.10)</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 TBIB</td>
<td>Theocentric-Biblical Ministry (6.35)</td>
<td>6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 PRCH</td>
<td>Competent Preaching and Worship Leading (5.89)</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 CLAR</td>
<td>Clarity of Thought and Communication (6.19)</td>
<td>6.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 DNOM</td>
<td>Denominational Collegiality (5.89)</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Conversionist Ministry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 EVAN</td>
<td>Assertive Individual Evangelism (5.08)</td>
<td>5.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 GOAL</td>
<td>Precedence of Evangelistic Goals (3.99)</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 CONG</td>
<td>Total Concentration on Congregational Concerns (3.67)</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 LAW</td>
<td>Law Orientation to Ethical Issues (3.85)</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 THCO</td>
<td>Theologically Oriented Counseling (6.25)</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social Justice Ministry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 PLIT</td>
<td>Aggressive Political Leadership (4.42)</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 CAUS</td>
<td>Support of Unpopular Causes (5.63)</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
08 OPEN  Openness to Pluralism (5.61)
Openness to cooperation with people whose theology,
culture, or educational methods are different.

16 OPRS  Active Concern for the Oppressed (5.22)
Knowledgeably and earnestly working in behalf of minority
and oppressed peoples.

33 IDEA  Interest in New Ideas (4.83)
Deep involvement with current thinking and openness to
testing new or current ideas.

81 WOMN  Support for Women in the Church (5.85)
Encouragement of women and others to assume leadership
roles, a willingness to work cooperatively with women.

84 JUST  Concern for Social Justice (5.57)
A ministry that points out social justice and peace issues in
scripture, contemporary public life, and personal decisions.

Community and Congregational Ministry

11 SERV  Pastoral Service to All (5.98)
Reaching out in ministering to persons of all classes, whether
members or not.

03 YUTH  Relating Well to Children and Youth (5.92)
Showing sensitivity and skill in ministering to children and
youth as individuals.

12 MISN  Encouragement of World Mission (6.08)
Stimulating a congregation response to world need that is
reflective, theologically based, and sacrificial.

55 BLDG  Building a Congregational Community (6.32)
Actions that will likely build a strong sense of community
within a congregation.

56 CNFL  Conflict Utilization (6.12)
Understanding conflict theologically and being able to utilize
conflict as a means for airing differences and stressing
concern for understanding.

57 LEAD  Sharing Congregational Leadership (6.13)
Active employment of lay leadership—regardless of gender—in
establishing and executing an overall parish strategy.

14 UNDR  Promotion of Understanding of Issues (5.53)
Developing, using, and encouraging theological, sociological
and psychological understandings in ministry.

Evangelical A

Three of the characteristics assessed in either Stage I or Stage II (PROV, MSBL, MNFM) are not anchored to a criterion
characteristic derived from the original POM research.
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