

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

June 6, 1952

*I hereby recommend that the thesis prepared under my supervision by* \_\_\_\_\_  
WESLEY LUELF DUEWEL

*entitled* \_\_\_\_\_  
SUPERVISION OF FIELD WORK IN AMERICAN  
PROTESTANT THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES

*be accepted as fulfilling this part of the requirements for the degree of* \_\_\_\_\_  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

*Approved by:*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Charles St. Johnson  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gordon Hendrickson  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Harold W. Lee



SUPERVISION OF FIELD WORK  
IN AMERICAN PROTESTANT THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES

A dissertation submitted to

The Graduate Faculty of the Teachers College  
of the University of Cincinnati

in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

1952

by

Wesley Luelf Duewel  
A. B., God's Bible School, 1938  
Th. B., God's Bible School, 1939  
Ed. M., University of Cincinnati, 1949

CINCINNATI  
UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY

JUN 3 1952

UMI Number: DP15733

## INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

**UMI**®

---

UMI Microform DP15733

Copyright 2009 by ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC  
789 E. Eisenhower Parkway  
PO Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346



## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

32  
29.8.52

The writer wishes to express his appreciation for the guidance and encouragement provided throughout this study by Dr. Charles W. Johnson, chairman of the advisory committee; Dr. Gordon Hendrickson and Dr. Harold W. See, members of the advisory committee; and Dean Carter V. Good, Director of Graduate Studies. He also wishes to express his appreciation for the cooperation of the officials of the American Association of Theological Schools and the field-work directors of its member seminaries.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                                        | Page   |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| LIST OF TABLES .....                                                   | xi     |
| <br>Chapter                                                            |        |
| I. THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING .....                                   | 1      |
| Purpose of the Study .....                                             | 1      |
| Historical Background .....                                            | 1      |
| Delimitations of the Study .....                                       | 3      |
| Related Studies and Justification of this Study ..                     | 4      |
| Contribution to Education .....                                        | 9      |
| Investigational Procedure .....                                        | 10     |
| The Organization of this Study .....                                   | 13     |
| <br>II. BASIC PSYCHOLOGICAL AND EDUCATIONAL PRINCIPLES .....           | <br>15 |
| Basic Definitions .....                                                | 15     |
| Theological Education .....                                            | 15     |
| Field Work .....                                                       | 16     |
| Supervision .....                                                      | 17     |
| Basic Principles of Learning .....                                     | 18     |
| The Nature of the Learner .....                                        | 18     |
| The Nature of Learning .....                                           | 22     |
| The Motivation of Learning .....                                       | 31     |
| Transfer in Learning .....                                             | 34     |
| Basic Principles of the Curriculum .....                               | 36     |
| Curricular Objectives .....                                            | 37     |
| The Content and Nature of the Curriculum .....                         | 39     |
| The Organization and Utilization of the Curriculum .....               | 43     |
| Summary .....                                                          | 46     |
|                                                                        | 47     |
| <br>III. THE ROLE OF DIRECT EXPERIENCE IN PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION ..... | <br>50 |
| The Value of Direct Experience in Professional Education .....         | 50     |
| Training Programs in Several Related Professions..                     | 52     |
| Dental Education .....                                                 | 52     |
| Medical Education .....                                                | 52     |
| Engineering Education .....                                            | 53     |
| Law Education .....                                                    | 54     |
| Teacher Education .....                                                | 54     |
| Theological Education .....                                            | 54     |
| The Role of Direct Experience .....                                    | 55     |
| Student Teaching in Teacher Education .....                            | 55     |

|                                                                            | Page   |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| The Role of Student Teaching .....                                         | 56     |
| Direct Experiences Prior to Student Teaching .....                         | 57     |
| The Organization of Student Teaching .....                                 | 57     |
| Trends in Student Teaching .....                                           | 59     |
| Field Work in Theological Education .....                                  | 61     |
| The Role of Field Work in Theological Education ...                        | 61     |
| Field Work and the Theological Seminary .....                              | 62     |
| Field Work and the Theological Student .....                               | 63     |
| Summary .....                                                              | 66     |
| <br>IV. THE ADMINISTRATION OF FIELD WORK IN THEOLOGICAL<br>EDUCATION ..... | <br>68 |
| Administrative Practices and Field-Work<br>Statistics .....                | <br>68 |
| The Location of the Seminaries .....                                       | 68     |
| Statistics of Enrollment and Field-Work<br>Participation .....             | <br>69 |
| The Amount of Field Work Required .....                                    | 72     |
| The Field-Work Activities Engaged In .....                                 | 75     |
| The Organization of the Field-Work Program .....                           | 78     |
| Financial Aspects of Field Work .....                                      | 83     |
| Recommended Seminary Scales .....                                          | 84     |
| Denominational Relations .....                                             | 86     |
| Follow-up Activities .....                                                 | 86     |
| Basic Principles for the Administration of<br>Field Work .....             | <br>87 |
| Making Use of Direct Experience .....                                      | 87     |
| Need for Supervision .....                                                 | 88     |
| Time for Field Experience .....                                            | 88     |
| Graded Field Experience .....                                              | 88     |
| Variety in Field Experience .....                                          | 90     |
| Clinical Experience .....                                                  | 91     |
| Need for Responsible Experience .....                                      | 91     |
| Individualized Field Experience .....                                      | 91     |
| Continuity in Field Experience .....                                       | 92     |
| Summer and Intern Experience as Field Work .....                           | 93     |
| Adapting Field Work to the Seminary .....                                  | 93     |
| The Field-Work Director .....                                              | 93     |
| Faculty Members and Field Work .....                                       | 95     |
| Denominational Supervision of Field Work .....                             | 96     |
| Local Supervision of Field Work .....                                      | 97     |
| Field Work Within the Curriculum .....                                     | 97     |
| Field-Work Seminars and Practicums .....                                   | 98     |
| Field-Work Credit .....                                                    | 98     |
| Field Work as a Requirement .....                                          | 98     |
| Financing Field Work .....                                                 | 99     |
| Limiting Time Spent in Field Work .....                                    | 99     |
| Avoiding Exploitation .....                                                | 100    |
| Follow-up Programs .....                                                   | 100    |

|                                                    | Page |
|----------------------------------------------------|------|
| Trends and Areas of Need .....                     | 101  |
| Trends .....                                       | 101  |
| Areas of Need .....                                | 101  |
| Summary .....                                      | 103  |
| V. PLACEMENT IN FIELD WORK .....                   | 107  |
| Practices in Field-Work Placement .....            | 107  |
| Subject Prerequisites for Field-Work .....         | 107  |
| Orientation Program .....                          | 108  |
| Methods Used in Gathering Student Infor-           |      |
| mation Prior to Placement .....                    | 110  |
| Methods Used in Gathering Information Con-         |      |
| cerning Available Fields .....                     | 112  |
| Pre-placement Conferences .....                    | 112  |
| Information Files .....                            | 113  |
| Basic Principles for Placement in Field Work ..... | 114  |
| Information About the Student .....                | 114  |
| Information About the Place .....                  | 114  |
| Information About the Supervisor .....             | 115  |
| Information Files .....                            | 116  |
| Criteria for Choosing Fields .....                 | 118  |
| Criteria for Suiting Students to Fields .....      | 118  |
| Acquaintance with the Field .....                  | 119  |
| Orientation of Cooperative Supervisors .....       | 120  |
| Orientation of Students .....                      | 121  |
| Conferences of Students with Place Repre-          |      |
| sentatives .....                                   | 121  |
| Placement Interviews .....                         | 122  |
| Field-Work Agreements .....                        | 123  |
| Areas of Need .....                                | 124  |
| Summary .....                                      | 125  |
| VI. THE SUPERVISION OF FIELD WORK .....            | 128  |
| Seminary Practices in Field-Work Supervision ..... | 129  |
| Individuals Engaging in Supervision .....          | 129  |
| Supervisory Techniques Used .....                  | 131  |
| Time Given to Supervision .....                    | 132  |
| Long-Range Plans .....                             | 132  |
| A Balanced Variety of Field-Work Experiences ....  | 133  |
| Supervisory Visits .....                           | 135  |
| Supervisory Conferences .....                      | 135  |
| Number of Students for Whom Seminary Super-        |      |
| visors Are Responsible .....                       | 137  |
| Denominational Supervision .....                   | 139  |
| Other Supervision .....                            | 139  |
| Types of Field Work for Which Supervision          |      |
| Has Been Most Satisfactory .....                   | 140  |
| Types of Field Work Found Difficult to Supervise.  | 140  |
| Supervisory Activities Tried and Found Im-         |      |
| practicable .....                                  | 142  |

|                                                                                                                                    | Page    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| Basic Principles for Field-Work Supervision .....                                                                                  | 145     |
| Democracy in Supervision .....                                                                                                     | 145     |
| Creative Supervision .....                                                                                                         | 146     |
| Scientific Supervision .....                                                                                                       | 147     |
| Planned Supervision .....                                                                                                          | 147     |
| Supervision and Self-Direction .....                                                                                               | 148     |
| Supervision and Psychology .....                                                                                                   | 149     |
| Supervision and Curricular Integration .....                                                                                       | 149     |
| Supervision and the Faculty .....                                                                                                  | 150     |
| Supervisory Objectives .....                                                                                                       | 152     |
| Supervisory Visits .....                                                                                                           | 153     |
| Supervisory Conferences .....                                                                                                      | 154     |
| Qualifications for Supervisors .....                                                                                               | 156     |
| Professional Training for the Ministry .....                                                                                       | 156     |
| Christian Experience .....                                                                                                         | 156     |
| Ministerial Experience .....                                                                                                       | 156     |
| Professional Educational Background .....                                                                                          | 156     |
| The Personality of the Supervisor .....                                                                                            | 157     |
| Interest in Supervision .....                                                                                                      | 158     |
| The Range of Supervision (An Outline of Activities<br>in Field-Work Supervision) .....                                             | 158     |
| Supervisory Activities Connected with Student<br>Observation .....                                                                 | 159     |
| Supervisory Activities Connected with Student<br>Participation in Ministerial Activities .....                                     | 160     |
| Supervisory Activities Connected with Inte-<br>gration of Field Work with Other Aspects of<br>the Curriculum of the Seminary ..... | 171     |
| Supervisory Activities Connected with Guiding<br>the Growth of Students .....                                                      | 173     |
| Supervisory Activities Connected with Seminary<br>Administration .....                                                             | 179     |
| Trends and Areas of Need .....                                                                                                     | 181     |
| Trends and Promising Developments .....                                                                                            | 181     |
| Areas in Need of Strengthening .....                                                                                               | 183     |
| Summary .....                                                                                                                      | 185     |
| <br>VII. THE EVALUATION OF FIELD WORK .....                                                                                        | <br>189 |
| Seminary Practices in Field-Work Evaluation .....                                                                                  | 189     |
| Evaluation at the Time of Enrollment .....                                                                                         | 189     |
| Evaluation Prior to Field Work of Previous<br>Leadership Activities .....                                                          | 190     |
| Reports Used in Evaluation of Field Work .....                                                                                     | 190     |
| Evaluatory Efforts at the Conclusion of Field<br>Work .....                                                                        | 195     |
| Instruments and Methods Used in Evaluation .....                                                                                   | 196     |
| The Role of Field-Work Evaluation .....                                                                                            | 196     |
| The Importance of Field-Work Evaluation .....                                                                                      | 196     |
| The Objectives of Evaluation .....                                                                                                 | 199     |

|                                                     | Page |
|-----------------------------------------------------|------|
| Basic Principles for Field-Work Evaluation .....    | 201  |
| Continuous Evaluation .....                         | 201  |
| Comprehensive Evaluation .....                      | 201  |
| Cooperative Evaluation .....                        | 202  |
| Evaluation According to Objectives .....            | 203  |
| Evaluatory Emphasis .....                           | 203  |
| Objective and Subjective Evaluation .....           | 203  |
| Reporting Evaluative Results .....                  | 204  |
| Error in Evaluation .....                           | 204  |
| Validity .....                                      | 205  |
| Reliability .....                                   | 206  |
| Self-Evaluation .....                               | 206  |
| A Long-Range Program .....                          | 207  |
| A Practical Program .....                           | 207  |
| Student Orientation .....                           | 208  |
| The Use of Results .....                            | 208  |
| Checking Results .....                              | 209  |
| Evaluation Reports .....                            | 209  |
| Rapport .....                                       | 209  |
| Basic Principles Concerning Individual Evaluation   |      |
| Instruments .....                                   | 210  |
| The Choice of Evaluative Instrument .....           | 210  |
| Organization of Content .....                       | 211  |
| Revision .....                                      | 212  |
| Promising Developments and Areas of Need .....      | 212  |
| Promising Developments .....                        | 212  |
| Areas of Need .....                                 | 215  |
| Summary .....                                       | 217  |
| VIII. FIELD-WORK RECORDS AND REPORTS .....          | 221  |
| The Purposes of Field-Work Records and Reports .... | 221  |
| Seminary Practices Concerning Field-Work Records    |      |
| and Reports .....                                   | 223  |
| Types of Records and Reports Used .....             | 223  |
| The Use of Field-Work Reports .....                 | 225  |
| The Use of Field-Work Records .....                 | 226  |
| The Preservation of Field-Work Records .....        | 227  |
| Basic Principles of Field-Work Records .....        | 229  |
| Qualities Desirable in Records .....                | 229  |
| Details of Form .....                               | 230  |
| The Use of Records .....                            | 230  |
| Field-Work Diaries .....                            | 231  |
| Check Lists .....                                   | 232  |
| Interview Forms .....                               | 232  |
| Cumulative Records .....                            | 233  |
| Anecdotal Records .....                             | 233  |
| Basic Principles of Field-Work Reports .....        | 235  |
| Qualities Desirable in Reports .....                | 235  |
| Details of Construction .....                       | 237  |
| The Use of Reports .....                            | 237  |

|                                                                                     |         |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
|                                                                                     | Page    |
| Areas of Need .....                                                                 | 238     |
| Summary .....                                                                       | 239     |
| <br>IX. THE INTEGRATION OF FIELD WORK WITH OTHER ASPECTS<br>OF THE CURRICULUM ..... | <br>242 |
| The Importance of Integration .....                                                 | 242     |
| The Meaning of Integration .....                                                    | 242     |
| The Role of Integration .....                                                       | 243     |
| Seminary Practices Concerning Integration .....                                     | 247     |
| The Use of Student Observation .....                                                | 247     |
| The Extent of Integration .....                                                     | 248     |
| Seminars and Practicums .....                                                       | 249     |
| Field Trips .....                                                                   | 252     |
| Case Studies .....                                                                  | 252     |
| Counseling .....                                                                    | 252     |
| Community Surveys .....                                                             | 253     |
| Participation in Community Projects .....                                           | 253     |
| Use of Community Resources .....                                                    | 253     |
| Use of Field-Work Reports for Term Papers .....                                     | 253     |
| Other Means of Integrating Field Work With<br>Class Work .....                      | <br>253 |
| Examples of the Integration of Field Work .....                                     | 254     |
| With Class Work .....                                                               | 254     |
| Integrating Field Work With Guidance .....                                          | 255     |
| Basic Principles for the Integration of Theory<br>And Practice .....                | <br>257 |
| The Basis for Integration .....                                                     | 257     |
| Planned Integration .....                                                           | 258     |
| Continuous Integration .....                                                        | 258     |
| Cooperative Integration .....                                                       | 259     |
| Evaluated Integration .....                                                         | 259     |
| Integration and Learning .....                                                      | 259     |
| Field Work as an Integrating Factor .....                                           | 260     |
| Basic Principles for the Use of Observation As<br>an Integrative Technique .....    | <br>261 |
| The Time for Observation .....                                                      | 261     |
| Observation Versus Active Field Work .....                                          | 262     |
| Observational Techniques and Aids .....                                             | 263     |
| Preparation for Observation .....                                                   | 263     |
| Supervised Observation .....                                                        | 263     |
| Integrated Observation .....                                                        | 264     |
| Evaluated Observation .....                                                         | 265     |
| Recorded Observation .....                                                          | 265     |
| Observation Based Upon Experience .....                                             | 266     |
| Basic Principles for the Integration of Field<br>Work With Class Work .....         | <br>266 |
| Field Work Within the Curriculum .....                                              | 266     |
| Professionalization of Courses .....                                                | 267     |
| Field-Work Materials for Course Use .....                                           | 268     |

|                                                       | Page    |
|-------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| Field Work as a Form of Evaluation .....              | 268     |
| The Most Integrative Type of Field Work .....         | 269     |
| The Teacher and Integration .....                     | 269     |
| Basic Principles for the Integration of Field         |         |
| Work With Guidance .....                              | 270     |
| Responsibility for Guidance .....                     | 270     |
| Specialists in Guidance .....                         | 271     |
| Guidance Based on Information .....                   | 272     |
| Continuous Guidance .....                             | 272     |
| Complete Guidance .....                               | 272     |
| Guidance for All .....                                | 273     |
| Self-Guidance .....                                   | 273     |
| Integration of Guidance With Supervision .....        | 273     |
| Integrating Clinical Pastoral Training With           |         |
| Field Work .....                                      | 274     |
| Historical Development of Clinical Pastoral           |         |
| Training .....                                        | 274     |
| Objectives of Clinical Pastoral Training .....        | 276     |
| Standards for Selection of Training Centers .....     | 277     |
| The Organization of the Training Program .....        | 277     |
| The Content of the Clinical Training Program .....    | 278     |
| Supervision and Methods Used in Clinical              |         |
| Training .....                                        | 279     |
| Clinical Training Statistics .....                    | 281     |
| Integrating Clinical Training With the Seminary       |         |
| Curriculum .....                                      | 282     |
| Areas of Need .....                                   | 284     |
| The Integration of Field Work With Class Work .....   | 285     |
| The Integration of Field Work With Guidance .....     | 286     |
| The Integration of Clinical Training With             |         |
| Field Work and the Entire Curriculum .....            | 287     |
| Summary .....                                         | 288     |
| <br>X. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS .....                  | <br>293 |
| The Problem and Its Setting .....                     | 293     |
| Purpose of the Study .....                            | 293     |
| Historical Background .....                           | 293     |
| Delimitations of the Study .....                      | 294     |
| Related Studies and Justification of This Study ..... | 294     |
| Contribution of the Study to Education .....          | 295     |
| Investigational Procedure .....                       | 295     |
| Basic Psychological and Educational Principles .....  | 296     |
| The Nature of the Learner .....                       | 296     |
| The Nature of Learning .....                          | 296     |
| The Motivation of Learning .....                      | 297     |
| Transfer in Learning .....                            | 297     |
| Curricular Objectives .....                           | 297     |
| The Content and Nature of the Curriculum .....        | 297     |
| The Organization and Utilization of the               |         |
| Curriculum .....                                      | 298     |



|                                                                               | Page |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| The Role of Direct Experience in Professional Education .....                 | 298  |
| The Administration of Field Work in Theological Education .....               | 299  |
| Basic Principles Underlying Field-Work Administration .....                   | 300  |
| Trends and Needs in the Field Work of Theological Schools .....               | 301  |
| Placement in Field Work .....                                                 | 301  |
| Basic Principles for Placement .....                                          | 302  |
| Placement Needs .....                                                         | 302  |
| The Supervision of Field Work .....                                           | 303  |
| Basic Principles Underlying Supervision of Field Work .....                   | 303  |
| Outline of Supervisory Activities .....                                       | 304  |
| Trends and Needs in Supervision of Field Work ...                             | 304  |
| The Evaluation of Field Work .....                                            | 305  |
| Basic Principles of Field-Work Evaluation .....                               | 306  |
| Needs in the Area of Field-Work Evaluation .....                              | 307  |
| Field-Work Records and Reports .....                                          | 307  |
| Basic Principles Underlying Field-Work Recording and Reporting .....          | 308  |
| Needs in Field-Work Recording and Reporting .....                             | 309  |
| The Integration of Field Work With Other Aspects of the Curriculum .....      | 309  |
| Basic Principles of Integration of Field Work With the Total Curriculum ..... | 310  |
| Clinical Pastoral Training .....                                              | 311  |
| Needs in the Area of Integration .....                                        | 312  |
| Conclusions and Recommendations .....                                         | 312  |
| The Attitude of the Seminaries .....                                          | 312  |
| The Extent of Field Work .....                                                | 313  |
| The Supervision Provided .....                                                | 314  |
| The Integration of Field Work With Other Aspects of the Curriculum .....      | 315  |
| Recommendations .....                                                         | 316  |
| Suggestions for Further Research .....                                        | 317  |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY .....                                                            | 319  |
| APPENDIX .....                                                                | 335  |
| A. Basic Principles Developed in This Study .....                             | 335  |
| B. Questionnaire .....                                                        | 345  |
| C. Seminaries Included in the Survey .....                                    | 353  |
| D. Seminaries and Institutions Visited .....                                  | 356  |
| E. Individuals Interviewed .....                                              | 358  |

# LIST OF TABLES

| Table                                                                                                                                                         | Page |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 1. Number of Member Seminaries of the American Association of Theological Schools Per State .....                                                             | 70   |
| 2. Number of Seminaries Located in Cities or Metropolitan Areas of Various Sizes .....                                                                        | 71   |
| 3. Number of Ninety-Six Seminaries in Which Field Work Was Optional or Required During the Several Seminary Periods .....                                     | 73   |
| 4. Number of Ninety-Six Seminaries Requiring Various Amount of Field Work As A Prerequisite to Graduation.                                                    | 74   |
| 5. Number of Ninety-Six Seminaries Which Reported Student Participation in Forty-Four Kinds of Field-Work Activity as Optional, Required, or Supervised ..... | 76   |
| 6. Frequency With Which Ninety-Six Seminaries Reported Students Participating in Forty-Four Types of Field-Work Activity .....                                | 79   |
| 7. Frequency With Which Ninety-Six Seminaries Reported Various Field-Work Activities as a Graduation Requirement .....                                        | 81   |
| 8. Number of Seminaries Using Certain Methods to Secure Data on a Student Prior to His Placement in Field Work .....                                          | 111  |
| 9. Number of Seminaries Using Certain Methods to Secure Data Concerning Places Available for Student Field Work .....                                         | 113  |
| 10. Frequency With Which Various Officials and Faculty Members of Ninety Seminaries Participated in Field-Work Supervision .....                              | 130  |
| 11. Number of the Seminaries Using Various Supervisory Techniques .....                                                                                       | 133  |
| 12. Number of Seminaries Providing Supervisory Visits to Students Participating in Six General Types of Field Work .....                                      | 136  |
| 13. Number of Seminaries Which Were Able to Supervise Certain Types of Field Work Most Satisfactorily .....                                                   | 141  |
| 14. Number of Seminaries Which Found Certain Types of Field Work Difficult to Supervise .....                                                                 | 141  |
| 15. Number of Seminaries Which Used Various Reports in Evaluation of Field Work .....                                                                         | 192  |
| 16. Frequency With Which Seminaries Received Various Evaluatory Reports from Students, Seminary Supervisors, and Cooperating Supervisors .....                | 193  |

|                                                                                                                                                                                              | Page |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 17. Number of Seminaries Which Reported Various Uses<br>of Field-Work Reports .....                                                                                                          | 227  |
| 18. Number of Seminaries Which Kept Field-Work Records<br>for Various Periods of Time .....                                                                                                  | 228  |
| 19. Number of Seminaries in Which One or More Classes<br>Used Various Techniques to Integrate Field Work<br>with Class Work, and the Total Number of Classes<br>Using These Techniques ..... | 250  |
| 20. Number of Seminaries in Which Various Techniques<br>Are Used to Integrate Field Work With Class Work,<br>Listed According to the Number of Classes Per<br>Seminary .....                 | 251  |

## CHAPTER I

### THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING

Purpose of the study.--- The purpose of this study of the supervision of the field-work aspect of the curriculum of American protestant theological education is to discover the nature of the field-work supervision being offered theological students today and to develop basic principles essential to an adequate program of field-work supervision.

The objectives of this study may be stated more specifically as:

- (1) a survey of the practices in theological education related to:
  - (a) Administration of field work
  - (b) Placement in field work
  - (c) Supervision of field work
  - (d) Evaluation of field work
  - (e) Records and reports used in field work
  - (f) Integration of field work with other aspects of the curriculum,
- (2) the development of principles basic to all aspects of field-work supervision, and (3) the discovery of trends and needs in the field-work program within American protestant theological education.

Historical background.--- Formal theological education in America began with the founding of the first colleges during the colonial period. All these early colleges were essentially theological training institutions (132:433-36). In time their objectives became more secular, and theological education was provided by individual professors of theology or by senior

ministers under whom the young ministers served as apprentices after graduation from college. The first theological school to be founded in America, as a separate and distinct institution for the training of ministers only, was established by the Dutch Reformed Church at Flatbush, Long Island, New York, in 1774. In 1784 the United Presbyterian Church established in Ohio the school which is now known as Pittsburgh-Xenia Theological Seminary (105:25).

This is an example of a denominational protestant school of theology.

Harvard is an example of an undenominational school of theology. Harvard first organized its separate divinity school in 1816, although theology had been taught in Harvard from the time of its founding (5:5). Since these early beginnings, theological schools have been established in many parts of the United States. The seminaries varied in creed, size, and level of scholarship. Some of these institutions trained for service in a particular denomination, while others had programs that were undenominational. A number of theological schools were comparatively short-lived, some united with other institutions, some developed into liberal arts colleges or universities, and many have continued as theological seminaries to this time.

The American Association of Theological Schools (142:9) was founded in 1918. It was first known as the Conference of Theological Seminaries and Colleges in the United States and Canada. In 1936 a new constitution was adopted by the organization and the name was changed to its present form (158:36). The association is the only accrediting body for theological seminaries in the United States. It holds biennial meetings and issues bulletins periodically. There are now (1951) 107 member institutions of the American Association of Theological Schools; seventy-five are fully

accredited. Of the 107 member seminaries, ninety-six are located within continental United States, ten are in Canada, and one is in Puerto Rico.

The association offers two classes of membership: full membership, for fully accredited schools, and associate membership. Associate members are institutions which have been recommended by the executive committee for associate membership after inquiry as to: (1) the extent to which the institution falls below accreditation standards, and (2) the attitude of supporting churches toward the efficiency and adequacy of the institution in educating and training for the ministry (161:16).

Delimitation of the study.— This study is limited in its scope to an investigation of the supervision of the field-work programs in seminaries that are members of the American Association of Theological Schools. Only those seminaries that are located in the United States are included.

In 1946 and in 1947 conferences were held to discuss field work in theological education. Twenty-four seminaries were represented at the first conference (159:42) and twenty-two at the second (1:107-08). Both conferences were held at the Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary in Philadelphia. These were the only regularly scheduled conferences which had been called for the specific purpose of studying field work. In both of these conferences some of the associate members of the American Association of Theological Schools participated actively, while a number of the fully accredited schools were not even in attendance. Since the discussions at these conferences provided background and inspiration for this study, no distinction has been made in this investigation between the associate and the fully accredited schools.

For the purpose of this study, field work includes those extra-class activities of a practical nature in which the theological student participates while attending a theological seminary and which furnish him experiences in the type of work commonly engaged in by American protestant ministers. Typical field-work experiences include student pastorates, counseling activities, work with social agencies, service as a teacher or director of religious education, home visitation, and choir leadership. While the generic term "field work" would include experiences that occur in clinical pastoral training or during a year of internship, these experiences were studied only incidentally in this research, since, in general, they were not under the active supervision of the seminaries.

An attempt was made to discover all the fundamental practices of the seminaries regarding field work and to develop basic principles concerning the various related phases of field-work supervision. No attempt has been made, however, to present in detail an ideal pattern of field-work supervision. This study assumes that, just as each individual grows and develops in relation to his total environmental situation, so each seminary must develop a unique field-work program to accord with its own philosophy, its own community and church inter-relationships, and its own facilities.

Related studies and justification of this study.-- The trend in general education to give increasing emphasis to direct experience has been reflected, to a degree, in the field-work program in theological education. In 1921, under the auspices of the Institute of Social and Religious Research, the Council of the Church Boards of Education began the first thoroughgoing study of the seminaries of America (105:vii). After three

years of research and conferences, this organization published its report, Theological Education in America, written by Robert L. Kelly. In this report, the only sentence specifically devoted to field work was:

There is in a few seminaries supervised field work, in which observation-visits under supervision are made to social service and human welfare agencies, and in which supervision is given to practice service with specific groups and individuals, and to field work of student pastors (105:58).

In 1932, Foster (75) published his thesis, Field Work and Its Relation to the Curriculum of Theological Seminaries. This thesis of 103 pages represented the first systematic research dealing specifically with the problem of field work in theological education. The study was done under the direction of the Department of Educational Research of Columbia University. Foster included data from sixty-eight seminaries in his survey. He discovered that fully three-quarters of the outside work of seminary students was "in no definite or effective way so controlled by seminary authorities as to enhance its intrinsic educational significance" (98: Vol. 3: 203).

Foster found it difficult to reduce to statistical tabulation much of the information he gathered, but he provided illustrations of the practices of the seminaries which had well-developed field-work programs.

From 1929 to 1932 a study of theological education in America was made under the joint auspices of the Conference of Theological Seminaries in the United States and Canada and the Institute of Social and Religious Research. A four-volume report was published in 1934 under the title, The Education of American Ministers. Volume III of this report, edited by Mark A. May, was devoted to reporting a survey of the seminaries and their



curriculum, faculties, student bodies, religious life, and patterns of administration and finance. One chapter of this volume was devoted to "The Seminary Laboratory: Field Work" (98: Vol. 3:192-251). The material in this chapter is a repetition of the main body of Foster's dissertation, republished practically word for word.

Foster set up three underlying principles for the further development of field work:

(1) The primary concern of the seminary is the education of the student for religious leadership. His education comes through a series of experiences which have unequal growth value. These educative experiences are not confined to books, courses, lectures, and other academic exercises, but are derived also from direct contacts with the problems of life. Certain types of field work experience have educational values which are fully equal to those of the classroom or library, though they require the help of both classroom and library fully to develop those values. And this dependence is reciprocal.

(2) The seminary and the student owe a responsibility to the employing institution. These institutions should get value received not only for money paid to the student but also for time spent in the supervision of his work. When the seminary places a student in a church or club or social agency, it immediately becomes in a measure responsible, through the student, for the success of the work which that student undertakes.

(3) The third principle emerges from the other two. The seminary, the student, and the employing institution become contracting parties jointly responsible for the successful outcome of the venture, both in terms of the tasks undertaken and in terms of that part of the student's education to be derived from the doing of those tasks (98: Vol. 3: 243-4).

Foster reported that unsolved problems remained in the areas of control, placement, time involved in field work, supervision and administration of field work, and the relation of field work to the curriculum. He suggested that in the further development of field work there should be provision for grading and supervising the field-work experiences (98: Vol. 3: 224-28).

The only study published on field work in theological education since the initial work of Foster in 1932 is that of Morgan, who wrote his dissertation at the University of Pennsylvania in 1942. His study was entitled "The Status of Field Work in the Protestant Theological Seminaries of the United States."

There were three phases of Morgan's study. He first made a preliminary brief survey of the status of field work in the protestant theological seminaries of the United States. For this he used a nine-item questionnaire. He then selected a group of forty theological seminaries which he felt had the strongest field-work programs and made an intensive study of their field work. Morgan also made a study of the field work of a selected group of seminary seniors. The questionnaire-study of the field work of the selected seminary seniors provided information which tended to substantiate the data gathered through his questionnaire survey and visits to the forty selected schools.

At the conclusion of his study Morgan pointed to these problems and needs:

(1) There is need for an authoritative treatise of the basic philosophy of field work, by one thoroughly acquainted with educational philosophy in general, and also with the particular philosophy of education which motivates the church.

(2) There is need for the establishment of some standards to be used by field work leaders in the selection of field work types best able to meet the educational needs of the students.

(3) A treatment of principles and techniques of supervision of field work, similar to that which has been provided for public school teaching, [sic] and social group work should be produced.

(4) Opportunity should be given the seminaries for regular and adequate exchange of ideas and experience related to field work (129:105).

Addresses on the importance of field work and reports of what particular seminaries were doing in their field-work programs had been given at various conferences and meetings (111:2). A number of theological schools were anxious to know what other similar institutions were doing in their field-work programs. Administrators and others responsible for field-work supervision had corresponded with one another and sought to share information concerning common problems. Need for assembling data on what the various theological schools were doing in this aspect of their curriculum was clearly indicated. The status and organization of the field-work programs within accredited theological schools and the forward-looking practices which were being developed in supervision of field work by those schools needed to be assembled and published. Fundamental principles underlying the entire field-work program needed to be drawn up.

In a letter under date of June 5, 1950, Morgan expressed his opinion concerning the need for further research:

I feel, personally, that there is room for another study on field work in view of the extremely rapid development of this particular type of theological approach. The crucial issue at the present time is supervision. It might be worthwhile for you to make a study aimed at this particular point of view. I do not know of any recent publication in the field of a study of field work (110:1).

In a letter under date of January 5, 1951, Nevin C. Harner, executive secretary of the American Association of Theological Schools, acknowledged receipt of a preliminary draft of the first chapter of this study with the words:

I am inclined to agree heartily that a study of field work in theological education is in order at the present time. It seems to me, furthermore, that your proposed procedure is sound (113:1).

This study has taken into consideration those needs which have been recognized and pointed out by leaders in theological education. The entire study has emphasized the area of supervision in the field-work program. This emphasis is directly in line with Foster's view as to where further development should occur and with Morgan's statement that the development of better field-work supervision was the crucial need. The first three of the four needs set forth by Morgan's dissertation are directly dealt with by the development of pertinent principles. The more detailed survey of the entire group of recognized theological schools makes available to the various seminaries information concerning the experiences and programs of the several schools, thus helping to meet the final need expressed by Morgan in his dissertation.

Contribution to education.— This research provides the first detailed study of field-work supervision as practiced by the entire membership of the American Association of Theological Schools, the only accrediting body in the field. Ninety-five per cent of the member schools located within the United States cooperated in one way or another; more than half of these were visited in person by the writer.

This research has developed the first comprehensive statement of basic principles underlying field work in theological education. Chapter II presents fifty-nine fundamental psychological and curricular principles underlying field work. In Chapters IV through IX fundamental principles are developed relative to the administration of field work, placement in field work, supervision of field work, evaluation of field work, records and reports used in field work, and the integration of field work with

other aspects of the curriculum.

The bringing together of a set of extensive criteria for a desirable program of supervised field work, and this detailed survey of the supervisory practices of the entire membership of the American Association of Theological Schools, make possible for the first time a critical evaluation of the adequacy of supervised field work in American protestant theological education.

In a number of the seminaries, field-work programs had developed as a result of careful faculty study. In many others, field work had simply "grown up" and the seminary had made whatever provisions or adjustments seemed feasible. The development of basic principles for field-work supervision now provides, in concise form, a body of reference materials which may serve as a guide to any faculty group interested in developing or reorganizing its field-work program. These principles will need to be revised, enlarged, and adapted by the individual seminary to meet its own particular needs. Individual adaptations of these fundamental principles may then serve to guide the seminaries in their development of more adequate field-work programs.

Investigational procedure.--- The following investigational procedure was used in this research.

(1) A survey was made of the literature treating field work in theological education. This included the reports of the biennial meetings of the American Association of Theological Schools; reports of addresses on field work given in other conferences and conventions; discussions in journals of theology, religious education, and clinical training; the

catalogues of the various seminaries; and books.

(2) A survey was made of the literature dealing with the psychological and curricular principles underlying the field-work aspect of the curriculum. A brief survey was also made of the literature dealing with the field-work aspect of the curriculum of teacher-training institutions. This provided a basis for comparison with the field-work program in theological education.

(3) On the basis of the total information available from the above-mentioned steps, a basic inventory form was constructed for use in surveying the supervision of the field-work aspect of the curriculum of the theological schools.

(4) This initial form of the questionnaire-inventory was submitted for criticism to several leaders in theological education who were interested in field work. It was also tested through discussion of its items with the field-work directors of several seminaries visited by the writer at that time. Necessary changes and revisions were made accordingly.

(5) A personal letter was sent to the directors of field work in the seminaries in the American Association of Theological Schools seeking to establish rapport and to secure their cooperation in the investigation. Then the basic questionnaire with the necessary instructions was sent to the field-work directors.

(6) Fifty-four of the seminaries were visited in person by the writer, or their field-work directors or other interested officials were interviewed. Personal visits were also made to the Institute of Pastoral Care, the Council for Clinical Training, and Bellevue Hospital (one of the

training centers of the Council for Clinical Training). A total of sixty-five interviews were held in gathering data for this study.

(7) Complete data were then recorded, tabulated, and analyzed. Data from the questionnaires were tabulated by use of an International Business Machine.

(8) Basic principles were developed for the major areas of concern in field-work supervision. The sources of data which were considered in the development of these principles included:

- (a) Literature of educational psychology, curriculum construction, educational administration and supervision, evaluation, and guidance
- (b) Literature of teacher education
- (c) Literature of theological education, with particular emphasis on that which discussed field work
- (d) Results of the questionnaire
- (e) Statements accompanying the returned questionnaire
- (f) Documents, report forms, and evaluation forms furnished by the seminaries
- (g) Information received during interviews with field-work supervisors and seminary representatives, and
- (h) Catalogues of the seminaries.

These principles are presented in the various chapters of the dissertation.

(9) The total data gathered concerning the practices of the seminaries in their field-work programs were compared with the basic principles enunciated. On the basis of this comparison, suggestions were given

concerning those aspects of field-work supervision where seminary practices were in need of strengthening.

The organization of this study.— Chapter II of this dissertation presents basic psychological and curricular principles which are true for education in general and for theological education in particular.

Chapter III discusses the role of direct experience in professional education. The value of direct experience in all professional education is pointed out, and the use of direct experiences in dental education, medical education, engineering education, law education, teacher education, and theological education is briefly described. A more detailed description is given of student teaching in teacher education, and the role and objectives of field work in theological education are set forth.

There is a common pattern of organization in Chapters IV through IX. In each of these chapters seminary practices are first discussed, basic principles are then developed, and the major areas in need of strengthening, as revealed by a comparison of practice with principles, are concisely described. Chapter IV discusses the administration of field work in theological education, Chapter V presents placement in field work, and Chapter VI discusses the supervision of field work. Chapter VII is devoted to field-work evaluation and Chapter VIII discusses field-work records and reports. Chapter IX discusses the integration of field work with other aspects of the curriculum. The integration of field work with class work, with the guidance program, and with the clinical training program is emphasized.

Chapter X summarizes the research done, the seminary practices in



their field-work programs, and the basic principles which should underlie seminary field work. The major areas where need for improvement became apparent during this study are also summarized.

Appendix I presents in outline form without documentation or discussion the 231 basic principles developed and presented in the various chapters. It may thus serve as a ready reference for quick location of any particular principle.

## CHAPTER II

### BASIC PSYCHOLOGICAL AND EDUCATIONAL PRINCIPLES

An adequate program of supervised field work must be based upon sound psychological and educational principles. No one engaged in theological education can neglect the developments in educational psychology and research without impairing the quality of education provided for theological students. This chapter seeks to define basic terms and to outline those psychological and curricular principles which have significance for field-work supervision.

#### Basic Definitions

In order that the terms used in this discussion may be clearly understood, the definitions of "theological education," "field work," and "supervision" are given at this point.

Theological education.--- Educational theorists are giving increasing recognition to the role that experience must play in education at its best. While some of the more traditional theological educators have been slow to recognize the true educative character and value of field work, yet slowly but surely direct experience has been assigned an increasingly important role in theological education.

The writer would present the following as his definition of theological education:

Theological education may be defined as that continuous reconstruction of the experience of the theological student which leads to increasingly satisfactory personal integration and spiritual maturity and

to increasingly satisfactory functioning as a minister.

The study of the Bible, theology, church history, and such "academic" areas of the curriculum as emphasize the acquisition of content and also the field-work aspect of the curriculum should be evaluated on the basis of their success or failure in contributing to both phases of the two-fold objective provided in the forementioned definition: (1) personal integration and spiritual maturity, and (2) effective ministerial functioning.

Field work.--- Field work in teacher education has been defined as:

Those experiences of the program of preservice education of teachers which provide, usually at the undergraduate level, for the participation (observing, assisting, teaching, etc.) of the prospective teacher, under the continuous guidance and supervision of the teacher-education institution, in the educational programs of schools are defined herein as student teaching (124:1362).

Turning to theological education, Foster defines field work as "outside work in some measure controlled by the seminary authorities so as to insure and utilize its educational significance to the student" (98: III: 192).

Morgan defined field work as "any form of supervised activity outside the formal classroom program which may provide the seminary student with laboratory experience significant for training in the work to which he is called" (129:6). Elsewhere Morgan (1:2) reports that seminaries tend to agree in practice that field work is work that (1) is other than class work, (2) emphasizes activity as learning, (3) requires supervision, (4) serves as laboratory experience for the more formal studies, and (5) is related to the future work of the theological student and to the needs of the Christian church.

In many seminaries there seems to be no adequate philosophy of field work but rather a form of organization and program which has grown by accretion as necessity has been forced upon them. Too frequently, field work is synonymous with practical activities which are financially remunerative for the student, with little regard for the educational significance of these activities. On the other hand, some seminaries distinguish carefully between "field work" and "supervised field work."

It may be well to distinguish certain field experiences from the more formalized activity known as field work. Every alert seminary teacher should provide for laboratory (i. e., field) experiences as a part of his course requirements. A student in a theology class will find his study has become very much more alive after discussing a theological point with an agnostic or with one who represents confirmed belief in another theological viewpoint. Although Chapter IX gives some consideration to such less formal field experiences, the primary focus of this research is on field work defined as follows:

Field work is the term applied to those direct experiences of the theological student involving observation of and participation in the ministerial function, obtained as a scheduled curricular activity under the supervision of the theological seminary.

Supervision.-- In recent years the concept of supervision has been broadened and re-interpreted to such a degree that a simple, concise, and fully satisfactory definition is difficult to formulate. The Dictionary of Education, edited by Good, defines supervision as

...all efforts of designated school officials directed toward providing leadership to teachers and other educational workers in the improvement of instruction; involves the stimulation of professional growth and development of teachers, the selection and revision of educational

objectives, materials of instruction, and methods of teaching, and the evaluation of instruction (78:400).

Barr, Burton, and Brueckner (12:12) substitute a fine print outline covering a half-page for a definition of supervision. This outline defines by describing. Perhaps the title of their book provides one of the simplest and best definitions which may be given: "Supervision--Democratic Leadership in the Improvement of Learning."

For the purpose of this research and as a usable concept in theological education, the writer presents the following as his definition:

Supervision in theological education is democratic leadership guiding the theological student into more effective performance of his ministerial functions.

#### Basic Principles of Learning

An effective program of theological education (119:337) should be based upon a sound theology, a practical educational philosophy, an adequate psychology, and a dynamic sociology. The principles of learning developed here seek to establish such a basis.

The nature of the learner.-- 1. The theological student is a dynamic, active being. As the student sits in a theology class, he does not passively accept or reject a theological proposition. He is continuously reacting to his learning situation (35:212; <sup>101b:241-42</sup>177:58). His childhood background and training, his relations with the theology teacher, his relations with other students who participate in the class discussion, his field-work experience the previous week-end, and the way in which a doctrine is at the moment being presented to the class all enter into the learning situation. The student is active physically, intellectually, and

emotionally (145:30). He does something as he sits in his class: he accepts, rejects, ignores, adapts, modifies, selects, and integrates.

2. The theological student is a unique individual. (101a:26) He has a background entirely different from that of the student sitting beside him (35:101b:343; 514-32; 145a:157; 145:30; 177:56). His potentialities for ministerial service; his maturity of Christian experience; his interests; his personal, religious, and ministerial problems are unlike those of any other student in the seminary. He may be intellectually capable but not as emotionally mature as is desirable in a minister of the gospel. He may be religiously mature but socially rather immature. Not all aspects of his nature develop at a parallel rate. The seminary must value his individual differences as contributing to social enrichment and as having potentiality for significant achievement. Each student was a unique individual when he came to the seminary and each will continue to be his own unique self as he leaves the seminary to enter the ministry.

3. The theological student is a social person (35:521; 77:124-5; 101b:131; 124:200). He is a member of social groups within his home, his church, and within the seminary. He interacts with his classmates, with his teachers, and with those to whom he ministers in his field work. His inter-relationships with all these individuals affect his personal and professional growth. The student is a social person in his own right, but he also has primary social obligations as a minister which he must effectively fulfill. The seminary has a definite responsibility for the social growth and interaction of the student.

4. The theological student reacts intelligently. His seminary

classes and activities need to present him with opportunities to analyze problems, plan appropriate courses of action, execute his plans, and appraise his results (101b:375,9; 1145a:383). He needs and desires guided experience in developing his own principles of action as a minister. He can effectively use a much richer and more varied curriculum than is commonly provided him. The seminary must plan for his total development and must enlist the cooperation of the student in planning for, evaluating, and supervising his own personal and professional growth.

5. The theological student reacts purposefully. He imparts personal meaning to his seminary learnings; he seeks to discover the significance of his seminary curriculum for his life work. However, he is not always able to recognize adequate reasons for all aspects of his seminary program. He seeks goals which have personal significance for him (101b:243; 177:61-5). His laboratory experiences need to integrate theory and practice so that his classes become alive. The student's reactions in his classes and in his field work are all motivated. There are reasons for his performance. His purposes may not always be reflected by his words and actions; neither are his needs always self-evident. In order that teacher and student purposes may be united, the seminary should provide for shared planning and evaluation of the educative experiences. This should characterize both classroom experience and field work.

6. The theological student reacts creatively. It is natural for him to use his imagination in creative self-expression of his ideas and feelings (1145:31). Each individual has creative capacity. The effective development of this capacity is highly important in the minister. The

seminary must avoid doing anything which might stifle the creativity of the theological student; it should seek to guide him in improved creative expression. Democracy in the classroom and in field-work supervision is an essential. Creativity will not be apparent or emerge except in an environment which is continuously conducive to freedom of action. In field work it is particularly important for the student to develop his own approach to the solution of problems which emerge.

7. The theological student is ready for certain learnings. At any given time there are learnings for which the student is ready and others for which he is not ready. His readiness is unique to himself (101a:5; 101b:41, 55; 145a:157; 35:31; 169:301-2; 177:83). It is uneconomical for the teacher to present work in disregard of the background of the student. Not all students are ready for the same type of field work at the same stage in their seminary study. A student may be intellectually ready but not spiritually or emotionally mature or ready. Field work may contribute much to readiness for certain class learnings. A felt need constitutes one type of readiness. Whether in the classroom or on the field, a student is ready for an experience (55:181) when

- (a) he can interpret its content readily
- (b) he can endow it with meaning
- (c) he can relate it to personal interest and need.

8. The theological student learns as a whole being. (145a:163) He is not an intellectual being in the classroom, an emotional being in the home, a social being in the church group, and a spiritual being in the pulpit. In the seminary classroom or in his field work the physical, emotional, intellectual, social, and spiritual aspects of his being are in constant inter-



<sup>101a:23-4; 101b:110</sup>  
 action (35:212; <sup>177:58</sup>). In each learning experience his whole organism is involved and affected. The seminary should provide for the development of all the student's powers (145:30). The student learns more economically and effectively when his whole being is involved in the learning process. This is why some of the most satisfactory learning and growth of the entire theological course may occur during carefully supervised field work.

The nature of learning.-- 9. Learning is an active process. The seminary student, like any other student, learns by doing (44:478; 81:137-8, <sup>101b:50-3, 356; 145a:334</sup> 340). Until he does something with the theory of his classroom or the situation in the field, the student has not learned. As he experiences, reacts, accepts, rejects, selects, and integrates he learns. The only way to prepare for effective ministerial functioning is to practice ministerial activities in an effective way. Peters has stated that "to be educated is to be an old hand at the many businesses of living because one has been through them in advance of the critical occasion and has matured effective techniques for dealing with them" (151:8). The role of the seminary teacher or field-work supervisor is to shorten trial and error and to aid the student in the development of insight. The student may learn vicariously through the experiences of others, e.g., how to conduct a church board meeting effectively, but he can do this only after he has had the requisite previous background to enable him to visualize the situation. Thus the theological student learns through his experiences. The doctrine of immortality will become a meaningful learning when the student has dealt with a child in his Sunday School class who has lost a loved one through death.

10. Learning results in responses, controls of response, values,

understandings, attitudes, appreciations, special abilities, and skills

<sup>101b:408</sup>  
(35:212). Since the student learns as a whole being, one learning experience may result in many learning products. The seminary teacher cannot ignore either direct or incidental learnings. A field-work supervisor may teach a student greater skill in the handling of church announcements, but the learning resulting from the democratic or undemocratic way in which the supervision was given may be of greater significance for the future functioning of the student-minister than the improved skill which constituted the direct learning. A student may acquire along with his knowledge of New Testament Greek an attitude which will unconsciously motivate him to forget his Greek and use it as little as possible once his training is completed.

11. Learning is facilitated by responding to whole situations.

Often the student must respond to whole situations before he can respond to the various parts of that whole (35:212; 55:308). Thus the student must be guided in his overview of the community as a whole before he tries to develop his program for the young people's group in the church where he is doing his field work. The student can understand his young people's group only when he sees it as a part of the church and community. In the case of skills, detailed analysis of the learning process may be highly desirable, but it should come after some facility in the skill has been established (169:299). Thus the student who is spending his week-ends in a student pastorate should be helped to achieve a fair degree of confidence and skill in his leadership of the public worship before excessive part-by-part analysis is made of his gestures during the sermon.

12. Learning is made more meaningful and permanent by integration.

Learning is effective to the extent that it is organized and related (37:21; 55:291; 81:325). Certain aspects of the liturgy take on new significance as their relation to church history is realized. The Reformation, in turn, takes on new meaning when the student-pastor applies reformation truths to present-day situations in a series of Sunday-morning messages. Diffuse, unrelated learning experiences can lead to mental confusion. Facts known in isolation take on new meaning when seen as a part of a larger situation. It is important for the student minister to know his own denominational history and background, but he must also see his denomination within the total pattern of Christendom. Differentiation and integration are not contrary to each other; they are complementary processes (77:328-30).

13. Learning is facilitated by proceeding from the known to the unknown. (1145a:338) Difficulty is increased by unfamiliarity more than by apparent complexity. Even a simple learning seems difficult when experiential background is lacking (81:134-5; 169:318-20). A counseling experience in a youth group will prepare the way for a study of pastoral care. The development of an adequate form of organization for a Sunday school will not seem so difficult to one who has participated in several well-supervised observations of efficient Sunday schools in action. On the other hand, counseling in connection with clinical theology may seem quite difficult to a student who has engaged in no supervised ministerial visitation. If learning is to proceed from the known to the unknown, theory must be integrated with practice and the sequence of field work should be individually graded.

14. Learning is facilitated when the curriculum is adapted to the

individual student. Full adaptation is dependent upon adequate knowledge of the student's abilities, interests, and needs (101b:403; 47:479; 169:199; 207-8).

When the learning is adapted to the student, it becomes meaningful to him. Theological education must be individualized much ~~more~~ extensively than it now is (77:309). An adequately integrated and supervised program of field work makes the curricular experiences satisfy purposes which the student currently accepts. Successful sermon preparation for one week may draw upon such subject areas as New Testament Greek, theology, church history, Christian ethics, and Old Testament history. An adequate field-work program will draw upon all areas of the curriculum. The student begins to think of the curriculum as a resource area and assumes increasing responsibility in guiding his own growth and in adapting the curriculum to his own needs.

15. Learning is facilitated when the learning experiences and content have meaning for the student. Meaning is supplied by the seminary student on the basis of his own experiential background (58:290-1; 124:686). Meaning can be most readily assured when theory and practice are integrated through field work. Experiences have meaning when they (77:307):

- (a) are related to the student's interests
- (b) contribute to his purposes
- (c) are involved in his living
- (d) prepare him for his future
- (e) involve problem solving and creative activity rather than formal drill or memory work
- (f) result in satisfying social relationships, and
- (g) build upon his experiential background.

These conditions are admirably fulfilled in a well-organized and integrated program of field work.

16. Learning is facilitated by a problem approach. A problem results in thinking and facilitates the discovery of relationships and the development of generalizations. Thus a problem sets the stage for the integration of learning by the theological student (37:21-2; 81:332-7). Field work provides the student with a succession of problems of varying difficulty. Class-work integrated with field work makes use of all these problems and the case materials which the student develops during his field work. Moreover, these problems are the student's own. The student may not always be the first to become aware of them; the field-work supervisor and the teacher often perform this function. But the student recognizes the problem as his own. Successive problems should bear some relationship if the highest learning is to be achieved. The problems of field work are inter-related in a functional whole.

17. Learning is facilitated by variety of experience (56:294-5; 77:319). Variety is conducive to interest, a powerful motivating force. When field work is integrated with classroom theory, a wider range of educative experiences is assured and better total results accrue. Experimental results tend to emphasize that a vitalized approach, making use of various activities and projects, leads to higher subject-matter achievement, greater social interaction, a higher quality of independent work, and more effective student leadership (171:429). Possible activities include observation, field trips to churches or institutions, participation in community-agency activities, the making of case studies and community or church surveys, and

counseling.

18. Learning is facilitated by practice. Practice should be of a form which leads to satisfaction (47:417; 169:227-8, 301-2) and care should be taken that the student has insight into the relationships involved in the practice (77:325-6). Speech or homiletic practice in preparation for a sermon or talk to be used in field work can be interesting and satisfying to the student. Practice will not be difficult to motivate if it is related to a meaningful field-work activity. Practice is difficult to motivate when the student does not realize a need for it (81:342). To be effective, practice must be an attentive process. Attention is natural in connection with practicing the public reading of the scripture lesson to be used the following Sunday or the preparation of a script for a radio broadcast.

19. Learning is facilitated by consciousness of the goal. The theological student should understand the purpose of the learning (47:478; 51:236; 81:132-3; 169:24-6). He must sense his need to learn. Intent to learn will come with recognition of this need. Establishing a clear and explicit goal has been termed the first step in economical learning (77:319). In a seminary classroom where social interaction is provided for, or in the field-work program, the student initiates or at least cooperates in the setting up of goals. One of the functions of the field-work supervisor is the guiding of the student in the preparation of a clear statement of objectives for every major field-work project he undertakes.

20. Learning is facilitated by the proper amount of guidance at the right time (55:309; 124:686). Insufficient guidance may discourage and undermine the confidence of the student; excessive guidance ~~thwarts~~

initiative and creativeness. The goal of the theology teacher is not to prevent the student from ever making an unorthodox statement on a theology paper, but rather to guide the student so that he can recognize for himself what is unorthodox and can make his own corrections. The goal of the field-work supervisor is not the prevention of all mistakes by the student-minister in his student pastorate, but rather the guidance of the student so that he can detect mistakes made, or about to be made, and can himself correct these. In every learning situation, the time comes when guidance rapidly diminishes in effectiveness, since the learner has by then understood the basic principles involved and has developed sufficient assurance to apply them.

The theological student needs freedom for responsible action (47:478; 81:129). The minister must continually act responsibly. Wise self-direction in the ministry is best assured by giving the student experiences in self-direction while he is still in training. He should be given a share in planning details of his curriculum, in evaluation of his own progress, and in interpreting the evaluative results. The teacher in the seminary should provide a cooperative, democratic atmosphere in which the student has increasing responsibility for self-direction and self-supervision as he becomes increasingly experienced and mature.

21. Learning is facilitated by self-evaluation by the student of his efforts (51:235-6; 356-7; 77:319). Self-evaluation keeps the student aware of his goal, makes his learning more thoughtful, and helps him avoid repeating errors. As the student notes his progress, his interest increases and he is strongly motivated. By developing in the student-minister an

attitude of self-evaluation, his continuing professional growth after he enters the ministry is better assured. Evaluation in the seminary should be a cooperative process in which diagnosis is a primary concern. As the student increasingly shares in evaluation and the interpretation of results, he assumes increasing responsibility for his own progress.

22. Learning tends to be better retained when it is reviewed or repeated at strategic times in ways which provide for new meaningful organization of the material (47:417; 55:283-4; 124:681). Review should not be of the nature of drill, nor should it be a repetition of the complete learning situation. Preparing a series of junior-church talks on the life of Christ may be an effective review for a course in the synoptic gospels. A written analysis of an observation of a Sunday school may serve as an effective review in religious education. A new but meaningful organization of the material as a review serves as an aid to generalization and transfer and assures better retention by vitalizing the subject or material.

23. Learning is facilitated by social interaction (35:122-33; 78:348). Many learnings are best secured when the class group, with the teacher, works together toward the solution of problems. The cooperative thinking of a group is often more fruitful than the independent thinking of the individual. Furthermore, group planning and group carrying out of plans develop leadership and followership on the part of those who are participating members of the group. It is particularly important that the minister be skilled in both leading and following. Much of his work is with committees, boards, and small church groups. The more experienced he becomes in the processes of group dynamics while he is a theological student, the more



effective can his ministry become. The field-work seminars or practicums provide opportunity for effective social interaction. Supervised group leadership should find a place in every sequence of graded field work.

24. Learning is facilitated by an effective student-teacher relation (51:248-9; 55:334-7). The "social climate" of the student group is strongly influenced by the leadership of the teacher. When the teacher or field-work supervisor exerts democratic leadership, learning tends to be more effective (124:746). The close inter-personal relations of the student and the field-work supervisor, which are inherent in carefully supervised field experiences, provide scope for broad motivation and facilitation of learning. When the student realizes that the criticism he receives is not of him as a person but of his performance and that he is valued as an individual of worth, he will tend to welcome extensive objective and diagnostic evaluation of his work and performance.

If the teacher or supervisor evidences keen interest, the student will tend to be interested. Interest and enthusiasm may not be intrinsic in all aspects of the curriculum, but they may be more successfully motivated by the teacher who has effective relations with the student and who exemplifies real interest himself. Archaeology, Hebrew, medieval European Christianity, or any other subject can become boring when taught by an uninspiring teacher who has ineffective relations with his students.

25. Learning is facilitated by wholesome mental hygiene in the student (55:282-3). No student learns well when he is physically ill or emotionally upset. Anxiety and frustration inhibit learning. They can be minimized by wholesome student-teacher relationships, wholesome mental

hygiene on the part of the teacher, and an emotional climate in the classroom which is conducive to learning. The minister deals with many frustrated and anxious individuals. If during his seminary training he has experienced the kind of leadership which is conducive to wholesome mental hygiene, he will be better able to provide such leadership for others. When the seminary student experiences an effective guidance program and realizes its aid in solving his personal and professional problems, he will tend to be more effective in his own pastoral care. A proper emotional set with freedom from emotional blocking is conducive not only to superior learning (51:98; 169:303, 445-50) but also to more effective ministerial functioning both in field work and after graduation from the seminary.

The motivation of learning.--- Motivation has been termed the "sine qua non" of learning (77:301). Poor seminary scholastic records are frequently due to the failure of the student to see relations between his curriculum and his ultimate work as a minister (77:307). Motivation is very complex (169:259-60). The motivating conditions

- (1) energize the student, and
- (2) direct the student in
  - (a) his utilization of prior learnings
  - (b) his later performance (124:572-3).

26. Learning is motivated by interest (169:252). Interest facilitates concentration (51:98). An able seminary teacher or field-work supervisor can probably develop interest in any necessary part of the seminary curriculum, even when interest is not spontaneous with the student. Many of the theoretical aspects of the curriculum may reveal their full value only

after need has been demonstrated in field work. To attempt to guide the student's learning without taking into account his interest is uneconomical if not futile. He learns better and remembers longer when he is having learning experiences which are personally satisfying to him (55:282). The integration of field activities with class work has important motivating possibilities through adding variety and concreteness and thereby increasing interest. It also stimulates self-evaluation.

27. Learning is best motivated by an aspiration level which is reasonable for the learner (47:479; 55:330; 81:153). An individually graded sequence of field work makes it possible for the student to work toward goals which present sufficient challenge to assure that their achievement constitutes a real success for the student and yet are not so difficult as to discourage effort or make success seem improbable. Goals should be attainable in a reasonable amount of time. A seminary may reserve the goal of full responsibility in a student pastorate until the senior year. However, intermediate, temporary goals may serve as steps toward the major goal. There can be real satisfaction accruing from the completion of a well-organized sequence of observations, a sequence of group-leadership experiences, and a period as a pastoral assistant during which a planned variety of ministerial activities leads toward full assumption of pastoral responsibility.

28. Learning is motivated by the experience of success (47:479; 81:130-1). Nothing succeeds like success. The experiencing of success is so powerful a motivating force that recognition of one success in learning may overcome the cumulative effect of several experiences of failure (55:

318). Success also lessens the effect of fatigue (51:98). Success in field work may provide the self-confidence necessary to successful social interaction by the student within the seminary. Field-work success may provide the motivation necessary to realize success in a particularly difficult "academic" aspect of the seminary curriculum.

29. Learning is motivated by the stimulation of an attitude of self-responsibility. The seminary student needs to assume increasing self-direction and self-responsibility for his growth and progress (55:335; 77:361-2). He is stimulated to do this as he experiences success. He can develop a pride in accomplishment by completing unaided a part of every field-work project. Self-evaluation is an essential aspect of self-direction. Self-evaluation is possible when the student has shared in class planning and in choice of his own field-work objectives.

30. Learning is motivated by a knowledge of results (51:236; 55:316-7; 172:344). Evaluation should be frequent enough to reveal and motivate progress. In field work, this means that supervisory visits once a semester are not sufficient. The results of the evaluation should be indicated by a particularized statement (55:321). Merely to tell the student that his skill in leading divine worship is increasing helps him little. No performance is wholly good, average, or bad. When the supervisor points out particular strengths, he provides a motivating sense of achievement; when he points out particular weaknesses, he provides diagnostic guidance and motivation for growth.

31. Learning is motivated by group approval. When the learning process makes use of group loyalties (81:131-2) and provides opportunity

for group approval (47:479; 169:251, 256-7), powerful motivating influences are brought to bear upon the student. "My field-work assignment" becomes "building up our Sunday school class." "My visitation assignment" becomes "making new contacts for our church." Furthermore, the success of the field-work assignment brings prestige within the field group served and within the student group when reports are given in the field-work seminar or practicum.

Transfer in learning.— By "transfer" in learning is meant the extent to which learning is "facilitated or obstructed by some previous learning of a kindred but not identical nature" (81:247). It is sometimes termed "transfer of training." It is fortunate that many learnings can be improved, modified, or inhibited without direct training. A seminary curriculum may be planned, organized, and carried out so that transfer of both method and content will result (36:461). The principles of transfer of training which follow are basic to attaining such a result.

32. Transfer must be directly taught for (51:339-40; 169:281-5). Every subject area in the seminary curriculum should be taught so as to ensure its application in the work of the student-minister. The psychological principles which are most effective in securing such transfer should be used. It must not be taken for granted that the course in Hebrew poetry will be functional in the student's field-work visitation; the course must be taught in such a way that the student recognizes the resources in Job for personal ministry to those who are sorely tried and the resources in Ecclesiastes for personal ministry to those who are engrossed in amassing wealth and in living for the present world only.

33. Transfer is facilitated by developing an expectation of transfer values (81:249). The class instructors should be sufficiently conversant with the range of field-work activities to be able to point out where course materials will prove of resource value. Such an expectation provides a desirable "set" which both motivates and directs.

34. Transfer is facilitated by identical or common elements in the two situations (172:338). The seminary student must realize that the generalization (law, rule, principle, or relationship) is a constant factor in a variety of situations (36:461). The homiletic principle "arrest the attention immediately" is applicable in a talk to the junior church, in the teaching of a Sunday school class, in personal evangelism with a business man, or in the delivery of the Sunday morning pastoral sermon. The principle of democratic leadership is applicable in a meeting of the board of deacons, in the Sunday school council, in the young married couple's Bible class, around the primary department sand table, and in the local ministerial association. The kind of leadership experienced in the seminary class will tend to perpetuate itself in the leadership of the future minister.

35. Transfer is facilitated by pointing out relationships (36:461; 51:340; 81:254-5). The seminary student must be made aware of the relationships which exist. Transfer depends upon understanding. All seminary subjects should be professionalized and all faculty members should be interested in the field work of the students. When theory and practice are integrated in the seminary, the essential relationships in the learning experiences of the students are discovered and generalized so that the learning is available for transfer and application (77:516).

36. Transfer is facilitated by meaningful learning materials and experiences (77:515). Meaningfulness is important for initial learning, for motivation, and for transfer. Meaning is best secured through the integration of field work with class work.

37. Transfer is facilitated by diversified illustration and application of the generalizations (36:461; 169:285). The seminary student can be furnished with these needed illustrations if the case materials from the field work of the seminary students are used as resource materials by the seminary teachers. The students must have practice in applying to his various field-work situations the generalizations he is expected to transfer, for when transfer occurs it is always specific; it is not general (51:338).

#### Basic Principles of the Curriculum

Educators today tend to define the curriculum as the body of experiences which the student has under the supervision of the school. The curriculum consists of "all the experiences which are utilized by the school to attain the aims of education" (124:307), the "body of prescribed educative experiences under school supervision, designed to provide an individual with the best possible training and experience to fit him for the society of which he is a part or to qualify him for a trade or profession" (78:113). If these definitions are accepted, no basic distinction between the so-called "curricular" and "extra-curricular" is valid; field work assumes its rightful place as an essential and inter-related aspect of the total curriculum.

Historically, theories of the curriculum have passed through a

succession of stages from the curriculum as discipline to the curriculum as enriched and controlled experience (10:1-56). The center of educational focus has shifted from subject matter and the learning process to the student. Although religion considers the individual personality to have inestimable value, yet theological education has been slow to bring its educational focus in line with that of education in general. The concern of the theological educator also must become two-fold: to enrich the experience of the student, and to help the student exercise self-conscious and self-directive control over his experiences (20:36). The seminary must enrich the experience of the theological student by giving range and depth to the content of his experience, interpreting the meaning of his experience, and relating his experience to his objectives as a minister of the gospel. The seminary must encourage its student to achieve self-conscious control and direction of his experiences by assisting him to define his objectives as a theological student and minister, by helping him organize his values, and by guiding him in his total experience and growth in accordance with his organized and dominant purpose of being a minister of the gospel. Thus the curriculum of the theological student becomes intelligently guided experience.

The curricular principles which are hereafter discussed are in harmony with the psychological principles which have been developed in the preceding pages and all have direct or indirect bearing on field work as an important interrelated aspect of the seminary curriculum.

Curricular objectives.-- 38. The seminary curriculum must be based on comprehensive objectives (123:54). An inadequate concept of the goals



of theological education or an inadequate understanding of the psychology of the student and his learning will result in the seminary providing less than the best for its students.

39. The curricular objectives must be dynamic (123:54). The seminary objectives must motivate to action. They must have such significance for a theological student that he will expend effort and sacrifice to attain them. They must also have significance for the seminary faculty, so that the objectives really guide them in their instruction and supervision of the field work of the students.

40. The curricular objectives of the seminary must be clear and stated in terms of the behavior of the student-minister (170:268-9). High-sounding terms are obscure and valueless as objectives. The terms must be defined by reference to the way the student reacts in the classroom, on the seminary campus, and in his field work. For example, "democratic conscience," "Christian character," "spiritual maturity," and "integrated personality" must be defined in terms of the minister's reactions in certain specific situations: a student-minister with a democratic conscience attuned to democratic principles will recognize his responsibility to the church served and will spend in that community at least the minimum amount of time specified in his contract; a spiritually mature student-minister will have a daily plan for devotional reading and prayer; an emotionally mature student-minister will not react to a church board's refusal to go along with his suggested program for the church as if he had received a personal affront. Too often curricular objectives are mere abstractions which are adopted and promptly forgotten (123:54).

41. The curricular objectives must be organized in a clear and careful way (107:68; 123:54-8). Related specific objectives (e. g., various ways a student-minister will behave and function if he is cooperative) may be grouped under a general category (e. g., "The effective minister is cooperative"). Both immediate and remote goals should be provided. A multiple statement of objectives is often desirable: one for the guidance of the seminary faculty, one for student use and stated in terms of the student's behavior, and one for public use, perhaps a more abbreviated form or the general category statements as suggested above.

42. The statement of the curricular objectives of the seminary should be revised as needed (107:68). The statement of the seminary objectives should be flexible, tentative in character, and subject to continuous refinement and development as need and experience may indicate. As continuous evaluation of student and the curriculum proceeds, teachers and students may see needs for new emphases. Crystallized objectives are an indication that the objectives are not functional and are not being used in any significant way.

The content and nature of the curriculum.-- 43. The curriculum should be based on a sound educational psychology (62:59-62). Many psychological principles have already been discussed. The seminary curriculum must keep pace with scientific investigation and incorporate the results of research in psychology and in education (143:92-107).

44. The seminary curriculum should be based on a democratic philosophy (170:262-5). The democratic ideals are identical with or are in harmony with Christian ideals. Democratic ideology represents the aims,

methods, and social relationships to which the American people are devoted. The seminary should be democratic in its policies, practices, and objectives. The principles of democracy are complex and inter-related and are subject to diverse interpretations. A few of the possible implications are here mentioned as suggestive of others which the seminary may evolve. Democracy in the seminary implies, among other things:

- (a) adapting the curriculum to the needs of the individual student, not an inflexible prescribed list of courses providing the same educational content for each student regardless of his background or need;
- (b) student participation in the planning of curricular details, not a curriculum pre-arranged, pre-cut, and dried even to the minutest details;
- (c) student participation in evaluation of his own growth, of the curriculum, and perhaps of instructional methods, although student evaluation would naturally be only a part of the total evaluatory process.

45. The curriculum should provide the seminary student as much direct experience as is educationally feasible and economical (25:143-5; 67:256). Vicarious experience has genuine value. However, in the words of Donham,

Unfortunately the academic environment tends to insulate men from the facts of human behavior and social life in their concrete and changing complexity...the college both can and must, if it is to perform its function of general training effectively...adopt methods which break down the isolation, give more opportunity for direct experience, and develop effective supplements to direct experience (60:259).

Field work provides this necessary contact for the seminary student, and the supervision of field work provides the necessary contact for the seminary teacher. Whitehead has said that "the second-handedness of the learned world is the secret of its mediocrity" (115:10). The more the ministerial student knows from direct experience about children and adults and their individual and collective behavior, the more effective he may become. By studying many situations he will be saved from superficial generalizations about human behavior and will tend to avoid dealing with symptoms rather than the disease. The initiative, purposefulness, reflection, cooperation, social responsibility, high ideals, and progressiveness which the minister needs are most surely developed and revealed through continuous and supervised experiences in field work. Ministerial education, apart from actual experience, suffers:

- (a) a loss of reality,
- (b) a loss of interest, and
- (c) a "split-mind" type of departmentalization.

46. The curriculum should provide for responsible experience for the seminary student (57:257). The ministerial student needs to deal with uncertain human behavior responsibly, to face facts responsibly. Breadth of background knowledge is not sufficient for the making of wise judgments. The student needs experience in making responsible decisions.

47. The seminary curriculum should have real-life significance for the student (81:318). The student must feel that the entire seminary curriculum ministers to his present and future needs as a minister of the gospel (25:130-1; 170:258-62). While present felt needs of the student

are not adequate as a basis for the selection of the curricular content, yet they may not be forgotten (55:177). Field work assists in giving new significance to curricular areas for which there was no original felt need on the part of the student.

48. The seminary curriculum should be comprehensive (108-286). It should take into account all of the needs of the student in his total environment. Intellectual, religious, social, and psychological factors must be considered. The seminary curriculum must also take into account the needs of the church and of society (170:254-7; 107:290-1). It must have both personal and social utility.

49. The seminary curriculum should be flexible (81:321; 123:58-9; 177:57). The curriculum must be adjustable to student, church, and social needs as they emerge. Constant revision is imperative.

50. The seminary curriculum should be an inter-related, integrated whole (25:147-50; 81:318; 124:348). Each seminary class and activity should be properly oriented with the total curriculum and should be related to the recognized objectives of the seminary. The curriculum must be internally consistent. No course or department has a justifiable place within the curriculum except as it is related to the total curriculum. Every seminary instructor and field-work supervisor is responsible for the integration of field work and class work. The seminary has no room for a staff or faculty member who is not sympathetic toward such integration. Academic work and field work do not have conflicting claims; they are mutually inter-dependent.

51. The seminary curriculum should emphasize social interaction at all points (124:348). Skill in social interaction is perhaps more

important in the related professions of education and the ministry than in any other profession. The minister needs to be skilled as a participant in and a leader of group thought. These skills can be learned only through supervised practice. Seminary classes, practicums, and field work need to emphasize social interaction.

The organization and utilization of the curriculum.-- 52. Basic content in the seminary curriculum should be selected by experts: details should be teacher-pupil planned (81:318). In order to secure an adequate range, balance, organization, and sequence of content, the service of experts on curriculum committees is desirable. Students should also serve on such committees. The details of planning, however, vary from class to class and from individual to individual. The curriculum committee may decide that each year the class in church administration should study pastoral visitation, evangelism, financial problems of the local church, the role of religious education in the church program, pastoral duties, marriages, funerals, and baptism. However the pupil-teacher planning committee may decide one year to begin their study by a series of observations as a class group, another year it may be thought desirable to have individual observations with class reports, while in still another year a more experienced group may decide that instead of observations they should plan a series of panel discussions and should call into the class several resource individuals. A flexible basic curricular organization provides opportunity to make pupil-teacher planning an occasion for learning. Basic principles and procedures need to be worked out in advance by committees on a long-term basis; short-term planning details need to be cooperatively developed as the learning process

advances.

53. The seminary curriculum should be cooperatively developed (107:286-91). Small committees should not dominate curricular development. Curriculum revision provides a most valuable learning experience for all involved, and all should participate in one way or another. The united effort of subject matter specialists, field-work supervisors, and students can produce a much more meaningful, integrated, and balanced program than can a more homogeneous group. No small group is skilled and expert enough to bring together all the skills, understandings, and background needed. No academic aspect of the curriculum should be developed by academic specialists alone and no field-work program should be developed by field-work specialists alone. Cooperation facilitates unity and integration.

54. The seminary curriculum should be organized (36:451-4). The trend in the psychology of learning in the last forty years has been toward an organization of experience rather than a mere summation of experience. Integration and balance must be planned for. No learning experience, whether in the classroom or on the field, should be left unrelated to the other experiences of the curriculum of the seminary. The service in the near-by penal institution must be related to the theology class; the course in New Testament history must be related to the survey being conducted by a group of middlers. The total learning experiences of the three years in the seminary must be organized into a meaningful whole.

55. The curricular organization should facilitate learning in natural settings (81:318). Field work is "ready-made" for this purpose.

56. The seminary curriculum should be continuously evaluated.

This evaluation should include:

- (a) the philosophy and objectives of the curriculum,
- (b) the curricular materials used,
- (c) the methods and techniques of using the curricular materials,  
and
- (d) the results in the students.

57. The seminary curriculum should be continuously revised (107:288). Continuous evaluation of the curriculum and continuous evaluation of the church, the ministers, and the community should lead to continuous improvement and development of the seminary curriculum. Revision should be a continuous rather than a spasmodic process.

58. The sequence of the items in the curriculum should be determined by such factors (81:326-7; 170:321-36) as:

- (a) the experiential background of the seminary student
- (b) the maturity of the seminary student (emotional, social, spiritual)
- (c) the interests of the seminary student
- (d) the usefulness of the content (subject matter or field experience)
- (e) the difficulty of the content
- (f) the relation to other content (whether certain prior field experiences or courses are essential to economical learning).

These various factors are interdependent and need to be kept in mind by the class planning group or by the student and supervisor during the planning of field work.



59. The curriculum of the seminary should be enriched by adequate aids (82:581-603). Field work needs to be enriched by resource persons (including faculty members) and library materials. Class work needs to be enriched by field experiences, observation, resource persons, audio-visual aids, and field-work documents, reports, and materials.

Trends in curriculum building.-- The following trends in curriculum building in education in general have significance for those working with the curriculum of theological education (143:547; 170:614-5):

- (1) Increasing attention is given to educational objectives.
- (2) Increasing emphasis is given to psychological principles.
- (3) Problem-solving is added to purely expository methods of teaching.
- (4) The curriculum is increasingly individualized.
- (5) The curriculum takes note of both individual and social goals.
- (6) Interests and felt needs of students are appealed to and utilized.
- (7) There is increasing emphasis upon the use of "activities."
- (8) Old subject-matter divisions are increasingly disregarded and the curriculum is increasingly organized around complete life experiences, centers of interest, desirable attitudes, and large understandings.
- (9) Students share in planning and in evaluation.
- (10) Curricular materials, methods, and experiences are increasingly diversified.
- (11) Curricular revision is becoming a process of democratic co-

operation and educational growth for all.

- (12) Curricular revision is recognized as a permanent and continuing process.

### Summary

This chapter presents basic psychological and curricular principles of significance to field work in theological education. After defining the terms "theological education," "field work," and "supervision," fifty-nine basic principles are developed and applied to theological education. Principles of learning are developed under four categories.

(1) The nature of the learner.-- The theological student is described as a dynamic, active being. He is a unique, social individual who reacts intelligently, purposefully, and creatively. He is ready for certain learnings, and he learns as a whole being.

(2) The nature of learning.-- Learning is considered to be an active process which results in responses, controls of response, values, understandings, attitudes, appreciations, special abilities, and skills. Learning is facilitated by responding to whole situations and is made more meaningful and permanent by integration. Learning is facilitated by proceeding from the known to the unknown, by an individually adapted curriculum, and by learning experiences which have meaning for the student. Learning is facilitated by a problem approach, by variety of experiences, by practice, and by consciousness of the goal. The proper amount of guidance at the right time and the learner's self-evaluation of his own efforts are conducive to effective learning. Learning tends to be better retained when it is

reviewed or repeated at strategic times in ways which provide for new and meaningful organization of the material. Learning is facilitated by social interaction, by an effective student-teacher relation, and by wholesome mental hygiene on the part of the student.

(3) Motivation of learning.-- Learning is motivated by interest, by an aspiration level which is reasonable for the student, and by the experience of success. It is also motivated by an attitude of self-responsibility on the part of the student, by a knowledge of results, and by group approval.

(4) Transfer of training.-- Transfer must be directly taught for, and it is facilitated by developing an expectation of transfer values. It is facilitated by identical or common elements in the two situations, by pointing out relationships, by meaningful learning materials and experiences, and by diversified illustration and application of generalizations.

The latter part of the chapter is devoted to basic principles of the curriculum. The position is taken that curricular objectives should be comprehensive, dynamic, and stated clearly in terms of the behavior of the student-minister. They should be organized in a careful way and should be revised as needed.

The content and nature of the curriculum are then considered. The curriculum should be based upon a sound educational psychology and upon a democratic philosophy. It should provide the seminary student as much direct experience as is educationally feasible and economical. The curriculum should provide for responsible experience of real-life significance to the student. The curriculum should be comprehensive and flexible, and should be

an inter-related, integrated whole. It should emphasize social interaction at all points.

The final section of principles is devoted to the organization and utilization of the curriculum. Basic curricular content should be selected by experts; details should be pupil-teacher planned. The curriculum should be cooperatively developed, organized, and should facilitate learning in natural settings. It should be continuously evaluated and revised. The sequence of the curriculum should be determined by a variety of factors related to the student and his learning experiences. The curriculum should be enriched by adequate aids.

The chapter closes with a discussion of curricular trends with which theological educators should be conversant.

### CHAPTER III

#### THE ROLE OF DIRECT EXPERIENCE IN PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

Professional education has developed rapidly during the past half century. Although a detailed comparative study of training for the various professions is beyond the scope of this study, this chapter presents a brief discussion of the important role that direct experience plays in professional education. After the value of direct experience in professional education is pointed out, the role of direct experience in dental education, medical education, engineering education, legal education, teacher education, and theological education is briefly presented. A more detailed description is then given of student teaching in teacher education. The chapter closes with a description of the role and objectives of field work in theological education.

The value of direct experience in professional education.--- Direct experience is valuable in all education; it holds a central place in professional training (90:183). The values gained through verbalized classroom procedures are enhanced by the direct experiences encountered in field work (74:17, 139, 319). Many students in professional education, including many theological students, have little or no background of experience to aid them in understanding the concepts presented in the class. Previous experiences may have been in direct contradiction to the basic concepts set forth in the training institution. Professional schools have too largely failed to make adequate provision for giving the students an adequate experiential background for the interpretation of the theory which they are

taught (143:10).

Teachers in professional schools must study the meaning which experiences have for their students in terms of the backgrounds of their students. Wherever the previous experience has been inadequate to give meaning, or where it has contributed to a wrong understanding, new and carefully guided direct experience is called for (74:17, 314). The complex society in which the minister and other professional men must function, and the complexities of the personalities and problems of those whom they shall serve, demand a wide range of experience, wider than any single school situation can offer.

The classrooms of professional schools furnish unquestionable evidence of the value of direct experience. Whenever a minister or teacher comes back to the training institution for graduate work and sits in the same class with undergraduates, the value of the rich background of the person with experience is immediately noticeable.

A student may find it relatively easy to gain insight and understanding with regard to some of the isolated aspects of his future profession through vicarious experiences and study. However, when he actually confronts the whole complex situation involved in his work he may be very confused (74:19). If student pastors, for example, are to get a complete picture of their future responsibilities, they must have experiences with all phases of the ministerial function. They must learn to know children, young people, and adults. They must learn to cooperate with Sunday School teachers, directors of religious education, choir leaders, official board members, conference or synodical officials, and other ministers of the

community or denomination. They need to know their people both in and out of church. They need a variety of experiences and they also need a culminating period of full pastoral responsibility so that all phases of their preparation may be brought into focus. Such a period of responsibility, when properly supervised, becomes functionalized and individualized education at its best.

### Training Programs in Several Related Professions

Dental education.--- Dental education provides a four-year undergraduate course. During the first two years there are standard science courses and much practical work is provided the student. During the third year the student begins to work on patients. The advanced dental student ordinarily has his own office hours, has patients assigned to him through the out-patient clinic, and completes all of the routine clinical work on them. All of his clinical work is under the direct and careful scrutiny of one or more faculty members (125:92).

The average dental student spends more than two-thirds of his time the first two years in laboratory work. During his third year he spends two-thirds of his time in clinical work. During his fourth and final year he spends nearly three-fourths of his time in the clinic (96:232-3). A survey made in 1945-46 showed that throughout the years of dental training the average student spent 1,147 clock hours in class, 1,567 in the laboratory, and 1,553 in the clinic (96:239).

Medical education.--- In the four years of medical education the first two years are considered "pre-clinical" and the last two "clinical"

years. The former drilling on text books and "didactic exercises" have been largely replaced by direct experiences in the laboratories and hospital wards, references to literature, conferences and seminars, and clinics (187:84). During the last two years the medical student devotes almost his entire time to clinical work. He takes histories, makes physical and laboratory examinations, and completes the "work up" of his case. The survey of medical education conducted by the American Medical Association indicated that the most important factor in the success of the clinical program was the responsibility placed upon the student (188:86). This survey stated that "The kind and amount of clinical material over which a medical school has satisfactory control and to which it has ready access will determine in large measure the success or failure of its educational program" (188:100).

Engineering education.--- Co-operative education, which was originated at the University of Cincinnati by Dean Herman Schneider in 1906, has found wide acceptance in engineering education. Under this plan the student alternates periods of attendance at college with periods of employment in industry. The employment is an essential element of the educational process and is related to some phase of the branch of engineering education in which the student is engaged. A range of experience is provided during the period of employment (49:117-8).

At the University of Cincinnati the co-operative course occupies eleven months of the year for five years. Engineering students begin their cooperative work at the beginning of the fifth term of their freshman year and continue it until the second half of their senior year. During this



period there are alternate eight-week periods of study and work. The student must satisfactorily complete eleven or more work periods in order to secure his "Certificate for Co-operative Experience" (4:12-13).

Law education.--- During the past decade the modern law school has begun to place a new emphasis upon developing skills. The older "case method" is not slighted, but it is made more compact so that practical training may receive greater emphasis. Thus far each school has experimented with what seemed best for its own situation. At the College of Law of the University of Cincinnati, in the senior year the law students give a half day per week to service with the Legal Aid Society. His work is supervised by the staff attorney of the society. Seventy-five hours are spent in this practical form of activity during the senior year and a certificate of completion is granted by the Legal Aid Society. Among the practical experiences afforded the law student during his period of study are: interviewing clients; tracing a title; taking a case through probate court; planning an estate; gathering, investigating, marshaling, and presenting fact; arguing appellate cases before faculty judges in "case clubs;" and preparing and filing briefs (100).

Teacher education.--- Student teaching is almost universally required in teacher education today. Campus laboratory schools, where available, are used for observation and limited student participation, and off-campus schools are used for full-time student teaching under the supervision of a faculty-member of the off-campus school. Further discussion of student teaching is provided in the next major section of this chapter.

Theological education.--- Some form of practical activity, usually

of a financially rewarding nature, is participated in by almost every theological student during some part of his seminary training. Many seminary students participate in such field work throughout their entire period of training. In many instances there have not been careful supervision and evaluation of the student's work. Field-work experiences, however, have undoubtedly contributed much to the thinking of the theological students. Chapters IV through X provide a more complete picture of the pattern of field work in theological education.

The role of direct experience.--- In summary, direct experience is playing an increasingly important role in all professional education. From a third to a half of the training period in the co-operative plan of engineering education, in dental education, and in medical education is given to direct experiences under some form of supervision. Theological students participate extensively in practical activities. Student teachers spend time in the observation of teaching and in responsible participation in classroom teaching. Law students are beginning to participate in a variety of practical experiences. Only in dental and medical education is it standard practice for the professional schools to provide their own close and continuous supervision. In teacher education and in theological education joint supervisory responsibility is shared by the training school and the institution served. Some supervision is provided for the engineering students by industry and for law students by attorneys and judges.

#### Student Teaching as a Factor in Teacher Education

It has been frequently pointed out that there is a very close

parallel between student teaching in teacher education and field work in theological education (99:6-7; 135:89-91; 136:106-8). Field-work leaders in theological education have felt the need for knowing the practice in teacher education. Many of the problems faced in the two fields are similar. While there are fundamental differences in the practices of the two professions, there are also evident similarities. In order that the use made of direct experience in teacher education may be compared with its use in theological education, the role of student teaching is here described.

The role of student teaching.--- Both in Europe and in America, student teaching has had a recognized role in the professional preparation of teachers from the time of the founding of the first training institutions (7:1-3; 52:371; 176:267). Student teaching, as a laboratory aspect of the preservice preparation of teachers, may be said to have had a development parallel with the movement toward professional education itself (124:1363). Student teaching is more frequently required for teacher certification in the various states than any other course in professional education. In most teacher-education curricula, student teaching is assuming a role of increasing importance (83:118). Knowledge of the performance of the student during his period of student teaching is becoming recognized as having great value in predicting his success or failure as a teacher (6:214; 11:187). Experienced teachers consistently rate student teaching as the most valuable part of their pre-service education (124:163). Supervisors of teachers also consistently rate student teaching as the significant factor in pre-service training (153:24).

Direct experiences prior to student teaching.-- The research of Evenden has shown that in half of the teachers colleges in the United States the opportunities to work with children before student teaching and the opportunities to see the children in their homes need improvement (48:104-18). Professional laboratory experiences prior to student teaching tend to emphasize observation (74:66-7). This observation is usually a part of a professional course and is usually done in groups rather than as an individual assignment. It is guided by a teacher and is generally confined to school situations. There is an increasing emphasis, however, upon volunteer work with social agencies and community-serving groups (67:96-102, 112). Such volunteer experiences have been found to strengthen the student's vocational purpose, to promote ease and confidence when actual teaching begins, and to serve as a screening device for teacher candidates (48:98-100).

The organization of student teaching.-- While many types of provision for student teaching are made today, the most typical is that of a campus laboratory or training school (sometimes called a practice, demonstration, or experimental school) supplemented by public-school facilities located near the college or university (124:1363). The campus schools tend to be used for observation and limited participation and the off-campus schools tend to be used for full-time student teaching. The major responsibility for supervision typically rests with the critic teacher (teacher of the class to which the student is assigned), while a supervisor from the teachers college makes periodic visits and holds conferences with the student teacher and with the student teacher and critic teacher together.

The critic teacher is sometimes called the supervising teacher.

Hahn's study in 1950 showed that an average of 9.6 quarter hours is now allocated to student teaching in elementary education, and an average of 7.3 hours in secondary education. This tends to be divided as follows: one-fourth to observation, one-fourth to partial teaching, and one-half to full teaching. Hahn found that over two-thirds of all supervisors, directing (critic) teachers, and recent graduates recommend an increase in the amount of student teaching (83:119).

Where the student spends one hour a day in student teaching, he receives experience in the making of assignments, the use of school equipment and school plant, extra-curricular activities, and the making and use of records and reports. He is shown the necessity for assuming responsibility, for originality, and for exercising initiative. A short term of full-time teaching, however, is essential to the student's gaining adequate experience in relations with fellow-teachers, school officials, parents, and the community. Full-time teaching also provides insight into the social, recreational, and religious activities of teachers (190:679).

The field-work program of the Appalachian State Teachers College illustrates the new student-teaching programs which are being developed. It is an interesting variation of the application of the principle of graded participation, and provides for observation and teaching as related aspects of a total experience, rather than as discrete phases with separate credit for each. One quarter (twelve weeks full time) is given to student teaching in some school within a radius of a hundred miles from the college. During the first week the student takes part in all of the school activities

except teaching. During the next two weeks, the student teaches one class. The teaching load is gradually increased until the student is teaching full time. However, during the tenth to twelfth weeks the student again teaches for only half-time and spends the other half in additional observation and participation in all the other phases of the school program. The college developed this program as a result of a survey of the problems met by beginning teachers (109:679).

Internship programs of student teaching, frequently involving a fifth year of training, are becoming more prominent. Typically, the intern teaches two or three hours daily and devotes the rest of his time to observation, conferences with his supervisor, and related courses. Some credit, varying from three to sixteen hours, is generally given. During the intern period, the student-teachers usually receive less pay than regular teachers. While only twenty-five per cent of the universities provide for the internship, ninety-seven per cent of those engaged in teacher education believe that internship training is desirable (124:1365; 174:665-7).

Trends in student teaching.--- Definite trends in regard to student teaching may be noted. The summary here provided gives indication of the direction of these trends.

1. There is a steady trend toward developing laboratory experiences as a definite part of the entire program of pre-service training (8:210; 48:268; 65:96-7; 85:202; 124:1364; 173:141-8). Vital experiences with children, schools, social agencies, and communities are secured prior to student teaching.

2. There is a tendency to lengthen the period of student teaching (3:259; 85:203; 124:1364).

3. There is a strong trend toward providing for an extended period of full-time, fully-responsible teaching experience (8:210; 48:98, 100, 212, 268; 85:202-3; 124:1364; 173:146-7). This period is placed near the close of the training and ranges from eight to twelve weeks in length. It is typically placed in the first semester of the senior year, although there is an increasing tendency to individualize the sequence of such experience.

4. The trend is to provide experiences in both laboratory schools and in off-campus public schools (48:98, 101, 212, 268; 173:144-5). Campus schools (when available) are used for initial experiences, but the final, full-time period of teaching is usually spent in off-campus schools.

5. There is a definite trend toward program integration. Earlier professional study is being related to student teaching, and student teaching is being fused with other curricular experiences (48:98, 268; 173:142; 124:1365). Barriers which have existed between other courses in professional education and student teaching are being broken down.

6. There is a trend toward including within the student teaching experience opportunities for the student to become acquainted with community resources and to help study and solve community problems. Emphasis is also being placed upon the study of child growth and adjustment, and upon the diagnosis of pupil needs (124:1365).

7. There is a trend toward providing a wide variety of professional experiences during the period of student teaching. There are continuous student-teacher planning experiences with the college supervisor, the

critic teacher, and the student-teacher participating. Experience is also provided in the guidance of extra-class activities, curriculum study and reorganization, and in the working of professional organizations (48:145-48; 124:1365).

8. There is a trend toward emphasis upon evaluation of student teaching and of the facilities of the training institution for providing adequate student-teaching opportunities (48:147-8; 124:1365).

9. There is a trend toward the development of the full-time teaching internship (48:146-47; 85:203; 124:1365-66). While this is widely favored by those engaged in teacher education, it is not a wide-spread practice as yet.

Field-work leaders in theological education have been more influenced by the practical-experience programs in teacher education than by those of any other branch of professional education. Therefore, it may be assumed that these trends in student teaching have great significance for theological education.

#### Field Work in Theological Education

The role of field work in theological education.— Most students in American protestant theological seminaries engage in some form of direct experience during part or all of their theological training. The writer's survey has shown that in seventy-three percent of the seminaries some field work is required for graduation. The average seminary has students engaging in twenty-two varieties of field work. These field-work experiences involve preaching, religious education, visitation, counseling, music leader-



ship, social service, survey making, and other miscellaneous activities.

Most commonly, the student devotes some time each week to some form of Christian service. Pastoral work, home missionary work, and clinical work are frequently engaged in full time during the summer. Very few students spend a full year in internship experience.

Most seminaries designate one or more individuals as responsible for the supervision of the field work of the students. Many seminaries, however, offer supervision during only a part of the student's period of seminary training.

The institutions served supply to the seminary reports on the field work of the students assisting them. Occasionally field-work agreements are drawn up between the student and the church or organization served.

Field work and the theological seminary.-- Field work serves definite functions in the theological seminary. The statements which follow point out some of the ways in which field work serves the seminary:

1. Field work serves as a means of relating and integrating all the varied aspects of the curriculum.
2. Field work serves as a means of evaluating the effectiveness of the seminary curriculum.
3. Field-work results suggest the direction of needed curriculum reorganization.
4. Field work serves as a laboratory for experimentally determining the most effective approaches to problems of the pastorate.
5. Field work provides an acceptable measure of the growth and development of the student and of his fitness for the work of the ministry.

6. Field work provides laboratory experiences to complement the more academic aspects of the curriculum.

7. Field work promotes inter-departmental understanding and co-operation in the seminary.

8. Field work helps make the seminary objectives more meaningful and functional.

Field work and the theological student.--- Field work performs a definite service to the theological student. Among the functions which direct experiences in Christian service fulfill for the student are:

1. Field work gives the student orientation to the entire work of the ministry.

2. Field work introduces the student to the types of problems confronted in the ministry and gives him an understanding of the resources needed and available to meet these problems.

3. Field work guides the student-minister in the development of an adequate professional approach, including ministerial ideals, ministerial attitudes, and ministerial ethics.

4. Field work, when properly supervised, guards the student from developing attitudes, understandings, and approaches to ministerial work which might prove detrimental in the ministry.

5. Field work, when properly supervised, secures the full educational value from the practical religious activities which the student engages in because of financial necessity or general interest.

6. Field work assists the student in the development of effective ministerial skills.

7. Field work motivates and facilitates learning; it gives meaning to the more academic aspects of the curriculum.

8. Field work assists the student in the evaluation of his own needs, understandings, and growth.

9. Field work provides the student with vocational guidance by helping him find the type of ministerial service in which he is most interested and for which he is best qualified.

10. Field work assists the student in applying classroom theory to actual real-life situations.

11. Field work develops in the student skill in cooperating with other ministers, denominational officials, members of his congregation, members of church boards and committees, community organizations, and the general public.

12. Field work develops in the student flexibility and the capacity to adjust readily to changing demands of church and community.

13. Field work develops skill in the use of community resources and gives the student an understanding of the role of the church in the community.

14. Field work develops in the student skill in the study and understanding of individuals and their problems through bringing him in contact with people of all ages and in a variety of situations.

15. Field work assists the student to become spiritually, socially, and professionally mature.

16. Field work provides the student the opportunity for making a creative approach to individual, church, and social problems.

17. Field work inducts the student-minister gradually into the full responsibility of the pastorate.

18. Field work develops in the student skill in counseling with people who have problems and in cooperating with medical doctors, psychiatrists, social workers, teachers, and others who also deal with the individual and his problems.

19. Field work provides financial support to enable the student to complete his theological training.

20. Field work develops a sense of personal responsibility for continued growth and development as a Christian minister, for increased ministerial proficiency, and for the furtherance of the total work of Christ's kingdom.

Field work and the institutions served.--- Student field work provides definite services to the churches and organizations in which the students receive their practical experiences. The seminary has an obligation to these institutions which cooperate with it in the training program. Among the functions which field work fulfills for these institutions are:

1. Field work provides leadership for the church or organization.
2. Field work helps to discover the interests and needs of the church or organization and of the community.
3. Field work furnishes a part-time ministry to churches or organizations which might not otherwise be served.
4. Field work, when supervised by the seminary, protects the church or organization from the mistakes of unsupervised novice ministers.
5. Field work promotes cooperation between the seminary and the

institutions served.

### Summary

This chapter has presented the role of direct experience in professional education. Direct experience is valuable and necessary in training for all professions. It provides background for the students, makes their academic work meaningful, and gives orientation to their future profession. A very large role is given to supervised, direct experience in dental education, medical education, and engineering education. An increasingly important role is being assigned to direct experience in law education, teacher education, and theological education.

There is a close parallel between student teaching in teacher education and field work in theological education. Student teaching has long held an important role in teacher education and is now the most universal requirement for teacher certification. Increasing emphasis is being placed upon observation and experiences with children prior to student teaching. During student teaching, observation and limited participation prepare the way for full-time teaching in public schools for a limited period under the supervision of a critic teacher and a supervisor from the teachers college. Internship programs are increasingly offered. There are definite trends in student teaching to include direct experiences throughout the training period, to lengthen the period of full-time responsible teaching, to integrate student teaching with other aspects of the curriculum, and to provide a wider range of experiences. Evaluation and the teaching internship are also increasingly emphasized. All these developments and

trends have great significance for theological education.

Field work is found throughout theological education today. Where it is not welcomed, it is at least tolerated as a necessary evil. Many kinds of field-work activities are engaged in by theological students. Some supervision is provided by most seminaries, although the extent of supervisory activities is very meager. It cannot yet be said that a serious effort is made by the majority of the seminaries to utilize the educational values inherent in the field work of their students. Field work is still inadequately supervised, inadequately evaluated, and inadequately integrated with the other aspects of the curriculum. While the institutions served provide some reports on the field work of the students assisting them, little leadership has been provided by the seminaries for improving the supervision of those institutional officials designated as cooperating supervisors. Field work can serve many important functions within the seminary, for the student, and for the institutions served. It can only do this, however, when it is more adequately supervised, evaluated, and integrated with the total curriculum.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE ADMINISTRATION OF FIELD WORK IN THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

This chapter presents general data concerning field-work participation and describes the over-all administration of field work in theological education. It also develops principles for the administration of field work. In the first section of the chapter the location of the seminaries is pointed out and statistics of enrollment and field-work participation are given. Other topics presented are: the amount of field work required by the seminaries, the field-work activities engaged in, the organization of the field-work program, financial aspects of field work, recommended scales for field-work remuneration, denominational relations, and follow-up activities. Twenty-nine basic principles for the administration of field work are stated in the second section of the chapter. A discussion of promising trends in field-work administration, and a description of the areas of need which should be considered if progress is to be furthered, are given at the close of the chapter.

#### Administrative Practices and Field-Work Statistics

The location of the seminaries.--- There are ninety-six theological seminaries located within the United States which are members of the American Association of Theological Schools. Half of these seminaries are located in the six states of Pennsylvania, Illinois, California, Massachusetts, New York, and Ohio. Ten of the seminaries are located in or near Chicago, seven in or near Boston, and five in or near Philadelphia.

Three seminaries are located in New York City and several others are situated near by.

Table 1 presents the number of seminaries in the various states. Table 2 shows the number of seminaries in cities or metropolitan areas of various sizes. Most seminaries are located in or near urban areas. Only fifteen seminaries are located in cities of less than ten thousand population. Seminaries in the larger cities have types of field-work opportunities available which are not common in the smaller towns or rural areas. On the other hand, most seminary graduates begin their ministry in smaller churches, many of which are located in the smaller towns and cities or in rural areas. It is important to furnish students in the theological seminaries a variety of field experiences, so that before graduation they will have had experience in a setting somewhat similar to what they may expect when they begin their first pastorates. It is recognized, of course, that a number of seminary graduates now go directly into specialized areas of ministerial service other than the pastorate.

Statistics of enrollment and field-work participation.-- In 1950-51\* there were 15,187 students enrolled in the ninety-six member institutions of the American Association of Theological Schools located within the United States. All but two of these seminaries gave a break-down of their enrollment into regular students (Juniors, Middlers, and Seniors) and other

---

\*  
For eight of these seminaries, the data furnished were for 1948-9 or 1949-50.



TABLE 1

NUMBER OF MEMBER SEMINARIES OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION  
OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS PER STATE

| State                      | Number<br>of<br>Seminaries |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| California .....           | 7                          |
| Colorado .....             | 1                          |
| Connecticut .....          | 3                          |
| District of Columbia ..... | 2                          |
| Georgia .....              | 3                          |
| Illinois .....             | 11                         |
| Indiana .....              | 1                          |
| Iowa .....                 | 3                          |
| Kentucky .....             | 4                          |
| Louisiana .....            | 1                          |
| Maine .....                | 1                          |
| Maryland .....             | 1                          |
| Massachusetts .....        | 7                          |
| Michigan .....             | 2                          |
| Minnesota .....            | 2                          |
| Missouri .....             | 2                          |
| Nebraska .....             | 1                          |
| New Jersey .....           | 4                          |
| New York .....             | 6                          |
| North Carolina .....       | 3                          |
| Ohio .....                 | 5                          |
| Oklahoma .....             | 1                          |
| Pennsylvania .....         | 12                         |
| South Carolina .....       | 1                          |
| Tennessee .....            | 3                          |
| Texas .....                | 4                          |
| Virginia .....             | 3                          |
| Wisconsin .....            | 2                          |

TABLE 2  
NUMBER OF SEMINARIES LOCATED IN CITIES OR METROPOLITAN  
AREAS OF VARIOUS SIZES

| Population               | Number<br>of<br>Seminaries |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| 500,000 and above .....  | 42                         |
| 200,000 to 499,999 ..... | 12                         |
| 50,000 to 199,999 .....  | 18                         |
| 10,000 to 49,999 .....   | 9                          |
| 2,500 to 9,999 .....     | 8                          |
| Under 2,499 .....        | 7                          |

students (Graduate and Special). In these ninety-four seminaries there were 11,781 regular students and 3,095 other students.

Over half of the regular seminary students (fifty-three per cent) participated in supervised field work. Sixty-five seminaries reported having students in supervised field-work programs, with a total of 6,263 students participating. Twenty-eight theological schools reported having students engaging in some form of unsupervised field work, the number of students in unsupervised field work being 1,078. Twenty-five seminaries reported having students engaging in field work not under the control of the seminary. There were 639 students thus engaged. Only four seminaries reported that they had students in unsupervised field work but none in supervised field work. Nineteen seminaries gave no data on the number of students engaging in field work but checked types of field-work activities in which their students engaged. Three seminaries gave no information whatever on field-

work participation. The total number of students enrolled in seminaries which gave no breakdown concerning the number of students engaging in or not engaging in field work was 4,492. The number of students definitely known not to be engaged in field work (i. e. enrolled in theological schools which reported data on student field-work participation but who were not themselves thus engaged) was 2,715. From a study of the catalogues of the seminaries which reported no data on field-work participation, it may be judged that these tended to be seminaries providing very limited, if any, field-work supervision for their students.

The amount of field work required.--- Field work was a requirement for graduation in sixty-seven schools, and while not stated as such was, for all practical purposes, a requirement in three others. It may thus be stated that in seventy-three per cent of the seminaries some field-work participation was essential for graduation. In 1934 Foster reported that only four of sixty-eight seminaries answering his question required field work for graduation (98:233). In two decades there appears to have been an increase from five to seventy-three per cent in the number of seminaries making this requirement. There was much variation, however, in the precise amount of field work required by the various seminaries. Table 3 shows the periods during the seminary course when field work was required in the various seminaries.

It may be noted that more seminaries required field work during the seminary year than required it during the summer. Of the seminaries which required field work during the summer, only five did not also require some field work during the school year. A number of seminaries which

TABLE 3

NUMBER OF SEMINARIES (NINETY-SIX) IN WHICH FIELD WORK WAS  
OPTIONAL OR REQUIRED DURING THE SEVERAL SEMINARY PERIODS

| Period                             | Optional | Required |
|------------------------------------|----------|----------|
| Junior year .....                  | 24       | 36       |
| Summer following junior year ..... | 29       | 15       |
| Middle year .....                  | 32       | 28       |
| Summer following middle year ..... | 30       | 14       |
| Senior year .....                  | 39       | 21       |
| A year of internship .....         | 18       | 4        |

favored the intern year reported that they found practical difficulties in putting internships into operation. They stated that the shortage of pastors and financial pressure tended to hurry students to an early graduation. Almost no students chose an intern year unless it was required of them. More seminaries required field work in the early than in the latter part of the seminary course. Perhaps this may be attributed to the fact that the seminaries realized that students engaged in financially remunerative work, whether it was a requirement or not, and hence they provided supervision early in the course so as to guard against serious mistakes and mislearnings.

Table 4 shows the varying amounts of field work required by the various seminaries. The most common requirement was one full year of field work. Twenty-two seminaries made this a minimum requirement and thirty-nine required more than a year, thus sixty-one seminaries required a year or more of field work as a prerequisite to graduation. Thirty-two seminaries

TABLE 4

NUMBER OF SEMINARIES (NINETY-SIX) WHICH REQUIRED VARIOUS AMOUNTS  
OF FIELD WORK AS A PREREQUISITE TO GRADUATION

| Amount                                                        | Number<br>of<br>Seminaries |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| No requirement .....                                          | 27                         |
| One summer .....                                              | 2                          |
| Two summers .....                                             | 2                          |
| One seminary year .....                                       | 22                         |
| Two seminary years.....                                       | 6                          |
| Three seminary years .....                                    | 9                          |
| One seminary year plus one summer .....                       | 2                          |
| One seminary year plus two summers .....                      | 1                          |
| Two seminary years plus one summer .....                      | 3                          |
| Two seminary years plus two summers .....                     | 4                          |
| Three seminary years plus one summer .....                    | 1                          |
| Three seminary years plus two summers .....                   | 5                          |
| One intern year .....                                         | 1                          |
| One intern year plus one seminary year .....                  | 1                          |
| One intern year plus two seminary years .....                 | 1                          |
| Three intern years plus three seminary years .....            | 1                          |
| Any two seminary years or summers .....                       | 1                          |
| Any four seminary years or summers .....                      | 1                          |
| Two seminary years, or two summers, or one intern year .....  | 1                          |
| One period of field work at any time .....                    | 1                          |
| Seminaries not specifying a requirement but implying one*.... | 3                          |

\* In two of these seminaries the entire student body was engaged in field work at the time of the survey.

required two years or more of field work as a prerequisite to graduation. Seven seminaries required three full seminary years or more of field work.

The field-work activities engaged in.-- Table 5 lists the wide variety of field-work activities engaged in by theological students. The forty-four items surveyed by check list, which were checked by from fourteen to seventy-five seminaries per item, were supplemented by two activities written in twice and seventeen written in once. Some of these were merely restatements of categories on the check list. Ninety-one seminaries listed optional forms of field work, averaging twenty-one per seminary. Forty-five listed required forms of field work, averaging four per seminary. Combining these lists, ninety-three seminaries indicated the varieties of field work engaged in by their students, averaging twenty-two per seminary. Sixty-six seminaries checked varieties of field-work activity which they supervised, averaging fifteen per seminary.

The check list grouped field-work activities under six categories: (A) Preaching, (B) Teaching, (C) Visitation, (D) Social Service, (E) Musical Leadership, and (F) Miscellaneous. Activities listed under these were checked as compulsory the following number of times: A--42; B--61; C--45; D--9; E--1; F--23. In other words, seminaries more frequently required a student to have experience in religious education and in visitation than in preaching. Sixteen seminaries which required no preaching experience did require some other form of experience, either religious education, visitation, or clinical work. The reasons for this lack of emphasis upon preaching activities are not apparent from the data gathered. Possible hypotheses are: (1) Some seminaries were de-emphasizing the

TABLE 5

THE NUMBER OF SEMINARIES (NINETY-SIX) WHICH REPORTED STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN FORTY-FOUR KINDS OF FIELD-WORK ACTIVITY AS OPTIONAL, REQUIRED, OR SUPERVISED

| Activity                                      | Optional | Required | Supervised |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------|----------|------------|
| <b>A. PREACHING</b>                           |          |          |            |
| 1. Occasional supply .....                    | 59       | 15       | 32         |
| 2. Assistant pastor .....                     | 60       | 11       | 44         |
| 3. Pastor .....                               | 53       | 10       | 38         |
| 4. Gospel mission work .....                  | 36       | 2        | 16         |
| 5. Radio broadcasts .....                     | 39       | 2        | 15         |
| 6. Street meetings .....                      | 20       |          | 10         |
| 7. Shop meetings .....                        | 14       |          | 8          |
| 8. Revival evangelism .....                   | 32       | 2        | 16         |
| <b>B. TEACHING</b>                            |          |          |            |
| 9. Sunday schools .....                       | 52       | 28       | 47         |
| 10. Daily vacation Bible schools              | 56       | 8        | 36         |
| 11. Week-day church schools ....              | 47       | 6        | 24         |
| 12. Catechetical classes .....                | 32       | 6        | 18         |
| 13. Directors of religious<br>education ..... | 50       | 8        | 31         |
| 14. Teacher-training institutes.              | 29       | 3        | 16         |
| 15. Settlement houses .....                   | 37       |          | 17         |
| 16. Kindergarten or nursery<br>schools .....  | 34       | 2        | 14         |
| 17. Church drama production ....              | 30       |          | 13         |
| <b>C. VISITATION</b>                          |          |          |            |
| 18. Private homes .....                       | 50       | 21       | 33         |
| 19. Hospitals .....                           | 53       | 15       | 35         |
| 20. Mental hospitals .....                    | 45       | 4        | 28         |
| 21. Penal institutions .....                  | 41       | 2        | 22         |
| 22. Homes for aged and orphans..              | 39       | 3        | 16         |

TABLE 5 (Continued)

| Activity                                          | Optional | Required | Supervised |
|---------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|------------|
| <b>D. SOCIAL SERVICE</b>                          |          |          |            |
| 23. YMCA leaders .....                            | 43       |          | 20         |
| 24. Club or scout leaders ....                    | 54       | 1        | 22         |
| 25. Leaders in summer camps ..                    | 52       | 2        | 21         |
| 26. Leaders in adult clubs ...                    | 36       |          | 13         |
| 27. Work with social agency ..                    | 36       | 1        | 16         |
| 28. Social case work .....                        | 30       | 1        | 14         |
| 29. Americanization work .....                    | 14       |          | 3          |
| 30. Social forums .....                           | 18       | 1        | 6          |
| 31. Work with other races ....                    | 38       | 2        | 18         |
| 32. Work with community<br>organizations .....    | 37       | 1        | 16         |
| <b>E. MUSICAL LEADERSHIP</b>                      |          |          |            |
| 33. Choir leaders .....                           | 28       |          | 7          |
| 34. Choir members .....                           | 51       |          | 12         |
| 35. Soloists .....                                | 39       | 1        | 8          |
| 36. Organists .....                               | 43       |          | 9          |
| 37. Accompanyists .....                           | 34       |          | 6          |
| <b>F. MISCELLANEOUS</b>                           |          |          |            |
| 38. Counseling .....                              | 40       | 8        | 8          |
| 39. Survey making .....                           | 48       | 8        | 9          |
| 40. Court and probation work..                    | 24       | 1        | 11         |
| 41. Religious journalism .....                    | 27       |          | 10         |
| 42. Distribution of religious<br>literature ..... | 20       | 2        | 7          |
| 43. Gospel teams .....                            | 25       |          | 12         |
| 44. Home missionary work .....                    | 39       | 4        | 23         |



preaching ministry, (2) in some instances teachers of religious education and clinical theology may have been more vocal than teachers of homiletics at times of curricular revision, and (3) in some seminaries teachers of homiletics or practical theology may have lacked professional background in educational psychology, the curriculum, and educational methodology and hence may not have been doing much to integrate theory and practice.

Fifteen of the forty-four activities were participated in by more than half of the seminaries. The percentage of seminaries which participated ranged from seventy-eight to fifteen. Table 6 lists the forty-four field work activities according to the frequency in which they were checked by the seminaries. One or more activities under each of the six general categories were participated in by students of more than half of the seminaries. More activities under religious education were checked than under any other category.

The field-work activities which were required for graduation in one or more seminaries have been listed according to frequency of requirement in Table 7. There were a total of thirty-one different field-work activities required for graduation by one or more seminaries. Only sixteen activities, however, were required by more than two seminaries. Six varieties of field-work activity were required by as many as ten per cent of the seminaries. Only one was required by as many as one-fifth of the seminaries.

The organization of the field-work program.--- The most common pattern of field work was that in which the student devoted a part of his time each week to some form of Christian service. This form of Christian

TABLE 6

FREQUENCY WITH WHICH NINETY-SIX SEMINARIES REPORTED STUDENTS  
PARTICIPATING IN FORTY-FOUR TYPES OF FIELD-WORK ACTIVITY

| Activity                                       | Frequency |
|------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Sunday school teaching .....                   | 75        |
| Occasional supply preaching .....              | 73        |
| Assistant pastorate .....                      | 71        |
| Hospital visitation .....                      | 65        |
| Private home visitation .....                  | 65        |
| Pastorate .....                                | 63        |
| Daily vacation Bible school teaching .....     | 63        |
| Directors of religious education .....         | 57        |
| Club or scout leaders .....                    | 55        |
| Leaders in summer camps .....                  | 54        |
| Survey making .....                            | 54        |
| Choir membership .....                         | 51        |
| Week-day church schools .....                  | 51        |
| Visitation in mental hospitals .....           | 49        |
| Counseling .....                               | 46        |
| YMCA leaders .....                             | 43        |
| Organists .....                                | 43        |
| Penal institutions visitation .....            | 43        |
| Home-missionary work .....                     | 43        |
| Visitation in homes for aged and orphans ..... | 42        |
| Radio broadcasting .....                       | 41        |
| Church soloist .....                           | 40        |
| Work with other races .....                    | 40        |
| Teaching catechetical classes .....            | 39        |
| Gospel mission work .....                      | 38        |
| Work with community organizations .....        | 37        |
| Work with social agencies .....                | 37        |
| Settlement-house work .....                    | 37        |
| Teaching kindergarten or nursery schools ..... | 36        |
| Leading adult clubs .....                      | 36        |

TABLE 6 (Continued)

| Activity                                   | Frequency |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Revival evangelism .....                   | 35        |
| Accompanyists in church music .....        | 34        |
| Teacher-training institutes .....          | 32        |
| Social case work .....                     | 31        |
| Church drama production .....              | 30        |
| Choir leading .....                        | 28        |
| Religious journalism .....                 | 27        |
| Court and probation work .....             | 25        |
| Gospel teams .....                         | 25        |
| Distribution of religious literature ..... | 22        |
| Conducting street meetings .....           | 21        |
| Social forum work .....                    | 19        |
| Americanization work .....                 | 14        |
| Shop meetings .....                        | 14        |

TABLE 7

FREQUENCY WITH WHICH NINETY-SIX SEMINARIES REPORTED VARIOUS  
FIELD-WORK ACTIVITIES AS A GRADUATION REQUIREMENT

| Activity                                       | Frequency |
|------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Sunday school teaching .....                   | 23        |
| Visitation in private homes .....              | 15        |
| Occasional supply preaching .....              | 15        |
| Hospital visitation .....                      | 13        |
| Assistant pastorate .....                      | 11        |
| Pastorate .....                                | 10        |
| Teaching in daily vacation Bible schools ..... | 7         |
| Teaching catechetical classes .....            | 7         |
| Counseling .....                               | 6         |
| Survey making .....                            | 6         |
| Directors of religious education .....         | 6         |
| Home missionary work .....                     | 4         |
| Visitation in mental hospitals .....           | 4         |
| Teacher-training institutes .....              | 3         |
| Teaching week-day church schools .....         | 3         |
| Visitation in homes for aged and orphans ..... | 3         |
| Distribution of religious literature .....     | 2         |
| Gospel mission work .....                      | 2         |
| Teaching kindergarten or nursery schools ..... | 2         |
| Leaders in summer camps .....                  | 2         |
| Visitation in penal institutions .....         | 2         |
| Radio broadcasts .....                         | 2         |
| Revival evangelism .....                       | 2         |
| Work with other races .....                    | 2         |
| Church soloists .....                          | 1         |
| Club or scout leaders .....                    | 1         |
| Social case work .....                         | 1         |
| Social forums .....                            | 1         |
| Street meetings .....                          | 1         |
| Work with community organizations .....        | 1         |
| Work with social agencies .....                | 1         |

service may be any of the variety of field-work activities listed earlier in this chapter. In highly organized programs with graded sequence, the form of activity might vary from week to week. Frequently, however, the same general activity continued for a full semester or for the school year. Under this pattern of organization, the classroom theory and the laboratory experiences could be most readily integrated. Forty-nine seminaries (fifty-one percent) reported that field work was reduced if scholastic work suffered.

Summer field work is another common pattern of organization. Table 3 indicates that while summer field work was welcomed by most seminaries, yet fewer made it a requirement than required part-time field work throughout the school year. An almost equal number of seminaries required the summer between the junior and middle year, and the summer between the middle and senior year. Only one seminary required field work during the summer following the senior year. Summer field work was at times coordinated with class work through a seminar held in the fall term.

The year of internship was looked upon favorably by a number of seminaries but was seldom utilized. It was generally recommended that the year between the middle and the senior year be the "clinical" or intern year. The Augustana Theological Seminary has pioneered in the requirement of this form of field-work organization. President Mattson of Augustana wrote that, while there was always considerable resistance to the intern year prior to assignment, yet in ninety per cent of the cases the student saw its value after his year of parish service had been completed (112). Andover-Newton had a required year of internship organized as a fourth

curricular year.

Clinical pastoral training was becoming a possible field-work option in many seminaries, and a few made it a requirement for graduation. Inasmuch as clinical work requires the student's full time, it is necessary to schedule it during a summer term except in a few seminaries which have made their schedule sufficiently flexible to permit a quarter or term during the school year to be devoted by a student to clinical work exclusively. Clinical pastoral training is discussed in fuller detail in Chapter IX.

Financial aspects of field work.-- The financing of the field-work program has long posed difficult problems for those seminaries which seek to develop an adequate program. Morgan (129) found that practices concerning financing the field-work department of the seminary, the salary of the field-work director and supervisors, and the scales of remuneration for student field work varied from seminary to seminary to such a degree that comparison and tabulation were difficult. For this reason, the present study did not make an extensive survey of the financial aspects of field work.

Most students engaging in field work received remuneration from the places served. Forty-five seminaries out of fifty-eight answering this question stated that from three-fourths to all of their students received such remuneration. Four seminaries reported that one-half to three-fourths of their students received financial remuneration for field work from the places served, seven reported that from one-fourth to one-half of their students received this aid, and two reported that less than a fourth of their students received any financial remuneration from the places served.

Comparatively few seminaries (eighteen) were able to provide any

field-work remuneration from their own funds. Of these, two provided remuneration for over three-fourths of their students, four provided this aid for from one-fourth to one-half of their students, while twelve provided it for less than one-fourth of their students. On the other hand, more seminaries (twenty-four) provided seminary scholarships for which no field work was required. Five seminaries reported giving such scholarships to more than three-fourths of their students, one gave it to between a fourth and a half of its students, while eighteen provided such aid for less than one-fourth of their students. It would seem desirable to work out plans whereby such aid might be given in the form of subsidies for field work, i. e., field-work scholarships, and thus provide more adequate and better balanced programs of field work.

Thirty-nine seminaries reported that students might hold other paying jobs while engaging in field work. Forty-four seminaries reported that students engaging in remunerative field work were eligible for seminary scholarships. Only sixteen seminaries required their students to report their yearly field-work earnings.

Recommended seminary scales.--- Thirty seminaries recommended a minimum scale of remuneration for student field work to churches and organizations employing their students. Four seminaries merely recommended that expense money be given. Three seminaries made recommendations on an hourly basis (e. g., fifty cents, seventy-five cents, one to two dollars per hour). Three made recommendations on a daily basis (e. g., ten dollars per Sunday, plus five dollars for one evening's visitation; fifteen dollars per day for youth and religious activities; fifteen dollars per Sunday plus expenses).

Eleven seminaries made their scale recommendations on a weekly basis. Recommendations varied from five dollars a week to sixty dollars a week, with twenty to twenty-five dollars per week the most frequently stated amount. Two seminaries had different scales for juniors, middlers, and seniors. One seminary had a higher scale for upper quarter students than for middle quarter students. One seminary varied the scale according to the type of field-work activity. Four seminaries recommended that the place served pay the student's expenses as a supplement to the suggested scale.

Five seminaries recommended scales on a monthly basis, with recommendations varying from twenty-five to two hundred dollars. Variations were made according to the type of field-work activity (e. g., \$37.50 for Sunday school teaching, \$75.00 for department supervision, \$100.00 to \$200.00 for the pastorate). Two seminaries recommended that expense money be given to supplement the suggested scale.

Eight seminaries recommended scales on the basis of annual salaries or salaries for the school year. The recommendations ranged from \$80.00 to \$2800.00 per year. Variations were provided for on the basis of whether the student was single or married (e. g., \$150.00 for a single student, \$175.00 for a married student), on the size of his family, on the type of field work done by the student, and on the year in the seminary (e. g., junior year--\$300.00; middle year--\$500.00 to \$600.00; senior year-- \$600.00 and up). Other variations were made according to the amount of time required per week (e. g., \$350.00 to \$400.00 for twelve to fifteen hours, \$1800.00 to \$2600.00 for above twenty hours). Travel expenses were suggested



in addition to the seminary scale in one instance, and one seminary recommended that a parsonage also be furnished the student.

One seminary had worked out a system of field-work "units," and recommended pay of five dollars per unit. One seminary merely recommended "an adequate standard of living."

As is evident from the data just quoted, only rarely did two seminaries recommend the same scale of remuneration for student field work. Some seminaries recommended a scale ten to twelve times greater than did other seminaries. One seminary had a scale thirty-five times that of another seminary. It would probably be difficult to justify such wide differences in rates of remuneration.

Denominational relations.--- Four seminaries reported that the denomination under whose jurisdiction they operated outlined for them a minimum field-work program. Two seminaries reported that the denomination outlined their complete field-work program. It is desirable that there be close cooperation and understanding between the seminary and the officials of the denomination with which it is affiliated. Each seminary, however, should probably have final jurisdiction in the form of its field-work program. Many seminaries had working arrangements whereby denominational officials shared in field-work supervision. This is discussed in greater detail in Chapter V.

Follow-up activities.--- Only twenty-one seminaries reported that their field-work director had any responsibility for follow-up of their graduates. Little attention seems to have been given to the possible benefits of follow-up work. Two seminaries reported that the field-work

director was responsible for follow-up until the first placement, two reported that he was responsible until the student was ordained, and three reported that the field-work director was responsible for follow-up for a period of one year. One seminary made its field-work director responsible for follow-up for a period of two years; one, for a three-year period; one, for a four-year period; and one seminary held its field-work director responsible for follow-up for a period of ten to fifteen years. Other comments given in response to this question included: "as asked," "only in problem cases," "keeps in close touch," "invite return interview," and "continuous."

#### Basic Principles for the Administration of Field Work

When considering the principles developed here and in succeeding chapters, it should be borne in mind, as was pointed out in Chapter I, that these principles are supplied for reference purposes. They have been developed in harmony with the thought and practice of many leaders in theological and other areas of professional education and with the statements of many educational psychologists. In order that they may focus attention and serve as a basis for cooperative faculty study in the various seminaries, the principles have been presented in a positive, rather dogmatic form. It is altogether possible that a seminary with a strong field work program may not have the facilities to implement fully and immediately the supervisory program envisaged and described in this and succeeding chapters. The philosophy of a given seminary may not be in full agreement with the philosophy underlying this study. Furthermore, no curricular reorganization or reorganization of field-work program should be undertaken by a

seminary without careful cooperative study of the problem by the entire faculty. The 231 basic principles developed in this research may serve as a basis for such cooperative endeavor by seminary faculties. They may serve as an indication of possible directional goals, and may provide a basis for evaluation of the adequacy of existing field-work programs. Seminaries should revise, enlarge, and adapt these basic principles underlying the various aspects of the field-work program and thus cooperatively outline and agree upon a clear, definite program of field work individually adapted to their situation. This will make possible a unified program of professional training in which theory and practice are adequately related by the entire seminary faculty and staff.

Making use of direct experience.-- The educational possibilities of all direct experiences of the student should, as far as is feasible, be utilized by the seminary (1:13; 14:44, 56; 29:4; 135:90; 136:110). The value of direct experience in theological education was pointed out in Chapter III. Psychological principles developed in Chapter II stated that learning is an active process (9\*), is facilitated by practice (18\*), and is motivated by interest (26\*). Direct experiences assure more active learning, more meaningful practice, and hence greater interest. Direct experience lays the foundation for vicarious experience (45\*), adds real-

---

\*Hereafter in this report a numeral followed by an asterisk indicates a reference to one of the numbered basic psychological and educational principles developed in Chapter II.

life significance (47\*), and gives the learning a natural setting (55\*). Most theological students engage in field work in order to secure financial assistance. It is uneconomical educationally for the seminary to ignore the potential educational value in these work experiences (14:44).

Need for supervision.-- Direct experience should be supervised (1:3, 13; 14:44-5; 99:1; 135:90; 180:93-7). The function of the field-work supervisor in a seminary is to make the learning more meaningful and permanent by means of integration (12\*), to guide in the learning process (20\*) and thus facilitate economy in learning and the avoidance of serious mislearnings, and to aid in motivation and evaluation (30\*, 31\*).

Time for field experience.-- Field experience of some kind should be provided throughout the seminary training period (19:354-6; 115:74). A form of field work with major responsibility (assistant pastorate, pastorate) may not be desirable until the middle or senior year. In order to provide laboratory experience to accompany class-room theory, however, some form of field experience (observation, occasional participation in field activities, or continuous field work) should be provided throughout the period of seminary training. Continuous field experience will contribute to continuous motivation of learning. Distributed practice provides more effective learning than short-term concentrated practice, although a period of concentrated service carrying full responsibility is also essential.

Graded field experience.-- Field experience should be graded in sequence when this is feasible (1:13-14; 49-51; 99:1, 8-9; 180:91). The

grading may include any or all of three possibilities: the grading of positions, the grading of field work within a position, and the grading of the degree and type of supervision.

Theological schools of denominations which do not permit students to assume full pastoral duties until after graduation from the theological seminary may develop a program in which field work during the junior year is limited largely to observation, while in the middle and senior years the student may begin participation in field work, including summer home-missionary activities and clinical training.

Field-work experiences may be grouped on three levels. The junior year may be used for group leadership (Sunday schools, youth work), the middle year may provide experience in supervising other group leaders, while the senior year may be used for responsible field work with the student becoming an assistant pastor, assistant director of religious education, or pastor.

Some grading of field experience is possible in almost any type of field-work position. Seminaries which permit students to become assistant pastors during the junior year may furnish the supervising pastor a graded sequence of appropriate activities for the student assistant.

Supervision itself may be graded. Opportunity for student initiative, self-evaluation, and self-direction may be increased throughout the seminary period.

All grading of experience must be flexible (49\*). In any given field situation, experiences will often emerge in a pattern or sequence other than that which had been planned. The sequence which emerges may be

more meaningful and educationally desirable for the particular student than that which had been planned for him (58\*).

Variety in field experience.-- Each student should have as large a variety of types of field experiences as is feasible (1:5-7, 11-12; 14:55; 80:128-30; 114:91-2; 135:92-3; 136:113). Other basic principles, however, should not be forgotten. Continuity of experience and variety in experience need to be kept in proper balance. No one student can participate in all possible varieties of field experience. Variety increases interest and thus contributes to the motivation of learning (17\*), aids transfer of learning (37\*), and helps meet the total needs of the student (48\*). The need for variety of experience is of great importance in theological education. A high school teacher is expected to major in two or three subject areas; a minister frequently engages in forms of preaching, teaching, counseling, evangelism, music leadership, and church administration.

Each seminary student should have field experiences with as many types of individuals as is feasible (1:5-7, 11-12). He should work with individuals of all age groups, all socio-economic levels, and from various nationalities and races. It may at times be advisable for the student to emphasize work with people having a different background from his own. He should have experiences with individuals in their home life, church life, social life, and with individuals in hospitals and other institutions. He needs to come to know and understand people of all ages and of both sexes--their lives, problems, and needs, and the Christian resources for ministering to them.

Field work experiences should provide some orientation to both rural and urban life (1:19, 41-2; 14:55; 114:91; 135:94). Most ministers will begin their ministry in smaller churches in rural communities or in churches which draw from rural areas. All ministers should be aware of the role of the rural churches in denominational and national religious life, and all should have some orientation to the opportunities and problems of the rural church.

Clinical experience.-- Clinical experience is valuable, but it is not a substitute for other types of field experience (1:6). Clinical pastoral training (presented in fuller detail in Chapter IX) holds great values for the theological student. Clinical training, however, should not be the first type of field work engaged in. Students who have had an adequate background of other field experiences, including some work as an assistant pastor or pastor, will derive greater benefit from their clinical training and will be more likely to keep the clinical emphasis in proper balance in relation to other aspects of the pastoral ministry.

Need for responsible experience.-- Each seminary student should have some experience in responsible ministerial work (1:34, 51; 114:92-3). Responsible experience may be obtained through serving as an assistant pastor or pastor. For those going into a specialized form of the ministry, responsible experience may be had through serving as an assistant director or director of religious education or as an assistant chaplain. An attitude of self-responsibility on the part of the student motivates learning (29\*, 46\*) and assists him to develop a creative approach to ministerial work (6\*).

Individualized field experience.-- Field work requirements should

be flexible enough to provide for individualization of the types, sequence, and amount of field experience (99:6; 114:91; 135:95; 159:8). Some students come to the seminary with a considerable background of ministerial and church experiences. Some have already worked with many types of individuals of various age groups. Obviously, such a student would not require the type of field experience needed by a young student who has lacked such opportunities. The vocational objectives of some ministerial candidates are clearer than those of others, and those knowing that they are preparing for a specialized form of the ministry should have field experiences which give them orientation to other activities but which emphasize preparation for the ministerial goal chosen. Each student is unique in his background (2\*, 7\*, 15\*) and hence needs a curriculum flexible enough to meet his needs (14\*, 47\*, 58\*).

Continuity in field experience.-- A degree of continuity in field work is desirable, and where feasible the student should have one period of a year in some responsible field-work position (99:1). The period of prolonged continuous experience in the same position may come near the end of the period of seminary training. Some form of responsible field work should be continued long enough for the student to secure an understanding of the ministry as a whole, including its total opportunities, responsibilities, and relationships. Only thus can the student see the pastorate in its natural setting. He needs continuity to enable him to analyze adequately the total church situation and the community in the full significance of its problems, opportunities, and needs (11\*). Continuity in field experience enables the student to achieve greater integration of learning (12\*, 50\*)



and greater personal integration. The intern year can provide the desired continuity in field experience.

Summer and intern experience as field work.--- The educational values of summer field work and of the intern year, where used, should be utilized just as in other types of field work (14:60; 99:2, 14-17; 149:56). Every reason for the seminary supervision of field work during the seminary year is equally applicable to summer field work or the internship. In certain circumstances greater responsibility for supervision during these periods may rest upon denominational or organizational officials, but this does not excuse the seminary for its obligation to make full educational use of all the experiences of the student and to maintain its over-all supervision of his development and growth.

Adapting field work to the seminary.--- The field-work program of the seminary should be adapted to its own objectives, philosophy, facilities, and church and organizational relations (14:45; 114:90). The field-work program should be individualized to the institution. This does not, however, imply that there should be a passive acceptance of circumstances which are not satisfactory, or that inadequate objectives or philosophy should be perpetuated.

The field-work director.--- The field-work director should be carefully chosen (1:9). A broader professional background and greater skill in leadership and guidance are required in the field-work director than in the faculty member who merely shares in the field work program but devotes his major energy and efforts to classroom teaching. A field-work director who lacks leadership ability and genuine interest in field work and in the

students may make a well-organized field-work program ineffective. An already over-worked administrator should not be expected to take over the additional responsibility of field-work supervision. Neither should the faculty member with the lightest load be automatically assigned the responsibility for field-work supervision. The field-work director should have an adequate background of professional educational training and should keep up with the literature on field work and guidance.

The field-work director should give the major portion of his time to field-work direction, and should have only minor teaching responsibilities (14:44-5, 57). In the case of the very small seminaries there will need to be an exception to this principle. Supervision and counseling, major aspects of field-work direction, are time consuming. This fact should be taken into account in determining the teaching load of the field-work director. In smaller institutions, the logical relationship between field work and guidance would indicate that major guidance responsibilities might also be assigned to the field-work director. It is probably desirable, however, for each field-work director to teach at least one subject.

The field-work director should work in close cooperation with the seminary administration and faculty (1:21-2). The field-work director has much information of value to the dean's office, the guidance office, student advisors and counselors, and other faculty members. This information should be filed in a manner to facilitate its frequent use by them. They, in turn, can render real service to the field-work department. Close cooperation is needed. The wise field-work director will refer students whose field work evidences a particular need to the appropriate faculty

member or official, and will thus bring this individual into the field-work program. This principle is further clarified in Chapter IX.

Faculty members and field work.-- All faculty members should share in the integration of field work with other aspects of the curriculum, and where feasible, in field-work supervision (10:88; 14:44-5, 57-9; 99:2, 5; 136:118; 156:45). Major responsibility for field-work supervision should rest upon the field-work director and his appointed assistants, but all faculty members should make occasional or regular supervisory visits and should be available for consultation with students needing help in the areas in which they specialize. Field work frequently reveals specialized needs. All faculty members should be available to serve as consultants during field-work seminars or panels.

Field work and its supervision are an essential aspect of the educational program of the seminary. The participation of all faculty members, to some degree, in supervisory visitation is beneficial to the seminary, to the students, to the faculty members themselves, and to the churches.

All-faculty participation in supervisory visitation aids in keeping the seminary curriculum adequately adjusted to the changing needs of church and community. It aids in the evaluation of the effectiveness of the courses, methods, and facilities of the seminary for guiding student growth and development and thus assures more adequate student guidance. All-faculty visitation helps toward the integration of the total curriculum and facilitates mutual understanding among the various departments of the seminary. It furnishes case material for classroom use and serves to obviate the danger of subject-matter specialists living in academic "ivory

towers." It works toward better teacher-student understanding and cooperation and enhances the value of the field work in the eyes of the student. All-faculty participation in supervisory visitation keeps the seminary in closer contact with the churches, serves as a valuable form of public relations with the churches, and secures a more adequate ministry for them.

Denominational supervision of field work.-- Denominational supervision of student field work is desirable but can not take the place of seminary supervision (14:56; 99:1, 7, 16; 135:94, 96; 149:56). There must be close coordination of all supervision given the student. It is the responsibility of the seminary to provide this coordination. In some types of field work the major burden of supervision is properly the duty of denominational or institutional officials. However, when the denomination delegates to the seminary the responsibility for training its ministers, it delegates with this the responsibility for over-all supervision of student field work. Seminary supervision is essential to assure that the full educational possibilities of the field experiences of the student are utilized, that field experiences are integrated with other aspects of the curriculum, and that gaps and overlapping in the training of the student are avoided. The seminary needs to receive regular field-work reports, ratings, and other documents concerning the field work of the student from all who cooperate in supervision. The seminary supervisor will need to make at least occasional supervisory visits to the student in his field.

Similarly, when an institution permits students to do field work in connection with its program, clinical or otherwise, it accepts the obligation to permit the seminary to capitalize on the educational values of

these experiences through regular field-work reports and documents, and to follow the development of the student through occasional observation.

Local supervision of field work.-- The supervisory aid of local church and organizational officials should be used, but it should be subject to the over-all leadership of the seminary (1:34; 99:1, 7; 159:13-14). In furnishing supervisory leadership, the field-work director will need to give orientation to supervising pastors and other cooperating officials regarding the program and objectives of the field-work department and the seminary. He will need to supply printed guides as to desirable types and sequence of field experiences, evaluative forms, report blanks, and other necessary materials. The seminary and these supervisory helpers have mutual obligations to each other and can make mutual contributions to each other. These cooperating supervisors constitute a kind of "larger faculty" of the seminary, and they should be helped to feel that they have a vital role in the seminary program.

Field work within the curriculum.-- The field-work program should serve as an integrating factor in the total seminary curriculum (1:8, 19, 21; 9:142; 10:88; 54:48; 136:116-7; 156:44-5; 180:98-9). Field work does not represent just another department in the seminary. It is a means of relating to one another the educational values of the various aspects of the curriculum (11\*, 12\*, 50\*). It makes the curriculum one meaningful whole. It serves to relate the traditional seminary disciplines to life. Not only may the student draw on all the curriculum in meeting his field-work situation, but also he may bring back illustrations and observations from his field experience to all his classes. Practicums, seminars, and supervisory

visits by faculty members aid in the integrative process.

Field-work seminars and practicums.-- It is not essential to organize field work as a subject area of the curriculum, but a field-work seminar or practicum is desirable (1:2, 17-18; 14:59; 99:2; 135:92, 94). Under efficient leadership the field-work seminar or practicum may aid the students in the progressive analysis of their fields. It may also serve to integrate and interpret the laboratory experiences of the students (12\*) and to relate them to classroom studies.

Field-work credit.-- Credit should be given for supervised field work (1:17, 27-9; 99:1, 10-11; 135:94; 180:100). Since field work is a major aspect of the professional preparation of the student, credit toward graduation should be given for satisfactory field-work participation. Academic credit makes the student more aware of the educational value of the field experiences and frequently stimulates the student to seek counsel and guidance in his field work.

Field work may be regarded as a laboratory aspect of the curriculum. A time schedule may be worked out for relating credit to a practicum ( e. g., three hours of field work being considered as the laboratory experience for each practicum hour). It is also possible to grant credit for field work apart from a practicum. Granting credit for field work helps to standardize the amount of field work done, for the students realize that excess time spent on the field will not count toward extra credit.

Field work as a requirement.-- Satisfactory field work under semi-nary supervision should be a requirement for graduation (1:17-18, 27-9; 14:56; 80:131; 99:2, 10-11; 135:93; 136:108; 180:100-1). Since field work

reveals the student's ability to apply his classroom instruction, it serves as perhaps the truest test of the student's readiness for graduation and the ministry. At the fifteenth biennial meeting of the American Association of Theological Schools in 1946, Ralph Woodward in a paper on "The Relation of Field Work to the Curriculum" stated:

In a revised statement of the principles of field work, drawn up by the Interseminary Commission for Training for the Rural Ministry, in 1943, it is declared, "In determining the student's total standing for graduation, honors, and placement, his field work record should be evaluated and given proportional credit." The weighting given to field work in proportion to the total requirement for graduation varies greatly among schools. However, since supervised field work not only provides experience but also the successful use of the materials, methods and knowledge gained in other courses, a fairly high weighting of this requirement for graduation would seem appropriate. Some individuals believe it ought to be weighted as high as twenty-five per cent of the total. In practice, schools vary from ten per cent down to nothing (180:101).

Financing field work.-- Field work should be adequately financed to permit a well-supervised and well-balanced program (1:9; 13:99-100; 99:13; 180:91). It is easier to finance the supervision than to finance a well-balanced program. Instead of assigning scholarship funds on a strictly academic basis, such funds should be designated as field-work scholarships. Such a field-work subsidy will enable the seminary to provide a more balanced field-work program. Juniors may then be assigned to observation or forms of field-work activity which bring little or no financial remuneration but which are educationally desirable.

Limiting time spent in field work.-- All field work and other remunerative employment of seminary students should be subject to seminary approval and supervision (99:1). This principle seeks to assure the educational use of all direct experience, to safeguard the student from

exploitation, and to preserve balance in the student's program.

A limit should be placed on the amount of time a student may spend on field work per week (1:16; 99:1; 180:99). Students carrying heavier field-work loads should be required to take fewer hours of academic work and to spread their seminary training over a longer period. The faculty should specify the maximum hours per week which a student may devote to field work and other remunerative work and still carry a full class schedule.

Avoiding exploitation.-- Seminaries should guard the student against exploitation by local churches or organizations (1:16; 180:90). The field-work department should give orientation to those persons or organizations employing students or utilizing their services in regard to the amount and type of service which should be expected and in regard to the remuneration which would be appropriate.

Seminaries should guard the churches or organizations served against exploitation by the students engaging in field work and against serious errors in the field service of the students (1:12-14; 16; 114:93-4; 180:98). Seminaries have a definite responsibility to the churches and organizations served. They should, however, avoid intrusion into the affairs of these institutions.

Follow-up programs.-- Follow-up programs for graduates are desirable and should be under the direction of the field-work office or the graduate placement office (14:61). If the follow-up program involves a kind of internship with seminary supervision, the direction should be from the field-work office. If the follow-up is mainly a check-up at a stated period after graduation, it may be conducted by the field-work office or



the graduate placement office.

### Trends and Areas of Need

Trends.-- If the progress made in the past decade continues during the next, by 1960 all seminaries will specify a minimum of one year of field work as a graduation requirement.

A comparison of the data gathered in this survey with those secured by Morgan shows a greatly increased emphasis upon visitation experience, counseling, clinical experience, and shop meetings (129:28).

The amount of interest evidenced in the internship indicates the possibility that a number of seminaries may provide for internship experience if the present shortage of pastors becomes less acute.

Areas of need.-- Field work should be given a larger role in the curriculum. It should be a graduation requirement and the seminary should give credit for field-work participation. Seminaries need to capitalize on all the direct experiences of the students. Field work under seminary supervision should be included throughout the entire period of seminary training. Closer supervision should be given during the early field experiences of the student, during the early part of distinctly new types of field experience, and the amount of seminary supervision should be adjusted according to the amount of supplemental supervision provided by cooperating supervisors.

Field work should be more carefully planned. Field experiences need to be adapted to the individual needs of the student. Every student should have an extended period of responsible field work as assistant pastor or student-pastor, unless he is preparing for a specialized form of

the ministry. A carefully planned program of supervised field work combining a graded sequence with a balanced variety of field activities throughout the training period, including a year as assistant pastor or pastor and a summer in clinical training, would probably be more desirable than extending the training period to four years in order to include an intern year.

A competent field-work director is the key to a successful field work program. Every field-work director should outline a personal program for professional growth. This program may include summer courses in supervision, guidance, counseling, evaluation, or clinical training. It should certainly include the reading of several professional books each year and attendance at professional and field-work conferences. While some faculties may still be prejudiced against emphasis upon field work, yet a wise field-work director can incorporate the various faculty members into his program in ways similar to those suggested in this chapter. Many field-work directors need to be relieved of part of their teaching responsibilities.

The field-work program should become a cooperative endeavor. All faculty members should be brought into the program as resource individuals and counselors and all should have some share in supervisory visitation. It is doubtful that there is a legitimate place in a professional theological school for any subject-matter specialist who has no interest in thus sharing in guiding the professional growth of his students. Supervision by denominational or institutional leaders and by cooperating pastors and officials should be coordinated under the leadership of the field-work

department of the seminary. Every student should share in a field-work seminar or practicum. The responsibilities of all involved in field work, supervisors, students, and institutions served, should be clearly defined.

Field work should be more adequately financed, so as to permit better supervision and a more balanced program of field activities. General scholarship funds should be used for field-work scholarships to subsidize the field-work program.

#### Summary

Most of the ninety-six seminaries which are members of the American Association of Theological Schools are located in urban areas. Of the 11,781 regular students in these seminaries, 6,263 are reported to be participating in supervised field work, and 2,715 are reported as not participating in field work. Adequate information was not reported for the remaining students. Sixty-seven seminaries required field work for graduation, one seminary year being the most commonly required period for field work. The forty-four field work activities listed were participated in by students from fourteen to seventy-five seminaries each. The "average" seminary required four types of field-work activities and had students participating in twenty-two varieties of field-work activity. More emphasis was placed on activities listed under religious education than on those listed under preaching, visitation, social service, musical leadership, or other miscellaneous activities. Thirty-one different field-work activities were required for graduation by one or more seminaries.

There were four patterns of field-work organization: field work during the seminary year, summer field work, the intern year, and clinical

training. Most emphasis was placed upon field work during the school year and least on the intern year.

Most seminary students received financial remuneration for their field work. This remuneration was generally provided by the organization served, although a few seminaries were able to supplement this from their own funds. Thirty-nine seminaries reported that students might engage in other remunerative employment while participating in field work. Only sixteen seminaries required students to report their field-work earnings.

Thirty seminaries recommended a minimum scale of remuneration for student field work, but there was no general agreement on a desirable salary. The seminary with the highest scale recommended a rate thirty-five times that of the seminary with the lowest scale. Some scales were drawn up on a daily basis, some on a weekly basis, others on a monthly basis, and a few on an annual basis. Variations were made according to the type of field work, the amount of time required for field work, the size of the student's family, his year in the seminary, and his seminary grades. In addition to the recommended scales, there were recommendations for travel expenses and for the provision of a parsonage.

Most denominations left complete jurisdiction over field-work programs to the seminaries. Only twenty-one seminaries held their field-work director responsible for follow-up activities after the student's graduation.

Twenty-nine basic principles for the administration of the field-work program were developed in this chapter. It was urged that the seminary make use of all of the direct experiences of the student, that field

experience be supervised, that field experiences be provided throughout the period of seminary training, and that a graded sequence of field-work activities be established. Each student should have a variety of types of field experience with as many types of individuals as possible, and each student should have some orientation to both rural and urban life. Clinical experience is desirable, but is no substitute for other types of field experience. The field work of the student should include responsible experience, should be individualized according to his needs, and should provide for some continuity of experience.

Summer field work and intern experiences should be supervised by the seminary. Each seminary should develop a field-work program adapted to its own objectives, facilities, and needs.

The field-work director should be carefully chosen, should devote the major portion of his time to field-work supervision, and should work in close cooperation with the faculty and administration. All faculty members should share in integrating field work with the rest of the curriculum and in supervising field work. Denominational, institutional, and church or organizational supervision of field work is desirable, but should be under the leadership of the seminary.

Field work should help integrate the entire seminary curriculum. Field-work seminars and practicums should be held. Credit should be given for field work and field work should be a requirement for graduation.

Field work should be adequately financed, so that a well-supervised and well-balanced program may be developed. All remunerative employment of students should be subject to seminary approval and supervision, and a

limit should be placed on the amount of time a student may spend in field work. Seminaries should guard the students from exploitation by the institutions served and they should guard the institutions from exploitation by the students. Follow-up programs should be developed.

There are trends toward making field work a requirement for graduation, toward increasing emphasis upon visitation experience, counseling, clinical experience, and shop meetings, and much interest is evidenced in the internship.

There are five major areas of need. Field work should be given a larger role in the curriculum and should be more carefully planned. Emphasis should be placed on the field-work director as the key to the field-work program. The field-work program should become a cooperative endeavor and should be more adequately financed.

## CHAPTER V

### PLACEMENT IN FIELD WORK

This chapter presents a description of the practices of American protestant seminaries in their field-work programs, develops principles basic to field-work placement, and discusses areas of need in placement. In the discussion of placement practices the subject prerequisites for field work and orientation programs are described. The methods used in gathering student information prior to placement and the methods used in gathering information concerning places offering field-work opportunities are also described. The use of information files is discussed. The twelve basic principles which are developed are concerned with gathering information prior to placement, criteria to be followed in the placement of students in field-work positions, orientation procedures, and field-work agreements. The chapter closes with a discussion of needs in the placement programs of the seminaries.

#### Practices in Field-Work Placement

Subject prerequisites for field work.-- In general, the seminaries required no special class preparation for field work other than the regular curricular sequence. Eighteen of the seminaries indicated that they had at least one particular type of field work for which there was a subject prerequisite. In some instances the securing of the necessary prerequisites was assured by reserving this type of field work till the middle or senior year, e. g., stating that a pastorate could

not be held during the junior year, or requiring that clinical work be restricted to the senior year. In other instances, a particular subject was stated as the prerequisite to a particular type of field work activity, e. g., anthropology before intercultural work; social missions before social work; pastoral psychology and pastoral counseling before counseling activities; parish administration, liturgics, or homiletics before preaching experience; urban church or social psychology before work in a city church; and rural church, rural economics, or town and country church before field work in rural or semi-rural areas.

The absence of extensive subject prerequisites suggests that seminaries consider academic, formal preparation not essential to most field work. The chief responsibility for successful participation in the various forms of field work is thus placed upon the supervisory program of the field work department, and, to some degree, upon orientation programs. The general movement toward a graded sequence of field activity in the better-organized programs was also a long step toward more adequate preparation of students for the more responsible forms of field work. Seminars and "coaching conferences" also provided preparation, although these were more frequently related to summer field work than to field work during the seminary year.

Orientation programs.--- General orientation programs were conducted for their new students by a number of seminaries. Specific orientation to field work was more limited. Orientation for field work was provided through joint conferences with supervisors, literature given through the field-work office, interviews with the field-



work director or his assistant prior to placement, classes in the practical fields, and special seminars or conferences. A notable exception was furnished by one seminary which had a three-to five-day orientation program each year during which students visited churches, community agencies, and hospitals near the seminary to note the programs being carried on (illustrative of the types of field-work opportunities available to the students). During this orientation program the curriculum and the field-work program were explained, discussion groups were held, and devotional periods, recreational periods, and dinner gatherings were scheduled.

Forty-three seminaries reported that they made some effort to give orientation to church or organizational officials prior to beginning their cooperative supervision of the field work of the seminary students. An analysis of the extent of these orientation programs, however, is not particularly gratifying. Some seminaries had a well-developed program of orientation combining personal conferences, extensive literature (statements of seminary philosophy and objectives for its field-work program, suggested techniques of supervision, sample reports, and illustrations of effective supervision), periodic correspondence throughout the school year, and one or more seminars of group conferences during the year. Many, however, had a meager program, in some instances consisting merely of a brief introductory letter, a single luncheon meeting, or a single visit or interview without furnishing printed materials for guidance or reference. The impression received was that, in general, seminaries did not recognize

or accept their responsibility to improve the quality of the supervision of the cooperating supervisors (who have a very large influence on the students' field-work learnings), or that the seminaries had not yet developed satisfactory educational partnerships with these cooperating supervisors to the point where these church or organizational supervisors would accept the leadership of the seminary and would seriously exert themselves in this joint project of developing a more adequate ministry.

Methods used in gathering student information prior to placement.--- It is essential to take a complete inventory of the student's past educational experiences, Christian and other leadership activities, personality, and interests, if the student and the field-work position are to be effectively matched. Table 8 shows the methods used by the field-work directors in securing information about the student. In some cases this information was available from the registrar's office or the Dean's office. In some cases the seminary was a division of a large university which conducted an extensive program of evaluation and testing and made this information available to the field-work director. In some seminaries there was a separate guidance office which secured and made available helpful data. Frequently, however, it was up to the field-work office to secure a variety of additional information before adequate background data were in hand to secure the best placement of the student.

The three most common methods of securing information were the interview with the student, the educational record--which frequently

TABLE 8

NUMBER OF SEMINARIES WHICH USED CERTAIN METHODS TO SECURE DATA  
ON A STUDENT PRIOR TO HIS PLACEMENT IN FIELD WORK

| Method                               | Employed  |              |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|--------------|
|                                      | Regularly | Occasionally |
| Interview with student .....         | 66        | 3            |
| Record of grades .....               | 48        | 8            |
| Record of previous field work .....  | 48        | 4            |
| Interest inventory .....             | 26        | 7            |
| Intelligence examination .....       | 21        | 10           |
| Diary or autobiography .....         | 25        | 4            |
| Personality test or inventory .....  | 21        | 6            |
| Information sheet .....              | 25        |              |
| Case study of student .....          | 15        | 10           |
| Physical examination .....           | 16        | 5            |
| Self-rating scale .....              | 7         | 6            |
| Anecdotal records .....              | 3         | 6            |
| *Recommendations .....               | 7         |              |
| Student-rating scale .....           | 1         | 4            |
| *Reports from former employers ..... | 3         |              |

\* These items were not included in the check list but were written in by field-work directors.

has a close correlation with field work (1:47), and the record of previous field work. Over sixty per cent of the seminaries which reported on this aspect of placement indicated they used these methods. Methods used by thirty per cent or more were the interview with the student, the educational record, the record of previous field work, interest inventories, intelligence examinations, diaries or autobiographies, personality tests or inventories, information blanks, and case studies.

Methods used in gathering information concerning available fields.-- Of the seminaries answering the question concerning the methods used in securing information in regard to the fields offering field-work opportunities, most indicated the use of correspondence, interviews, and telephone conversations, while a fairly large number indicated the use of personal visits to the fields. Ten mentioned receiving information from church or denominational officials as an addition to the check list. Table 9 lists this information.

Pre-placement conferences.-- Fifty-six seminaries regularly scheduled conferences between the student and the field-work director prior to placement and seven did so occasionally. Thirty-three reported that conferences between the student and a representative of the group to be served were regularly arranged, while twenty-three others reported that such conferences were sometimes held. Only nine seminaries reported that it was customary for a pre-placement conference to be held between the student and a denominational representative, although thirty others reported that such conferences were occasionally held.

TABLE 9

NUMBER OF SEMINARIES WHICH USED CERTAIN METHODS TO SECURE DATA  
CONCERNING PLACES AVAILABLE FOR STUDENT FIELD WORK

| Method                                | Employed  |              |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|--------------|
|                                       | Regularly | Occasionally |
| Correspondence .....                  | 59        | 9            |
| Interview .....                       | 53        | 14           |
| Telephone .....                       | 41        | 16           |
| Visit to place .....                  | 25        | 22           |
| *Church or denominational officials.. | 2         | 8            |

\* This item was not included in the check list but was written in by field-work directors.

Information files.-- Fifty-five seminaries reported that they kept an information file on places offering field work. This information is of value in the placement process, in the orientation of students to field work (one seminary reported that one hundred and fifty items in the information file were checked out by students during the space of a year), and in the supervisory program. Several seminaries supplemented their information file by a large wall map with pins indicating the fields being operated (one seminary used pins with different colored heads to indicate different types of field work). One seminary kept a card file of places soliciting student aid and another card file of places occupied. When a working agreement between the student and the place served was entered into, the card was

transferred from one file to the other.

### Basic Principles for Placement in Field Work

Information about the student.-- The field-work director  
should secure adequate background information about the student before  
placing him in field work (1:34; 159:11). Each student is unique in  
 the experiential background he brings to his field experience, in his  
 ability and personality, and in his educational and personal needs (2\*).  
 He is ready for certain types of field work and not for others (7\*).  
 The position should be interesting and challenging to him (26\*) but  
 should not involve problems for which his experiential background  
 might not prove adequate. His experiences need to be adapted to his  
 total needs (14\*). Among the aspects the field-work director will  
 desire to inventory are: previous Christian service, previous leader-  
 ship activities (in school, church, and community), vocational plans,  
 health, educational record, emotional maturity, interests, special  
 skills and abilities, and Christian experience.

Information about the place.-- The field-work director should  
secure adequate background information concerning the places available  
for student field work (1:34). The director should secure information  
 concerning the nature of the work to be done, the size and charac-  
 teristics of the group to be served, the available facilities for the  
 development and maintenance of a desirable program of activity, and  
 the educational possibilities of the activities. He should ascertain  
 the amount and quality of local supervision which will be available,

the remuneration which may be expected, and the amount of time which will be required for preparation, travel, and actual field work. He should make use of any records of past field work with the local co-operating supervisor and any records of past field work with the group or organization. He should also seek information concerning the interests, prejudices, or peculiarities of the group to be served, problems which are likely to arise, and the attitude of the group toward the student assistant. No student should be recommended to a field position until it has been investigated and approved by the field-work director (159:11).

Information about the supervisor.-- The field-work director should secure adequate background information concerning the cooperating supervisors from the church or organization (159:13). The field-work director should know the educational and professional background of the supervisor, his previous experiences with student assistants, and his understanding of the objectives of the seminary and its philosophy of field work. The director should know how much time the supervisor is able or willing to devote to his supervision. Any other information concerning the personality, philosophy, or methods of the cooperating supervisor should be utilized. A minister who is not capable of giving careful and efficient supervisory guidance to a student should not receive a student assistant from the seminary. These qualifications are desirable in a cooperating supervisor:

1. He must be competent in the field in which he is to serve as a supervisor.

2. He must have the personality and temperament of a counselor.

3. He must show increasing understanding and skill in supervisory techniques.

4. He must possess knowledge of the particular plan for field work and what he is expected to do as a supervisor (159:14).

Information files.-- Information gathered concerning students, places, and cooperating supervisors should be kept in appropriate files (1:94-5; 159:15). The student file may contain a summary of the cumulative educational record of the student; summaries of any personality, psychological, or aptitude tests given; a detailed statement of previous experience in leadership activities; and any other background information which may be available on the student. To this may be added, during the period of the student's field work, his regular field work reports (supplemented by copies of church bulletins, programs, photographs, field-work diaries, surveys made); supervisors' reports on the student; summaries of interviews with the student; summaries of class grades of the student and of any faculty discussions or decisions concerning the student; and any other available data which may be gathered during this time.

The place file may include a cumulative form which lists the students who have served the church or organization, the period of their service, and remarks. It is well to prepare standard forms to be filled out for each place and to be filed along with the cumulative form. This second form should contain such basic data as the size of



the church or organization, names and addresses of the local leaders, the name and address of the local cooperating supervisor or denominational supervisor, the times of church or organizational services and activities, important aspects of the local program, and remarks. The place file may be arranged alphabetically according to geographical location or according to church or organizational name. Some seminaries may find it practicable to have major divisions in the file according to denominations, types of organizations, or states. When a student file becomes inactive, or at the time when the student changes his field-work activity, supplementary materials pertinent to the place may be transferred to the place file. These may include selected copies of church or organizational bulletins, surveys, and other materials to indicate the type of program which has been carried on. Students may be asked to complete a summary report form on the place at the close of a period of field work with a church or organization. This may be placed in the place file. It will assist in providing continuity of program when a new student goes to the place. It will give valuable orientation material to any who make use of it.

The file on the cooperating supervisors is useful in keeping together background data on the supervisor and his supervision. It also provides useful orientation to a new person who takes over duties as field-work director. Over a period of years a field-work director builds up a valuable store of information about cooperating pastors and churches, but this is lost to his successor unless proper filing systems have been in operation.

Criteria for choosing fields.--- The field-work director should develop an acceptable list of criteria for a desirable field of service (1:33-5; 159:13). Even though many places may not satisfy all the points covered in the criteria, such a check list can serve as a valuable guide to the supervisor in his orientation of the student and in his work with the local church and organization. Some points which illustrate the type of criteria that may be developed are:

1. The field should be reasonably accessible.
2. The position should present a genuine need, opportunity, or challenge.
3. The opportunity should offer experiences of potential educational value.
4. The position should provide reasonable remuneration (unless the seminary can subsidize, or unless no expense is involved in the field work and this activity is of a temporary nature).
5. The organization should be able to furnish adequate supervision.
6. The church or organizational officials should be willing to cooperate with the seminary and the student.
7. The field should offer continuity of experience for a reasonable period.

Criteria for selecting students to suit fields.--- The field-work director should develop a check list of criteria to aid in deciding if a given field is desirable for a given student (99:1, 15;

114:90-1; 136:116; 159:10). It will be impossible to hold inflexibly to hard and fast rules, for it will never be possible to have "tailor-made" situations for all students. The field-work director, however, needs a set of criteria to guide him in his placement activity.

Points which might be covered in such criteria are:

1. Does the student have adequate experiential background and ability to undertake this activity?
2. Will this activity provide experiences of a different type, with a different age level, or with a different type of person from previous experiences?
3. Is the student sufficiently mature spiritually, socially, and emotionally to command respect in this form of leadership?
4. Does the student have real interest in this type of activity?
5. Does the student welcome working with this group?
6. Is the student temperamentally suited to working harmoniously with the local supervisor who will be responsible for supervising this activity?
7. Will this activity demand too much time from this student?
8. Is the student able to carry on this activity without undue financial strain?
9. Will this experience harmonize at this time with the individually graded sequence desirable for this student?

Acquaintance with the field.-- The field-work director should, as far as feasible, be personally acquainted with the field situation

(159:12). Interviews conducted at the seminary, telephone conversations, and correspondence are useful, but it is desirable for the field-work director to visit the field in person. Over a period of years a field-work director will have acquired a personal knowledge of many places through his supervisory visits. When a new place offers itself, however, it is desirable for him to visit the field, contact local officials, arrange for a cooperating local supervisor, and gather data and impressions on the spot. Unfortunately, this will not always be possible. Personal acquaintance with the field enables the director to render more valuable assistance in counseling and guidance during the period of field work.

Orientation of cooperating supervisors.-- The field-work director should give orientation to all cooperating supervisors (1:40). This orientation may be given by means of literature, correspondence, personal interviews, and orientation conferences. Bulletins and printed statements should be given to every prospective supervisor. These should contain the philosophy and objectives of the field-work program; illustrations of the responsibilities of the supervisor, the attitudes that may be desirable, and the techniques which should prove useful; and summaries of student activities often found in the type of work he will be supervising. Such literature is particularly helpful if it is rich in anecdotes showing how other supervisors have functioned. The literature should also present criteria to be used in evaluating the student's field work. Report forms, check lists, rating scales, and similar forms may be supplied. A self-evaluatory

form for the supervisor to use in checking his supervisory activities is helpful. Orientation conferences, lasting one or two days, may be held at the beginning of the seminary year. In these conferences the supervisors and representatives of the churches and organizations served meet with students and faculty. Objectives and plans of the seminary can be described, reports of past field-work experiences can be shared, and problems and plans can be discussed.

Orientation of students.-- The field-work director should give orientation to all students participating in field work (1:47-8, 51-3: 159:12-13). Student orientation may be accomplished by means of literature, personal interviews, orientation conferences, and seminars. The literature distributed should include statements of the philosophy and objectives of the field-work program, job-analyses of the types of field work available and the major values of each, and criteria by which field work can be evaluated. The student should be provided with the necessary report forms, check lists, and self-evaluative devices. Sample reports from other years may provide helpful orientation. Spring seminars can provide orientation and preparation for summer field work. The arrangements which the field-work director makes for job visitation and preview by the student and for his conference with a representative of the group to be served, and the initial interview with the field-work director or his assistant also serve a vital function in orientation.

Conferences of students with place representatives.-- The field-work director should schedule or arrange for conferences at the

seminary or in the field between the student and the representatives of the church, organization, or denomination (1:52). Preliminary conferences at the seminary make it possible for the employing agent to interview several students and for the student to make preliminary contacts with representatives from several groups. However, there is a definite value in the student's visiting and previewing the place to be served before he enters into a definite agreement. The field-work director can furnish the student additional information about the field and previous field work done there. Similarly, the field-work director can furnish the employing agent information about the student. The student should always be given some choice in field work, so that he does not feel he is being made to follow arrangements entirely pre-arranged for him (52\*). Such democracy (44\*) and flexibility (49\*) are always educationally desirable.

Placement interviews.-- The field-work director should schedule placement interviews with the student (1:52). There should be an initial interview with the student (particularly, prior to the first placement) in which the director gets to understand the student and his interests, goals, and attitudes. Ideally, there should also be a later interview with the director, in which the student reports on his initial impressions from his preview of one or more fields. At this time a decision as to his final choice can be made by the student. Practical difficulties may necessitate, especially in larger seminaries, that this second interview be conducted by an assistant to the field-work director.

Field-work agreements.--- The field work director should supervise a definite work agreement between the student and the employing group (1:52-3). A copy of this agreement should be kept on file in the field-work office. The agreement should recognize the responsibility of the cooperating group to the seminary, of the seminary to the cooperating group, of each of them to the student, and of the student to both of them. This agreement may be on a form provided by the seminary and signed by the student, the field-work director, and the group representative. The agreement may take the form of an official letter from the church or organization, outlining duties, remuneration, and relationships. Whether or not the working agreement is in the form of a contract, it should be clear, detailed, and in writing. Among the problems that are frequently met in field work and which could be avoided to some degree through a carefully developed agreement are:

- (1) Arbitrary changes in programs in the field
- (2) Use of student services for inconsequential activities (as "chore" or errand boys) and in merely routine matters
- (3) Lack of graded experience within a field-work position
- (4) Inadequate financial remuneration
- (5) Excessive demands upon the student
- (6) Lack of adequate supervision and counsel on the part of the cooperating supervisor
- (7) Lack of adequate supervision and visitation by the seminary representative (1:33). Employing groups quite generally desire more frequent consultation with the seminary field-work supervisor

than they are accustomed to receive (1:39).

#### Areas of Need

A comparison of the placement practices of the theological seminaries today with the principles which have been developed in this chapter reveals three major areas of need.

There is a need for more adequate utilization of data in the placement of students in field work. A wider range of data needs to be secured and adequate filing systems should be inaugurated. Less than half of the field-work offices use any method of securing data concerning the student other than noting his previous marks and having a personal conference with him, during which his previous field work is ascertained. A wider range of data-gathering techniques should be used in securing information about the student, the field, and the cooperating supervisors. Few seminaries have adequate information on the places served, and almost no data are secured concerning the co-operating supervisors. All the information secured should be appropriately filed. Adequate supervisory leadership is impossible without adequate data.

Placement must be more carefully planned. Almost all seminaries need to develop criteria concerning what constitutes a satisfactory field and criteria to be used in matching students with fields. Many seminaries practically let the students place themselves, regardless of previous experiences or present educational needs. Perfect matching of students and jobs may never be feasible, but more carefully



planned placement is the first step toward the full educational utilization of field-work experiences. A way must be found to place educational above financial considerations. Seminaries need to supervise the drawing-up of definite field-work agreements which carefully outline the responsibilities of students, the seminary, and the place served.

A new emphasis should be placed upon orientation in field work. Students need to be given orientation to field work in general and to the specific field-work activities they undertake. More adequate orientation literature should be provided, so that the field-work director can devote the major portion of the time spent in interviewing to intimate personal guidance. Less orientation has been given to supervisors than to students. Since the field-work directors have few personal contacts with the cooperating supervisors, it is a necessity to provide these cooperating officials with adequate orientation literature, including suggested graded sequences for the types of activities they supervise.

#### Summary

The seminaries required little by way of specific class prerequisites to field work. While some seminaries gave orientation to juniors, little specific orientation to field work was provided. Nearly half of the seminaries provided some orientation to cooperating church or organizational supervisors, but this orientation was usually quite meager, consisting of an introductory letter, a telephone conversation, a single interview, or a single luncheon meeting. Few seminaries made a serious effort to improve the supervision offered by

these cooperating supervisors.

Over sixty per cent of the seminaries reported that prior to placement an interview was held with the student, his previous field work was ascertained, and his educational record noted. Thirty per cent or more of the seminaries also made use of one or more of the following: interest inventories, intelligence examinations, diaries or autobiographies, personality tests or inventories, information blanks, and case studies. Information concerning the available fields was secured by correspondence, interviews, telephone conversations, and by visits to the fields. Sixty-three seminaries reported that student-director conferences were more or less regularly held prior to placement, fifty-six reported that students more or less regularly had interviews with a representative of the place offering field work, while thirty-nine seminaries reported that students at times held conferences with denominational representatives. Information files were frequently used to keep information on places offering field work.

Twelve basic principles for placement in field work were developed. Prior to placement, adequate information should be secured concerning the student, the place, and the cooperating supervisor. This information should be appropriately filed. Criteria should be developed for choosing fields and for matching students with fields. The field-work director should have a personal acquaintance with the fields.

The field-work director should give orientation to all cooperating supervisors and to all students participating in field work.

He should schedule conferences at the seminary between the students and those desiring to employ them. He should himself interview the student prior to placement and should supervise the formulation of a definite work agreement between the student and the employing group.

Three major areas of need are: more adequate utilization of data in the placement of students in field work, more careful planning of field-work placement, and more adequate programs of field-work orientation.

## CHAPTER VI

### THE SUPERVISION OF FIELD WORK

Supervision is the most crucial area in field work today. This chapter reports on seminary practices in field-work supervision, develops basic principles related to this supervision, outlines the wide range of possible supervisory activities, and points out major areas of need in field-work supervision today.

In discussing seminary practices, the individuals who serve as supervisors, the techniques they employ, and the time they devote to supervision are described. Practices discussed include long-range plans, efforts to assure a balanced variety of field-work experiences, supervisory visits, and supervisory conferences. The number of students being supervised, and the supplementary supervision provided by denominational and local leaders are described. Types of field work in which supervision has been most satisfactory and those for which it has been difficult, as well as supervisory activities tried and found impracticable, are also discussed.

Basic principles set forth the nature of supervision and its relation to the curriculum and to the faculty. Supervisory objectives, supervisory visits, supervisory conferences, and the qualifications for supervisors are also treated in the section on basic principles.

An extensive outline of the range of supervision suggests over four hundred possible activities connected with field-work supervision.

Trends and promising developments in field-work supervision

are described and six major areas of need are discussed.

### Seminary Practices in Field-Work Supervision

Individuals engaging in supervision.-- The most common title used to designate the individual assigned the main responsibility for the supervision of field work was Field-Work Director. Other titles used were: Chairman of the Field-Work Committee, Director of Church Development, Director of Clinical Training, Director of Community Service, Director of Ministerial Services, Director of Practical Work, Director of Rural Church and Life Work, Director of Supervised Field Work, Director of Training, Field Director, and Field-Work Supervisor.

The survey questionnaire did not specifically ask whether all members of the faculty participated in field-work supervision, but seven seminaries indicated that this was their policy. Three of these--Cumberland Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Princeton Theological Seminary, and the Theological Seminary of the Evangelical and Reformed Church in the United States--stated that all faculty members made supervisory visits. An eighth seminary, Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, mentioned that "most" of its faculty members made supervisory visits to observe the work of from one to ten students per year.

Table 10 presents the frequency with which various faculty members and seminary officials participated in field-work supervision as reported by ninety seminaries. In reading the table it must be remembered that most field-work directors taught one or more classes, but these were not specifically mentioned in the data. The teaching

TABLE 10

THE FREQUENCY WITH WHICH VARIOUS OFFICIALS AND FACULTY MEMBERS  
OF NINETY SEMINARIES PARTICIPATED IN FIELD WORK SUPERVISION

| Official or Faculty Member                 | Frequency |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Field-Work Director (or equivalent)* ..... | 32        |
| Dean .....                                 | 20        |
| Professor of Practical Theology .....      | 20        |
| Professor of Religious Education .....     | 15        |
| President .....                            | 10        |
| Professor of Christian Education .....     | 9         |
| Professor of Theology .....                | 7         |
| Professor of Old Testament .....           | 7         |
| Assistant Field-Work Director .....        | 5         |
| Professor of New Testament .....           | 5         |
| Professor of Church History .....          | 5         |
| Professor of Homiletics .....              | 6         |
| Professor of Pastoral Theology .....       | 4         |
| Professor of Church Administration .....   | 4         |
| Professor of Church Music .....            | 4         |
| Professor of Public Speaking .....         | 3         |
| Professor of Rural Church .....            | 3         |
| Professor of Applied Christianity .....    | 3         |
| Professor of Biblical Literature .....     | 3         |
| Professor of Preaching .....               | 2         |
| Professor of Christian Social Ethics ..... | 2         |
| Professor of Research .....                | 2         |
| Professor of Education .....               | 2         |
| Professor of Christian Philosophy .....    | 2         |
| Professor of Missions .....                | 2         |
| Professor of Clinical Training .....       | 2         |
| Vice President .....                       | 1         |
| Student Counselor .....                    | 1         |
| Professor of Pastoral Work .....           | 1         |
| Professor of Pastoral Psychology .....     | 1         |

\* Apparently some field-work directors listed themselves by the subject which they teach.

TABLE 10 (Continued)

| Official or Faculty Member                | Frequency |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Professor of Town and Country .....       | 1         |
| Professor of Sociology of Religion .....  | 1         |
| Professor of Church and Community .....   | 1         |
| Professor of Counseling .....             | 1         |
| Professor of Greek .....                  | 1         |
| Professor of Biblical Introduction .....  | 1         |
| Professor of Social Work .....            | 1         |
| Professor of Kindergarten Education ..... | 1         |
| Professor of Psychology of Religion ..... | 1         |
| Professor of History of Education .....   | 1         |
| Professor of Islamics .....               | 1         |

responsibilities of the field-work directors were almost always in the practical fields, practical theology and religious education being the most usual subjects taught by them.

It will be noted that thirty administrators (presidents, vice presidents, deans) were mentioned as participating in field-work supervision. Fifty-four of those who participated in field-work supervision taught practical theology or a related subject. Twenty-seven of those participating in supervision taught in the general area of religious education. Thirty-eight of those participating in supervision were listed as field-work directors, assistant field-work directors, or counselors. The remaining forty-two taught a variety of subjects ranging from Old Testament and theology to Greek and church music.

Supervisory techniques used.--- The most common supervisory

techniques regularly used by the seminaries were the individual conference and written reports of some form or other. Group conferences, practicums and seminars, and supervisory visits were also common. Table 11 gives the frequency with which the various supervisory techniques were checked by the seminaries. Five additional items were written in by field-work directors.

Time given to supervision.-- Thirty-seven seminaries gave estimates of the time their field-work directors devoted to supervision. The range was from three per cent to one hundred per cent. The average field-work director in these seminaries spent forty-two per cent of his time in supervision. Fifty-one seminaries gave reports on the amount of time devoted to supervision by one or more members of their staff. The greatest amount of time reported was by a seminary which stated that its staff gave almost the equivalent of the full time of three men (2.75) to field-work supervision. The average for the fifty-one seminaries was fifty-six per cent of the time of one man.

Long-range plans.-- Twenty-two seminaries reported that they at times required their students to make long-range plans for their field work. The submission of such a plan to the field-work director involves a valuable form of supervision. The plans were most frequently required (eleven seminaries) for some form of the pastorate, including the summer pastorate (other types of supervisory activity were less frequently engaged in during the summer). Four seminaries mentioned that long-range plans were required for "preaching" and four stated that they were required for "religious education." Some



TABLE 11

NUMBER OF THE SEMINARIES (NINETY-SIX) USING VARIOUS  
SUPERVISORY TECHNIQUES

| Supervisory Technique          | Number of Seminaries Using |              |       |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|-------|
|                                | Regularly                  | Occasionally | Never |
| Individual conferences .....   | 68                         | 12           | 16    |
| A written report of form ..... | 65                         |              | 31    |
| Practicums or seminars .....   | 43                         | 6            | 47    |
| Group conferences .....        | 40                         | 22           | 34    |
| Supervisory visits .....       | 35                         | 25           | 36    |
| Check lists .....              | 28                         | 7            | 61    |
| Long range plans .....         | 23                         |              | 73    |
| Rating scales .....            | 13                         | 6            | 77    |
| Bulletins .....                | 9                          | 7            | 80    |

of the other items mentioned were related to preaching and religious education. In summary, fifteen seminaries required at times the preparation of long-range plans for preaching and related activities, six seminaries for religious education and related activities, and one seminary each required them for research experiments, counseling, experiments in rural life, social work, and visitation.

A balanced variety of field-work experiences.--- There was little apparent systematic planning by the seminaries for an adequate variety of field-work experiences for each student. It was still generally possible for a student to find a form of field-work activity which he enjoyed and performed fairly satisfactorily and to continue

that work throughout his period of seminary training. There were no fixed principles for the assurance of a balanced variety of experiences, as a rule, but the field-work director simply relied on his own discretion. Four seminaries, however, required a different type of field work in the junior year from what was done during other years. Two of these four seminaries required a different form of activity each year. Three seminaries stated that they used a graded sequence of activities to insure a balanced variety of experience. Seven seminaries mentioned that they changed assignments, although it was not indicated whether a change in assignment necessarily involved a change in type of field-work activity. Three of these seven seminaries stated that assignments were changed each year, and one stated that assignments were changed each semester.

Two of the seminaries which required a different type of field-work activity in the junior year from what was done in other years specified that the junior year should be given to group leadership. One seminary required each student to do some rural work, and one required each student to do clinical work. One seminary specified three units of field work, one of which had to be the leadership of a group or church, one a summer pastorate, and the other "optional under guidance." One field-work director stated that he preferred field experience in depth rather than in variety. Principles developed in Chapter IV point out that both variety and continuity were desirable in field work.

Other comments of field-work directors on their methods of

securing balance in the field experiences of the students included "yearly check list," "mimeographed instructions to pastor," "counseling supervising pastors," and "faculty committee reviews each student's field-work program."

Supervisory visits.-- Table 12 lists the number of times per semester that a student's field work was observed by a seminary supervisor. This information was furnished for six main categories of field work. Regardless of the category, however, few students received more than one visit per semester from the seminary supervisor. Forty-seven seminaries did not respond on this question or indicated that supervisory visits were never made, and two other responses were too indefinite to tabulate. Summarizing, it may be stated that students in half of the seminaries did not receive any "on-the-spot" supervision by the seminary, and that the students in the other half of the seminaries received, on an average, two supervisory visits during one or more of their seminary years. This is totally inadequate.

Supervisory conferences.-- Forty-seven seminaries reported that supervisory visits were at times followed by individual conferences between the supervisor and the student. Most of these seminaries made this a regular practice. In one seminary, less than a fourth of its supervisory visits were followed by a student-supervisor conference; in three this was done from a fourth to a half of the time; and in four this was done from a half to three-fourths of the time. In thirty-four, however, three-fourths or more of their supervisory

TABLE 12

NUMBER\* OF SEMINARIES PROVIDING SUPERVISORY VISITS  
TO STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN SIX GENERAL TYPES OF FIELD WORK

| Type of Field Work     | Number of Supervisory Visits per Semester |   |   |   |   |   | Weekly |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|--------|
|                        | 1                                         | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 8 |        |
| Preaching .....        | 31                                        | 6 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 |        |
| Teaching .....         | 24                                        | 6 |   |   | 1 | 1 | 1      |
| Visitation .....       | 16                                        | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |   |        |
| Music leadership ..... | 9                                         | 2 |   | 1 | 1 |   | 1      |
| Counseling .....       | 7                                         | 2 |   | 1 | 1 |   | 3      |
| Social work .....      | 13                                        | 3 | 1 |   | 1 |   | 1      |

\* Forty-seven of the ninety-six seminaries furnished usable answers to this question.

visits were followed by student-supervisor conferences (thirty-two of these stated that this was always done). Five seminaries made it a practice to hand the student a written criticism following the student-supervisor conference.

Thirty-nine seminaries reported on the number of student-supervisor conferences which their students engaging in field work averaged per year. In these theological schools the average student had four such conferences per school year. Inasmuch as at least one and often two conferences per year are necessary for the placement activity, this implied that the student's only other conferences were following the two supervisory visits which the average student had per

year. This clearly implies that other forms of evaluation, records, and reports received by the field-work office were seldom used as a basis for student counsel and guidance apart from such times as the student was seen in connection with a supervisory visit. A further implication is that student-supervisor conferences in these seminaries were seldom initiated by the student. This suggests that the students either were unaware of their weaknesses and need for counsel and guidance or else did not feel free to avail themselves of the facilities provided for their use. If students were unaware of their areas of need, there must have been inadequate evaluation and interpretation of the evaluations made. In some cases the evaluation program may have been used for administrative purposes rather than for guidance.

There was undoubtedly a great deal of incidental guidance provided through casual student-supervisor contacts both in and out of the field-work office. Very important supervision can often be rendered by this method, but it is clearly inadequate as a major or only procedure. There must be a carefully planned series of supervisory-guidance contacts, if the student is to be helped to become the most useful and effective minister and person which he is capable of becoming. These data imply that perhaps such guidance will result only from a more adequate program of supervisory visitation.

Number of students for whom seminary supervisors are responsible.--- The average supervisor in a teacher-training institution is responsible for 15.8 student-teachers and also has some teaching responsibility. It has been pointed out that all data on the length,

frequency, regularity, and convenient timing of supervisory visits in teacher education indicate that under the present state of things supervisors cannot possibly furnish adequate supervision through conference and visitation (83:120). The situation is even worse in theological education and, in addition, few seminary supervisors have had specific training for supervision. According to the present survey, 194 teachers, administrators, and field-work directors were responsible for the supervision of whatever field work was done by 15,187 students, or an average of seventy-eight students per supervisor. In actual practice, however, only 6,263 students were reported as receiving supervision, which made an average of thirty-two students per supervisor. This does not, however, eliminate the responsibility of the seminaries to make educational use of and to guide the field work of the other students who engage in field work. At the time of this survey only 2,715 students were definitely stated to be not engaged in field work. Of the others, 1,717 were known to be engaged in field work without any supervision, and information was not available concerning 4,492, many of whom were undoubtedly engaged in field work.

In summary, if each seminary supervisor devoted the same amount of time he gave to field-work supervision (an average of fifteen per cent of his time) and spread his efforts among those known to be engaged in field work, each supervisor would have been responsible for thirty-seven students in that small fraction of his time. If the complete figures were known (as shown in the preceeding paragraph) the actual situation would have been shown to have been even more

disproportionate. It is totally impossible for adequate supervision to be given student field work until supervision is more widely shared by faculty members and until field-work directors are released from more of their additional responsibilities.

Denominational supervision.-- Twenty different titles were mentioned by the seminaries when they referred to the denominational officials who assisted them in the supervision of field work. Much of this variation was due to the differences of denominational terminology. The officials might be grouped in three main categories: general denominational heads (e. g., bishops, moderators, and others), officials from the general denominational headquarters (e. g., National Council for Home Missions; National Council, Department of Town and Country), and district or area officials (e. g., district superintendents, presidents of synods, conference superintendents). The amount of supervisory assistance rendered by these officials varied from case to case.

Other supervision.-- In addition to the seminary officials, field-work directors and assistants, faculty members, and denominational supervisors of various kinds, supervision was also provided in some cases by hospital chaplains, psychiatric ward staff of institutions served, the Council for Clinical Training, the Institute for Pastoral Care, pastors' committees, social agency staff, presidents of institutions served, cooperating pastors, graduate assistants, advanced students, and student committees. All such assistance is valuable, but should be under the over-all leadership of the seminary.

There is danger in the field-work director erroneously assuming this non-seminary supervision to be greater in amount and value than is actually the case.

Types of field work for which supervision has been most satisfactory.--- The field-work directors were asked to state the types of field work for which they had been able to provide the most satisfactory supervision. Fifty-three seminaries mentioned eighty-four activities in response to this question. A total of thirty-eight different activities were mentioned. These are grouped in Table 13. Items grouped under "others" included such answers as "community survey," "summer field work," "junior-middle year," and "near-by week ends."

Types of field work found difficult to supervise.--- Forty-two seminaries listed one or more types of field-work activity which they had found difficult to supervise. Thirty-seven items were mentioned one or more times in a total of sixty-seven responses. This information is listed in Table 14. The "other preaching activities" in this table included such items as "mission teams," "street preaching," "revival evangelism," and "occasional supply preaching." The "others" category in Table 14 included such items as "court projects," "intern year," "students from denominations not specially interested in training," "special jobs," and "experimental projects in church family life."

In comparing Tables 13 and 14 it should be remembered that differences in the supervisory facilities, church and organizational



TABLE 13

NUMBER\* OF SEMINARIES WHICH WERE ABLE TO  
SUPERVISE CERTAIN TYPES OF FIELD WORK MOST SATISFACTORILY

| Type of Field Work               | Number<br>of<br>Seminaries |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Pastoral work .....              | 38                         |
| Other preaching activities ..... | 8                          |
| Religious education .....        | 16                         |
| Clinical work .....              | 5                          |
| Social agency work .....         | 4                          |
| Visitation .....                 | 4                          |
| Others .....                     | 8                          |

\* Fifty-three of the ninety-six seminaries answered this question.

TABLE 14

NUMBER\* OF SEMINARIES WHICH FOUND  
CERTAIN TYPES OF FIELD WORK DIFFICULT TO SUPERVISE

| Type of Field Work               | Number<br>of<br>Seminaries |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Social agency work .....         | 13                         |
| Pastoral work .....              | 12                         |
| Other preaching activities ..... | 10                         |
| Visitation .....                 | 7                          |
| Counseling .....                 | 6                          |
| Religious education .....        | 3                          |
| Others .....                     | 10                         |

\* Forty-two of the ninety-six seminaries responded on this question.

personnel, and community resources of the various seminaries might cause a field-work activity to be easy to supervise in one situation and difficult in another. Some differences might be accounted for by the types of orientation programs carried on for students and for co-operating supervisors; other differences might be due to adequate or inadequate programs of evaluation and reporting; while the type of working agreement entered into between the seminary and the cooperating church or organization might be a deciding factor in yet other situations. In some instances the personality, skill, and professional training of the supervisor might be the significant factor.

Supervisory activities tried and found impracticable.--- The question concerning what supervisory activities were tried and found impracticable provided particularly interesting answers. Twenty-six seminaries made some reply to this question. These replies could be better interpreted if further information were available concerning the seminaries and the field-work directors concerned.

Seven field-work directors stated in one way or another that they had found supervisory visits impractical. Two of these explained that they lacked the time. One stated that such visitation generally "does not result in much information that a district superintendent did not have." Here the point raised is the seminary's philosophy of field work. If the seminary feels that field work and its supervision are not an essential aspect of the curriculum and that field-work supervision is primarily the responsibility of church officials, perhaps it can leave such supervision to church officials. If,

however, field work is considered a vital part of the curriculum with real educational value, and if the seminary has a responsibility for guiding the personal and professional growth of its students, then regardless of how welcome the church official's cooperating supervision may be, the seminary has a primary supervisory responsibility of its own. It was interesting to note that the field-work director of another seminary of the same denomination made precisely the opposite comment. The only thing he had found impractical was "supervision by a denominational leader." The seminary should always work in cooperation with its own denominational leaders, but it is difficult to understand how a training institution can maintain a sound and effective curriculum or guidance program, if it delegates all or even primary supervisory responsibility to non-seminary people.

Four field-work directors stated that full-faculty participation in supervision was found impractical (although one of these admitted that such participation had never really gone beyond the discussion stage). The reason stated by one was that the time of the faculty was "too valuable to use in supervision," and this reason was implied in the statement of another director. Here again the philosophy of supervision and general educational principles are in question. It was pointed out in Chapter III that graduates of teacher-training institutions consistently rate their supervised student-teaching as the most valuable part of their teacher education. It may well be that students who had been properly supervised in their seminary field work would feel similarly after graduation. If the educational value

of laboratory experience and the importance of integrating theory and practice were recognized by a faculty member, it is questionable whether he would feel that time was "too valuable" to be devoted to supervision of field work.

Three field-work directors stated that they had found practicums impractical. The unknown factors here are the method in which these practicums were conducted and the group leadership furnished by the director.

Each of the following items was listed by only one field-work director: "keeping in touch with student pastors," "records and reports," "cumulative records," "student pastorates," "supervision by a seminary representative," "permitting a local pastor to do the whole job of supervising," and "full week-end experience during the school year."

In summary, most of the activities or methods stated as impracticable by one or more field-work directors were highly recommended and found desirable by far more than condemned them, and most were in accord with basic educational and psychological principles. In some instances, the limitations were in the finance or personnel made available by the seminary. It must be remembered that the development of an adequate field-work program must be a cooperative undertaking thoroughly understood by the entire seminary staff. It requires time to orient a group which has been somewhat prejudiced against laboratory experience and the field-work program. The field-work department cannot move too far in advance of the thinking of the administration

and the faculty.

#### Basic Principles for Field-Work Supervision

Democratic supervision.--- Supervision should be democratic (29:148-53; 24\*; 29\*; 44\*; 46\*). The student needs to experience the kind of leadership which he should provide others throughout his ministry. The supervisor is responsible for (1) developing in the student a democratic conscience (an awareness of democratic principles and their value) and (2) assisting the student to develop skills in democratic leadership. A democratic conscience (12:49-51) involves a firm belief in democratic principles, the desire and purpose to live democratically, faith in the ability of others to live democratically, the willing assumption of the obligations and responsibilities of democracy, and experience in democratic living. Skill in democratic leadership involves generalized principles evolved from developing improved democratic techniques in such ministerial activities as leadership of church boards and committees, leadership in public prayer, leadership in public and personal evangelism, leadership in community activities, and democratic followership as well as leadership in church bodies, committees, and boards. A study in teacher-education of 411 student-teachers has shown, furthermore, that the growth which a student makes as a teacher depends just as much upon the relationship between him and his supervisor as it does upon the activities he performs (126:27-8). The student-supervisor relationship in theological education is equally important.

Supervision must be based on respect for the individual theological student (44:21; 78:123-24). This is a corollary of the principle that supervision must be democratic. The concept of individual worth involves respect for the personality of the learner, faith in his potentialities, and opportunity for him to develop creative ability. While this concept must be balanced by a recognition of the obligation of the seminary to the church and community served by the student, it is well to focus attention here on the student himself. Since he is capable of assuming increasingly responsible direction of church activities (4\*, 29\*), he should be given a part in making those decisions which have a direct bearing upon his future activity. Supervision should be sufficiently flexible to provide for differentiation in the kind and amount of supervisory activities. This individualization should be on the basis of the abilities, needs, and interests of the student-minister (126:34-41).

Creative supervision.-- Supervision should be creative (12:62; 30:333-34; 169:344). Traditionally, much supervision has been prescriptive. Democracy substitutes leadership for authoritative direction (12:53). While democracy utilizes experts, yet its respect for individual worth provides opportunity for great flexibility in order to give opportunity for and recognition of creativity on the part of the one supervised. This harmonizes with the statement, "the democratic spirit and the scientific attitude are at one in their emphasis upon experimentalism" (12:55). Every normal individual is capable of some degree of creative expression (6\*); those who expect

to be leaders should be capable of a large degree of creativity. Co-operative undertakings seem to facilitate creativity.

Creative supervision not only will provide opportunities for creative expression, but also will seek hidden or latent talent. Creative participation develops slowly, but is fostered by creative supervision; it leads to creative leadership on the part of the student-minister. Creative supervision will stimulate initiative, self-reliance, individual responsibility, originality, creative self-expression, and the creative leadership of others.

Scientific supervision.--- Supervision should be scientific (12:56; 29:68-100). The supervisor must approach his work systematically and objectively. He must strive for greater precision and expertness in his methods, so that he may have a sound basis for his supervisory leadership. This imposes a demand for close inter-action with the student and the group ministered to by the student, adequate orientation to the needs of both, full and continuous evaluation, and careful record keeping. Scientific supervision is difficult and is subject to some limitation, inasmuch as the ministerial activity involves dynamic inter-action in complex social situations, and even the inter-personal relationships of pastor-parishioner require subjective evaluation. Nevertheless, supervision's emphasis upon adequate evaluation and diagnosis is certainly scientific, and the supervisory activity utilizes the scientific principles developed by psychology.

Planned supervision.--- Supervision should be planned (52\*, 54\*). Supervision must not be limited to student-supervisor conferences

initiated by the student who is conscious of problems in his field work. Field-work supervision involves supervisory visitation, evaluation, the use of field-work reports, and extensive counseling. Students need to feel free to initiate conferences with their supervisor, but such conferences alone do not constitute an adequate supervisory program. Among the weaknesses inherent in such a limited procedure are: (1) students are often unaware of some of their most serious needs; (2) some students will not avail themselves of this opportunity, while others will, if permitted, monopolize the supervisor's time; and (3) such a philosophy of supervision is problem-centered rather than personality-orientated. The goal of supervision should not be primarily correction, nor should it be primarily prevention; supervision should seek to encourage growth and the development of individual strengths. Only by a cooperatively and carefully planned supervisory program can each student be assisted to become the best minister which he is capable of becoming.

Supervision and self-direction.-- Supervision must lead to self-direction (12:63-4; 95:103; 115:10; 156:12). Cooperation in the planning activity and in the evaluative process will naturally lead the student to increasing insight into the adequacy of his ministerial functioning, to increasing recognition of the areas of growth which he should emphasize, and to his assumption of increasing responsibility for such growth. However, this can result only when the supervisor has developed in the student an understanding of the objectives of the field work and its supervision, and an understanding of the



supervisory techniques employed. The experiencing of democratic supervision is essential to the greatest growth on the part of the student-minister and to his own functioning as a democratic leader and supervisor within his church. It has been shown that the growth of the student-teacher will be directly in proportion to his opportunity to share constructively in the planning and development of his student teaching (126:27-28). It may be assumed that the same would hold true for the student-minister in his field work.

Supervision and psychology.-- Supervision should be based on psychological principles (143:92-107). Many of these concepts were described in Chapter II. A few are repeated here by way of illustration. Supervision must take account of the whole situation in which the student-minister is functioning (11\*). The supervisor should see that the student gets a variety of experiences (17\*). He must adjust his guidance to the needs of the student (20\*) and must assist the student to become efficient in evaluating his own work (21\*). He must guide the student to increasing personal integration, and this can be furthered by pointing out the relation of field work to class work (12\*).

Supervision and curricular integration.-- Supervision should promote curricular integration (12:64-65). Those participating in field-work supervision should carry their findings back to the seminary and thus promote the integration of theory and practice and the readaptation of the seminary curriculum to bring it in line with revealed student and church-community interests and needs. Such

supervisory efforts will also promote the continuity of the curricular program of the individual student. The necessity of the very close correlation of field-work supervision and general guidance is apparent, although the guidance activity of the seminary should go beyond the usual program of field-work supervision. Effective supervision draws upon the assistance of "content" instructors ( e. g., teachers of theology and Old Testament prophecy) as areas of interest or need are indicated during the field-work activities. This serves to unite all the classes of the seminary through the field-work function.

Supervision and the faculty.--- Supervision should be an all-seminary responsibility (45:30). It was pointed out in Chapter IV that all faculty members have a responsibility for integrating field work with class work and for sharing in supervision. Even though the over-all responsibility for coordination and direction of field work is in the hands of the director, yet all of the staff have some responsibility for field-work supervision. Faculty members teaching in the practical fields, advisors, counselors, and those assisting in the guidance function have particular responsibility. The full integration of theory and practice, however, requires the professionalization of all subjects in the seminary curriculum, and this is naturally furthered when all faculty members are kept in touch with contemporary parish problems being met by their students, and when all are aware of how the content of their courses is functioning in the ministry of their students. Seminary evaluation must include more than a sampling of verbal responses, whether pencil-and-paper or oral; it must test how

these verbalizations function in the student's ministry.

Every seminary faculty member would profit from sharing the responsibility of the supervision of the field work of at least two or three students each year. This would facilitate keeping the curriculum of the seminary oriented to objectives and needs, and would facilitate the vitalization of class-room instruction. There is some question as to whether a faculty member should be retained, if he is so little concerned with the integration of theory and practice, so little interested in the professional growth of his students, and so lacking in ministerial experience or personal qualities that he cannot function satisfactorily as a joint-supervisor of the field work of a few students.

It would be desirable if every faculty member had taken professional courses in supervision, but this is highly improbable. It would still be possible, however, to give much of the orientation needed through the cooperative process by which all seminaries should develop, evaluate, and continuously improve their field-work program. All such curricular reorganization will tend to fail, if it is produced by administrative fiat or as a result of the work of a small committee composed only of faculty members teaching in the practical fields.

In teacher education the trend is for individual professors of psychology, sociology, and educational methods increasingly to leave the campus with their students and to share their teaching experiences as much as possible. Armstrong and Others reported that in many places the entire faculty is now taking joint responsibility

for supervising student teachers (8:211).

Professional education must not be considered that small part of the curriculum assigned to courses in the practical fields. While not every staff member may have occasion or need to provide professional or field experiences for the students in each of his courses, yet he should contribute to the student's background for such experiences, should be responsible for helping the student to see the relationships between his courses and the field-work experiences, should help the student to generalize from his experiences, and ideally should have some share in the supervision of the field-work activities of a few students (74:30-31).

Supervisory objectives.-- The objectives of field-work supervision should be clearly formulated (71:73; 126:27, 146). It is important that the person being supervised clearly understand the objectives of supervision. Seminaries should provide their students with statements of field-work objectives and supervisory objectives as a part of their orientation program. An understanding of the objectives: (1) makes possible definite goal-seeking and eliminates aimless effort (5\*, 19\*), (2) creates a sound basis for a cooperative attitude, and (3) provides a basis for self-evaluation on the part of the student. Objectives should be clear-cut and definite (40\*, 41\*), but should not be so detailed as to hinder cooperative planning (52\*, 53\*).

Supervision of field work is a type of teaching and must include in its view, when stating its objectives, the general objectives

of the theological seminary and of the ministry. It must also recognize the purposes and responsibilities of the theological student.

More intensive supervision will be needed by the student-minister at the outset of his field experience, but successful supervision of graded field work should tend to obviate the necessity for such continued close and intensive guidance. Emphasis upon self-direction and self-supervision leads the student to set up for himself his own objectives in his field work, objectives which are for him dynamic, reasonable, and worthwhile. Such emphasis leads him to assume responsibility for achieving his objectives and to evaluate his own progress toward meeting them. The over-all goal of creative supervision is self-supervision on the part of the student-minister.

The ultimate objective of the minister's work, and hence of all field work and its supervision, is the furtherance of Christ's work through the church. If the student-minister's attention is focused on this rather than on himself, self-consciousness tends to be minimized and the field-work objectives of the seminary become personally significant to him (126:26-28).

Supervisory visits.--- Supervisory visits should be made at least once a month by a seminary representative to each student participating in field work (153:24; 126:55, 150). Quality of observation during visitation is important, but the visits need to be frequent enough to afford the supervisor opportunity to make a fair evaluation of the student's strengths and weaknesses and thus enable him to provide the student effective personal and professional

guidance. Supervisory visits should be frequent enough to insure the continuous progress of the student, to prevent the formation of wrong habits, and to enable constructive help to be provided. It is often impossible for the supervisor to see a natural situation on his first visit, for his presence may be disturbing to the student. One of the chief weaknesses in theological education has been the lack of adequate contacts between the student and his supervisor.

Supervisory conferences.-- Supervisory conferences should be held by a seminary supervisor with each student at least once a month (153:24). Supervisory conferences are essential to the most effective field-work participation and to adequate student guidance. The integration of field work with guidance is discussed in greater detail in Chapter IX. A 1951 survey in teacher education pointed out that student-teachers in general wanted more supervision than they were receiving, and that directing teachers (corresponding to cooperating supervisors in theological education) also desired much more help from the training institutions than they were receiving (83:120). A similar situation exists in theological education in the supervision of field work, although theological education has given much less serious consideration to supervision than has teacher education. If it is considered ideal for student-teachers to have weekly conferences with their supervisors (153:24), student-ministers should have no less than monthly conferences with their supervisors.

Student-supervisor conferences are, perhaps, even more important in theological education than in teacher education, since the

supervision given by the cooperating pastors and officials in theological education tends to be less adequate than that furnished by the supervising teachers in teacher education. Several factors contribute to this situation: (1) a school situation is a more unified experience than a student pastorate, where the church, homes, and the community are involved each week in any effective program; (2) a school situation with its daily schedule throughout the week presents a closer continuity than does church activity which, in student pastorates, has to be confined largely to week-ends; and (3) school activity tends to be with a more homogeneous group than is met in church activity, so that church activity would tend to require more adjustment and more varied skills, and hence a greater degree of supervision.

For the field-work director merely to work through a series of reports from the student and his cooperating supervisor, or for the director even to make supervisory visits is in itself not adequate; there must be cooperative endeavor between student and supervisor aimed at the greatest possible personal and professional growth of the student. Such cooperative endeavor, which can take place through frequent supervisory conferences, would mean much to the student, the church, and the seminary. Supervision has tended to be too largely negative and corrective or preventive; it needs to be positive and creative. Concern has been shown to prevent or correct the mistakes of the student-minister; emphasis must now be placed on analyzing the student and working with him as he develops into the most effective minister which he is capable of becoming.

### Qualifications for Supervisors

Professional training for the ministry.-- The supervisor should have had an adequate professional training for the ministry.

He should have had adequate seminary training, with extensive courses in the practical fields.

Christian experience.-- The supervisor should have a mature Christian experience. He should be characterized by a strong, well-grounded faith, a deep devotional life, and Christian zeal, or he will not be able to give adequate counsel and inspiration and the example of character needed by the student-minister as he confronts his needs and problems. It has been shown that the student-supervisor relationship is equally as important as the field-work activities themselves (126:27-28). If this is true in teacher education, it is of even greater importance in theological training.

Ministerial experience.-- The supervisor should have had an adequate background of successful ministerial experience (71:73; 126:41-45). Successful ministerial experience provides an important background for classroom teaching in the seminary; it is indispensable for the field-work supervisor. Experience in any of the specialized forms of the ministry is helpful, but successful pastoral experience is the one essential.

Professional educational background.-- The supervisor should have had an adequate professional background in education (71:73; 121:). The supervisor should have had basic training in educational psychology and in supervision. Among the courses which could contribute to such



a background would be educational psychology, child psychology, adolescent psychology, mental hygiene, the psychology of personality, clinical methods, educational sociology, school supervision, guidance, counseling techniques, and evaluation. Those lacking a fully adequate background can learn much through cooperative faculty undertakings and discussions. It would be desirable for the supervisor to have had field work in supervision under an expert supervisor, but it is highly improbable that this ideal will be widely feasible for some years to come.

The personality of the supervisor.-- The supervisor should have a mature personality (12:800; 29:68-100; 121:244-47). The supervisor should be well-adjusted, flexible, and should have a genuine interest in people. Other desirable qualities are the ability to make prompt decisions, breadth of interest, cooperativeness, creativity, culture, enthusiasm, equanimity, firmness, the habit of commendation, industriousness, initiative, intelligence, leadership, open-mindedness, optimism, orderliness, a wholesome philosophy of life, poise, reverence, self-confidence, self-control, a sense of humor, sympathy, and tact. It must not be thought, however, that a personality is a sum of a large number of discrete elements or "personality traits." A personality is a functioning whole. No one individual is equally strong in all aspects of his personality. A list such as this, however, may be useful to focus attention on desirable characteristics of a personality that is wholesome, attractive, and effective in the supervisory relationship.

Interest in supervision.-- The supervisor should have a genuine interest in supervision. The supervisor should have a real interest in people and a particular interest in his students and in the welfare of the congregations which they serve. He should genuinely enjoy the supervisory activities. He should have sufficient professional interest to keep up with the latest developments in supervision, theological education, and the psychology of human relations.

### The Range of Supervision

#### (An Outline of Activities in Field-Work Supervision)

The supervisory activities engaged in by directors of field work in theological education are, in general, less extensive in scope, less intensive, and often less organized and planned than are those of supervisors of student-teaching in teacher education. Theological education has much which it can learn from teacher education, but it must adapt and develop techniques and methods which are suited to its own circumstances. In the preparation of the suggestive list of supervisory activities which follows, much help was received from the literature of teacher education, in particular from Mooney (126: 11-13, 86-87, 122, 126-27), while many other suggestions were received from the survey (by personal visits, interviews, correspondence, and questionnaires) of the actual supervisory activities now being performed in the field-work programs of the several seminaries. Some of the specific activities listed may be performed by faculty members in connection with their courses (e. g., the supervision of student observation during field experiences which have been integrated with class-

room theory). Other activities may be performed by supervising ministers, chaplains (in connection with clinical work), or others cooperating in the supervisory function. For the most part, however, these activities are the responsibility of the seminary supervisors, who should perform them when the specific situations and needs of the students warrant. During the survey, the writer became aware of the very limited concept of supervision held by a number of those responsible for supervising the field work of the seminary students. It was then that the need for a lengthy, suggestive outline of this nature became apparent.

# I. Supervisory Activities Connected with Student Observation

## A. Directing Student Observation

1. Planning with the student the specific things to be observed
2. Developing with the student principles to be used in the observation of ministerial activities, of groups or individuals, or of church or community situations
3. Developing or acquainting the student with previously developed check lists, rating scales, or similar devices to assist in more objective observation
4. Suggesting supplementary readings to give background for the observation planned
5. Giving the student instruction in the making of anecdotal records, case studies, and other techniques of study which utilize observation
6. Acquainting the student with aspects of the situation or church program where observation will take place
7. Acquainting the student with typical opportunities, difficulties, or problems which may come under observation
8. Providing a balanced sequence of student observation
9. Adapting individual programs of observation according to individual interests, experiences, and needs
10. Assisting the students to arrange their schedules to make it possible to carry out the observation
11. Arranging for transportation, in connection with the observation

12. Preparing the minister, church committee, Sunday School teacher, and others whose activity is to be observed by giving orientation as to the purpose of the observation, the background of the group doing the observation, and at times suggesting possible arrangements to facilitate the observation
13. Guiding in the sending of appropriate expressions of appreciation by the student or group to the church or organization observed
- B. Evaluating Student Observation
  1. Discussing the basic principles illustrated in the situation observed
  2. Providing for each student's participation in discussion of the activity or situation observed
  3. Assisting the student to analyze and understand the situation observed
  4. Checking the reports and check lists as marked by the student to discover the carefulness of observation and depth of insight
  5. Checking the student's observation by means of quizzes or tests

## II. Supervisory Activities Connected with Student Participation in Ministerial Activities

- A. Supervisory Activities Relating to Placement in Field Work
  1. Securing information concerning the places offering field work opportunities
    - a. Corresponding with pastors, churches, and organizations
    - b. Telephone conversations with pastors or representatives of churches and organizations
    - c. Visiting prospective places offering field work
    - d. Interviewing representatives from places desiring student field work
    - e. Developing and using information blanks and check lists for recording information about places offering field work
    - f. Preparing an opportunity file listing data of the places seeking student services
    - g. Preparing a place file giving background information concerning places where field work has been done or is currently being carried on
    - h. Making data in the files available to other seminary supervisors or staff members
    - i. Making data in the files available to students for orientation purposes
  2. Securing information concerning the student seeking placement in field work

- a. Recording in the field work office basic information about the student obtained from the registrar, Dean's office, student advisor, counselors, or obtained directly by the field-work director, such as may be obtained from
  - (1) Physical examination
  - (2) Intelligence examination
  - (3) Previous scholastic record
  - (4) Seminary scholastic record
  - (5) Interest inventory
  - (6) Diaries made in connection with courses or field work
  - (7) Autobiographical accounts
  - (8) Self-rating scales
  - (9) Student-rating scales
  - (10) Personality inventories or tests
  - (11) Anecdotal records
  - (12) Records of interviews
  - (13) Statements from counselors or advisors
  - (14) Statements from former employers
  - (15) Recommendations
  - (16) Case histories
- b. Securing and recording information concerning the previous field work or similar activity of the student, through
  - (1) Interview with the student
  - (2) Securing records from churches or organizations served
  - (3) Securing written accounts of previous field-work type experiences
  - (4) Developing and using printed forms and check list summarizing previous field work experience
  - (5) Preparing a field-worker's file with basic information about the students currently engaged in field work (Some seminaries use a loose-leaf notebook instead of a card file) in concise form
  - (6) Preparing a personnel file giving all available background information concerning students engaged in field work, or seeking field work and summarized information concerning the field work of former students. In this file may also be placed--in addition to the information received under 2-a above--all field work reports received by the seminary during

the field-work experience, whether from the student himself, his seminary supervisor, cooperating supervisor, or others, and any other pertinent data which may come to hand.

- (7) Summarizing data in the personnel file on a given student upon his graduation and placement, and preserving the summary in the file

- 3. Placing the student in the field-work position educationally the most desirable for him
  - a. Conducting an initial interview with the student to learn to know him, his interests, and needs
  - b. Supplying information to the student concerning several alternative opportunities
  - c. Supplying information to church or organization representatives concerning several available students
  - d. Arranging for the church or organization representative to interview several students
  - e. Arranging for the student to meet several church or organizational representatives
  - f. Arranging for the student to preview the situation tentatively agreed upon
  - g. Conducting an interview with the student to finalize and put in writing the field-work agreement with the place chosen
  - h. Filing a copy of the field-work agreement, giving the student a copy, and giving the church or organizational representative a copy

#### B. Supervisory Activities Relating to Orientation for Field Work

- 1. Giving orientation to the minister, church, or organization desiring student field-work assistance
  - a. Preparing bulletins outlining the basic principles and objectives of the field-work program of the seminary
  - b. Interviewing individuals who will share in the supervisory process (e. g., pastors, directors of religious education, district superintendents, hospital chaplains and social agency workers)
  - c. Holding brief orientation sessions with church or organizational committees and boards
  - d. Preparing and distributing check lists for use in evaluating student field work and report forms
  - e. Preparing and distributing statements of supervisory techniques and methods

- f. Preparing and distributing suggested lists of activities in graded sequence considered desirable for students engaging in the various types of field work
  - g. Holding orientation conferences at the seminary with students, faculty members, and church or organizational representatives and supervisors attending
  - h. Giving organizational or church representatives written or oral summaries of the background of possible student assistants
  - i. Preparing forms for field-work agreements and minimum scales for financial remuneration for the various types of field work
2. Giving orientation to the student participating in the field-work program
- a. Preparing and distributing bulletins outlining the philosophy, objectives, and principles of the seminary field-work program
  - b. Interviewing students who will participate in the field-work program
  - c. Holding orientation conferences with student groups
    - (1) With all students participating in the field-work program
    - (2) With students, faculty, and representatives of the churches or organizations desiring field service
    - (3) With students participating in a particular type of field work (e. g., pastoral work, social agency work, religious education, and clinical work)
  - d. Preparing and distributing check lists for use in self-evaluation by the student, and thus indicating aspects considered important by the seminary
  - e. Permitting the student to read selected background material from the place file to give orientation concerning the place to be served, or giving an oral summary of background data on the place or organization
  - f. Suggesting reference materials containing background data on the organization or church, its history, purposes, methods, and activities
  - g. Holding a joint conference with the student and the church or organizational representative

- C. Supervisory activities relating to guidance of students in field-work activities
  - 1. Assisting the student to develop his plan of work
    - a. Encouraging the student to familiarize himself with the recent history and activities of the church or organization
    - b. Encouraging the student to make whatever surveys or studies are necessary for the preparation, further development, or reconstruction of his plan of field work
      - (1) Community surveys
        - (a) economic backgrounds
        - (b) social and racial backgrounds
        - (c) church census
        - (d) recreational needs
        - (e) health needs
        - (f) social agencies and their activities
      - (2) Surveys of the church or organization
        - (a) activities
        - (b) interests
        - (c) needs
        - (d) recognized problems
      - (3) Surveys of available resources
        - (a) community resources
        - (b) speakers
        - (c) audio-visual aids
        - (d) denominational or organizational resources
  - c. Referring the student to resource materials available
    - (1) Preparing annotated bibliographies of books, pamphlets, and periodicals
    - (2) Preparing annotated lists of available audio-visual aids
    - (3) Guiding the student in utilizing the aid of church or inter-church offices and organizations
  - d. Requiring and checking written statements of field-work plans
    - (1) Objectives
    - (2) Activities
    - (3) Special plans
  - e. Holding group conferences, seminars, or practicums for discussion of common problems, methods, and for the reporting on activities
  - f. Holding individual conferences with the student



- g. Making supervisory visits
  - (1) To make on-the-spot check of student's work
  - (2) To hold on-the-spot conferences with the student and church, organizational, or community representatives
- h. Assisting the student in self-evaluation of his plan
  - (1) Clarifying objectives
  - (2) Preparing a simple evaluatory device based on these objectives
  - (3) Checking and interpreting the results of the evaluation
- 2. Guiding the student in the performance of his field activities
  - a. Making supervisory visits
    - (1) As scheduled
    - (2) Upon student request
    - (3) As special need is indicated
  - b. Holding practicums, seminars, or group conferences
    - (1) Of all engaging in field work
    - (2) Of all at a particular level of field work (e. g., all Juniors)
    - (3) Of all engaging in a particular type of field-work activity (e. g., student pastors)
    - (4) Of all interested in a particular problem or method
  - c. Holding individual conferences with the student
    - (1) Prior to making a supervisory visit
    - (2) Following a supervisory visit
    - (3) According to a pre-arranged schedule (e. g., two a semester)
    - (4) Upon request of the student
    - (5) Upon request of the cooperating supervisor, when he finds a particular need indicated
    - (6) Upon student's completing field-work activity with a church or organization
  - d. Holding individual conferences with others
    - (1) The cooperating supervisor
    - (2) Denominational representatives
    - (3) Other interested parties
  - e. Holding joint conferences of the student, seminary supervisor, and representative of the church or organization served

- f. Receiving student reports of field-work activity
  - (1) Report forms
  - (2) Monthly or other summaries
  - (3) Field-work diaries
  - (4) Reports of self-evaluation
- g. Receiving reports from supervisors
  - (1) Other seminary supervisors
    - (a) Faculty members
    - (b) Graduate assistants
    - (c) Student committees
  - (2) Ministers or organizational officials in charge
  - (3) Selected members of the congregation or co-workers in the organization
- h. Preparing and circulating bulletins on the field-work program, containing such helps as
  - (1) Book or magazine article reports, or annotated references on materials just published
  - (2) Reports of significant field-work activities of fellow-students or others
  - (3) Summaries of the total seminary field work
  - (4) Listings of new audio-visual aids and available speakers
  - (5) Discussions of typical or emergent field work problems
  - (6) Quotes and excerpts from addresses and articles
  - (7) Sample plans, programs, sermon illustrations
  - (8) Sample self-evaluation devices
- i. Advising the student on special or emergent problems
  - (1) Referring the student to appropriate faculty members who might render assistance in areas in which they specialize
  - (2) Assisting the student with a problem in sermon or program construction
  - (3) Suggesting substitutes in time of illness
  - (4) Advising the student on the filling out of denominational or organizational reports
  - (5) Advising the student on relations with community organizations and other ministers

- (6) Advising the student on other emergent church or organizational problems
- D. Supervisory Activities Relating to Evaluating the Field-Work Activity of the Student
  - 1. Setting up comprehensive objectives for the field-work program
    - a. Participating in faculty discussion concerning the relation of the field-work program to the total curricular objectives of the seminary
    - b. Giving leadership in the setting up by the field-work committee (or in small seminaries, ideally by the entire faculty, if all participate in supervision) of over-all field-work objectives
    - c. Giving leadership in the listing by the field-work committee of specific behavior situations for each of the over-all objectives set up, which should indicate whether or not the objective was being realized
  - 2. Developing evaluative instruments for all the objectives of the field-work program
    - a. Selecting and trying promising evaluative methods used elsewhere
      - (1) Check lists, such as
        - (a) Activity check list
        - (b) Time check list
        - (c) Church or organizational check list
        - (d) Check list on the preaching program
        - (e) Check list on the voice
        - (f) Check list on homiletic performance
        - (g) Check list on conduct of church service
      - (2) Rating scales, on a variety of areas or approaches such as those listed immediately above
      - (3) Anecdotal record techniques
      - (4) Case study techniques
      - (5) Profile charts
    - b. Developing evaluative instruments particularly suited to the seminary's needs
      - (1) Securing the cooperation of other faculty members, cooperating supervisors, and students in the development of an instrument

- (2) Determining the techniques which will best fit the specific behavior situations selected (D-1-c above)
  - (3) Preparing a variety of items for each technique and selecting those giving greatest promise
  - (4) Arranging the sequence of the items chosen
  - (5) Weighting (where desirable) the items
  - (6) Preparing clear and simple instructions for administration and for the interpretation of results
  - (7) Developing tentative norms (where feasible)
- 3. Improving evaluative instruments for seminary use in its field-work program
  - a. Checking the evaluative instruments developed by the seminary
    - (1) Trying them out on seminary groups
    - (2) Checking the validity of the results by means of other evaluative instruments and/or other criteria
    - (3) Checking the reliability of the evaluative instruments
    - (4) Comparing the reliability, validity, and usability of seminary prepared instruments with those available elsewhere
  - b. Revising the evaluative instruments developed by the seminary
  - c. Adapting evaluative instruments developed elsewhere for use by the seminary
- 4. Supervising a program of continuous evaluation of field-work activities
  - a. Assuring that all important objectives of the field-work program are being evaluated
  - b. Assuring that all participating in the supervisory function also participate in evaluation
  - c. Assuring that the evaluative program is carried on continuously
  - d. Giving leadership to a program of continuous professional improvement in evaluation
  - e. Guiding the student in his self-evaluation
    - (1) Helping him develop personal field-work objectives
    - (2) Helping him develop simple means of self-evaluation and/or acquainting him with already developed means at his disposal

- (3) Assisting him in developing skill in self-evaluation
- (4) Motivating the student toward continuous self-evaluation and professional improvement
- (5) Discussing with the student the results of evaluation by others and interpreting these results
- 5. Interpreting the evaluation program of the seminary
  - a. Interpreting the evaluation program to the student
    - (1) Acquainting him with the objectives of the evaluatory program
    - (2) Acquainting him with the methods and techniques used
    - (3) Acquainting him with the results recorded in his cumulative record and interpreting these
  - b. Interpreting the evaluation program to the seminary faculty
    - (1) Interpreting the program to new faculty members
    - (2) Summarizing for the faculty the results of the cooperative evaluation process
    - (3) Comparing the results secured with those secured by the same or other methods
    - (4) Suggesting possible implications for curriculum revision or changes in evaluative procedures
    - (5) Pointing out to individual faculty members the students with interests, abilities, or problems in areas of their specialization
    - (6) Suggesting to the faculty the students for whom a cooperative case study is desirable
    - (7) Cooperating closely with the student's advisor, counselor, or the seminary guidance office
  - c. Interpreting the evaluation program to cooperating supervisors
    - (1) Interpreting the program to those beginning their work as cooperating supervisors
    - (2) Summarizing the results of the cooperative evaluation program

- (3) Providing special summaries for the student(s) for whom they have particular responsibility
  - (4) Suggesting to the cooperating supervisor any implications for him
- d. Interpreting the evaluative program to other interested individuals
  - (1) Preparing summaries of the field-work program for the use of the seminary president in his reports
  - (2) As a part of the public relations program of the seminary, furnishing to conference, synodical, or other denominational leaders reports and interesting items concerning the field-work program
  - (3) Writing articles for church and other religious publications
  - (4) Preparing brief bulletins and leaflets for prospective students to interest and orient them
- E. Supervisory Activities Relating to the Maintenance of Field-Work Records
  - 1. Surveying the use being made of field-work records by the seminary faculty, advisors, and administration
  - 2. Discovering the types of records not being used which would contribute to teaching and counseling efficiency
  - 3. Developing cooperatively with the other supervisory helpers record forms which would
    - a. Supply all essential information of value to instructors, counselors, or administration
    - b. Minimize work in recording and summarizing
      - (1) Printed forms
      - (2) Check lists
      - (3) Code systems
  - 4. Developing an adequate filing system for field-work records
  - 5. Encouraging the use of anecdotal records and training in their use (where necessary)
  - 6. Encouraging the preparation of cooperative case studies
  - 7. Providing for the summarization at stated times of all anecdotal and similar material
  - 8. Making field-work records available to the seminary staff
    - a. Providing for central filing

- b. Supervising the ethical use of recorded materials
- c. Providing basic information for requested recommendations
- d. Encouraging wide use of field-work records as a basis for curricular reconstruction, guidance, and as case material for course supplementation

### III. Supervisory Activities Connected with Integration of Field Work With Other Aspects of the Curriculum of the Seminary

#### A. Supervisory Activities Related to Integrating Observation With Class Work

- 1. Encouraging the faculty members to plan and assign observations as a part of their course requirements
- 2. Pointing out the implications for other classes of aspects of situations observed as a part of the course requirement of a particular class
- 3. Encouraging students to make use of their observations in class discussions, projects, and term papers
- 4. Encouraging more efficient observations through
  - a. Careful planning of the observation
  - b. Clarifying the purposes of the observation
  - c. Providing background for the observation
  - d. Providing techniques for improved observation (when indicated)
    - (1) Information blanks
    - (2) Check lists
    - (3) Rating scales
    - (4) Tape or wire recordings
  - e. Giving orientation to the group or individual observed (when indicated)
  - f. Written or oral reports of observation
  - g. Group discussion of observation
  - h. Student evaluation of observation experience
  - i. Basing one or more examination questions on observations
- 5. Giving faculty members information concerning transportation details in connection with observations

#### B. Supervisory Activities Related to Integrating Field Experiences (other than observation of field work) With Class Work

- 1. Encouraging faculty members to plan and assign field experiences as a part of their course requirements, such as
  - a. Making a case study of a child or adolescent
  - b. Making a survey of a church, organization, or community
  - c. Preaching a sermon on a theological doctrine or aspect of church history

- d. Securing experience in a social agency
- e. Counseling an individual
- f. Making a field trip
- g. Participating in a community project
- 2. Encouraging faculty members to use resource individuals contacted by students during field work
- 3. Pointing out the implications for other classes of aspects of field experience provided by a particular class
- 4. Encouraging students to draw upon their class-related field experiences in their field-work seminars and field work
- 5. Encouraging more profitable field experience through means similar to III-A-4 above
- C. Supervisory Activities Related to Integrating the Field-Work Program with Class Instruction
  - 1. Developing a sympathetic understanding of the field-work program on the part of all faculty members
    - a. Encouraging full faculty discussion of the relation of field-work objectives to the total seminary objectives
    - b. Encouraging as broad faculty participation as is practical in the setting up or revision (when indicated) of the field-work program
    - c. Incorporating all faculty members (as far as possible) into some phase of field-work supervision
    - d. Requesting the help of all the faculty in periodic evaluation of the field-work program
    - e. Providing all faculty members with periodic summaries of field-work reports
    - f. Securing faculty participation in orientation conferences with cooperating supervisors and students
  - 2. Incorporating all faculty members in the field-work program to as great a degree as is feasible
    - a. Referring students with particular interests or problems, as shown in field work, to the faculty member specializing in that area
    - b. Using faculty members as resource individuals when field-work seminars or conferences discuss problems related to their area of specialization
    - c. Requesting faculty members to provide quotations or to write brief articles for the field-work bulletins, indicating points of significance of their subjects for field work
    - d. Reporting to faculty members student expressions of appreciation of their classes gleaned during field-work supervision



- e. Requesting aid of all faculty members when special study of an individual student is required
        - (1) Furnishing anecdotal records
        - (2) Rating the student
        - (3) Contributing background data for case study
      - f. Holding faculty case-conferences concerning individual students when the field work reveals the need
      - g. Encouraging each faculty member to assume full supervisory responsibility (including visitation) for the field work of at least two students
    - 3. Providing graded field experiences to correlate with the curriculum sequence of the seminary
    - 4. Conducting seminars and practicums
    - 5. Encouraging and recommending each faculty member to teach to some degree in the practical field
      - a. A unit in one of the courses (perhaps related to his area of specialization or interest)
      - b. A one-period presentation in one of the courses
      - c. A special course (perhaps taught only every three years), not necessarily a full quarter or term in length
  - D. Supervisory Activities Related to Integrating the Field-Work Program with the Guidance Program of the Seminary (See IV-A)
- IV. Supervisory Activities Connected With Guiding the Growth of Students
  - A. Supervisory Activities Related to Guiding the Personal Growth of Students
    - 1. Coordinating the guidance provided through the supervision of field work with that provided by the seminary guidance program
      - a. Providing the information required by the Dean's office
        - (1) Supplying the records desired
        - (2) Making available detailed information on the field work of a student (upon request)
        - (3) Bringing to the attention of the Dean any notable successes or serious problems that emerge
      - b. Coordinating the guidance efforts of the field-work personnel with those of the student's advisor or counselor (if such is provided in the seminary set up)

- (1) Exchanging basic information of value in guidance or supervision
  - (2) Cooperating in case studies where indicated
  - (3) Consulting concerning student plans, interests, or problems
- c. Coordinating the guidance provided by faculty members with that provided by field-work personnel
  - (1) Referring the students with particular interests, abilities, or problems to those most able to help them ( e. g., speech teacher, music teacher, or theology teacher)
  - (2) Making field-work office files available for judicious use of faculty members
  - (3) Securing the assistance of faculty members in rating students or providing anecdotal records or other data on students with problems
- d. Referring particular problems to the appropriate staff member or specialist designated by the seminary
  - (1) The pastor of the seminary church
  - (2) The seminary physician
  - (3) The seminary psychiatrist
- 2. Providing leadership in the development of guidance services or providing the actual guidance services where the seminary makes no other provision, or where the field-work director is the designated one responsible for guidance
  - a. Giving leadership in a cooperative study by the full faculty of the range and frequency of student problems which become apparent during the field-work program or which are related to the field-work program
  - b. Giving leadership in clarifying the philosophy of the seminary as to its responsibility in the area of personal-professional guidance
  - c. Giving leadership in the development of a statement of guidance objectives for the field-work program, or for the entire seminary program
  - d. Giving leadership in the cooperative study of methods and techniques which might be used in meeting these objectives
  - e. Helping inaugurate and promoting a cooperative program of comprehensive, continuous guidance

- (1) Providing group guidance activities
  - (a) Orientation week for freshman
  - (b) Orientation field-work conferences
  - (c) Guidance classes for group study of common problems, such as
    - (aa) Study habits
    - (bb) Educational planning (e. g., elective courses, extra-seminary courses such as clinical work or summer field work)
    - (cc) Personality
    - (dd) Health
    - (ee) Hetero-sexual adjustments
    - (ff) Budgeting and financial problems
    - (gg) Spiritual problems
    - (hh) Social relationships
    - (ii) Emotional maturity
  - (d) Assemblies and convocations
  - (e) Clubs
  - (f) Special units on guidance in core courses
  - (g) Panel discussions
  - (h) Case conferences
  - (i) Guided discussions in seminars or practicums
- (2) Providing individual guidance activities
  - (a) Discussing personal problems in individual conferences
  - (b) Referring students with special problems to appropriate specialists
  - (c) Suggesting reference sources for further study by the student
  - (d) Providing information and suggestions concerning scholarships or work opportunities or serving as a reference
  - (e) Administering and interpreting diagnostic instruments

- (aa) Intelligence examinations
    - (bb) Aptitude tests
    - (cc) Interest inventories
    - (dd) Personality and adjustment inventories
    - (ee) Self-evaluative check lists and rating scales
    - (ff) Projective techniques
    - (gg) Sociometric techniques
  - (f) Utilizing autobiographies, diaries, and personal documents
  - (g) Utilizing information blanks and problems check lists
  - (h) Securing cooperation in anecdotal record keeping on the student
  - (i) Securing the cooperation of faculty and supervisors in making a case study
  - (j) Keeping detailed records of the counseling and guidance process
    - (aa) Scores on diagnostic instruments and interpretations thereof
    - (bb) Reports of specialists
    - (cc) Summaries of educational record
    - (dd) Summaries of all background data
    - (ee) Statements of problems faced
    - (ff) Statements of decisions made or plans evolved
    - (gg) Detailed accounts (as far as possible) of counseling interviews
  - (k) Interviewing the student's friends, relatives, teachers, and supervisors
  - (l) Conducting case conferences for the consideration of the student and his problems
  - (m) Making follow-up checks on individuals as needed
- (3) Evaluating the guidance program of the field-work department or seminary, by

- (a) Problem check lists, adjustment inventories, rating scales
    - (b) Follow-up studies
    - (c) Student opinionaires
    - (d) Guidance program check lists
    - (e) Comparisons with the guidance programs of other seminaries
  - (4) Improving the guidance program
    - (a) Leading in cooperative faculty study (or study by supervisory group)
    - (b) Stimulating the use of self-evaluatory devices by those participating in the guidance program
    - (c) Developing case conferences for faculty discussion
    - (d) Encouraging occasional reports on books, periodicals, or guidance programs seen in operation
  - (5) Developing a library of guidance materials
    - (a) Books and pamphlets
    - (b) Periodicals
    - (c) Audio-visual aids
- f. Developing guidance materials
  - (1) Securing student and faculty co-operation in preparing bulletins, manuals, and check lists
- B. Supervisory Activities Related to Guiding the Professional Growth of Students
  - 1. Coordinating the efforts of the seminary to provide guidance in professional growth
    - a. Encouraging the cooperation of all seminary instructors, particularly those in the practical fields, in providing guidance in professional growth
      - (1) Encouraging group discussion and study
      - (2) Developing participation in field-work supervision
      - (3) Referring students with special problems to those specializing in related areas
      - (4) Securing the services of faculty members as resource individuals in seminar or conference sessions

- devoting attention to their area of specialization
- b. Coordinating the efforts of the cooperating supervisors in their guidance of the professional growth of the students
  - (1) Giving orientation (See II-B-1)
  - (2) Providing leadership in the supervisory effort
    - (a) Conducting conferences for the discussion of common problems, suggestions, and approved techniques
    - (b) Providing bulletins, check lists, and other supplementary materials
  - (3) Providing leadership in field-work evaluation (See II-D-5-c)
  - (4) Providing leadership in the guidance function
    - (a) Providing orientation (See III-A-2-a to d)
    - (b) Providing background information concerning the student
    - (c) Providing resource materials (See IV-A-2-3-(5))
- c. Providing group guidance in any area where a felt need emerges and for which regular provision is not otherwise made (e. g., orientation to parliamentary law--if this is not provided by a seminary class)
- 2. Providing individual guidance in professional growth
  - a. Developing in the student a greater appreciation of the ministry as a profession
  - b. Suggesting supplementary professional literature
  - c. Guiding the student in making professional contacts
    - (1) Ministerial associations
    - (2) Denominational leaders
    - (3) Ministers of other groups represented in the community
  - d. Guiding the student in meeting denominational requirements (of conference or synod)
    - (1) Steps toward ordination
    - (2) Required courses of study
    - (3) Attendance at official bodies
  - e. Encouraging the student to develop a long-range plan for professional growth

- (1) The development of a personal professional library
- (2) The continuation of self-evaluation
  - (a) Check lists, etc.
  - (b) Recordings of sermons preached
- (3) Graduate theological study
- (4) Short term refresher courses, institutes, and clinical training
- (5) Occasional trips to observe the functioning of churches known for a well-developed program

See also II-C and II-D-4-e

V. Supervisory Activities Connected with Seminary Administration

A. Cooperating with the Administration in Seminary Policy

1. Cooperating (upon invitation) in the development of seminary policy
2. Cooperating in the carrying out of seminary policy
  - a. Within the field-work aspect of the curriculum
  - b. In the coordinating of field work with other aspects of the curriculum
    - (1) Subject matter content
    - (2) Guidance
    - (3) Scheduling field work
    - (4) Maintaining the proper balance between field-work obligations and other seminary study

B. Administering the Financial Aspects of the Field Work Program

1. Preparing the field-work budget
  - a. Supervisors' salaries
  - b. Field-work office expense
    - (1) Records
    - (2) Secretary's salary
    - (3) Bulletins and other publications
    - (4) Postage
  - c. Mileage allowances for supervisory trips
  - d. Orientation conference expenses
  - e. Field-work scholarships or subsidies
2. Administering the field-work budget
3. Accounting procedures
  - a. Financial accounting
  - b. Supply and equipment accounting

C. Cooperating with the Administration in the Evaluation Program and in Records

1. Cooperating in the evaluation of students
2. Cooperating in the evaluation of the seminary program
  - a. Field work
  - b. Guidance
  - c. The total program

3. Furnishing the records desired by the administration
  - a. Field-work records
  - b. Student personnel records
- D. Cooperating in the Seminary Program of Social Interpretation (Public Relations)
  1. Interpreting the seminary area to the administration
    - a. The attitude of the churches and the public toward the seminary
    - b. The information concerning the seminary possessed by the churches and the public
    - c. The services which the churches desire from the seminary
  2. Interpreting the seminary family to the administration
    - a. The attitude of seminary graduates concerning the seminary program
      - (1) Strengths recognized
      - (2) Weaknesses pointed out
    - b. The attitude of seminary students as discovered during the supervision of their field work and during guidance activities
      - (1) General evaluation of the seminary program and of field work in particular
      - (2) Changes desired by the students
  3. Interpreting the seminary to the churches, organizations, and communities served
    - a. The objectives of the seminary
    - b. The services offered by the seminary
    - c. The needs of the seminary
  4. Interpreting the seminary to church, denomination, and other officials contacted during field-work supervision
  5. Interpreting the seminary to the students in the field-work program
    - a. The objectives of the seminary
    - b. The inter-relation between field work and other aspects of the curriculum
    - c. The services offered by the seminary to the student
    - d. The services rendered by the seminary to the churches.



### Trends and Areas of Need

Trends and promising developments.-- During the seventeen years between the publication of Foster's study in 1934 (75) and the present survey, there was a very rapid growth of interest and effort in field-work supervision. Then twenty-eight seminaries provided faculty supervision for field work; in 1951 ninety seminaries listed individuals responsible for field-work supervision, an increase of 321 per cent. Then fourteen seminaries provided for supervisory visitation of student field work; in 1951 sixty seminaries provided for such visitation, an increase of 428 per cent. Then eighteen utilized student conferences and reports; in 1951 seventy-nine seminaries used individual conferences, sixty-five employed some form of written reports, and sixty-two used group conferences. When these categories are grouped together as in the 1934 study, eighty-seven seminaries used some form of conference or report, an increase of 483 per cent.

Field work is gradually securing recognition as an essential aspect of the curriculum. Forty-five per cent of the seminaries reported that they were either in the process of revising or intensifying some aspect of their field-work program or planned to do so in the near future. Nine seminaries were adding another field-work supervisor, six were for the first time assigning a man full time to field-work supervision, four were adding more assistant supervisors (such as graduate students), and four were increasing the time their field-work director was to devote to supervision. One seminary was planning

a program to increase the amount of supervision by local supervisors, three simply stated that they planned intensified field work, and one hoped to extend its supervision to include the middle as well as the junior year. One seminary hoped to add a year of closely supervised follow-up. Two seminaries planned to increase their emphasis upon the intern year, and another planned to add a half-year internship.

Other aspects of seminary field-work programs were also being changed. Five seminaries were working toward a greater integration of classroom study and field work; one of these (Colgate-Rochester Divinity School) was making a radical revision of its policy in order that such integration might be assured. Two seminaries were adding clinical training. Two were planning to give credit for field work. Two were planning more joint-supervisory conferences of seminary supervisor, local or denominational supervisor, and student. Two seminaries were planning a more adequate system of reports. One seminary was inaugurating a new testing program which it was integrating with field work, and one was increasing its guidance activity in its field-work supervision. One seminary was considering a graded field-work program, another was planning to provide for both urban and rural field work, while yet another was strengthening its placement program. One school was putting a new emphasis upon recordings in its field-work program. Another seminary was re-evaluating its system of field-work finance. One seminary was adding a practicum, while another was considering de-emphasizing the practicum and putting greater emphasis upon the integration of the regular classes with field work.

One of the most ambitious program changes under way was the five-fold program in one seminary which wrote:

We are now in the process of reorganizing the whole department: we plan (1) Closer tie-in between field work and curriculum [sic] (2) Definite assignment of students to faculty members (3) More adequate reports (4) Regularly scheduled conferences with students (5) Faculty conferences on field work.

Limitations designed to strengthen the field-work program were reported by two seminaries. The one planned to limit the amount of time the student was permitted to devote to his field work. The other planned not to permit a clinical (intern) year without close and regular church supervision.

Areas in need of strengthening.--- A comparison of the data gathered in the survey of the supervisory practices of the seminaries with the principles developed in this chapter reveals several areas where increased emphasis should be placed.

More time needs to be devoted to field-work supervision. Many seminaries should release their field-work directors from most of their teaching obligations, so as to enable them to give almost all their time to field-work supervision. Field-work supervision should be shared by all faculty members, but corresponding adjustments of schedules will need to be made. With the average seminary supervisor devoting only fifteen per cent of his time to the supervision of from thirty to forty students, it is impossible to carry on adequate supervision.

A wider range of supervisory techniques needs to be regularly used. Three-fourths of the seminaries never used supervisory bulletins,

rating scales, or had students make long-range plans for their field work. About half of the seminaries never used check lists or practicum and seminars. Over a third of them never made supervisory visits or held group field-work conferences, and nearly a third never asked for written reports of any kind from the students or from the representatives of the places served. Most seminaries should make frequent use of all these supervisory techniques.

Supervisory visits and supervisor-student conferences should become much more frequent. The average student receives two supervisory visits during each year that he spends in field work and has four conferences with his supervisor. These conferences must take care of placement, discussion of field work progress and problems, and personal and professional guidance. Supervisory visits and supervisory conferences should both be scheduled monthly, with provision for the student to initiate other conferences whenever he feels the need of them.

A graded sequence of field-work should be provided. Much lip service has been given to the desirability of a graded sequence, but only a fifth of the seminaries gave any indication of a plan to insure variety or balance in the student field-work experiences.

The supplementary supervision provided by cooperating church and organizational officials needs to be supervised by the seminary. The quality of supervision provided by these helpers is largely taken for granted or ignored. A new effort should be made to incorporate these cooperating supervisors into the seminary "larger faculty" and

to provide them with adequate leadership and supervision.

Supervision of field work should be increasingly professionalized. Supervision must make greater use of the findings of educational and psychological research and of the supervisory techniques and evaluatory instruments which have been developed. Increasing emphasis must be placed upon planning supervision, making it scientific, and making it a cooperative endeavor. The supervisory approach must be changed from a negative to a positive one. Supervision must become concerned with more than the prevention and correction of mistakes; it must become genuinely creative.

#### Summary

Various titles have been given to the individual responsible for the coordination and direction of field work, but "Field-Work Director" was the most common designation. In addition to their supervisory duties, most field-work directors taught at least one subject in the seminary, the most common one being practical theology. The supervisory techniques most frequently used were individual conferences and written reports. Other supervisory techniques reported included group conferences, practicums and seminars, supervisory visits, check lists, long-range plans, rating scales, and supervisory bulletins. The average person engaged in supervision of field work spent fifteen per cent of his time in this endeavor; the average seminary had three persons assisting in field-work supervision.

Only twenty-two seminaries had students prepare long-range

plans for their field work and even less had any method to secure variety or balance in the field-work activities of students. Almost no seminaries used a graded sequence of field-work activity. The average supervisor made two visits per year to each student engaged in field work and held four conferences with him (including placement conferences). This was shown to be totally inadequate. The average seminary supervisor was responsible for thirty-two students. Perhaps a fourth to a half of the students engaged in field work were not supervised. Denominational officials and church or organizational officials assisted in the supervision of student field work. Information concerning the types of field work most satisfactorily supervised or found difficult to supervise and concerning impractical types of supervisory activity was inconclusive. Situations varied from seminary to seminary and activities stated to be impractical or difficult by one or more seminaries were termed desirable or satisfactory by many others.

Eighteen basic principles related to field-work supervision were developed in the chapter. Supervision should be democratic and based on respect for the individual theological student. Supervision should be creative, scientific, and planned; it should lead to self-direction on the part of the student. Supervision should be based upon psychological principles and should promote curricular integration. All the faculty should share in the supervisory function. Field-work objectives should be clearly formulated. Monthly supervisory conferences should be the minimum rule.

A field-work supervisor should have a mature Christian experience, should have had professional training for the ministry, and should have had successful experience as a minister. He should also have had an adequate professional background. He should have a mature personality and a genuine interest in supervision.

A detailed outline of suggested supervisory activities was presented. Over four hundred specific supervisory activities or phases of activities were listed in the outline. The first section was devoted to supervisory activities in connection with directing and evaluating student observation. In the second section, many supervisory activities were suggested in connection with student participation in ministerial activities. These were grouped under five major categories dealing with placement in field work, orientation for field work, guidance in field-work activities, evaluation of field work, and maintenance of field-work records. In the third section, supervisory activities connected with the integration of field work with other aspects of the curriculum were grouped under integrating observation with class work, integrating with class work the field experiences which were not a part of the regular field-work program, integrating the field-work program with classwork, and integrating field work with guidance. The fourth section listed many supervisory activities connected with guiding the personal growth of the students and with guiding the professional growth of students. The final section of the outline was devoted to supervisory activities connected with seminary administration. Activities suggested here were grouped

under four categories: cooperating with the administration in seminary policy, administering the financial aspects of the field-work program, cooperating with the administration in the evaluation program and in seminary records, and cooperating in the seminary program of social interpretation (public relations).

During the past two decades there has been a very rapid growth of interest and effort in field-work supervision. Field work is being increasingly recognized as an essential aspect of the curriculum of the theological seminary, and nearly half of the seminaries were either revising and strengthening their field-work programs at the time of the survey or were planning to do so.

In spite of the rapid growth of the field-work program, there are a number of aspects of field-work supervision which need increased emphasis. Field-work directors and other faculty members need to devote more time to field-work supervision, and they should use a wider range of supervisory techniques. Supervisory visits and supervisory conferences with the individual students should become much more frequent. A graded sequence of field-work activity should be arranged and the supplemental supervision provided by cooperating church and organizational officials should be brought under closer supervision by the seminaries. Seminary supervision of field work needs to be increasingly professionalized.



## CHAPTER VII

### THE EVALUATION OF FIELD WORK

This chapter discusses practices and principles of field-work evaluation and closes with an indication of promising developments and needs. Seminary practices discussed are related to evaluation at the time of enrollment, evaluation prior to field-work placement, reports used in field-work evaluation, evaluative efforts at the conclusion of field work, and instruments and methods used in field work. The role of field-work evaluation, including its importance and purposes, is discussed. Eleven basic principles for field-work evaluation are developed, seven basic principles for the administration of the field-work program are presented, and twelve principles concerning specific types of evaluation instruments are pointed out. Two outstanding examples of the type of evaluation instruments which may be constructed for use in field work are described. The chapter closes with a discussion of four major areas of need in the program of field-work evaluation.

#### Seminary Practices in Field-Work Evaluation

Evaluation at the time of enrollment.-- A specific request for information concerning seminary policies relative to enrollment was not made in connection with this survey. Fifteen seminaries, however, sent copies of their application blanks. Approximately half of these asked for data concerning previous Christian service, the implication being that this was evaluated as a part of the general

qualifications of the student for admission to the seminary.

Evaluation prior to field work of previous leadership activities.-- Table 8 in Chapter V listed the various methods used regularly and occasionally by the seminaries to secure student information prior to placement in field work. Fifty per cent of the seminaries stated that they regularly inquired concerning the previous Christian service of the student, and several others stated that they sometimes asked for this information. Twenty-five of the seminaries stated that they made use of an information blank. Twenty of these were available for analysis. While the blanks supplied information of value to the field-work office, comparatively little effort was made to secure an indication of the quality of work done. Twelve of these seminaries asked the student to list or state the activities he had performed. Five asked that these activities be listed according to various categories, thus making it easier to evaluate the range of previous laboratory-type work. Two asked the student to check which items of a list of qualifications for ministerial work he possessed, while another asked the student to check a similar list of general abilities. Two seminaries asked for data on the salary which the student had received for Christian service over a period of years, apparently judging quality of work by rise or decline in salary, and one asked for the number of new members the student had received into the church. Seven seminaries indicated that they sought evaluations of the student from references supplied by him.

Reports used in evaluation of field work.-- Chapter VIII

discusses field-work records and reports, but some discussion of these is essential at this point, since much of the evaluation of field work is based upon these reports. Sixty-five seminaries reported that they used some form of written report in their evaluation of field work. Table 15 lists the number of times the various evaluative reports were used. Printed report forms and summaries of field work were most commonly used, and self-evaluative devices, anecdotal records, and field-work diaries were used least.

Table 16 presents the frequency per semester with which various evaluative reports were used by students, by seminary supervisors, and by the cooperating supervisors in the churches and organizations which employed the students. By far the most reports thus used in evaluation were made by the students themselves; cooperating supervisors in the churches or organizations served made the fewest reports. Of the 628 reports on field work submitted each semester throughout the sixty-five seminaries, the students themselves supplied 349, the seminary supervisors provided 173, and the cooperating supervisors supplied 106. Very few report forms were used more than once a quarter. On the average, at the end of each semester the field-work directors of these sixty-five seminaries had eight or nine reports of some type or other on each student engaged in field work.

It is encouraging to note that rating scales were beginning to be used. Six seminaries had their field-work director or other seminary supervisors make some use of a rating scale. Fifteen had cooperating supervisors use rating scales. In some instances, the

TABLE 15

NUMBER\* OF SEMINARIES WHICH USED VARIOUS REPORTS  
IN EVALUATION OF FIELD WORK

| Type of Report                             | Number<br>of<br>Seminaries |
|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Printed report forms .....                 | 61                         |
| Summaries of field work .....              | 53                         |
| Essay-type reports .....                   | 48                         |
| Check lists of field-work activities ..... | 44                         |
| Student rating scales .....                | 21                         |
| Summaries of anecdotal records .....       | 9                          |
| Field-work diaries .....                   | 9                          |
| Student self-evaluation scales .....       | 8                          |

\* Sixty-five of the ninety-six seminaries indicated use of some type of evaluative report.

rating scale was but a small section on a larger printed report form, while at other times a carefully prepared separate scale was used.

Very little attention was devoted to formal student self-evaluation. Five seminaries had the student rate himself or his work once a semester during the field-work period, and three had the student make such evaluations twice a semester. There is a strong trend throughout education toward emphasis upon self-evaluation as an indispensable phase of economical and responsible learning. There is sound psychological basis for this emphasis. It is hoped that more serious consideration will be devoted in theological education to self-evaluation by the student, by the teachers and supervisors, and by the

TABLE 16

FREQUENCY WITH WHICH SIXTY-FIVE SEMINARIES RECEIVED VARIOUS  
EVALUATIVE REPORTS FROM STUDENTS, SEMINARY SUPERVISORS, AND  
COOPERATING SUPERVISORS

| Source and Type of Report                               | Frequency per Semester |    |   |    |   |   |   |              |
|---------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|----|---|----|---|---|---|--------------|
|                                                         | 1                      | 2  | 3 | 4  | 5 | 8 | 9 | Each<br>Week |
| Total by student .....                                  | 59                     | 24 | 3 | 16 | 1 | 2 |   | 9            |
| Essay-type report .....                                 | 15                     | 5  |   | 1  | 1 | 1 |   | 3            |
| Summary of field work of student .                      | 16                     | 9  | 1 | 1  |   |   |   |              |
| Printed report form .....                               | 6                      | 4  | 1 | 10 |   | 1 |   | 4            |
| Check list of field work .....                          | 10                     | 2  | 1 | 3  |   |   |   | 2            |
| Diary of field work .....                               | 7                      | 1  |   | 1  |   |   |   |              |
| Student self-rating scale .....                         | 5                      | 3  |   |    |   |   |   |              |
| Total by seminary supervisors .....                     | 42                     | 13 | 2 | 5  |   | 2 | 1 | 3            |
| Check list of field work .....                          | 11                     | 4  | 1 |    |   |   | 1 | 1            |
| Summary of field work of student .                      | 14                     | 1  |   | 1  |   |   |   |              |
| Printed report form .....                               | 6                      | 3  | 1 | 1  |   | 1 |   | 1            |
| Essay-type report .....                                 | 5                      | 3  |   | 1  |   |   |   | 1            |
| Student rating scale .....                              | 3                      | 1  |   | 1  |   | 1 |   |              |
| Summary of anecdotal records .....                      | 3                      | 1  |   | 1  |   |   |   |              |
| Total by cooperating supervisors ...                    | 49                     | 12 | 3 | 6  |   |   |   |              |
| Printed report form .....                               | 14                     | 6  | 1 | 1  |   |   |   |              |
| Student rating scale .....                              | 11                     | 2  | 1 | 1  |   |   |   |              |
| Essay-type report .....                                 | 9                      |    | 1 | 1  |   |   |   |              |
| Summary of field work of student .                      | 7                      | 2  |   | 1  |   |   |   |              |
| Check list of field work .....                          | 6                      | 1  |   | 1  |   |   |   |              |
| Summary of anecdotal records .....                      | 2                      | 1  |   | 1  |   |   |   |              |
| Grand total from all sources in<br>all seminaries ..... | 150                    | 49 | 8 | 27 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 12           |

seminary as a whole.

Anecdotal records were little used by the theological schools. Five seminaries sought such records from their faculty supervisors and four sought them from cooperating supervisors. All who share in the supervisory program are constantly making value-judgments concerning the field-work efforts of the students for whom they are responsible. Unless these value-judgments are based on purposefully and carefully gathered data which have been systematically recorded, however, they will tend to be casual, based on incomplete information, biased, and unscientific. The validity and reliability of such value-judgments are subject to grave doubt. While anecdotal recording methods are not wholly objective, yet correct use of them provides a long step toward improving validity and reliability and thus making observation and value-judgments sound bases for guidance.

Nine seminaries asked students to submit field-work diaries. Only one of these asked for the diary to be submitted monthly. The evaluation of frequently submitted diaries is time-consuming, but it can be one of the most adequate substitutes for frequent supervisory visitation, if students have been given instruction concerning what to include in the diaries and if there is some supervisory visitation by the seminary supervisor and guidance by the cooperating supervisor.

Twenty-two seminaries required their students to summarize their field-work experiences at least once a semester, ten asked for such a summary from the church or organization, and sixteen required a summary statement from the faculty supervisor. Most of these

summaries were provided on report forms and consisted mainly of statistical data.

Evaluative efforts at the conclusion of field work.-- Thirty-one seminaries required students to make a detailed report of the field-work director whenever they completed a field project, and fourteen others used this procedure at times. Thirty-six seminaries regularly scheduled conferences between the student and the field-work director whenever the student completed a field-work project, while another twelve seminaries occasionally had such conferences. In ten seminaries it was customary for the student to have a conference with a denominational supervisor whenever he completed a service project, and seventeen other seminaries reported that denominational supervisors occasionally held these conferences with students. Conferences between the student and local officials at the conclusion of the student's field work with an organization were reported as regularly scheduled by twelve seminaries and as occasionally scheduled by another twenty-five. Joint conferences of the student, field-work director, and others were seldom held at the conclusion of field-work projects. Five seminaries reported that such conferences were regularly held, and twenty-one reported that they were sometimes held.

Other means which field-work directors mentioned as being used to assist them in the evaluation of completed field work included conferences of field-work associates; seminars, practicums, and similar group meetings; conferences between the field-work director and the cooperating supervisor; and quarterly meetings with local and

denominational officials.

Instruments and methods used in evaluation.--- The close relation between evaluation and records and reports has been apparent in the preceding paragraphs. Most records and reports have some value for purposes of evaluation. Similarly, statements of evaluative results are useful in records and reports. The next chapter deals more particularly with this related area.

In addition to the reports, records, and conferences already discussed, various seminaries and schools have made use of anecdotal observation guides, check lists of activities, analyses of experiences, attitude inventories, inventories of social experiences, inventories of leadership experiences, problem analyses, field-work notebooks, informal conferences, interviews, other group conferences, socio-metric techniques, and various tests, reports, summaries, and written statements.

Evaluative instruments were constantly being developed and improved, and many of the precise forms were specific to a local situation. Field-work directors and their associates will need to continually revise, improve, and adapt methods and devices to make them appropriate to their own needs.

#### The Role of Field-Work Evaluation

The importance of field-work evaluation.--- There has been a general tolerance of or acceptance of field-work activities by most seminaries. Some have preferred to minimize field work, while others



have delegated to it a large and increasingly important role in their curriculum. There has been too great complacency, however, concerning the results of student field work. The Encyclopedia of Educational Research has stated:

Institutions which educate teachers have tended to accept student teaching on "faith" because...this course has so often been rated by experienced teachers as the most meaningful experience of their preservice program of professional education (124:1336).

The same statement could be made concerning the attitude of many seminaries toward field work. So long as students have been protected from making serious mistakes which might hinder the church or organization served, so long as field work has not seriously interfered with class work, so long as satisfactory remuneration has been given, and so long as the seminary felt the students were evidencing some growth, the field-work program has been presumed to be satisfactory. Questions which have been too infrequently raised are:

Is the student experiencing the greatest personal and professional growth possible?

Is the student receiving a balanced variety of field experiences?

Is the student engaging in the type of field-work activity which is educationally most desirable for him at this stage of his training?

Is the student fully integrating field work with his class work?

Are all faculty members integrating field work with their class work?

Is field work making the greatest possible contribution to the total seminary program?

Is the field-work supervision adequate? Is it fulfilling its stated objectives?

Could a different type of field-work program achieve greater results from a comparable expenditure of effort, time, and finance?

Are the students aware of inadequacies in the seminary program and in field work as organized by the seminary?

Are the churches aware of inadequacies in the seminary field-work program?

Are the seminary graduates fully equipped for the ministerial activities they are expected to begin?

Evaluation is not an end in itself. It is an essential phase of the total teaching-learning-testing-guidance-growth process which constitutes effective education (81:204; 184:365-8). It is not an activity added to seminary instruction or field work; it is a part of the total process. It involves the coordination of self-evaluation and learning on the part of the student and evaluation and instruction on the part of the teacher. It is calculated to improve and promote both learning and instruction. It makes the educational effort of the seminary more effective through providing a better understanding of the pupil and of the educational activities of the seminary.

The survey of teacher education conducted by the American Council on Education has pointed out how a sound and widely-shared program of evaluation can serve to integrate the educational process:

Emphasis on self-evaluation under guidance, continuous throughout the preparatory program, will help the individual to integrate himself and the institution to integrate its services. Appraisal of the institutional program as a whole will result in faculty cooperation in the clarification of objectives and consideration of the degree to which the various parts of the program fit together and support each other. Thus, through democratic action, order, sequence, and unity will be increased (48:104).

The importance of field-work evaluation depends, from one standpoint, on the importance given to the field-work aspect of the curriculum. If the field-work program is inadequate and provides few opportunities for the students to reveal their real competence, then the evaluation of their limited and pre-structured activities will

have comparatively little significance. The character of the field-work situation determines, in part, the value of the appraisal (184:354-55). Where the field-work program is more adequate, however, its appraisal provides the seminary its best opportunity to judge the effectiveness of its educational program, for the ability to use knowledge and training must be judged from actual behavior, and the field-work program provides a situation most nearly corresponding to the actual work of the ministry. Mere ability to verbalize about the minister's work is no test of the adequacy of ministerial training. Genuine understanding and skill are best proved by a test of functional ability, for in the students' actual functioning in ministerial capacities can best be seen their grasp of fundamental principles and understandings; their understanding of the application of the Bible, theology, or church history to human need; and their maturity and spiritual resources.

The objectives of evaluation.-- Evaluation has significance for the student and for the seminary. Evaluation must be in terms of concrete objectives, and if these objectives are stated in clear, precise terms of student behavior, they can serve a double function: they can define the goals of the institution, and they can set the goals of the student (184:361-63). Objectives are discussed in some detail in Chapter II. It is evident that, if the objectives are to be functional for both student and seminary, they must be cooperatively developed through the process of trial and error in the administration and interpretation of the evaluative process. Only thus will the

dangers of mere verbalism and philosophical statements be avoided.

The multiple functions of field-work evaluation may be summarized by the following statement of purposes (48:104; 51:356; 74:31-32; 81:2, 6, 7; 155:5-12; 169:390):

#### Administrative purposes

1. To reveal student growth and progress
2. To provide a basis for grading students
3. To provide adequate records of the student's work
4. To provide a basis for student guidance
5. To provide a basis for student recommendations and placement
6. To provide a basis for curricular evaluation and re-organization
7. To assist in the integration of classroom theory with practice
8. To provide a basis for appraisal of teachers, courses, methods, and books
9. To provide a basis for supervision of the faculty
10. To provide a basis for public relations (seminary reports to the denomination, cooperating organizations, and the public)
11. To provide research data.

#### Supervisory purposes

1. To reveal student strengths, abilities, and aptitudes
2. To reveal and diagnose student problems, difficulties, and needs
3. To reveal adjustment
4. To provide a basis for individual guidance
5. To provide motivation for the student
6. To reveal student achievement, understanding, and skill
7. To guide in adapting the field work to individual needs.

#### Student purposes

1. To clarify seminary objectives
2. To provide instruction
3. To reveal areas of study individually needed to be emphasized
4. To reveal aptitudes, and skills for vocational guidance.

### Basic Principles for Field-Work Evaluation

Continuous evaluation.--- Evaluation should be a continuous process (48:103; 51:349; 74:31-32, 284; 145:325; 56\*). Since evaluation is an integral part of the teaching process and self-evaluation an integral part of the learning process, the evaluation process must be continuous with the teaching-learning process. Economical teaching can occur only when the teacher has clear proof of the achievement and growth of the student; economical study and practice can occur only when the student knows the areas where his knowledge and performance are satisfactory and where they are real (22\*, 30\*). The next step in a graded sequence of field work can be wisely and surely chosen only when the student mastery and understanding of the activity just completed are known. It is also necessary to know the total orientation and background of the individual student (7\*, 13-15\*, 20\*, 58\*). The supervisor is a teacher and field-work supervision is individualized instruction. The field-work supervisor must know the usual performance of the student, and not just his performance once a semester when a supervisory visit is made. Only when evaluation is continuous can growth be properly guided and difficulties promptly diagnosed and met.

Comprehensive evaluation.--- Field-work evaluation must be comprehensive (35:422; 51:348-49; 81:209, 211; 141:273; 145:328-29; 163:175; 184:354-55; 187:312). Since the student learns as a whole (8\*, 10\*), the whole student must be evaluated. The seminary must take into account the student's individual characteristics, background,

the community situation, and the church or organizational situation. It must take account of the student, the demands of the field, the demands of the ministry as a profession, and the effectiveness of the seminary program. Moreover, the evaluation must provide an adequate sampling of the data, factors, functions, or aspects appraised. Evidence should be obtained from as many sources as possible, and as many types of information as possible should be obtained. All essential aspects of the field work should be evaluated, including its integration with course content, for field work is the final test of the seminary's ability to train ministers. All available methods and techniques of evaluation should, where feasible, be used.

Cooperative evaluation.--- Field-work evaluation should be a cooperative process (35:412; 66:103; 74:31-32, 284; 76:5-8; 86:118; 141:273; 164:178-79; 184:354-55). Evaluation is not a mysterious, exclusive prerogative of specialists, but a pervasive activity which should be participated in by all who share in the supervision of the student's field work and by the student himself. The participation of all is necessary to fullest student growth. The evaluative result can not be properly interpreted by the supervisor or understood by the student, unless the student and supervisor can discuss together the results of the evaluation. This is particularly true when the evaluative technique involves observation. When the student realizes that the supervisor is not there to "get something" on him, but that he has the privilege and responsibility of explaining the situation observed and of discussing in a democratic atmosphere the interpretation

of the evaluation, he will come to appreciate and welcome increased supervision and evaluation.

Evaluation according to objectives.--- Evaluation should be based upon an adequate statement of field-work objectives (47:647; 81:211; 145:325-28; 155:24-25; 164:76; 169:388-89; 196:64-65). The seminary field-work objectives should be stated in terms that are clear, precise, and easily understandable. They should be concrete and stated in terms of changes observable in the student during his field work. Only real objectives should be listed, not those given mere lip service. Each statement should contain one objective only, so that it can be readily identified. Specific objectives may then be grouped under a summary objective that is general to them. Further discussion of objectives is found in Chapter II.

Evaluative emphasis.--- Evaluation should be according to the same scale of emphasis found in the objectives and in the curricular content (55:302-04; 81:211-13; 164:111; 184:363). Only that which is adequately dealt with in the curriculum should be evaluated. Things emphasized most should be emphasized in evaluation. From the student's point of view, the goals most extensively evaluated are the most important ones, and goals not appraised will not seem important. Primary rather than secondary factors should receive emphasis. Since field-work emphasizes activity, its evaluation should emphasize the application rather than the possession of knowledge. Thus evaluation becomes unified with both the content and the method of teaching.

Objective and subjective evaluation.--- Both objective and

subjective evaluations are desirable and necessary (74:284). Many of the values most important for the minister are difficult or impossible to measure objectively. Many growth values sought are best evaluated through a critical analysis of descriptive evidence from skilled observation of specific behavior and specific situations. Anecdotal and other types of descriptive records are essential, although the evidence should be made as specific and objective as possible. Importance is attached not so much to the single factor or aspect described, but rather to the combination of them, as provided from cumulative descriptions and records prepared from the skilled observation of several individuals. On the other hand, much objective evidence will also be available, and this should be sought and used.

Reporting evaluative results.-- Evaluation should reveal the student's performance analytically as well as compositely (55:233, 317-18). Evaluative data should facilitate diagnosis of individual strengths and weaknesses as well as position within a larger group. Progress should be revealed in terms of the individual's own record as well as in terms of the entire student group.

Error in evaluation.-- All evaluation is subject to error (81:214; 134:27-31; 164:66, 95-98). Instruments of measurement may be inadequate, the persons using them may be inadequate, or the evaluative instruments may be used for specific purposes for which they were not designed. The persons evaluating may fail to follow directions adequately, they may misinterpret results, or they may fail to evaluate the total aspects of a situation. Errors in field-



work evaluation, as in any other form of evaluation, may be due to limitations in the one evaluating, in the instrument, or in the method used. Supervisors and others need to be aware of these limitations. Since measurement is subject to constant error, the instrument must be valid; since it is subject to variable error, the instrument must be reliable; since measurement is subject to personal error, objectivity is desirable; and since it is subject to errors of interpretation, instructions and other details should be standardized. Measurement in education is always a sampling.

Validity.--- The evaluation should be valid (54:232; 55:302; 81:204, 215; 124:1473; 139:27-28; 155:487-89, 507; 169:394-95). A valid test is that which measures accurately the factor it claims to measure. An evaluating device in theological education may have statistical validity, curricular validity, and ministerial validity, corresponding with Terman's criteria (164:66-69) of "world success." Statistical validity is computed by a mathematical process. Curricular validity refers to the extent to which the evaluating device fully represents the learning experiences of the curriculum. The term ministerial validity is used to refer to the extent to which the evaluating device fully represents those factors which are primary in success in ministerial activity. This would, of necessity, involve some subjective evaluation. A rating scale which would be valid curriculum-wise for one seminary field-work program might be entirely or largely invalid for the field-work pattern followed in another seminary. Various factors influence validity; among these are

reliability (treated under the next principle) and rapport. Rapport is essential for validity, for evaluation is a highly individualized matter. Some students may need to be encouraged, while others may need to be impressed with the importance and seriousness of the evaluation. Wholesome student-supervisor relations are highly important for the right psychological attitude on the part of both student and supervisor during the evaluation. On the other hand, a properly conducted program of evaluation is conducive to wholesome student-supervisor relations. It is also important that the student understand the over-all evaluation program.

Reliability.-- The evaluation should be reliable (124:1016-17, 1473-4; 139:28-29; 155:201-08; 161:278; 164:83-89). Reliability refers to the constancy or consistency with which a thing is measured. A valid test will of necessity be reliable, but a reliable test may not necessarily be valid. A test low in reliability is never good, one high in reliability may not be. Objectivity is very closely related to reliability, but it must be remembered that objectivity is always relative. An evaluative device to appraise democratic leadership on the part of the student-minister, for example, should be made as objective as possible. The more clear and precise the items, statements, or questions, the more reliable the evaluation instrument will tend to be. Reliability is also affected by rapport, motivation, subjective scoring, distractions, and the extent of sampling.

Self-evaluation.-- All evaluation should emphasize and lead to self-evaluation (7:56-57; 74:285, 320; 81:213-14; 145:330-31). The

entire evaluation program should lead to the student-minister's increasing use of and efficiency in self-evaluation. The student needs to grow in ability to appraise his own functioning in ministerial activities. No one should be more concerned with the growth of the learner than the learner himself. The evaluation process should be shared with him in all its aspects: the setting up of objectives, the choice of or devising of instruments for evaluation, and the interpretation of the evaluation results. Only as the student grows in power of intelligent self-criticism of his work will he be able to guide his own continuous growth after his graduation. The supervisor should develop in the student the interest in and ability to note and record his own development and to discover reasons for success or failure. The evaluation of the field-work program should utilize both individual and group self-appraisal. Student suggestions for the improvement of evaluation are desirable and are often very valuable.

#### Basic Principles for the Administration of the Evaluation Program

A long-range program.--- A long-range evaluation program should be developed (76:5-8; 81:215; 155:486). The development of a long-range program will facilitate cooperative planning and participation, comprehensive evaluation, and greater use of the results of evaluation. The time for the various evaluations to be made should be selected with care.

A practical program.--- The field-work evaluation program should be practical (76:5-8; 164:90-95; 178-83). The evaluation

program should not require an excessive expenditure of time, effort, or money. The program should not be out of proportion to the emphasis given to field work in the seminary curriculum. It should take account of the available facilities and personnel. It should utilize the help of all cooperating in the supervisory program, but it should not involve skills which are not possessed, unless orientation and assistance are first given in the development of the desired skills.

Student orientation.-- The students should understand the over-all evaluation program (81:215; 155:121-23; 164:75). Students should be aware of the objectives of the evaluation program, the steps in evaluation, the basis of the interpretation of their work, and the uses made of the evaluation. If the students understand the following steps in evaluation, they will be able to become more proficient in self-evaluation, the goal in the evaluative process:

1. Setting up the objectives of evaluation
2. Defining the behavior to be evaluated
3. Selecting the situations in which the behavior is expressed and in which it may be evaluated
4. Constructing any device to aid in the recording of the behavior expressed
5. Recording the behavior that takes place in the situations
6. Evaluating the behavior recorded
7. Evaluating the appraisal device and improving it as needed.

The use of results.-- The evaluation results should be used (35:422; 55:302; 164:206; 124:367-68; 196:65). The results of evaluation should be applied in a practical way. If this is not done, the whole program is useless and is a failure. Evaluation should be followed by analysis of the reasons for success, diagnosis of failure, and appropriate remedial procedures. It is futile to argue on the

inadequacies of the evaluation instead of improving the educative process. The results of evaluation will always have implications for both the student and the seminary, and both should follow them through. The results should point the way to an improvement in the curriculum of the seminary and in the guidance of the student. Evaluation is justified only as it leads to improvement. The use of evaluation instruments is questionable if the entire purpose is the issuance of grades.

Checking results.-- The results of evaluation should be checked with an outside criterion whenever possible (164:125). The results should at least harmonize with common sense. Terman found it wise to remember this in his construction of psychological tests of mental ability (164:68), and it should be remembered always.

Evaluation reports.-- The results of evaluation should be reported and interpreted to the student as soon as possible (55:233; 81:215; 83:120; 188:11-19). Knowledge of results facilitates learning (30\*). It not merely facilitates interest and permanence of learning, but also it enables the student to supervise his own further growth. It should be remembered that the period immediately following an evaluation period is the best time for learning.

Rapport.-- Student-supervisor rapport should be established and maintained (55:318; 155:486; 196:65). This is essential to validity and to reliability. The student cannot function at his best, and the supervisor will have difficulty in keeping evaluation objective unless this condition is satisfactorily realized. The student

must realize that appraisal is in his interest. This realization is aided by prompt reporting of evaluation results and by interpretation of the nature of the success or failure. The student must also be sure of the sincerity of the supervisor. A student who has done his best, but who is always reported as unsatisfactory, or a student who has not done his best but who is always reported as superior in achievement will be harmed by the evaluation process.

#### Basic Principles Concerning Individual Evaluation Instruments

The choice of evaluative instrument.-- The evaluation instrument should suit the purpose it is to serve (164:112). An instrument may serve several purposes, but it will not serve them all equally well. If the primary purpose is individual guidance or diagnosis, the instrument will need to be constructed differently and perhaps used differently than when its primary purpose is to provide information for curricular revision.

The nature of the instrument must take into consideration the conditions under which it will be administered (164:90-95, 112). The time available, the skill of the one who will use it, the duplicating facilities, and other such factors must not be forgotten during the selection or development of an evaluation instrument.

The evaluation device should provide for individual differences in ability and needs (164:113, 117; 196:64-65). What is easy for one may be difficult for another. The content should range from easy to difficult for whoever is evaluated.

Mechanical details of evaluation instruments.--- Provision should be made for a convenient written record of the student's responses (164:118-20). A check list, scale, rating form, or simple code may save much effort and promote accuracy of observation and recording. Scoring should be as simple as possible.

Directions for administration should be clear, concise, and complete (81:213; 164:119).

There should be adequate instructions detailing expected responses and the basis of interpretation of results (81:212; 164: 90-95, 123). A key or manual should be furnished and information concerning weighting, norms, and similar details should be provided.

In tests and printed instruments of evaluation, attention must be given that no clues as to the expected response are given (81:212).

Organization of content.--- Each separate thing to be evaluated will, in general, require a separate evaluation (164:76; 196:64). During observation the one observing cannot have his attention adequately focused on a variety of items. A device to evaluate emotional maturity will not serve equally well in evaluating leadership ability, although the one will naturally have some bearing on the other. The extent to which an educational objective has been realized is best learned by aiming for it directly rather than by inferring it indirectly from the measurement of something else.

A test should include more than one type of item (81:213; 164:113). This facilitates interest and thus motivates a more

reliable response.

Test items of the same type should be grouped together (81: 212; 164:117).

The evaluation device should be as simple as is feasible (196: 78-79, 85). The device most easy to interpret is the scale, which classes the individual according to descriptive categories. In a scale each item must involve only one outcome and must be expressed in degrees by clearly distinguishable descriptions. Check forms are simpler to use than scales and are more economical of space on the printed form. Unless they are carefully controlled, however, they tend to become increasingly detailed and impractical from revision to revision. While there is no one ideal form for all purposes, a most helpful evaluation instrument is a check list which combines the best features of a scale-type evaluation, the check list, and the anecdotal record, and which is used in connection with an individual conference. This type of device may be developed and used for many separate aspects or concerns of the field-work program.

Revision.--- The evaluation device should be critically revised as need is indicated (164:117). The evaluation program, including the instruments used, the methods used, and the persons involved, should all be subject to evaluation and adjustments should be made as need is indicated.

#### Promising Developments and Areas of Need

Promising developments.--- J. M. Ballinsky and A. P. Guiles



copyrighted in 1947 what is termed the "Andover Newton Theological School Psychological Test." This test was constructed with a dual purpose in view: (1) to give guidance to admitting committees of theological schools concerning the background and aptitude of the student for theological education, and (2) to assist field-work directors, counselors, and faculty members in guiding and counseling their students. Several seminaries were making use of this test. The scoring of all tests is done at Andover Newton by the authors, a feature which might be necessary for the establishment of adequate norms and until a complete manual of interpretation is furnished, although some seminary officials objected to this. The test booklet provides for the recording of five pages of background data on the student, including his academic background, leadership background, experience in church activities, and reasons for desiring to enter the ministry. There are three sections in the test. Section one is a vocabulary test; section two tests the general background of the student for theological education, including his knowledge of the church, theological vocabulary, the Bible, theology, philosophy, and related fields. Section three is an interest inventory specifically designed for theological students.

Walker M. Alderton, director of field-work activities at Chicago Theological Seminary, gave an examination to his field-work students at the end of each year, varying the examination from year to year. In one test, typical of those which he gave, there were four sections, covering nine pages. The first section was termed "Relating

Field and Course Activities" and contained thirty-five items, each of which was to have a double rating. On the left, the particular aspect of field work mentioned was rated on a four-point scale as to its value and importance in the first year of the student's seminary life and study. On the right, the student rated himself on the same field-work aspects. On a four-point scale he indicated how well he thought he had done. The four divisions of this first section were on orientation (seven items), defining the job and beginning activity (six items), "relating your growing thought as a student to the demands which responsibility has made upon ideas, personal commitment, and skill" (six items), and evaluation of ways and means (fifteen items). The second division related to personal and professional adjustments faced in connection with field work. Twelve items were to be rated as to whether they constituted a difficulty or problem at the time of admission to the seminary, whether they were still difficult for the student although a solution was being worked out, or whether they were still unsolved and a cause for definite concern. The student was then asked to write briefly concerning two of these problems which he sensed as difficult, or he could write instead on "perplexities which you feel of wide-spread concern to students entering the ministry at the present time." In the third section, the student was asked to write briefly on seven aspects of seminary life. Concerning each of these he was to state his expectation as a new student and the degree of satisfaction he had received from them. He was asked to add comments on any other items he wished to discuss. The final section of the

examination provided for the student's summarization of one or two of his basic convictions about the rewards and opportunities in religious leadership.

Another evaluative instrument developed by Alderton in connection with field work was a brief but helpful instrument for the student's use in evaluating his own democratic leadership of groups with which he was working in his field work. The student rated himself at two points on each of six continuums to show: (1) the type of leadership he felt he exerted at the beginning of his field work, and (2) the type of leadership he felt he exerted at the time of the examination.

Other devices which have been developed by individuals responsible for field-work supervision included rating scales for use in evaluating the student during individual conferences, outlines for the preparation of student autobiographical accounts, student rating scales, personality rating scales, and rating scales of homiletic performance. Self-evaluative devices included ratings of personal characteristics, interest inventories, inventories of social skills, and an inventory of cooperation.

Evaluative devices should be developed for appraising the desirability of a place or organization for student field work, the cooperative supervision of local or other officials, the supervision offered by the seminary supervisors, and the total field-work program of the seminary.

Areas of need.--- At the 1947 field-work conference evaluation

was termed "a vast area largely unexplored but presenting many interesting possibilities" (1:47). An analysis of the report forms and other evaluative instruments used impresses one with the mediocre quality of many of them. Considerable statistical data are gathered, and the summarization of the data gathered throughout the semester is undoubtedly a time-consuming clerical task. Field-work directors should not be required to spend their own time in the compilation of such figures. While there has been considerable quantitative summarization of field work done, there has been large neglect of qualitative evaluation of the students' field-work efforts.

There is a need for increased emphasis upon evaluation of field work. This is one of the most crucial aspects of supervision. Gathering of statistical data and occasional visits to observe student work may give a false impression of the quality and adequacy of the field-work program. Thirty-two seminaries (one-third) reported no formal evaluation whatever of student field work. Most of the other seminaries do little qualitative evaluation. Other seminaries should receive inspiration from the seminaries which are pioneering in evaluation and which are developing evaluation programs commensurate with the importance that should be given to appraisal of field work.

There is need for use of a larger variety of evaluative techniques, in order to provide a total appraisal of the quality of the students' field work. This is essential to field work and to guidance. Most seminaries have done little more than make some use of various forms of written reports to supplement impressions gained

in observation and conferences. Among the techniques which should be increasingly used are rating scales, anecdotal records, and field-work diaries.

There is need for improving the report forms used in connection with evaluation. Attention should be given to more than the gathering of statistical data for administrative reports. These have little use in evaluation apart from furnishing some indication of the range and extent of student activities. Specific and concrete objectives for the evaluation of field work should be set up and evaluative forms which will contribute to the attainment of these objectives should be developed.

There is real need for a creative approach to field-work evaluation and for the development of new techniques of evaluation specifically adapted to the field-work program.

#### Summary

When the qualifications of students desiring to enter the seminaries were decided upon, some consideration was given to previous Christian service. Half of the seminaries inquired concerning previous Christian service before assigning students to field work. This information was frequently given on information blanks. Much use was made of field-work reports in evaluating the adequacy of the field work of seminary students. Most of these reports were furnished by the students themselves, many were furnished by seminary supervisors, and some were provided by cooperating supervisors. The average semi-

nary received eight or nine reports per semester for each student engaged in field work.

A few seminaries were beginning to use rating scales, but little use was made of student self-evaluation, anecdotal records, or field-work diaries. A number of seminaries asked for written summaries of field-work experiences. Conferences were frequently held with the student at the conclusion of a field-work project. More than a third of the seminaries scheduled such conferences between the student and field-work director, and other conferences were also held with denominational or local supervisors.

Evaluation has an important role in field-work supervision. Too frequently the value and adequacy of the field-work program have been taken for granted. Field-work evaluation provides, perhaps, the best evaluation of the effectiveness of a seminary's curriculum. Evaluation, however, must be based upon a recognition of the many purposes which it may serve for seminary administration, field-work supervision, and for meeting student needs and goals.

Thirty basic principles were developed for field-work evaluation, the administration of the evaluation program, and for specific evaluative instruments. It was pointed out that evaluation should be continuous, comprehensive, and cooperatively undertaken. Evaluation should be based on field-work objectives and should present the same emphasis found in the curriculum. Both objective and subjective evaluation is necessary, and evaluative results should be reported analytically as well as compositely. All evaluation is subject to

error, hence effort should be made to have valid and reliable instruments. All evaluation should lead to self-evaluation.

A long-range, practical evaluation program should be drawn up and students should be oriented to its purposes and methods. Evaluation results should be checked, promptly reported, and used. Evaluation is dependent upon the establishment of rapport between the student and the one evaluating.

The evaluation instrument should suit the purpose it is to serve, the conditions under which it is to be administered, and the individual needs of the student. Mechanical details are important: provision should be made for a record of responses; adequate directions for administering, scoring, and interpreting results should be furnished; and care should be taken that no clues are furnished as to the desired response.

A separate appraisal is usually required for each thing to be evaluated. Tests should include several types of items appropriately grouped. Evaluating devices should be kept as simple as is feasible and should be revised as need is indicated.

A number of interesting evaluative devices have been developed for use in field-work evaluation, but these have mainly been specific to local situations. Two examples of the types of instruments which may be constructed were given.

Four major areas of need in field-work evaluation were pointed out. There is need for increased emphasis upon evaluation in field work, particularly upon qualitative evaluation. There should be a

larger variety of evaluative techniques used, and the report forms used in connection with evaluation need to be improved. There is real need for the development of new instruments and techniques for field-work evaluation.



## CHAPTER VIII

### FIELD-WORK RECORDS AND REPORTS

This chapter suggests the purposes of field-work records and reports, and then discusses the types of reports and report forms used by the seminaries today in the field-work programs, the use of anecdotal records and other report forms, the use of field-work records, and the preservation of field-work records. Basic principles of field-work reports and of field-work records are developed. The chapter closes with a summary of areas of need in the reporting and recording of field-work information.

#### The Purposes of Field-Work Records and Reports

An adequate system of reports and records is essential to the effective operation of the field-work program of the seminary. Adequate field-work evaluation would be largely meaningless, if not impossible, apart from appropriate records. The individualization of instruction and curricular reorganization are both dependent upon the records kept by the seminary. It has been claimed that the growth of public school efficiency could be traced through the study of school records and reports (197:327). Certainly the adequacy of the record and report forms of the seminary and the use made of them constitute one measure of the effectiveness of the seminary. Field-work records and reports are an integral and important part of the records and reports of the seminary.

An adequate system of records and reports serves the following

purposes (61:387-88; 197:331-32).

- (1) It aids in the study of the student and thus provides a basis for the individualization of the curriculum and for its improvement and reorganization.
- (2) It provides a sound basis for guidance.
- (3) It supplies information concerning student growth, achievement, strengths, and weaknesses to students, staff-members, and church officials.
- (4) It promotes remedial work in such areas as health, mental health, spiritual character, and curricular courses.
- (5) It provides a basis for grouping within the seminary.
- (6) It furnishes information necessary in the granting of special awards and the preparation of recommendations.
- (7) It provides data for research.

To summarize, the major purpose of student records is to make available the basic information which the seminary needs in providing a program of instruction and guidance in personal and professional growth (124:1299). Each record form and each item included in the form needs to be evaluated in this light.

A distinction should be made between records and reports. Records tend to be of a more permanent nature than reports and are used as a basis for making reports. Reports are made by a person or office to another office or person (124:924). A student record is usually individual; a student report may be a summarization of data on an individual student or on a group of students. Records and reports

are closely related, but clear distinctions may be noted.

#### Seminary Practices Concerning Field-Work Records and Reports

Types of records and reports used.--- Inasmuch as field-work reports and records so frequently served as the main basis for evaluation, or included a statement of the results of evaluation, the preceding chapter on evaluation discussed some details of the various record and report forms used by the theological seminaries. Table 15 presented the number of times various evaluatory reports were used by sixty-four seminaries which furnished data concerning practices in field-work evaluation. Table 16 presented the frequency with which these seminaries received various evaluatory reports from students, seminary supervisors, and cooperating supervisors.

Sixty-four seminaries used some form of written reports or records, over half of which were furnished by the students, and only a sixth of which were furnished by cooperating supervisors. Sixty-one seminaries had printed report forms, while forty-eight made use of essay-style reports. Forty-four seminaries used report forms which consisted of or included a check list. Fifty-three theological schools asked for summary statements at the conclusion of periods of field work. Less use was made of other types of report and record forms. Few of the report forms were used more than twice a semester; many were used only once a semester. In 1947 the Interseminary Commission for the Training for the Rural Ministry recommended that the following be the minimum standards for seminaries: (1) monthly reports from students,

(2) reports from the cooperating supervisors at least once a semester, and (3) a report from the seminary supervisor following each supervisory visit or personal interview.

Although only nine theological seminaries used anecdotal records, there was a definite trend in education in general to use them to supplement other types of records and reports (124:1300). The field-work director in his supervision and guidance of the professional growth of the student could profitably use anecdotal information which might be furnished by the faculty and cooperating supervisors. The director himself would have frequent opportunity to make such records.

Field-work diaries were used by nine seminaries. In these the student recorded his activities, problems, successes, failures, new insights, subject areas related to the field work done, related reading done by him, issues to be raised in the practicum or seminar, and other reactions.

Some form of check list was used by forty-four seminaries. Most seminaries had the same general check list for all students. Interview forms were used by only a few seminaries. One seminary used paper of different colors for interviews scheduled at different times during the seminary training.

Cumulative records of field work were seldom used. Several of the Presbyterian seminaries used the same type of form, with slight modifications to meet their particular needs. On these forms, for each term of seminary study a space was provided for notations on the

following items: place, type of work, position and address of correspondent, the reports received from the church or organization and from the student, and the mark given to the student. Space was also provided for a brief summary of pertinent personal data concerning the student and for a summary of his previous field-work experiences.

One seminary had a cumulative record form which provided space for recording for each year the place where field work was done, the financial remuneration received, other work done, and the name of the supervisor of the practicum. Space was provided for comments and recommendations by this supervisor. Another seminary recorded the successive assignments and provided a record of periodic evaluations of six aspects of the student's work: spirituality, dependability, diligence, tact, initiative, and effectiveness.

The use of field-work reports.--- The oral and written reports by the student to the field-work directors were taken into consideration by the director when holding advisory conferences with the student following a supervisory visit. Reports from cooperating supervisors were seldom available for use in these conferences, since these evaluations were generally furnished at the close of the semester. Twenty-one seminaries, however, asked for more than one report per semester from the cooperating supervisors, and in their cases these reports were also available for use in counseling.

Field-work reports were used in the determination of student marks in the comparatively few seminaries which gave grades for satisfactory field work.

The statistical data gathered from field-work reports were used by the field-work directors in their preparation of annual reports of the seminary field-work programs, in reports to denominational officials, and in seminary publicity through seminary bulletins, alumni bulletins, and descriptive leaflets.

The use of field-work records.--- Morgan in his survey of field work a decade ago found that only half of the theological students interrogated indicated an awareness that any reports or records of field work were being kept. Only thirty-nine per cent stated that these had ever been used during any conference with them. Morgan concluded that record keeping was often only a mere formality (129:86-87).

Table 17 presents the frequency with which the seminaries reported during the present survey that various individuals, other than the field-work director, made use of the field-work records. In over half of the seminaries no one other than the field-work director ever made any use of these records. The deans were the only individuals reported to make regular use of these records in as many as a fourth of the seminaries. The two most common uses made of field-work records (apart from counseling in connection with field-work supervision) were in further field-work placement or when a recommendation was requested. However, even for these purposes, only a third of the seminaries made regular use of these records.

One of two things seemed to be indicated: either the content of these records was so inadequate that they had little utility, or else the seminaries had an inadequate philosophy and procedure. Records

TABLE 17

NUMBER\* OF SEMINARIES WHICH REPORTED  
VARIOUS USES OF FIELD-WORK RECORDS

| Use of Records                        | Regularly | Occasionally |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|--------------|
| In further field-work placement ..... | 32        | 12           |
| In recommending student .....         | 31        | 12           |
| By dean .....                         | 24        | 19           |
| By faculty .....                      | 15        | 21           |
| By denominational officials .....     | 12        | 21           |
| By outside people .....               | 3         | 13           |

\* Sixty-six of the ninety-six seminaries reported on this item.

are made to be used; they are not an end in themselves. Since two-thirds of the seminaries did not regularly use field-work records when placing or recommending students, a new emphasis was clearly needed.

The need of integrating field work with class work was emphasized by the fact that scarcely fifteen per cent of the seminaries reported any regular use by the teacher of field-work records.

It was surprising that, although eighty-five per cent of the seminaries were denominational schools, yet only twelve reported that denominational officials made regular use of their field-work records.

The preservation of field-work records.-- Only thirty-seven seminaries indicated that they kept field-work records of a student after he was graduated. Table 18 shows the length of time these records were kept by these thirty-seven schools. It will be noted that only

TABLE 18

NUMBER\* OF SEMINARIES WHICH KEPT FIELD-WORK RECORDS  
FOR VARIOUS PERIODS OF TIME

| Period of Time                    | Number |
|-----------------------------------|--------|
| Permanently .....                 | 6      |
| Twenty years .....                | 1      |
| Ten years .....                   | 2      |
| Five years .....                  | 5      |
| Four years .....                  | 1      |
| Three years .....                 | 7      |
| Two years .....                   | 1      |
| One year .....                    | 3      |
| Till satisfactory placement ..... | 1      |
| Thus far** .....                  | 2      |
| Indefinitely .....                | 8      |

\* Thirty-seven of the ninety-six seminaries reported on this item.

\*\* One: five years; one: two years.

about a fourth of the seminaries kept them as long as three years.

This is another indication that the field-work records either were little valued by the seminary administration or contained little helpful information. Adequate field-work records should be of as permanent value as any other seminary record of the student.

Twenty-five seminaries kept a permanent summary of the student's field work. Only six kept the original records permanently.



### Basic Principles of Field-Work Records

Qualities desirable in records.--- The field-work records should be as comprehensive as the stated objectives of the field-work program (182:203; 197:331).

Field-work records should be cumulative (182:205; 197:336). They should provide basic information concerning the pre-seminary background of the student and continuous information covering the period of the student's study in the seminary.

The field-work records should be sufficiently detailed to provide information in a form adequate for aid in the individualization of instruction and in guidance (182:203-05).

The field-work records should be simple (61:560; 182:206). In the pursuit of simplicity, however, adequacy and utility must not be forgotten.

The field-work records should be well organized (182:206; 197:331). They should be so designed that essential data concerning the student may be readily interpreted or summarized by busy teachers or anyone else using the records.

Each record form or procedure should be adapted to the function it is designed to facilitate (guidance, instruction, supervision or administration) (61:560).

Records should be made as reliable and comparable as possible through the use of as objective data as are available (182:206).

Subjective evaluations are often of great import, and all records should provide for both subjective and the more strictly objective data.

However, by careful construction it is possible to make evaluative instruments and anecdotal record forms somewhat objective.

Details of form.--- The record forms and procedures adopted should be such as to minimize the amount of time required in using them (61:560). Wherever feasible, the time of the staff should be saved by adapting the forms so that clerical help can use them.

Record forms should be of uniform type wherever careful comparisons and summarizations are to be made (182:206; 197:331).

There should be a minimum of repetition of items in the various record forms used by the seminary (182:206; 197:331).

Careful attention should be given to mechanical details (182:207; 197:331). The record forms should be constructed of durable materials. Simple codes are sometimes desirable to enable the recording of a maximum of information in a minimum of space. The use of record cards of different colors aids in distinguishing those designed for different purposes. A folder form for the cumulative record provides a convenient means of retaining together other more temporary record forms.

Record forms require a detailed manual of instructions to facilitate recording, summarization, and interpretation (182:207; 197:336).

The use of records.--- Record forms should be kept as few in number and simple in form as is feasible (61:560). Whenever a form can be adapted to several purposes without too great sacrifice of simplicity, such a record form should be used, and carbon copies may

be made.

There should be a clear distinction between temporary and permanent records (197:336).

Field-work records should be centrally filed and should be accessible to all the seminary faculty (182:205; 197:331). This is important for the integration of field work with class work. The need for occasional confidential data should not hinder the freedom of use of the general records.

There should be a regular calendar schedule for the completion and summarization of report forms (197:336). There should also be careful check-up to see that the forms are being properly and efficiently used.

A system of field-work records should be associated with a program of faculty and staff education as to the value, preparation and use of these records (182:208).

There should be careful evaluation of the record system and provision for revision when need is indicated (182:208; 197:336). The record system must not be allowed to become static. It will need to change as the philosophy and objectives of the seminary and of the field-work aspect of the curriculum grow and develop.

Field-work records should be kept as long as any records of the student are kept (159:15). No phase of the student's record is more important than the record of his field work.

Field-work diaries.-- Field-work diaries should be regularly used by the student and checked by the seminary supervisor (108:403-4).

The student should be taught how to state concisely in a specified sequence such matters as activities, problems, successes, failures, new insights, subject areas related to the field work done, related reading completed, issues to be raised in the practicum or seminar, and similar reactions. The supervisor should check these weekly, especially at the beginning of a new field-work activity, and return them promptly for reference and use by the student.

Check lists.--- Field-work activity check lists should be prepared for specific types of field work (35:434; 155:214-20). General check lists used by all students are useful for statistical purposes. For evaluative use in supervision and guidance, however, specific types of field work should have check lists specially prepared for them. A list for pastoral activity might include items such as board meetings conducted, funerals assisted in, denominational meetings observed or participated in, and other similar activities. The submission of such a check list by the student to the supervisor at stated periods provides a quick survey of the range of experiences obtained. A similar check list might be given to the cooperating supervisor for his guidance in providing an adequate range of field experiences for the student.

Interview forms.--- Prepared forms should be used by supervisors in recording interviews (124:1314). These may provide a record of the items covered in the interview, ratings of the student, decisions reached, and other similar data. The use of interview forms will save the supervisor's time and will promote continuity in the

supervisory guidance.

Cumulative records.-- Cumulative record forms must not be too elaborate, detailed, or complex (196:79). Teachers will not care to use records which are time-consuming. Cumulative records are useless if they are not used. Graphic presentation of numerical data, or profile charts (e. g., of ministerial abilities revealed in field work) are useful in the cumulative record (76:51-52; 182:230).

Anecdotal records.-- All who cooperate in the educational leadership of the student should share in the preparation of anecdotal records (124:926; 155:380). All teachers and all who share in the field-work supervision should cooperate in the preparation of anecdotal records for the students for whom they are responsible.

Care should be taken that the incident is recorded objectively (77:742; 155:381). The incident, the comment or interpretation, and the recommendation (where required) should each be separated by a line drawn across the card or by some other means. The incident should state only what was seen or heard. A statement like "John was cooperative" belongs with the interpretation, not with the incident, for his action might not have been judged cooperative by another observer. The incident should state only what John said or did, e. g., he came five minutes late, he smiled when he spoke to the children, he said "Please keep your seats" five times but the children disregarded his suggestion. No record should be made of an incident to which the observer has reacted emotionally.

Each observer should be fair in his comments (124:926). The

anecdote reveals the attitude of the observer as well as that of the student: the favorable as well as the unfavorable, strengths as well as weaknesses, the normal as well as the unusual. There is danger in reporting only the spectacular. If a student's reaction was not his customary one, this fact should be noted in the interpretative comment. No anecdote should be recorded unless the incident is accurately remembered.

Anecdotes should be recorded as soon after the occurrence of the incident as is feasible (155:380). Small cards may be carried in the pocket by the supervisor. Recording should be done the same day as the incident occurred.

The records should be kept as brief as possible (155:380). Long comments are usually not necessary. Unless records are kept brief the whole system may break down through the excessive time required.

Anecdotal records should emphasize those activities, attitudes, and relationships emphasized by the objectives of the field-work program and the seminary (124:926).

Anecdotal record forms should be used (124:926). This makes the writing of anecdotes less laborious and facilitates filing. Space should be provided for the student's name, observer's name, date, and occasion. Separate spaces should be provided for recording the incident, the comment or interpretation, and any recommendation. A three-by-five inch card is large enough.

Anecdotal records should be filed in the field-work office (155:381).

A schedule for the submission of the records should be set up (155:381). The supervisors and faculty members should know the approximate number of forms they are expected to complete. The days on which the record cards are due in the field-work office should be designated. A form kept in the office should be checked for each form received. This aids in keeping an account of the number of records received from each observer and the total number for each student.

All information contained in anecdotal records should be kept confidential (155:382). Summarizations, however, should become a part of the cumulative record.

Summarization should be regularly and skillfully done (124:926; 155:381-82). Summarization should be done at stated periods, at least once a semester. Summarization should not be done by clerical help, but by the field-work director, who may dictate his summarization if feasible. The director should look for meaningful patterns and trends. He should give due regard to having a sufficient number of anecdotes from several individuals concerning the same student, and should remember that the information recorded is only a small sampling of the total functioning of the student.

#### Basic Principles of Field-Work Reports

Qualities desirable in reports.-- Field-work reports should be as inclusive as are the objectives of the field-work program (182:242). Understandings, interests, skills, attitudes, and adjustment are to be taken into account along with achievement. Reports will need

to note progress and maturity in social and spiritual matters as well as in academic matters. If field-work reports are to be related to the objectives, however, these objectives will need to have been stated in terms of specific behavior goals (172:486; 196:66). A general objective of the seminary may be to foster "cooperativeness" on the part of the future minister. However, if this is to be evaluated, recorded, and reported, it must be stated in terms which can guide the student and faculty, e. g.: A cooperative ministerial student will work harmoniously with (1) his field-work supervisor, (2) his cooperating supervisor, (3) the board of deacons of the church he serves, (4) denominational officials, (5) other clergymen serving the same community he serves, (6) community-serving agencies, and (7) his fellow seminary students. It might be necessary to break down even more specifically such a statement as the above (e. g., specify various ways in which a cooperative ministerial student will cooperate with his field-work supervisor or board of deacons).

The report form should be understandable to all who will use it (182:242). It should be self-explanatory to any student, church official, or faculty member who might use it.

Report forms should be cooperatively developed (196:66-92). The entire faculty, any cooperating supervisors, and the students should share in the development of report forms.

The report must take into consideration the student as an individual and as a member of the seminary group (182:243). Progress must be reported in terms of class growth and status and also in terms



of individual ability, status, and growth.

Report forms should be so designed that desire for growth and improvement is stimulated (196:110).

Reports to the public should be kept simple (196:76, 105).

The more details and references to highly specific objectives included in the report, the more easily it can be misunderstood.

Details of construction.-- Each thing evaluated should be reported separately (171:47; 196:109). If effort is to be recognized, then it must be evaluated and reported separately from achievement. Each mark or designation on the report must refer to one distinct quality; it must not represent a conglomeration incapable of analysis into its various components.

The report should state in simple terms the philosophy of the seminary and its field-work program (182:242).

The report should provide for inclusion of evidence and comments relative to the evaluations recorded (196:110).

The report should be constructed so as to require a minimum expenditure of time in its preparation (196:110).

The report should provide evaluations in terms which can be easily translated into other symbols or systems of marking (196:110).

The use of reports.-- The number of report forms should be kept to a minimum (196:107). If several report forms are to be used at the same time, they should, when feasible, be incorporated into a single form.

Separate report forms should be used for separate purposes

(196:109). In general, reports designed for use in supervisory guidance should be of a different form from those used for administrative purposes or for public relations.

Teachers must be educated in the writing of informal comments if these are to be used (196:91). Such comments should be specific rather than general, should give evidence, and should be understandable. A brief description of what the student did is the most intelligible form of supplementary comment.

Whatever forms are used in reporting to the student and to the public, a five-point scale should be maintained for administrative record purposes (196:83).

#### Areas of Need

Even though most seminaries kept some form of field-work records, there was great variation in the kind of records kept, the quality of the records, and the use of the records. The following needs are apparent:

The nearly one-third of the seminaries which kept no field-work records whatsoever should inaugurate adequate procedures. Record-keeping should be universal.

The quality of field-work records should be greatly improved. They should include more than statistical or administrative data. Much more use should be made of evaluative ratings and anecdotal illustrations in the report and record forms already prepared.

New emphasis should be placed on the use of anecdotal records,

field-work diaries, and cumulative records of student field work.

Field work records and reports should be used much more extensively in counseling, as resource material for class work, in issuing field work marks, for administrative purposes, and in seminary publicity.

#### Summary

An effective field-work program is dependent upon an adequate system of records and reports. These serve many purposes and are essential to supervisory guidance and to the integration of field work with class work.

Sixty-four seminaries used written reports and records. More than half of these were furnished by the students, and only a sixth by cooperating supervisors. From a half to three-fourths of the seminaries employed printed report forms, summary statements, and essay-style reports. Forty-four used check lists. Anecdotal records and field-work diaries were used by nine seminaries each. Few seminaries employed interview forms or cumulative records. Field-work reports were used in counseling, grading, and in seminary publicity. Little use was made of field-work records except in counseling, placement, and recommendations. In a fourth of the seminaries the dean frequently used these records; in half, no one but the field-work director used them at any time. Only a third of the seminaries regularly employed these records in field-work placement or in making recommendations. Faculty members and denominational representatives made almost no use of the records. About a

fourth of the seminaries kept field-work records as long as three years.

Thirty-four basic principles were developed for field-work records and fifteen for field-work reports. It was pointed out that field-work records should be comprehensive, cumulative, sufficiently detailed, and yet simple and well organized. Records should be adapted to the purposes they are to serve, and should be made as objective, reliable, and comparable as possible. The form of the records should help minimize the time needed in their use. Records should be uniform, without unnecessary repetition of items on various forms, and of proper mechanical construction. Adequate instructions should be provided for recording, summarization, and interpretation. Record forms should be kept as few as is feasible, and temporary records should be distinguished from permanent records. Records should be centrally filed, completed and summarized according to a calendar schedule, and the faculty should be oriented to their use. The record system should be evaluated and revised as needed, and field-work records should be kept as long as any student records are kept.

Field-work diaries should be regularly used and checked, check lists should be prepared for specific types of field work, and interview forms should be used by supervisors. Cumulative forms should be kept simple. Anecdotal records should be prepared by all who supervise or teach the student. Recording should be objective, fair, and should be done soon after the occurrence of the incident. Records should be brief and should emphasize things stressed by the field-work and seminary objectives. Special forms should be used, submitted according to

a calender schedule, and filed. They should be kept confidential, and should be skillfully and regularly summarized.

Field-work reports should include evidence on all field-work objectives. They should be understandable and cooperatively developed. They should consider the student as an individual and as a member of the group. They should motivate growth, and those designed for public relations should be simple. Each thing evaluated should be reported separately; the report should state simply the underlying philosophy, and space should be provided for comments. Reports should require a minimum of time in preparation, and should be translatable into other systems of marking. Report forms should be kept to a minimum, although separate forms will be needed for separate purposes. Teachers should be trained in the writing of informal comments. Regardless of the form used, a five-point scale should be maintained for office use.

There is need for all seminaries to keep adequate records and for the improvement of the quality of records now being kept. There should be a new emphasis upon anecdotal records, field-work diaries, and permanent cumulative records of field work. Field-work records and reports should be extensively used.

## CHAPTER IX

### THE INTEGRATION OF FIELD WORK WITH OTHER ASPECTS OF THE CURRICULUM

If the field work is to perform its full functions, it must be integrated with the entire range of curricular experiences. This chapter begins with a discussion of the important role which integration plays and then discusses the practices of the theological seminaries in their integration of field work with seminary courses and with the seminary guidance program. Basic principles are then developed for the integration of theory and practice, for the use of observation as an integrative technique, for the integration of field work with class work, and for the integration of field work with guidance. A section of the chapter is then devoted to the program of clinical pastoral training and to how it may be integrated with field work and other aspects of the curriculum. The chapter closes with a statement of the major areas of need in the integration of field work with class work, guidance, and clinical pastoral training.

#### The Importance of Integration

The meaning of integration.-- During the last two decades there has been increasing attention given to the concept of integration. The terms "integrated" and "integration" have been used in a variety of ways, and educators have discussed at length whether the term "integrated" should be applied to individual behavior only, or whether it also should be applied in other ways, e. g., the integration of theory and practice, an integrated curriculum. Without elaborating on the

arguments involved, it may be pointed out that the Encyclopedia of Educational Research recognizes nine legitimate usages of the term and does not limit the term "integrated" to a characterization of behavior (124:489). The Dictionary of Education, edited by Good, recognizes two definitions of integration and also has two definitions for "course, integration" and one for "curriculum, integrated" (78:107, 114, 221). Hopkins and Others, who have been leaders using the term in <sup>a</sup>more restricted way, discuss three usages of the term by educators (one usage being broken down into three subdivisions) and also speak of an "integrated curriculum" (94:21-22, 49). Theological educators in their conferences and literature have regularly used the term "integration" to refer to the relating of field work with other aspects of the curriculum (1:18-19; 99:4; 125:18-21; 156:40; 159:31-39). For these reasons, in the discussion of this chapter the term "integration" is used primarily as meaning the curricular process of relating theory to practice.

The role of integration.--- One of the most fundamental problems in education is that of relating theory and practice. This is evidenced by the fact that "the integration of theory and practice," "relating theory and practice," "integrating the curriculum," and "class work versus laboratory work" are timeworn topics. Dewey has said: "Theory separated from concrete doing and making is empty and futile" (57:281). At the seventh biennial meeting of the American Association of Theological Schools this statement was made:

...much of our teaching by which we expect to develop the

professional skills is in situations so unlike the places where they will actually be used that it could scarcely be defended if we really expect to have the student learn the thing in the seminary (167:41).

President Van Dusen, of Union Theological Seminary, has referred to the balancing and relating of subject matter disciplines with the practical disciplines as "the livest issue in the philosophy of theological education at the present time" (68:64).

In Chapter II basic principles of transfer in learning were discussed. It was pointed out that, if classroom learnings in the theological seminary are to function in the ministerial activity of the student after his graduation, certain conditions must be met. The teaching must directly aim for such transfer, i. e., be professionalized (32\*). The more the seminary learning situation and the future activity of the minister have in common, the greater the assurance of the efficiency of the learning (34\*). The learning experiences must be meaningful (36\*), well illustrated and frequently applied (37\*), and the student must be shown the relationships (35\*) and helped to expect the learning to function in his ministerial work (33\*). It is evident that neither the traditional "academic" seminary course nor the traditional field-work activity of the seminary student can meet these requirements if either stands alone. These requirements can be met only by the close integration of the seminary courses with the field work.

Dean Muelder, of Boston University School of Theology, pointed out at the Inter-Professions Conference on Education for Professional Responsibility that:

Indeed, one of the major problems in theological education



today is the tendency of the splintering of the curriculum and offering the theologian not an integrated professional training in classroom and field work, but a mosaic of fragments (68:178).

Dean Shailer Matthews, of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, pointed out in 1932 that the old concept of the curriculum as consisting of the giving of informative content to be memorized was changing to a concept of the curriculum as a functional task, and that the center of concern was shifting from the presentation of truth to the development of personality (118:16-29). The task of the theological seminary is professional; all courses and all activities should be conditioned by the profession for which the students are being prepared.

The distinction between an academic or scholastic knowledge of a subject and a professional knowledge of that subject is real (7:24). Assignments can be made on an academic or on a professional basis (68:95). Thus a five-thousand word paper on the organization of the various units of Judeo-Christian literature into the form found in our Bible might be wholly appropriate for a student preparing to be a research scholar or professor of biblical literature, but it would be academic for the average seminary student. The vast majority of the seminary students on the B. D. level are preparing for the pastoral ministry and begin their work in comparatively small churches (114:91). For the average student, therefore, it would be professional, functional, and certainly more meaningful to prepare three twenty-minute sermons on "How the Bible Came to be One Book."

Vocational techniques and skills should not be separated by

any unbridgeable chasm from the subjects which provide the Biblical and historical background to be interpreted by means of these techniques and skills. The seminary is concerned with the student as a whole being (8\*). The student-minister requires both information and skill in the impartation of that information to others. Either knowledge or skill is incomplete without the other; each is given meaning by the other. Content must be functionally understood; the student must not merely acquire ideas, he must go beyond the acquiring of verbalized knowledge and must be able to implement his ideas and make his knowledge functional (74:139). This total goal must be the objective of both the "academic" and the "professional" courses.

There have been two traditional patterns of thought regarding theory and practice. In the one, theory has been emphasized first, and practice has followed the theory. Practice served as a kind of test of the ability to apply the previous learning. Such theory courses have served mainly to fulfill academic requirements for graduation. Professional growth of both the teacher and the minister has too often been left chiefly to a trial-and-error type of experience which has followed theory. In the other traditional pattern, theory has been presented in the classroom; practice has been acquired through the practical activities required by economic necessity. The seminary has rationalized that such a procedure, after all, was good, for thus knowledge was applied; but the seminary took little responsibility for systematic and accurate application in practical situations. There was a naive faith that the relation of the theory to the actual

practice was self-evident, that the student was capable of being his own teacher and supervisor in this one regard, and that growth was automatic so long as serious mistakes were avoided.

The principles set forth later in this chapter suggest a third approach to the problem of relating theory and practice. The integration of theory and practice can be planned; theory and practice can be kept parallel with each other, and the results of integration can be evaluated so that the planned integration may be made increasingly effective.

#### Seminary Practices Related to Integration

The use of student observation.-- Sixty-two seminaries reported that they had one or more classes using student observation of church or other activities. The exact number of classes which used observation was not available, inasmuch as some did not list the names of all the courses but merely used a plural term, such as "religious education courses" or "homiletics courses." It was clear, however, that more than one hundred and fifty courses made some use of observation. At least sixty-three of these courses were in the general area of practical theology and church administration, and thirty-seven were related to religious education. The average for the sixty-two seminaries was between two and three classes per seminary that coordinated student observation with other work in the course.

Mooney's survey of 414 student teachers, though completed in 1937, provides an interesting comparison from teacher education (126:

58). He found that sixty-four per cent of the student-teachers had observation in connection with both subject-matter and educational theory courses. Eighty per cent had a period of observation before practice teaching and also engaged in observation at various times during the practice-teaching period. Forty-seven per cent had further observation after the completion of their term of practice teaching.

The extent of integration.--- Undoubtedly many seminary instructors asked questions during their classes which drew upon the students' experiences in their field work, and undoubtedly many students volunteered illustrations or questions based upon their field work. However, little formal effort to integrate field work with class work was evident in theological education. In an effort to discover to what extent field experiences of any type were used to relate theory to practice (regardless of whether these were actually under the direction of the field-work department), questions were asked concerning which classes made use of student observation, field trips, case studies, counseling activities, community surveys; which used community resources; and which provided for student participation in community projects. Questions were also asked concerning the number of practicums or seminars held and concerning the number of classes in which field-work reports could take the place of term papers.

Seventy-seven seminaries made a total of 595 uses of the integrative techniques listed in the survey, or an average of nearly eight per seminary. A typical seminary had two classes which used student observation, one or two practicums or seminars, one class which used

field trips, and three or four classes that used one of the other integrative techniques. In a number of instances a class used several techniques, so that often only two or three classes in the seminary actually made any formal effort to integrate field-work type experiences with class work.

Table 19 presents the number of seminaries in which one or more classes used selected techniques for relating theory and practice. It also presents the total number of classes which used these techniques. Table 20 presents the number of classes per seminary which used these integrative techniques. Brief paragraphs then summarize the data on each of the techniques surveyed. It may be noted that the three general areas in which most integration was evident were: (1) practical theology (203 specific examples), (2) religious education (108 specific examples), and (3) clinical theology and counseling (twenty-three specific examples). In many instances the reply was not sufficiently specific to permit classification in this way (e. g., "field work," "senior practicum").

Seminars and practicums.-- Forty-three seminaries stated that they made regular use of practicums or seminars, while six others stated that they used them occasionally. Forty of the forty-three stated the exact number which were held. There was a total of at least 105 practicums or seminars in protestant theological schools. Of the seminaries which gave information on how many times a week seminars and practicums met, fifty stated that they met weekly; three, that they met twice a week; and eleven indicated that they met less

TABLE 19

NUMBER OF SEMINARIES\* IN WHICH ONE OR MORE CLASSES  
USED VARIOUS TECHNIQUES TO INTEGRATE FIELD WORK WITH  
CLASS WORK, AND THE TOTAL NUMBER OF CLASSES USING THESE TECHNIQUES

| Integrative Technique                         | Seminaries | Classes |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------|---------|
| Observation by students .....                 | 62         | 150     |
| Practicums or seminars .....                  | 43         | 105     |
| Field trips .....                             | 42         | 92      |
| Case studies .....                            | 30         | 45      |
| Community surveys .....                       | 35         | 44      |
| Counseling activities .....                   | 33         | 43      |
| Use of community resources .....              | 22         | 43      |
| Use of field-work report for term paper ..... | 22         | 43      |
| Participation in community projects .....     | 19         | 30      |

\* Sixty-four of the ninety-six seminars reported on this item.

TABLE 20

NUMBER OF SEMINARIES IN WHICH VARIOUS TECHNIQUES ARE USED TO INTEGRATE FIELD WORK WITH CLASS WORK, LISTED ACCORDING TO THE NUMBER OF CLASSES PER SEMINARY

| Integrative Technique                          | Number of Seminaries Having Various Numbers of Classes |    |    |    |   |   |   |
|------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|----|----|----|---|---|---|
|                                                | 1                                                      | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| Observation by students .....                  | 15                                                     | 12 | 12 | 13 | 3 |   | 1 |
| Practicums or seminars .....                   | 17                                                     | 6  | 9  | 2  |   | 5 | 1 |
| Field trips .....                              | 14                                                     | 13 | 9  | 5  | 1 |   |   |
| Case studies .....                             | 23                                                     | 4  | 2  |    |   |   | 1 |
| Community surveys .....                        | 27                                                     | 7  | 1  |    |   |   |   |
| Counseling activities .....                    | 28                                                     | 5  |    |    | 1 |   |   |
| Use of community resources .....               | 12                                                     | 5  | 1  | 2  | 2 |   |   |
| Use of field-work reports for term paper ..... | 11                                                     | 6  | 2  | 2  |   | 1 |   |
| Participation in community projects....        | 11                                                     | 6  | 1  | 1  |   |   |   |

than once a week. Seventeen seminaries reported on the length of time devoted to the seminar or practicum each week: three met for one hour; four, for two hours; six, for three hours; and three met for four hours.

Many field-work seminars and practicums were specific in character, while others were general (e. g., "general practicum," "senior practicum," "summer service preparation," "field projects," and "Christian leadership"). Among those more specific in character were "research in urban religious life," "student-movement methods," "clinical training," "Christian-education directors," "parish administration," "boys' club leaders," "professional religious leaders among college students," "pastoral care," and "pastors seminar."

Field trips.--- Forty-two seminaries reported that one or more classes made use of field trips. A total of ninety-two classes in these forty-two theological schools coordinated field trips with their class work. Of these, thirty-five classes were in the area of practical theology, seventeen were religious education classes, and thirty-eight were other courses in the practical field. A theology class was the only class outside the practical field.

Case studies.--- Thirty seminaries reported that one or more of their classes regularly had the students make case studies. A total of forty-five classes utilized case study techniques. Fifteen of these were in the area of practical theology and ten were in religious education. All of the classes were in the practical field.

Counseling.--- Thirty-three seminaries reported that one or more of their classes gave students practical experience in counseling



people. A total of forty-three classes provided this experience. Eighteen of these were in the area of practical theology, five in clinical work, and four in religious education. All were in the practical field.

Community surveys.--- Thirty-five seminaries reported that a community survey was made by one or more of their classes. The total number of classes making such surveys was forty-four, with all in the practical field. Seventeen of the classes were in the area of practical theology and four in religious education.

Participation in community projects.--- Only nineteen seminaries reported that students participated in community projects in connection with any of their classes. All thirty of the classes reported were in the practical field. Ten were in the area of practical theology and six were religious-education classes.

Use of community resources.--- Twenty-two seminaries reported a total of forty-three classes which made use of community resources. All of these classes were in the practical field. Thirteen were classes in practical theology and four were classes in religious education.

Use of field-work reports for term papers.--- Twenty-two seminaries reported having one or more classes in which a student could use a field-work report as a term paper. All forty-three of these classes were in the practical field. Fourteen were practical theology classes and thirteen were religious-education classes.

Other means of integrating field work with class work.---

Information concerning any other means used to integrate field work with class work was requested during the survey, and some helpful replies were received. Class discussions frequently provided opportunity for drawing upon the student's field-work experiences and some classes drew upon field work for data in papers or for supplying case studies for class discussion. Sermons prepared by the student for class use were at times employed in field work. Some seminaries recorded student-led services in the churches and then played these back before the class for discussion and criticism. One seminary had a religious-education club which discussed practical problems. Field-work conferences between supervisors and students were used to emphasize the inter-relations within the entire seminary program. Frequent faculty discussions of field work and its implication for class work, and teacher-teacher or teacher-field-work supervisor conferences performed integrating functions in some seminaries. Although the survey found only one subject outside of the practical field which reported making any specific attempt to integrate field work with class work, yet the survey of the literature revealed several examples (some of them quite old), and these are mentioned in the following paragraphs.

Examples of the integration of field work with class work.--

A professor of church history regularly made it a point to use assignments which had a double function. Instead of assigning a long academic discussion of "Primary and Secondary Causes of the Reformation," he would require the preparation of the necessary outlines for a Lenten series of talks on "Six Reformation Portraits" (68:95).

An instructor in church efficiency assigned a term paper which presented a summary of the student's field work. The results of two preliminary surveys were summarized under three main heads: (1) what a minister ought to know about his field, (2) how he can discover it, and (3) how he can use it. The responsible denominational official, in the area served by this seminary, stated that student pastors had improved from fifty to a hundred per cent since this program was inaugurated (167:34-35).

It was suggested that a class studying the doctrine of eternal life in theology might be assigned the writing of a five hundred word letter to a widow who had recently lost her only child (68:96).

A theology teacher always included a question related to field work in his examinations. For example, he described a sick person and the nature of his illness and then asked how the minister would use theology in ministering to this need, or he described the question of a skeptical inquirer and asked how the query should be answered (1:22).

Integrating field work with guidance.--- An effective field-work program cannot be carried on without emphasis upon student guidance. In fact, field-work supervision consists of professional and personal guidance. Some seminaries made no attempt to relate field work and guidance, while others did so only incidentally. In some, however, the field-work director had an assigned share in responsibility for student guidance, or he had the major responsibility for the seminary guidance program.

One seminary wrote, "field work is our attempt to guide the

student;" another said, "we combine them;" while yet another wrote, "the two are almost the same; everything seems field work." Two seminaries mentioned that the field-work director was the designated official responsible for both field work and guidance. On the other hand, one seminary wrote that it made no effort to relate field work and guidance. One seminary reported that every professor was responsible for guidance, that each semester a faculty conference was held to sort out problem cases, and that field work was a part of the total picture. The most frequent way in which seminaries mentioned that they related field work and guidance was through personal conferences. Of the fifty seminaries which reported how they tried to relate the two, twenty-six mentioned personal conferences.

Faculty conferences or consultations were mentioned by eight seminaries. In one seminary, personal counseling followed a group discussion by a staff of five; another seminary had a faculty guidance committee; and still another had a committee on "counseling and guidance," of which the field-work director was a member. Frequent consultation back and forth between faculty members concerning field work and guidance problems was common in some theological schools.

One seminary stated that its field-work results were the basis for its guidance program. In another theological school, a copy of the monthly field-work report was given to the faculty member who was the designated advisor for the student. The personal conferences and interviews were often largely based upon field-work reports and supervisory observations or on reports from other faculty members.

One seminary with a well-developed program made it a policy to maintain continual, informal contact with the students, and thus continuous guidance was possible. Another scheduled a monthly conference with the student. On the other hand, several seminaries implied that their efforts were usually restricted to the cases most obviously needing guidance or which showed emotional maladjustments. It was generally agreed, however, that it is far more desirable for each student to be given guidance. In the personal conferences of one seminary, which used this more thorough plan, individual plans and programs were worked out in advance, and then the field-work supervisor followed through with check-ups and reports to note how the student was progressing in the fulfillment of his plan.

In one seminary, guidance responsibility was divided among the field-work office, the employment office, and the full-time psychiatrist.

#### Basic Principles for the Integration of Theory and Practice

The basis for integration.— The basis of integration must be the growth of the student, not the logic of the subject or the logic of the activity (7:v; 74:287; 99:3-4; 118:22, 25-27; 126:19; 136:97, 100-01; 167:37-39). The curriculum must neither be subject-centered nor activity-centered; it must be student-centered, i. e., personality-oriented. The curriculum must be individualized to the need of the student (58\*). It must be suited to him (7\*, 13\*, 27\*) and meaningful for him (15\*, 19\*). A curriculum will need to be flexible (49\*) if it is to serve this purpose. New cooperative fields, perhaps cutting

across traditional subject lines, will need to be cooperatively developed. The curriculum will be functional to the degree that it serves a useful educational purpose in the growth of the student toward personal and professional effectiveness. The continuous growth of the student toward maximum personal and ministerial efficiency is to be the seminary goal and the basis for its evaluation, not the accumulation of marks on a pre-arranged sequence of courses, nor the checking off of a pre-arranged sequence of activities. The goal is guided growth, growth toward effective ministerial functioning. On such a basis must the integration be planned.

Planned integration.--- Integration must be definitely planned (74:30; 54\*). Integration cannot be assumed, nor can its benefits be presumed. Definite provision must be made for the relating of theory and practice in the way educationally most effective. Transfer values will be attained only when the teaching is definitely planned to that end (32\*).

Continuous integration.--- Integration must be continuous throughout the period of seminary study (1:24-25; 126:19). Integration must begin with the earliest orientation of the student, and must continue throughout his entire period of seminary study. Growth must be total and continuous. If the whole student is to grow, his learning must not be artificially compartmentalized at any time (8\*, 10\*, 11\*, 12\*, 48\*, 50\*). Through the utilization of observation and graded field experiences, the entire period of study may become functionally significant and integration may become characteristic of the entire

growth process (i. e., learning) for which the seminary has assumed responsibility.

Cooperative integration.--- Integration must be cooperatively undertaken (7:35; 37; 68:99; 74:30; 99:2; 53\*). Departmental or educational isolationism is psychologically unsound, educationally wasteful or even harmful, and professionally disastrous. Theoretical and practical fields need to be inter-related; teachers in these several fields need to plan together, share findings with each other, and supplement each other in their educational leadership. There must be a close relationship between those responsible for field work and those responsible for "academic" work. Mutual understanding, unity of objectives, and coordination of efforts of the entire seminary faculty and staff are a minimum essential.

Evaluated integration.--- The extent of integration must be continuously evaluated. Integration is of such importance that the degree to which it is being achieved should not be taken for granted. Its results need to be carefully evaluated. It is possible to develop integration report forms for both students and supervisors, in which the use of classroom and related learnings in the field-work activities of the student is listed, checked, or rated. Similarly, it is possible to check and evaluate the use that faculty members make of case materials developed in field work and the extent to which they are utilizing the various field-work activities to supplement their class work.

Integration and learning.--- Integration contributes to

effective, economical, and permanent learning (74:141; 99:5; 11\*, 12\*, 35\*, 50\*, 54\*). When theory and practice are integrated, interest is increased, learning experiences are more vivid, and the learning becomes more permanent. Inasmuch as one laboratory experience may contribute to understandings in several areas of study, and since a new understanding may be functional in various ways, integration of theory and practice promotes economy of learning and permits a greater range of significant curricular material to be included in the period of seminary study. Many standard activities present in unintegrated field work are mere routine and enhance the experience of the student very little if they are repeated too often.

Field work as an integrating factor.--- Field work is an integrating factor in the entire seminary curriculum (1:18; 99:14; 159:37). In field work the practical or "skill" courses and the knowledge or "content" courses find their common meeting ground. Field work increases student appreciation for courses by bringing a new recognition of their need and value and by giving needed background for them. Field work provides motivation for a thorough guidance program with genuine appeal to the student. It lays the foundation for clinical training.

The field-work department serves as a referral agency to send students to the particular faculty members who can help them with the needs, difficulties, or problems which emerge. It informs the whole faculty and administration of student progress or weakness, and provides the most crucial evaluation of the total curriculum. Field work also



serves to relate the seminary to the church and community.

### Basic Principles for the Use of Observation

#### As an Integrative Technique

It does not seem as alarming to place a theological student in a student pastorate without prior supervised observation as it does to place a surgeon's knife in the hand of a medical student who has never watched an operation, but the results may be tragic in either case. Freshmen students in teachers colleges, when observing high-school classes that they had attended the previous year, confess to the entirely different viewpoint from which they now see these classes. Similarly, the ministerial student has undoubtedly participated in church activities prior to entering the seminary, but he now sees them with a different objective, and with a new background and interest. Observation gives the student orientation to ministerial life and activity, to community needs and resources, to the problems of individuals, and to the service which the minister can render to the individuals (41:33). Observation acquaints the theological student with ministerial problems and opportunities and with the role of the minister in the church and community. It serves to relate theory and practice.

The time for observation.--- Observation is useful throughout the period of seminary training (7:89; 74:140; 199-200). The initial program of orientation to the seminary and to the field-work program at the time of registration for the junior year should depend heavily upon observation. Observation is useful as an initial overview of a

particular field-work experience. It may be related to most, if not all, seminary courses. It is useful after the completion of a specific type of field work and at the close of the seminary period to give an overview of the larger situation and to facilitate study of the inter-relation of the various parts. The student then has an experiential background which makes it possible for him to understand the situations observed and to derive helpful implications of personal value to him. In teacher education, it has been found that it is ideal to begin observation prior to student teaching and to continue it during the practice period.

Observation versus active field work.--- Observation can never be wholly separated from participation (74:140; 141:203). Observation is a part of all participation. Furthermore, observation should be made participatory. This does not imply that the observing student should be given a major responsibility, but his observation should be an active process (1\*, 9\*), physical activity not necessarily being implied. The student's observation should be based upon an understanding of the background of the situation observed so that he can, at least to some degree, evaluate what he observes. He does not simply see passively what is going on; he does something about his observation and relates the observation to his own purposes.

Observation cannot take the place of active field work (86:120). While observation is very useful, it has its limitations. Fully responsible field work should be provided each student at some time during his seminary training (20\*).

Observational techniques and aids.-- A variety of observational techniques and aids should be used (126:32-35). Report forms, check lists, and rating scales should be prepared for the specific situations or groups to be observed. Anecdotal records are sometimes needed. A case study or a survey may be of value. Sociometric studies can make definite contributions in some instances. Both one-time observations and continuing observations of the same individual or group over a period of time have value.

Preparation for observation.-- The student should be prepared for the observation (7:81-82). The student should be provided background concerning the situation to be observed, the basic principles involved during the observation, and the criteria to be used in evaluating the situation. He should be prepared by means of previous discussions and outlines. Mimeographed guide sheets are useful. The student needs to be taught how to observe, so that his observation will have definiteness and purpose. In his early observations he should not attempt too much. He should be held responsible for an evaluation of his observation through either written reports or class discussions.

The group to be observed should be given orientation (126:32-33). This orientation is essential to adequate cooperation. Furthermore, without this background there is danger of a "staged" rather than a real-life situation.

Supervised observation.-- Observation must be supervised (179:34-35). Observation may be a wasteful method unless the observations

are interpreted and related to theory. The observation must be planned, made a part of a graded sequence, coordinated with the total curriculum, evaluated, and interpreted. Observation must be scientific. It should cover an adequate range of situations, groups, and individuals. While occasional observation of a mediocre situation may be instructive, emphasis should be placed on the observation of outstanding activities. Both rural and urban church situations should be observed. Overlapping of observations should be avoided, and a variety of observational techniques should be used. Initial orientation to observational techniques may be provided. However, specific guidance and supervision will need to be given by all teachers who use observation to supplement their class work or who use observational findings obtained in connection with other courses and activities. Supervision of observation should be cooperatively undertaken. Only as observation is supervised can its full educational value be realized.

The responsibility of the supervisor in observation includes:

- (1) Indicating things to be looked for
- (2) Indicating principles involved
- (3) Providing general orientation or background
- (4) Suggesting alternate methods or approaches
- (5) Showing the relation to classwork or field work
- (6) Guiding the evaluation of the observation
- (7) Supplying the techniques needed in observation
- (8) Guiding the recording of observation notes for future use in courses and in field work
- (9) Giving needed orientation to the group being observed
- (10) Informing the faculty members and field-work supervisors of the nature of the observation to facilitate their making use of the findings (126:34-35).

Integrated observation.-- Observation should be related to the total program of the seminary (126:34). Observation should not

be undertaken as a form of "busy work." It is not an end in itself. It is an integrative technique and should facilitate the relation of theory to practice whether in subject courses or field work. It should be coordinated with all the fundamental seminary courses and activities.

Evaluated observation.-- Observation should be evaluated (126:32-33). The student should be helped to become scientific in his observation. He should not be casual or blindly receptive, but constructively critical of what he sees and hears; he should be looking objectively for facts. The student should discriminate in his observation and should not become lost in a maze of details. He should see major outlines, major strengths, and major weaknesses. There will need to be individual evaluation of the work observed and group evaluation of the experiences obtained. The entire program of observation should be evaluated. The program should be adequate in range and quality, but it should not be permitted to become uneconomical through needless repetition or overlapping.

Recorded observation.-- Information received through observation should be recorded as promptly as is feasible (7:82-83). Where possible, check lists or other means of recording activities and experiences should be used while the observation is going on. Among the observational errors which may be avoided by prompt recording are: (1) errors due to forgetting what was observed, (2) errors due to addition through false associations when recalled at a later time, and (3) errors due to the influence of suggestions at the time the observation is reported. On the other hand, the student must be helped to

think through impressions to be recorded and to beware of making snap judgments.

Observation based upon experience.-- Observation is most effective when it is built upon a background of direct experience (74:140; 141:203). After the student has had personal experience with a particular type of situation, he has a basic insight which assists him in understanding the strengths and weaknesses in other similar situations. A period of extensive observation of outstanding churches and ministers just prior to graduation would be most rewarding. This is substantiated by the fact that, while a larger percentage of inexperienced teachers rate actual student teaching above observation, a larger percentage of experienced teachers rate supervised observation of expert teachers followed by personal conferences as more valuable than actual teaching experience. The integrative function of observation is present throughout the entire course, but there are special educational values in observation based on direct experience obtained in field work.

#### Basic Principles for the Integration of Field Work with Class Work

Field work within the curriculum.-- Field work should be integrated with all departments and courses of the seminary (1:15-16; 3:261; 7:v; 48:114; 54:48; 118:22; 126:17-18; 135:92; 159:37-38, 40; 180:98-99). Every department and course should make it possible for theory and practice to grow together. Every class in the seminary should be regarded as an element of a vocational curriculum. As far as possible,

every educational experience should be planned with regard for the other educational experiences of the theological student. All should contribute to his personal and professional needs in a united and continuous program.

Professionalization of courses.--- The courses of the seminary should be professionalized (1:26; 7:24-25, 37; 84:105-06; 136:98-99). Subject matter should be treated professionally. Unless a fair percentage of the seminary courses are "professionalized," it is doubtful whether the seminary can legitimately be termed a professional school. The professionalization of courses involves both content and method. The subject matter must have a definite bearing upon the actual work of the ministry. It must provide a content background for religious instruction, ministerial counseling, and preaching. Emphasis must be placed on the significance of the content for men and the church, and it must be shown how this content functions as a resource in ministerial work. Methodologically, there must be a conscious organization of the learning materials and experiences with regard to the professional responsibilities of the future minister.

The professionalization of subject matter involves assisting the ministerial student to see, understand, or use:

- (1) The psychology of the subject (e. g., how to adapt it to the comprehension of the hearers)
- (2) The history of the subject and the role it has played in the development and life of the church
- (3) Values which the subject holds for the minister himself

- (4) Present aims and ministerial practices in regard to the subject
- (5) Principles for selecting and organizing the materials of the subject for ministerial use
- (6) Specific difficulties in presenting the material
- (7) Literature of the subject (providing a basis for further study)
- (8) Actual sermon construction (using course materials)
- (9) Evaluation of the results from various methods of using the materials of the course in ministerial activity.

While not all of the above items may be possible in the case of every seminary course, they should be generally possible.

Field-work materials for course use.--- Field work provides basic materials of value in the regular courses (1:23; 118:17-18; 156:26, 28, 34, 45; 159:35, 40). An adequate program of field-work reporting and recording makes available to all faculty members a wealth of material fundamental to or related to their courses. From participation in field-work seminars, the faculty member can gain new insights into how his subject area is, or is not, being used by the students during their ministerial activities. Case materials can be developed in connection with the field-work program, and they can serve many purposes in the various courses.

Field work as a form of evaluation.--- Field work provides the best means, perhaps, of evaluating the effectiveness of the curriculum and the teaching methods used (3:261; 118:18). The practical



activities of the student provide the testing ground for classroom theory and the professional content of the courses. Practical activities also provide opportunity for the tryout of skills learned in connection with the courses. The final test of teaching is the ability of the student to apply the knowledge.

The most integrative type of field work.-- The more responsible and active the student's participation in adequately supervised field work, the more satisfactory his integration of theory and practice tends to become (48:212; 74:141; 114:91-92; 124:1381). The more the student recognizes the real inter-relationships, the more unified and effective his learning will become (15\*, 35\*, 50\*). Graduates of theological seminaries frequently complain that they were not adequately prepared for the actual problems of the ministry. For the most part, this means that their field work was not adequately integrated with subject-matter courses.

The teacher and integration.-- The teacher is the major factor in the integration of class work with field work (1:26; 15:352, 361; 74:217; 140:11; 159:32, 37). The personality of the teacher is more important than the organization of the curriculum. The teacher must not merely recognize the possibility of integration; he must be well adjusted himself and must integrate theory and practice within his own thinking and teaching. Efforts at integration are handicapped if the subject-matter teacher is not or has never been a successful minister. A teacher who is not interested in the practical results of his classroom theories has no legitimate place on the seminary faculty. The

seminary has no room for one who is a subject-matter specialist only. This does not mean that all class content must be limited to that which will have immediate professional utility, but it does mean that all subjects should be treated professionally.

The focus of concern is not a departmental or academic specialty; it is the growth and development of effective ministers of the gospel. The seminary must not be an aggregate of departments; it must be a unified institution devoted to guiding the personal and professional growth of its students. The objectives of the seminary should focus on the student (40\*), and every faculty and staff member should agree in principle with the seminary objectives. The professional education of the student is the united responsibility of all faculty members. An individualistic or departmental approach will lead to conflicting goals, overlapping of content and experience, inadequate use of resources, lack of balance within the curriculum, and student disintegration. To avoid such an unintegrated approach, staff members and students must continually coordinate their efforts. If all faculty members do not share in some aspect of field-work supervision, provision should at least be made for representatives of the different instructional departments to attend field-work seminars, practicums, and group conferences of student-ministers and supervisors.

#### Basic Principles for the Integration of Field Work with Guidance

Responsibility for guidance.-- Every faculty member and field-work supervisor has a responsibility for guidance (45:319; 65:10, 17;

108:130; 124:931). There is a growing recognition among educators that the guidance viewpoint must permeate all teaching and supervision. The over-all purpose of education is the guidance of the growth of the student. A division of work and responsibility is necessary, but all should recognize the obligation of using their functions to further student growth.

Each student should have one individual who has been assigned special guidance responsibility for him (65:17; 108:44). If the faculty member to whom the student is assigned does not participate in field-work supervision, he should keep in close contact with the field-work office, since field-work supervision provides some of the most vital insights into student needs, potentialities, and growth. The more ideal arrangement is where faculty loads are adjusted so that every faculty member has some supervisory responsibility and serves as advisor to the students he supervises.

One individual should be assigned responsibility for coordinating the guidance program (108:48). This individual may be a guidance specialist. Often, however, the field-work director is the logical one to head up this program. A faculty committee (guidance committee or field-work committee) may be made responsible for the guidance program, but the chairman of this committee would then be the one with chief coordinating responsibility.

Specialists in guidance.-- Guidance frequently requires the services of a specialist (108:41-42). The advisor or supervisor needs to recognize his own limitations and utilize the aid of all who can

render service. Each faculty member is somewhat of a specialist in his own teaching area, and should be brought into the guidance and supervisory program as needed. In addition, outside specialists such as psychologists, psychiatrists, medical doctors, and others should be called in as need is indicated.

Guidance based on information.-- Guidance must be on the basis of adequate information concerning the student (65:17-18; 108:40; 124:931). Inasmuch as student information is essential to field-work placement, field-work supervision, and guidance, it is logical that guidance and field-work supervision be closely related, and, if possible, integrated into a single unified program. Both guidance and field-work supervision require a comprehensive evaluation of the whole student; both should be cooperative procedures.

Continuous guidance.-- Guidance should be continuous (44:7; 65:12-13; 108:32-33). Guidance, like supervision and evaluation, should continue throughout the period of the student's field work and seminary study.

Complete guidance.-- Guidance should deal with the whole student (44:7; 65:20; 108:38-39). The whole student learns, grows, and develops (8\*). Any problem may lead to areas of need which involve the whole student. The field-work director or student advisor responsible for guidance may need to deal with problems which appear to be essentially physical, spiritual, social, psychological, or vocational, but which rapidly develop into total problems of the whole personality.

Guidance for all.-- Guidance should be provided for all students (44:6-7; 65:16-17; 108:36-37). Every student should be helped to maximum growth. Guidance and supervision should not be merely remedial or preventive, but should be constructive and creative. Every student needs guidance, the well-adjusted as well as the obviously maladjusted.

Self-guidance.-- Guidance should lead to self-guidance (44:4, 8; 74:247, 251; 319-20; 108:35-36; 5\*; 21\*; 29\*). Just as supervision must lead to self-supervision and evaluation to self-evaluation, so the student should be helped to understand his own potentialities, needs, and resources so that he can assume increasing responsibility for his own guidance in accordance with our democratic philosophy of education (44\*).

Integration of guidance with supervision.-- The integration of guidance with supervision promotes the most adequate and economical program both in guidance and in field-work supervision. Almost every principle discussed in the preceding paragraphs is applicable to both guidance and supervision. If the two functions are separated, there is bound to be overlapping and there may be gaps. Educators are coming to realize that guidance is almost synonymous with the best understanding of the words "teaching," "education," and "supervision" (78:194; 108:21-23; 124:930). However, it is wise to emphasize both guidance and supervision until an adequate program for each is established.

### Integrating Clinical Pastoral Training with Field Work

It was not originally the intention of this survey to give consideration to the role of clinical pastoral training in theological education. During the personal visits to the seminaries, however, it became apparent that the field-work directors were very much concerned about the clinical training program and its relation to the total seminary curriculum. Considerable regret was expressed over the fact that the seminary had so little control over the clinical training program. On the other hand, many expressed deep satisfaction over the benefits their students had derived from a period of clinical training. It soon became evident that no discussion of field work in general, or of its supervision and integration with other aspects of the curriculum, could avoid consideration of the clinical training program.

Historical development of clinical pastoral training.-- Clinical pastoral training is also called "clinical theology." The term "clinical year" has been used to apply to a full year of clinical pastoral training and also to a full year of internship, regardless of the kind of field work done during that year. This section deals only with clinical theology.

Clinical pastoral training was pioneered in Cincinnati in 1923 under Dr. William C. Keller. Keller supervised four Episcopalian theological students from an Ohio seminary in their field work in Cincinnati mental and social institutions. This program began to grow, but it was soon transferred elsewhere (192:111).

In 1925 Worcester State Hospital in Massachusetts accepted

four Boston seminary students as ward orderlies under the supervision of Anton T. Boisen, then chaplain at Worcester. Dr. Helen Flanders Dunbar, also of the Worcester staff, and Dr. Richard C. Cabot were influential in securing seminary interest in clinical training during these early years. In 1930 the Council for Clinical Training was incorporated at Boston by Cabot, Boisen, William A. Bryan, William Healy, Henry Wise Hobson, Ashley Day Leavitt, and Samuel A. Eliot (14:47; 45:2). There has been a gradual but steady expansion of the work of the Council since that time.

For five years during the middle nineteen-thirties, the Earhart Foundation subsidized clinical work under the leadership of Andover Newton Theological Seminary. Seven seminaries and eight institutions cooperated in this program. The Institute for Pastoral Care has since been founded in Boston. The Institute is an interdenominational organization under the direction of Rev. Rollin J. Fairbanks. It published for several years the Journal of Pastoral Care. It conducts clinical courses for graduate pastors each summer, and is a co-sponsor for the Pastoral Counseling Center in Boston, which serves clergy and lay people of any denomination. The Institute for Pastoral Care and the Council for Clinical Training are co-sponsors of national conferences on clinical pastoral training. Since 1950 the Journal of Clinical Pastoral Work and the Journal of Pastoral Care, both first published in 1947, have been merged under the title, The Journal of Pastoral Care, under the sponsorship of the Council for Clinical Training (147:1).

At the present time, the Council for Clinical Training has training centers in the following institutions:

**Mental Hospitals:**

Bellevue Hospital, New York, N. Y.  
 Elgin State Hospital, Elgin, Illinois  
 Independence State Hospital, Independence, Iowa  
 Larned State Hospital, Larned, Kansas  
 Manteno State Hospital, Manteno, Illinois  
 New Hampshire State Hospital, Concord, N. H.  
 New Jersey State Hospital, Greystone Park, N. J.  
 New Jersey State Hospital, Trenton, N. J.  
 Norristown State Hospital, Norristown, Pennsylvania  
 Norwich State Hospital, Norwich, Connecticut  
 Philadelphia State Hospital, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  
 Saint Elizabeths Hospital, Washington, D. C.  
 South Carolina State Hospital, Columbia, S. C.  
 State Hospital, Little Rock, Arkansas

**General Hospitals:**

Bellevue Hospital, New York, N. Y.  
 Cook County Hospital, Chicago, Illinois  
 Episcopal Hospital, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  
 Freedmen's Hospital, Washington, D. C.  
 Gallinger Municipal Hospital, Washington, D. C.

**Penal and Correctional Institutions:**

D. C. Penal Institutions, Lorton, Virginia  
 Federal Correctional Institution, Talahassee, Florida  
 Federal Detention Headquarters, New York, N. Y.  
 Federal Reformatory, Chillicothe, Ohio  
 Federal Reformatory, El Reno, Oklahoma  
 Illinois State Training School for Boys, St. Charles, Illinois  
 National Training School for Boys, Washington, D. C.

The Council consists of about twenty-five trained chaplains conducting clinical pastoral training in the afore-mentioned institutions. The Board of Governors is chosen from professional and lay groups. There is an advisory committee of theological educators, physicians, psychiatrists, and others.

Objectives of clinical pastoral training.-- The Council for Clinical Training states the following as its objectives:



1. To enable the student to gain understanding of people, their deeper motivations and difficulties, and their emotional and spiritual strengths and weaknesses
2. To help the student develop effective pastoral methods for ministering to people, recognizing his unique resources, responsibilities and limitations as a clergyman
3. To help the student learn how to work cooperatively with representatives of other professions and to utilize community resources
4. To encourage a desire for further understanding of religion and life, particularly such as may be obtained through appropriate research (45:3).

Standards for selection of training centers.--- Only the institutions which meet the standards of the Council are approved for training purposes. Twenty-five institutions are now on the approved list. The criteria that must be met by the institution desiring approval are:

1. Excellence in their field
2. Orientation toward and an operating program of cure or rehabilitation for patients and inmates
3. An approved, fully qualified chaplain-supervisor as a regular member of the staff
4. Sufficient inmates or patients who are good subjects for study and supervised pastoral work
5. Facilitation for groups of theological students (including access to confidential case records)
6. Institutional supervision through another staff member (in addition to the chaplain)
7. Institutional maintenance for students while they are in training (45:5).

Organization of the training program.--- The minimum time for which a student is accepted is twelve weeks. The trend is toward a full year of clinical training. Theological students reside at the institution during their period of clinical work. Active clergymen are able to arrange for part-time training and short courses at some

of the centers. When a theological student spends a full clinical year, the time is usually divided between a mental hospital and either, or both, of the other two types of training centers (general hospitals and penal institutions).

In the acceptance of trainees, first preference is always given to theological students, while clergymen and other religious workers receive second preference. Occasionally students of other professions are accepted, but this is not encouraged. The summer quarter is almost exclusively reserved for theological students. No supervisor is permitted to accept more than six students at one time. Three to six students are considered to be the optimum number. Academic credit for clinical pastoral training is granted only by the theological schools. The Council furnishes reports and marks to these seminaries upon request.

The content of the clinical training program.-- The training program provides for an orientation period, regular interviews with selected patients or inmates plus less intensive study of others, and careful observation, recording, and evaluation of data. The student does selected reading, has clinical studies, and participates in group discussions. There are contacts with community social agencies. The student has regular conferences with the chaplain-supervisor for personal and professional guidance, and he attends staff conferences. These twelve topics are always treated during the course:

1. The growth and development of the individual
2. The structure of society
3. The interrelationships of the individual and the group

4. Common factors which interfere with the optimum development of the individual or the group (sources of conflict)
5. The meaning of illness or delinquency (as attempts to meet or avoid conflict)
6. The techniques of therapy: individual and group
7. The clergyman as counselor
8. The clergyman-counselor as related to other counselors
9. The church as a group
10. The clergyman as leader of the religious group
11. The relation of the church to other groups
12. The correlation of sacraments, rites and other religious resources, such as preaching, prayer and the Scriptures, with secular concepts (45:4-5).

Supervision and methods used in clinical training.--- Two types of supervision are furnished the theological student during his residence at a training center (39:375). The chaplain exercises theological supervision, and the institutional supervisor designated for this task provides institutional supervision. An attempt is thus made to keep the student primarily oriented to his professional responsibility as a minister, and likewise to the institution and its routine. In this way, the theological student, the patient, and the institution are protected from misdirected emphasis or exploitation.

The two major methods used are: (1) direct experience in relationships with persons under stress and (2) a study of the results of the experiences, observations, and research of others (45:4). The student keeps careful notes of all interviews and submits these to his supervisor at least once a week. These records form the basis for weekly student-supervisor conferences which last, on an average, two hours or longer. "Life history studies," i. e., case studies stressing the relevance of religion, theology, and the church, are made for the individuals selected for the most intensive study.

About two-thirds of the seminars are conducted by the supervisor. Emphasis is placed upon the growth and development of the person in religion, the treatment he has received or is receiving in the institution, and what the church or pastor might have done in the past or should now do. Other seminar sessions are conducted by representatives of other professions. Visits are made to other nearby institutions and agencies, and reference reading lists are furnished.

Great emphasis is placed on the growth of the individual theological student through his interaction with his fellow-trainees. This is a form of group therapy. Often students feel that their greatest gain has been a deeper awareness of their own interpersonal relations (33:15). As a result of this new insight, the student is able to be much more sensitive to the needs of others and yet be less personally and emotionally involved in his relations with those whom he is helping. The non-directive approach is used throughout.

Both the individual student and the student group tend to go through definite stages of growth (109:40-43). As the individual student begins to assess himself, he first tends to be defensive, then passes through a stage of anxiety, after which he increasingly tends to express personal feeling. Then comes a period of increasing introspection as the student becomes more and more aware of basic psychological mechanisms. Finally, his personal development becomes more mature and is characterized by spontaneity. Not all students reach this final stage of spontaneous interaction.

The first stage of the group growth is characterized by

"testing-out," with most of the initiative left to the leader and little group interaction. The second stage of this non-directive approach tends to be one of resistance to the leader and some hostility because of his refusal to "give all the answers." The third stage is one of acceptance as the student-members of the group begin to understand the method and learn to appreciate the importance of being made to think things through for themselves. The group begins to take over the responsibility for the discussions and tends to analyze its own group processes. The final stage is one of responsibility, with the group functioning in a well-organized and productive way and, ideally, with every member feeling responsible for the group action and decisions.

The chaplain-supervisor is the key figure (109:43-44). His attitudes and methods set the standard for the group. He serves as a catalyst. He is responsible, also, for seeing that the training is definitely theological and that the student comes out as an increasingly mature and understanding minister, able to assist in the cure of souls (not just a student who has a superficial knowledge of a few psychological techniques and who has become an extremist on psychiatry).

Clinical training statistics.-- Twenty-five training institutions are now approved by the Council for Clinical Training. There are nearly thirty approved supervisors. Over twelve hundred theological students and ministers have received clinical training. About one hundred students are enrolled across the country during the summer quarter; fifteen to twenty are enrolled in each of the other quarters.

The 1950 enrollment was about two hundred. Twenty-seven seminaries now cooperate with the Council for Clinical Training. In most of these seminaries clinical training is optional. At the Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary in Virginia, at Alexandria, Virginia, clinical training is a graduation requirement.

Integrating clinical training with the seminary curriculum.--

There is a definite trend to include clinical training during some part of the period of seminary study (68:96; 104:106). Some of the most active leaders in clinical training, however, have pointed to limitations in the clinical program as it is now organized (34:68-70; 68:96; 92:245). Most of these criticisms have been concerned with integration.

Clinical training has been criticized as having more momentum than orientation and as falling short in the preparation of men for the parish ministry. Deans of theological seminaries and field-work directors interviewed during this survey expressed apprehension or regret that the theological seminary had so little control over the clinical program. While theological educators serve on the advisory committee of the Council for Clinical Training, the Council itself consists of chaplain-supervisors. These chaplain-supervisors, in some instances, served as part-time faculty members, yet the seminaries through their field-work departments exercised no direct supervision over the student during his period of clinical training. Some field-work directors felt that too frequently students who went into clinical training failed to return to the regular ministry. Others complained

that the students most lacking in emotional maturity tended to gravitate toward clinical training because of their own personal needs, and that there had been inadequate screening of candidates. They felt that these students tended to become extremists on psychiatry. There was an acknowledgement on the part of some, however, that these complaints were now less valid than formerly.

It is evident that one of the prime needs in connection with clinical training is a better mutual understanding between seminary representatives and leaders in clinical training. This is a first requisite to the adequate integration of clinical training with the seminary curriculum.

There is also a need for more adequate preparation of the student for their clinical training (68:99). If the vocational background of the student is deficient, the "practical" training may be impractical. It might prove desirable for the seminary to require certain courses as prerequisites to clinical training. It might be desirable to restrict clinical training to the latter part of the seminary period, so that the student would have more adequate theological background and greater spiritual resources when he began this training in a separate institution. Some field-work directors felt that clinical work should not be permitted until after the student had engaged in fully responsible ministerial work as a pastor or in home missionary work.

Another possible step in the integration of clinical work with the full seminary curriculum would be the maintenance of some

degree of seminary supervision during the period of clinical training. It might be desirable for the field-work supervisor to attend one or more of the seminar sessions at the training center, where feasible, in order that he might observe the reactions of the student, have a personal conference with the student, and also have a personal conference with the chaplain-supervisor. The Council had a report sheet which it sent to the seminaries within two weeks after the close of the training period. An essay-type report was often sent along with this sheet. It is possible that a joint conference of clinical leaders and field-work directors might develop a more adequate system of mutual exchange of data concerning the student and his growth, and might develop a more adequate system of reporting.

A seminary follow-up program after the period of clinical training might also serve to promote better integration. It was suggested that a practicum the year following the summer clinical work might review, analyze, and summarize the values of the summer experience (14:54). It is possible that some related field-work activity might be participated in during the year following the clinical training. This might involve hospital visitation or counseling activities in the pastorate. The case materials developed and the insights gained should be freely drawn upon in the regular seminary courses.

#### Areas of Need

This chapter has discussed one of the most crucial phases of the field-work program. Integration has been greatly neglected.



While the thesis of the principles developed is that the integration of theory and practice can be planned, that theory and practice can be kept parallel, and that the results of integration can be evaluated so as to become increasingly effective, yet the survey has shown that this is still unknown in any adequate or regularly scheduled way. Needs in the three main areas of concern in this chapter are now discussed.

The integration of field work with class work.--- These needs have been shown:

There is need for cooperative study of the possibilities of integrating field work with class work. There is little indication of the awareness of the possibilities, values, and need for such integration. Misunderstanding on the part of other faculty members and departments can be largely dispelled by means of cooperative study. The dean or president of the seminary is the one to institute and lead such a program, but the field-work director has an important role.

There is need for cooperative development of techniques for more adequate integration of field work with class work. These procedures may be developed within each seminary by a committee consisting of representatives of the various departments and the field-work director.

An "integration form" is an example of a possible technique. Three-by-five inch cards might be prepared with a place for such items as place, time, occasion of the incident, knowledge or skill used, insights gained, related curricular areas, problems raised, information

desired, and a place to be checked if the student desired a personal conference. These cards might be used by the students in connection with their field work, and given to the director each Monday. They might be distributed by the director to the faculty members whose subject areas were used in the field-work or whose courses are related to the problems or issues raised. This type of form would make the faculty members aware of how closely their subjects are related to field work, and provide them with useful suggestions. It would also facilitate more adequate guidance than would be otherwise possible, and would be a valuable form of field-work report.

There is need for professionalizing the instruction of all the seminary classes. This is especially urgent in the subjects not in the practical field. Without such professionalization of the curriculum, the seminary is not a professional school in the strict sense of the term.

There is need for a planned program of student observation. Observation should be carefully prepared for, adequately supervised, and integrated with the total seminary program. A planned observation program will make class learnings more meaningful, give orientation to the student, prepare for field work, and will help to relate theory and practice. Just prior to graduation a new emphasis should be given to observation of outstanding examples of ministerial work.

The integration of field work with guidance.-- Field work has been more closely related to guidance than to any other aspect of the curriculum. Few seminaries, however, have given adequate emphasis

to guidance or have made their entire faculty guidance-conscious.

There is a need for providing more adequate supervisory guidance for all the students all the time. This aid must be constructive, concerned with the whole student, and it should be provided continuously throughout the seminary period. The ideal solution would be for every faculty member to share in the supervision of some student field work and to serve as faculty advisor for those he supervises.

The integration of clinical training with field work and the entire curriculum.-- There has been almost no integration of clinical training with field work or any other aspect of the curriculum.

There is need for clinical training to be made more definitely pastoral training. Fairbanks, director of the Institute for Pastoral Care, stated: "In our enthusiasm over pastoral methods, psychiatry, and psychoanalysis we have come perilously close to losing sight of our original vocation" (68:97). Cabot and Dicks (39:376) have stated: "Most students are still occupied in various useful activities but not as Christian ministers" (39:376). Bruder, editor of the Journal of Pastoral Care, wrote "...what we call clinical pastoral training falls short of its objective in preparing men for a parish ministry... this is not parish training--it is hospital training" (34:68-69). Fairbanks further stated: "Whereas the plea only a few years ago was that we incorporate clinical training into theological education, now our educators are rightly beginning to insist that we incorporate some theology into clinical training!" (68:97).

There is need for providing clinical pastoral training in parishes. Training in mental institutions, general hospitals, or penal and corrective institutions is most helpful, but it is not sufficient for prospective ministers. Each student should have a period of supervised clinical training in a parish. This would necessitate a longer seminary period (39:376). Bruder suggested that a fourth year of professional training on this level should lead to a doctor's degree (34:69-70).

There is need for closer coordination of efforts by the seminary and the clinical-training center. This coordination involves seminary preparation of the student for his clinical period, mutual exchange of information and reports on the student, and follow-up work under the guidance of the seminary field-work director.

The seminary supervisor should have some share in the supervision of the student, even when he is at the training center. All of the student's reports and records covering the period of clinical training should be available to the field-work director.

#### Summary

The term "integration" is primarily used in this dissertation to refer to relating theory and practice. Integration plays an important role in education, but theological educators have thus far done little to integrate field work with the other aspects of the curriculum.

Sixty-two seminaries reported over a hundred and fifty classes

which made use of observation as an integrative technique. Seventy-seven seminaries reported 595 uses of the integrative techniques surveyed. Only one class outside of the practical field was reported to use any of these integrative techniques. Courses in practical theology reported nearly twice as many uses of integrative techniques as did courses in religious education.

Forty-nine seminaries had a total of 105 practicums or seminars. Forty-two seminaries reported a total of ninety-two classes which used field trips, and thirty seminaries reported that a total of forty-five classes used case study techniques. Counseling experience was provided in forty-three classes of thirty-three seminaries. Thirty-five seminaries had a total of forty-four classes making use of community surveys, but only nineteen seminaries (thirty classes) reported participation in community projects. Twenty-two seminaries had a total of forty-three classes which made use of community resources. In forty-three classes of twenty-two seminaries it was possible for a student to submit a field-work report in place of a term paper. Other means of integrating field work with class work were reported by a few seminaries.

Field work was more closely integrated with guidance than with any other aspect of the curriculum. Fifty seminaries reported ways in which they related the two, personal conferences being the method mentioned most frequently.

Basic principles were developed for the integration of theory and practice, for the use of observation as an integrative technique,

for integrating field work with class work, and for integrating field work with guidance. A total of thirty-four basic principles were developed.

It was stated that the basis for integration should be the growth of the student, and that integration should be planned, continuous, cooperative, and evaluated regularly. Integration contributes to effective, economical, and permanent learning. Field work serves as an integrating factor within the curriculum.

Observation should be used throughout the period of seminary study. It can never be wholly separated from participation, but it cannot take the place of active field work. A variety of observational techniques and aids should be used. The student and the group to be observed should be prepared for the observation. Observation should be supervised, integrated, evaluated, and recorded. It is most effective when based upon experience.

Field work should be integrated with all departments and courses of the seminary, and all seminary courses should be professionalized. Field work provides basic materials for the regular courses and serves as a form of evaluation for the total curriculum. The most integrative type of field work is that which provides the most responsible experience and which is most adequately supervised. The teacher is the major factor in integration.

Every faculty member and field-work supervisor has a responsibility for student guidance. Some individual should have assigned responsibility for each student, but one person should be responsible

for coordinating the guidance program. Guidance specialists should be used as needed. Guidance should be based on adequate information and should be continuous, complete, and provided for all. Guidance should lead to self-guidance. The integration of guidance with field-work supervision provides the best program for both.

Clinical pastoral training has had a slow but steady growth since its inception in 1923. The Council for Clinical Training is the major organization in this field, although the Institute for Pastoral Care performs a very useful function. The Council has clear objectives and careful standards for the selection of training centers. A twelve-week period is the minimum in the clinical training program; the Council recommends a year's training. Not more than six students may work with one chaplain-supervisor at a time. Supervision is provided by the chaplain-supervisor and by an institutional representative.

The clinical training program utilizes direct experience in relationships with persons under stress and the study of similar activities and research by others. The student has experience in case studies, makes extensive notes, and has weekly conferences with his supervisor. He attends seminars and staff conferences. The inter-relations within the trainee group are used for group therapy.

Twenty-five mental hospitals, general hospitals, and penal institutions are now approved as training centers, about thirty chaplains are members of the Council, and over twelve hundred students and others have received training. Twenty-seven seminaries now

cooperate with the Council for Clinical Training.

Clinical training has not been sufficiently integrated with the seminary curriculum, seminaries have little supervision of the program, and there have been misunderstandings between seminary officials and clinical leaders. Students need to be more adequately prepared for this training, some seminary supervision should be maintained over the student during his training, and a seminary follow-up program should be developed.

A number of areas of need were discussed. There is need for cooperative study of the integration of field work with class work, for cooperative development of integrative techniques, for making the instruction of all seminary classes professional, and for a planned program of student observation. There is need for more adequate and continuous supervisory guidance, with field-work supervision and guidance becoming one integrated program. Clinical training should be made more definitely pastoral training, with provision for some training in the parishes. There is also need for closer coordination of the efforts of the seminaries and clinical training centers.



## CHAPTER X

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

All ninety-six seminaries belonging to the American Association of Theological Schools and situated in the United States were included in this survey of the field-work practices, and in particular of the supervision of field work, in protestant theological education. After presenting the problem and its setting, this research summarizes basic psychological and educational principles applicable to field work in theological education, and describes the role of direct experience in professional education. It then summarizes seminary practice, basic principles, and major areas of need for the following aspects of field work: administration, placement, supervision, evaluation, records and reports, and integration with the other aspects of the curriculum. It concludes with a statement of needed research in the area of field-work supervision in theological schools.

#### The Problem and Its Setting

Purpose of the study.--- The specific purpose of this study was to survey field-work supervision in theological education, to develop basic principles essential to an adequate program of field-work supervision, and to state the major areas needing emphasis in field-work supervision.

Historical background.--- Although the first colleges established during the colonial period were essentially theological schools, beginning with 1774, schools devoted primarily to training

for the ministry, some denominational and others undenominational, were founded. The American Association of Theological Schools, the only accrediting body for protestant theological seminaries in the United States, was formed in 1918.

Delimitations of the study.-- This study was limited to an investigation of field-work practices, with special emphasis on supervision, in those seminaries located within the United States which were members of the American Association of Theological Schools. Field work was considered to include the practical activities of the theological student during his seminary training that furnished him experiences in the types of work commonly engaged in by ministers.

Related studies and justification of this study.-- The survey of theological education, conducted by Kelly in 1921, made almost no mention of field work. Foster's study of field work and its relation to the curriculum of theological seminaries, included in the four-volume report on The Education of American Ministers, was published in 1934. Foster suggested that emphasis should be placed on grading and supervising the field-work experiences of the theological students.

The Status of Field Work in the Protestant Theological Seminaries in the United States, completed by Morgan in 1942, is the only other published study on field work. In this survey Morgan sent a nine-item questionnaire to the theological schools, studied intensively the field work of forty selected seminaries, and made a questionnaire study of the field work of selected seminary seniors. His conclusions pointed to a need for: (1) a treatise on the basic philosophy of

field work, (2) the establishment of standards for the selection of field-work activities, (3) a treatise on the principles and techniques of field-work supervision, and (4) opportunity for seminars to exchange information regarding field work.

There was a rapid increase in interest and activity in field work during the decade following Morgan's study. Two field-work conferences were held, many addresses given, and articles written concerning various aspects of field work. Both Morgan and Nevin C. Harner, executive secretary of the American Association of Theological Schools, stated that there was need for a new study of field-work supervision, and both approved the general procedure and scope of the present study.

Contribution of the study to education.-- This research provides the first detailed study of field-work supervision involving the entire membership of the accrediting association in theological education. It has developed the first comprehensive statement of basic principles (231 are stated) underlying field work in theological education and its supervision. By bringing together practices and principles, it has made possible for the first time a critical evaluation of the adequacy of supervised field work in American protestant theological education.

Investigational procedure.-- First a survey was made of the literature dealing with: (1) field work in theological education, (2) psychological and curricular principles underlying field work in professional education, and (3) supervision of field work in teacher education. On the basis of information gained from these preliminary

surveys, a basic questionnaire was constructed, tested and revised, and sent to all member seminaries of the American Association of Theological Schools. Fifty-four of these seminaries and three centers for clinical training were visited by the writer in person. The complete data were recorded, tabulated, and analyzed. On the basis of the information from the survey of literature and the survey of seminary practices, basic principles were developed for all major aspects of field-work supervision in theological education. All data gathered were compared with the basic principles developed, and suggestions then given to strengthen seminary practices.

#### Basic Psychological and Educational Principles

The following psychological and educational principles were selected as particularly applicable to theological education.

The nature of the learner.--- The theological student is a dynamic, active being. He is a unique social individual who reacts intelligently, purposefully, and creatively. At any specified time he is ready for certain learnings and he always learns as a whole.

The nature of learning.--- Learning is an active process that leads to multiple results. It is facilitated by responding to whole situations and is made more meaningful and permanent by the integration of all the factors involved. Learning is facilitated by proceeding from the known to the unknown, by an individually adapted curriculum, and by meaningful experiences. It is facilitated by a problem approach, by variety of experiences, by practice, and by consciousness

of the goal. Proper guidance at the right time and the learner's self-evaluation of his efforts are essential. Retention of learning is aided by review at strategic times in ways which provide for new, meaningful organization of the material. Learning is facilitated by social interaction, an effective student-teacher relation, and wholesome mental hygiene on the part of the student.

The motivation of learning.--- Learning is motivated by interest, an aspiration level which is reasonable, and the experience of success. It is also motivated by a self-responsible attitude, knowledge of results, and group approval.

Transfer in learning.--- Transfer must be directly taught for, and it is aided by developing an expectation of transfer values. It is facilitated by identical or common elements in the two situations, by pointing out relationships, by meaningful learning materials and experiences, and by diversified illustration and application of generalizations.

Curricular objectives.--- Curricular objectives should be comprehensive, dynamic, stated clearly in terms of the behavior of the student-minister, organized in a careful way, and revised as needed.

The content and nature of the curriculum.--- The curriculum should be based on a sound educational psychology and a democratic philosophy. It should provide much direct experience, including responsible experiences of real-life significance. The curriculum should be comprehensive, flexible, and should be an integrated whole emphasizing social interaction at all points.

The organization and utilization of the curriculum.-- While basic curricular content should be selected by experts, details should be pupil-teacher planned. The curriculum should be cooperatively developed and organized, and it should facilitate learning in natural settings. The sequence of the curriculum should be determined by a variety of factors and it should be enriched by adequate aids to learning. It should be continuously evaluated and revised.

#### The Role of Direct Experience in Professional Education

Direct experience is essential in professional education. It provides background, makes academic work meaningful, and gives orientation to the profession. It is given a very large role in dental, medical, and engineering education, and is playing an increasingly important role in law, teacher, and theological education.

There is a close parallel between field work in teacher education and in theological education. Student teaching is now the most universal and highly valued requirement for teacher certification. Increasing emphasis is being placed upon observation prior to and during student teaching. In student teaching, limited participation is followed by full-time teaching for a period under the supervision of a critic teacher and a supervisor from the teachers college. There is a direct trend toward increasing the amount and range of teaching experience and integrating it with the rest of the curriculum.

Field work is almost universal in theological education and a wide range of activities are participated in by theological students.

Seminaries are increasingly providing for the supervision of field work, although field-work evaluation and the integration of field work with other aspects of the curriculum have been little emphasized. Supervised field work serves many important functions within the seminary and for the students and the institutions served.

#### The Administration of Field Work in Theological Education

The ninety-six seminaries which participated in this study had 11,781 regular students, of whom 6,263 engaged in supervised field work and 2,715 did not participate in any type of field work. Adequate information was not furnished concerning the others. Sixty-seven seminaries required field work for graduation, a full year or more being specified by most of them. The forty-four field-work activities listed in the survey were widely participated in by most of these schools. The "average" seminary required four types of field work and had students participating in twenty-two varieties of activity. More emphasis was placed on religious-education activities than on those listed under preaching, visitation, social service, musical leadership, or others. Most emphasis was placed on field work during the seminary year, some on summer field work and clinical training, and least on the intern year.

A majority of the students received financial remuneration for their field work. A few seminaries supplemented with their own funds the compensation received by these students from the places they served. Few seminaries required students to report their field-work earnings.

Thirty seminaries recommended a minimum scale of remuneration for field work, but there was no general agreement on what constituted adequate remuneration. One seminary recommended a scale thirty-five times that of another. Variations were recommended according to the type of field work, the amount of time required, the size of the student's family, travel expenses, and similar items.

Most denominations exercised no jurisdiction over field-work programs. In twenty-one seminaries the field-work director was responsible for follow-up studies of graduates of the seminary.

Basic principles underlying field-work administration.-- The seminary should capitalize on all the direct experiences of the student. Field work should be supervised, and a graded sequence of field activities should be provided for the entire period of seminary training. Each student should have a variety of types of field experience, including orientation to both urban and rural life. Clinical training in hospitals and penal institutions is desirable, but is no substitute for other field work. The student should be provided experiences for which he has full responsibility, and a continuity of experiences individualized to his needs. Summer field work and intern experiences should be supervised by the seminary. Each seminary should adapt its field-work program to its own circumstances and possibilities.

The field-work director should be qualified, and should devote most of his time to supervision of field activities, working in close cooperation with the faculty and administration. All faculty members should share in the supervision of field work and its integration with



the total program. Denominational and organizational supervision should be under the leadership of the seminary.

Field work contributes to the integration of the entire curriculum. Field-work seminars and practicums should be a vital part of the program, and field work should be required and given regular credit.

Field work should be adequately financed so that a well-supervised, well-balanced program may be developed. All student employment should be subject to seminary supervision, and a maximum limit should be set on the amount of time devoted to field work. Seminaries should guard both the students and the institutions served from exploitation. Follow-up programs should be developed.

#### Trends and needs in the field work of theological schools.--

There were trends toward making field work required and toward more emphasis upon visitation experience, counseling, and clinical training; much interest was evidenced in the internship, but the developments were meager. Field work should be given a larger role in the curriculum and be more carefully planned. Emphasis should be placed on the field-work director as the key person in the development of the field-work program. The field-work program should be a cooperative endeavor and should be more adequately financed.

#### Placement in Field Work

The seminaries had few specific course prerequisites to field work and provided little orientation for students. About half of the

seminaries provided some orientation, usually quite meager, for co-operating supervisors. Over sixty per cent reported that a pre-placement interview was held with the student and that his previous field work and educational record were taken into consideration. Thirty per cent or more made use of one or more of the following: interest inventories, intelligence examinations, diaries or autobiographies, personality tests or inventories, information blanks, and case studies. Information concerning available fields was secured by correspondence, interviews, telephone conversations, and visits to the fields. In sixty-three seminaries student-director pre-placement conferences were held; in fifty-six, students had pre-placement conferences with representatives of the places offering field work; while in thirty the students sometimes had conferences with denominational representatives. Information files on places offering field work were frequently kept.

Basic principles for placement.-- Prior to placement of a student in a field-work position, adequate information should be secured concerning the student, the place, and the cooperating supervisor. This information should be filed in the field-work office. Criteria should be developed for choosing fields and for matching students with fields. The director should be personally acquainted with the fields, and should give orientation to all cooperating supervisors as well as to students. He should schedule conferences at the seminary between students and prospective employers, and should supervise the formulation of definite work agreements.

Placement needs.-- There is need for more adequate collection

and utilization of data in placement, more careful planning of placement, and more adequate programs of field-work orientation.

### The Supervision of Field Work

Supervision is the most crucial area in field work today. "Field-Work Director" is the most common title of the individual with chief responsibility for supervision. The most commonly used supervisory techniques were individual conferences and written reports. The survey revealed that three-fourths of the seminaries never used supervisory bulletins, rating scales, or long-range field-work plans. About half made no use of check lists, or practicums and seminars. More than a third never made supervisory visits or held group field-work conferences, while nearly a third at no time asked for written reports of any kind either from the students or from the representatives of the places served.

The average supervisor spent fifteen per cent of his time supervising the field work of thirty or more students. The average seminary had three people engaging in field-work supervision. The average supervisor made two visits per year to the student and held four conferences with him, including the placement conferences. At least a fourth of the students engaged in field work received no supervision. Denominational officials and church or organizational officials assisted seminaries in field-work supervision. Virtually no seminaries employed a graded sequence of field-work activities.

#### Basic principles underlying supervision of field work.--

Supervision should be democratic and based upon respect for the student. It should be creative, scientific, and planned; it should lead to self-direction on the part of the student. Supervision should be based on psychological principles and should promote curricular integration. All the faculty should share in supervision and the formulation of clear objectives for the program. Monthly supervisory visits and conferences should be the minimum frequency.

The field-work supervisor should have had mature Christian experience, successful ministerial experience, and should be professionally trained. He should have a mature personality and a genuine interest in supervision.

Outline of supervisory activities.-- A detailed outline of over four hundred specific supervisory activities or phases of activities was developed and presented in Chapter VI. Major sections of the outline were devoted to supervisory activities related to directing and evaluating student observation, supervising student participation in ministerial activities, integrating field work with other aspects of the curriculum, and cooperating in seminary administration.

Trends and needs in supervision of field work.-- Field work is increasingly recognized as an essential aspect of the seminary curriculum, and nearly half of the seminaries were either revising and strengthening their field-work programs or were planning to do so. More time should be devoted to field-work supervision and a wider range of supervisory techniques should be employed. Supervisory visits and conferences should become much more frequent. A graded sequence of

field work should be developed and much more supervision should be given by the seminary to those cooperating in supervision of the students. Seminary supervision of field work should be increasingly professionalized.

#### The Evaluation of Field Work

There is comparatively little formal evaluation of field work done by the seminaries. Before students are accepted for seminary training some consideration is usually given to previous Christian service. Prior to placement, the previous service is evaluated by half of the seminaries. Much use is made of field-work reports when evaluating the adequacy of the field work of the students. Fifty-six per cent of these reports are furnished by the students, and only seventeen per cent by the cooperating supervisors. The average seminary received eight or nine evaluative reports per semester for each student engaged in field work.

Many means are available for seminary use in the evaluation of field work, including interviews, rating scales, anecdotal records, check lists, tests, and field-work diaries. A few seminaries were beginning to use rating scales, but very little use was made of student self-evaluation, anecdotal records, or field-work diaries. Many seminaries made use of check lists, and at least half of the seminaries when evaluating field work employed essay-type reports, summaries of field work, or printed report forms. Conferences were frequently held with the student at the conclusion of a field-work project. More than

a third of the seminars scheduled such meetings between the student and the director, and other conferences were held with denominational or local supervisors.

Basic principles of field-work evaluation.-- Evaluation should be continuous, comprehensive, and cooperatively undertaken. It should be based on field-work objectives and should emphasize the same points emphasized by the curriculum. Both objective and subjective aspects of evaluation must be considered, and evaluation results should be reported analytically and compositely. All evaluation is subject to error, hence effort should be made to have valid and reliable instruments for gathering information, and persons making the evaluations should be carefully trained. All evaluation should lead to self-evaluation. A long-range, practical evaluation program should be drawn up and students should be oriented to its purposes and methods. Evaluation results should be checked systematically, promptly reported, and adequately used. Evaluation is dependent upon proper rapport.

The evaluation instrument should be carefully constructed so as to suit the specified purpose, the conditions under which it is to be administered, and the individual needs of the student. A separate appraisal is usually required for each aspect evaluated. Evaluation instruments should be kept simple and should be revised as needed. Tests should include several types of items appropriately grouped, and no clues should be given to the answers. Adequate directions should be furnished for administering and scoring tests and for interpreting the results.

Needs in the area of field-work evaluation.-- There is need for greater emphasis upon evaluation, particularly upon qualitative evaluation. A larger variety of evaluative techniques should be used and the report forms employed in evaluation should be improved. There is real need for the development of new instruments and techniques for field-work evaluation.

### Field-Work Records and Reports

Field-work records and reports served many purposes, including those connected with supervisory guidance and integration of field work with class work. Sixty-one seminaries used printed report forms, fifty-three asked for summaries of field work, forty-eight employed essay-type reports, and forty-four used check lists. Twenty-one made use of student rating scales; nine asked for summaries of anecdotal records; nine, field-work diaries; and eight, student self-evaluation scales. Very few seminaries made use of cumulative field-work records, and almost none employed interview forms. Few report forms were used more than once a quarter; many, only once a semester. Unfortunately, many of the printed report forms provided for the collection of little more than statistical data. Field-work records and reports were consulted by the director in counseling and occasionally in determining field-work marks. The statistical data gathered were used in annual reports of the field-work program, in reports to denominational officials, and in seminary public relations. In half of the seminaries no one other than the field-work director used the records and reports

regularly, although in a fourth of the seminaries the dean made considerable use of them. Faculty members and denominational officials rarely consulted these records. About a fourth of the seminaries preserved field-work records as long as three years.

Basic principles underlying field-work recording and reporting.--

Field-work records should be comprehensive, cumulative, sufficiently detailed, yet simple and well organized. They should be adapted to the purposes they are to serve, and should be as objective, reliable, and comparable as possible. They should be constructed so as to economize time in their use. Records should be uniform, avoid unnecessary repetition, and have proper mechanical construction. Record forms should be as few as is feasible. Temporary records should be distinct from permanent records, central filing should be provided, and the faculty should be oriented to their use. The record system should be evaluated and revised as needed, and field-work records should be preserved as long as any other student records.

Students should be taught the use of field-work diaries, and these diaries should be checked periodically by the supervisor. Special check lists should be provided for the various common types of field-work activity. Interview forms should be employed by the supervisor. Cumulative forms should be kept simple, and adequate instructions should be given for their use. Anecdotal records should be prepared by all who supervise or teach the student. Recording of anecdotes should be objective, fair, and done promptly after the occurrence of the incident. Anecdotes should be brief and should



emphasize things emphasized by field-work and seminary objectives. Regular anecdotal forms should be used and these should be submitted according to a calendar schedule. They should be kept confidential and should be skillfully and regularly summarized.

Field-work reports should be comprehensive, understandable, and cooperatively developed. They should consider the student individually and as a member of the group. They should motivate growth of the student and give adequate information to those concerned with his development. Each thing evaluated should be reported separately; the report should indicate the underlying philosophy and provide space for comments. Reports should be economical of time and capable of translation into other systems of marking. Regardless of the system used for public reports, a five-point scale should be maintained for office use. Report forms should be kept to a minimum, though separate forms are required for separate purposes. Teachers should be trained in the writing of informal comments.

Needs in field-work recording and reporting.-- All seminaries should keep adequate field-work records, and the quality of the records should be improved. There should be a new emphasis upon anecdotal records, field-work diaries, and permanent cumulative records of field work. These records should be used by faculty members, seminary officials, and denominational officials.

#### The Integration of Field Work with Other Aspects of the Curriculum

Little had been done to integrate field work with other aspects

of the curriculum. Sixty-two seminaries reported a total of more than a hundred and fifty classes using observation. Although seventy-seven seminaries reported 595 uses of the various integrative techniques surveyed, only one of these was in a class outside the practical field. Courses in practical theology were reported to use integrative techniques twice as frequently as were religious education courses.

Forty-nine seminaries had a total of 105 practicums or seminars, forty-two had ninety-two classes employing field trips, and thirty reported a total of forty-five classes using case studies. Counseling was done in connection with forty-three classes of thirty-three seminaries; thirty-five seminaries reported forty-four classes employing community surveys; but only nineteen seminaries (thirty classes) reported participation in community projects. Twenty-two seminaries (forty-three classes) made use of community resources. In forty-three classes of twenty-two seminaries it was possible for a student to submit a field-work report as a term paper.

Field work was more closely integrated with guidance than with class work. Fifty seminaries reported on the manner in which they related field work and guidance, personal conferences being the most usual method.

Basic principles of integration of field work with the total curriculum.-- The basis for integration should be student growth, and integration should be planned, continuous, cooperative, and regularly evaluated. Integration contributes to effective, economical, and permanent learning. Field work helps integrate the total curriculum.

Observation should be used throughout the period of training, but it should not be wholly separated from participation. A variety of observational techniques should be used. Both the student and the group to be observed should be prepared for the observation. Observation should be supervised, integrated, evaluated, and recorded. The most effective type of observation is that which involves a type of activity previously experienced.

Field work should be integrated with all departments and courses of the seminary, and all seminary courses should be professionalized. Field work provides basic materials for the regular courses and serves to evaluate the total curriculum. The most integrative field work is that which is most adequately supervised but at the same time places the greatest possible responsibility on the student. The teacher is the key to integration.

Every faculty member and field-work supervisor has a guidance responsibility. While each student should have an advisor, one person should coordinate the guidance program. Guidance specialists should be used as needed. Guidance should be based on adequate information, should be continuous, complete, and provided for all, but should eventually lead to self-guidance. When supervision is integrated with guidance, the whole program is thereby strengthened.

Clinical pastoral training.-- Clinical training has had a slow, steady growth. The Council for Clinical Training is the major organization carrying responsibility in this field, although the Institute for Pastoral Care performs a very useful function. Twenty-

five mental or general hospitals and penal institutions were approved by the Council as training centers and more than twelve hundred students and others had been trained under its supervision. Twenty-seven seminaries cooperated with the Council.

The training program involved a minimum of twelve weeks, while a full year of training was urged by the Council. Supervision was provided by the chaplain-supervisor and by an institutional representative. The training program utilized direct experiences in relationships with persons under stress and the study of similar activities and research by others. The student made case studies, prepared extensive notes, had weekly conferences with his supervisor, and attended seminars and staff conferences. The interrelations of the trainee group were used for group therapy.

Needs in the area of integration.--- There is need for a cooperative study of the integration of field work with class work, cooperative development of integrative techniques, the professionalization of all seminary classes, and a planned program of student observation. Field-work supervision and guidance should be integrated into a more adequate and continuous program. Clinical training should become more definitely pastoral training, and seminary and clinical leaders should coordinate their efforts.

#### Conclusions and Recommendations

The attitude of the seminaries.--- There was a rapid growth in supervision of field work during the two decades following the first

study of field work. In some phases of supervision, growth was nearly five hundred per cent. At the time of this survey, field work had a recognized role in most seminaries and one member of the faculty or administration had been assigned the responsibility for its supervision.

There were still a few seminaries and a number of faculty members who were merely benevolently tolerant of field work, especially since it provided financial remuneration for the students, but whose educational philosophy did not concede it any vital function within the curriculum. Most of the ardent protagonists of field work had not only recognized the importance and function of field experience, but they had been experimenting with and adapting means for the improvement of its supervision. Several seminaries had developed outstanding field-work programs. The attitude of most seminaries and a very large number of faculty members, however, was that of acceptance of field work and an almost naive faith in its efficiency apart from extensive supervision, evaluation, or integration with the full seminary program. At the time of the survey, there was a rather general movement toward improving the quality of the field-work program, and an attitude of welcoming feasible proposals promising a more adequate professional training for the ministry.

The extent of field work.--- More than half of the regular students of the seminaries participated in supervised field work and many others engaged in unsupervised field work. Students engaged in a wide range of activities, but very few were provided a graded sequence of activities or a balanced field-work program. Nearly three-

fourths of the seminaries required field work for graduation, a year or more being usually specified. In the formulation of requirements, more emphasis was placed on religious education than on preaching.

The supervision provided.--- The range of supervisory activities engaged in by the field-work directors and seminary supervisors was steadily widening as increased time was made available for supervision and as supervision became more professional. The average seminary supervisor spent fifteen per cent of his time supervising thirty-two students. In the average seminary three persons shared in supervision.

Little specific orientation for field work was provided students or cooperating supervisors in the churches and organizations served. Prior to placement, the director generally had an interview with the student, considered student data gathered on an information blank or from the registrar's office, and secured information concerning the field to be served. About a third of the seminaries reported pre-placement conferences between the student and the representative of the place to be served.

The student, during each year of field work, had an average of two supervisory visits and four supervisory conferences. Some additional supervision was provided by cooperating supervisors or denominational officials. Each semester the student prepared five or six written reports, often mainly statistical; the seminary supervisor made two or three; and the cooperating supervisor made one or two. Printed report forms, summaries of field work, essay-type reports, and

check lists were commonly used, but student-rating scales, summaries of anecdotal records, field-work diaries, and student self-evaluation scales were little used. Apart from the use of these records and reports, little formal evaluation was done. At the conclusion of a field-work project, about a third of the seminaries required a detailed report from the student and scheduled a conference between him and the supervisor. In over half of the seminaries the field-work records and reports were never used by anyone other than the director. Deans used them more regularly than anyone else outside the field-work office staff. Only a third of the seminaries regularly consulted these records during further placement or when making recommendations. Field-work reports were used in counseling, in making annual reports on field work, and in seminary publicity. Cumulative records were seldom used, and nearly two-thirds of the seminaries did not preserve field-work records after the graduation of the student.

The integration of field work with other aspects of the curriculum.-- There was little formal integration of field work with class work. In the practical fields, the field-work type of activities was used in connection with a number of courses. Student observation, practicums or seminars, and field trips were frequently employed. Some use was also made of case studies, community surveys, and counseling activities. Less than a fourth of the seminaries reported any class employing community resources, providing for participation in community projects, or permitting field-work reports to be used as term papers. Field work was more closely integrated with guidance than with any other

aspect of the curriculum. Supervisory conferences often served both supervisory and guidance functions. Clinical pastoral training was only slightly integrated with field work or with class work.

Recommendations.-- The following recommendations summarize the major needs which became apparent during this study.

1. More time should be made available for field-work supervision in theological education. Field-work directors should give the major portion of their time to supervision, while all seminary faculty members should share to some extent in this supervision.

2. Supervision of field work in theological education should be intensified. Orientation and placement procedures should be strengthened, and more supervisory visits and conferences should be held. The quality of the supervision given by the cooperating supervisors should be improved and brought more closely under the guidance of the seminary field-work director.

3. Evaluation of field work in theological education should receive much greater emphasis. There is real need for evaluation instruments and techniques specifically adapted to field work. The use of a wider range of evaluative devices is greatly needed, and the records and reports used in evaluation need to include more qualitative data.

4. Field work should be integrated with the entire curriculum of the seminary. It is important that field work be integrated with all courses of the seminary; that guidance and field-work supervision become one integrated program; and that clinical pastoral



training be closely related to field work and the other aspects of the seminary curriculum. Since adequate integration depends upon the cooperation of all seminary teachers, it is urgent for the entire faculty groups of the seminaries to study cooperatively the functions and role of field work within the seminary curriculum, and for each faculty member to have at least a small share in field-work supervision.

Suggestions for further research.— There has been almost no research on field-work supervision. Theological education would profit greatly from an active research program. The suggestions here given indicate types of projects which would be desirable.

1. There is need for a careful development of graded sequences of activities for specific types of field work in theological education. The grading of field work has been discussed for twenty years, but almost nothing has been done thus far by the seminaries.

2. There is real need for the development of valid and reliable instruments for field-work evaluation in theological education. New instruments need to be devised, validated, and made generally available to the seminaries. The research needed in the development of such instruments would require the cooperation of the field-work departments of a number of seminaries.

3. There would be value in an experimental study comparing the total learnings of two groups of seminary students: one group provided with the typical contemporary curriculum, supplemented by field work, but with little integration; the other group provided with an integrated curriculum in which courses cutting across traditional

subject lines would parallel and be inter-related with a carefully graded sequence of field-work activities. A valid study of this type would be dependent upon careful evaluation of the total personal and professional growth of the students, and consequently must be delayed until satisfactory evaluation instruments are available.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Addresses and Discussions of the Second Conference on Field Work in Theological Education, March 15-16, 1947 at the Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Philadelphia: The Conference, 1947. Pp. 108.
2. "American Protestantism and Mental Health," Journal of Clinical Pastoral Health, 1 (Winter, 1948), 1-26.
3. Andrews, Leonard O. "Experimental Programs of Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education," The Journal of Teacher Education, 1 (December, 1950), 259-67.
4. Announcement of the College of Engineering, University of Cincinnati, 1952-1953. University of Cincinnati Bulletin, Vol. 48, No. 3. Cincinnati, Ohio: The University, 1952. Pp. 91.
5. Announcement of the Harvard Divinity School, 1949-1950. Official Register of Harvard University, Vol. 46, No. 20. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The University, 1949. Pp. 61.
6. Archer, Clifford P. "Recruitment, Institutional Selection, and Guidance of Teachers," Review of Educational Research, 16 (June, 1946), 209-16.
7. Armentrout, Winfield Dockery. The Conduct of Student Teaching in State Teachers Colleges. Colorado Teachers College Education Series, No. 2. Greeley, Colorado: Colorado State Teachers College, 1927. Pp. viii / 198.
8. Armstrong, W. Earl; Hollis, Ernest V.; and Davis, Helen E. The College and Teacher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1944. Pp. x / 311.
9. Baker, Oren H. "The Practical Field in Theological Education," The Sixteenth Biennial Meeting of the American Association of Theological Schools, pp. 141-43. Bulletin 18. Lexington, Kentucky: The Association, June, 1948.
10. Baker, Oren H. "Toward More Integration in Theological Education," The Seventeenth Biennial Meeting of the American Association of Theological Schools, pp. 85-98. Bulletin 19. Lexington, Kentucky: The Association, June, 1950.
11. Barr, Arvil S. "Measurement and Prediction of Teaching Success," Review of Educational Research, 19 (June, 1949), 185-90.

12. Barr, A. S.; Burton, William H.; and Brueckner, Leo J. Supervision. Democratic Leadership in the Improvement of Learning. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, Inc., 1947. Pp. vii / 879.
13. Barstow, Robbins W. "Report of the Committee on Scholarship Aid and Student Subsidies," The Twelfth Biennial Meeting of the American Association of Theological Schools, pp. 61-6. Bulletin 14. Princeton, New Jersey: The Association, July, 1940.
14. Beaven, A. W. "The Report of the Committee on Supervised Training," The Tenth Biennial Meeting of the American Association of Theological Schools, pp. 44-62. Bulletin 11. Chester, Pennsylvania: The Association, July, 1936.
15. Becker, Carl H. "Character and Aims of the New German Teacher-Training System," Teachers College Record, 23 (January, 1932), 347-63.
16. Bell, Walter P. "The Function of the Ministry," Journal of Clinical Pastoral Work, 2 (Autumn, 1949), 113-23.
17. Bevens, Bruce B. "Current Practices in Student-Teaching in Arkansas." Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Cincinnati, 1937. Pp. iii / 58.
18. Biddle, W. W. "Workshop Method in Teacher Training," Educational Administration and Supervision, 28 (September, 1942), 426-37.
19. Billings, Neal. "Four Years of Practice Teaching," Elementary School Journal, 44 (February, 1944), 352-57.
20. Blackwood, James R. "Enter the Seminary Intern!" The Christian Century, 62 (July 18, 1945), 836-37.
21. Blyler, Dorothea. "Student Teaching in the American Association of Teachers Colleges," Educational Administration and Supervision, 33 (February, 1947), 75-87.
22. Boisen, Anton T. "The Challenge to our Seminaries," The Journal of Pastoral Care, 5 (Spring, 1951), 8-12.
23. Boisen, Anton T. "The Period of Beginnings," The Journal of Pastoral Care, 5 (Spring, 1951), 13-16.
24. Bonacker, Ralph D. Report on the Clinical Training Program at Bellevue Hospital--1947. Bellevue Hospital, 1947. Pp. 57.
25. Bower, William Clayton. The Curriculum of Religious Education. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925. Pp. xii / 283.

26. Bower, William Clayton. "The Training of the Ministry for a New World Order," Religious Education, 49 (January-February, 1945), 12-18.
27. Bowman, Rufus D. "Some Needs of the Post-War World and Their Implications for the Seminary Curriculum," Christian Education, 26 (June, 1943), 256-62.
28. Briggs, George W. "The Theological Curriculum, The Christian, and the World," The Review of Religion, 12 (November, 1947), 5-28.
29. Briggs, Thomas H. Improving Instruction. Supervision by Principals of Secondary Schools. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1938. Pp. ix / 587.
30. Brim, O. G. "Creative Supervision of Student Teaching," Educational Administration and Supervision, 18 (May, 1932), 333-46.
31. Brown, Arlo Ayres. "The Next Steps in Theological Education," The Eleventh Biennial Meeting of the American Association of Theological Schools, pp. 17-23. Bulletin 13. Louisville, Kentucky: The Association, July, 1938.
32. Bruder, Ernest E. "A Clinically Trained Religious Ministry in the Mental Hospital," Quarterly Review of Psychiatry and Neurology, 2 (October, 1947), 543-52.
33. Bruder, Ernest E. "Clinical Pastoral Training in a Mental Hospital," Journal of Clinical Pastoral Work, 2 (Spring, 1949), 15-24.
34. Bruder, Ernest E. "The Goals of Clinical Pastoral Training Reappraised," The Journal of Pastoral Care, 5 (Spring, 1951), 68-70.
35. Burton, William H. The Guidance of Learning Activities. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1944. Pp. xiv / 601.
36. Buswell, G. T. "Organization and Sequence of the Curriculum," The Psychology of Learning, pp. 445-63. Forty-first Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part 2. Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Co., 1942.
37. Buswell, G. T. "Psychology of the Newer Methods of Teaching," Elementary School Journal, 46 (September, 1945), 14-22.
38. Butterweck, Joseph S. "Student Teaching--When, Where, and How?" The Journal of Teacher Education, 2 (June, 1951), 139-42.
39. Cabot, Richard C. and Dicks, Russell L. The Art of Ministering to the Sick. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1936. Pp. viii / 384.

40. Camp, Cordelia. "A Cross-Section of Student Teachers' Evaluations of Their Own Teaching," Educational Administration and Supervision, 30 (January, 1944), 48-56.
41. Campbell, William Giles. A Manual for Observation and Directed Teaching. Revised Edition. Los Angeles: The University of Southern California Press, 1940. Pp. 138.
42. Carr, Malcom Wallace. Dentistry and Agency of Health Service. New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1946. Pp. xxiv / 219.
43. Catalog of Princeton Theological Seminary, 1949-1950. The Princeton Seminary Bulletin, Vol. 43, No. 2. Princeton, New Jersey: The Seminary, 1949. Pp. 117.
44. Chisholm, Leslie L. Guiding Youth in the Secondary School. New York: American Book Company, 1945. Pp. xi / 433.
45. Clinical Pastoral Training. Annual Catalog, 1950. Council for Clinical Training, Inc. New York: The Council, 1950. Pp. 25.
46. "Clinical Pastoral Training as a Religious Experience," The Journal of Pastoral Care, 5 (Spring, 1951), 31-35.
47. Cole, Lawrence E. and Bruce, William F. Educational Psychology. New York: World Book Company, 1950. Pp. xv / 768.
48. Commission on Teacher Education. The Improvement of Teacher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1946. Pp. xvi / 283.
49. Committee on Aims and Ideals of Cooperative Engineering Education. "The Cooperative System--A Manifesto," The Journal of Engineering Education, 37 (November, 1946), 117-34.
50. Cooper, Russell M. Better Colleges--Better Teachers. Published by the North Central Association Committee on the Preparation of High School Teachers in Colleges of Liberal Arts, 1944. Pp. viii / 167.
51. Crow, Lester D. and Crow, Alice. Educational Psychology. New York: American Book Company, 1948. Pp. xiv - 599.
52. Cubberley, Ellwood P. Public Education in the United States. A Study and Interpretation of American Educational History. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1934. Pp. xix / 782.
53. Curriculum Committee of the School of Education, Syracuse University. A Functional Program of Teacher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1941. Pp. x / 259.

54. Davis, Jerome. "Social Aspects of Theological Seminary Training," The Sixth Biennial Meeting of the Conference of Theological Seminaries and Colleges in the United States and Canada, pp. 40-51. Bulletin 6. New York: The Conference, September, 1928.
55. Davis, Robert A. Educational Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1948. Pp. x / 349.
56. Dewey, John. Democracy and Education. An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1924. Pp. xii / 434.
57. Dewey, John. The Quest for Certainty. New York: Minton, Balch, and Company, 1929. Pp. 318.
58. Dewey Joseph C. and Goltry, T. Keith. A Guide-Book in Observation and Student Teaching. Elementary Level. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Company, 1942. Pp. ii / 136.
59. Doherty, Robert E. The Development of Professional Education. The Principles Which Have Guided the Reconstruction of Education at Carnegie Institute of Technology, 1936-1950. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: Carnegie Institute of Technology, 1950. Pp. ii / 58.
60. Donham, Wallace Brett. Education for Responsible Living. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1944. Pp. xii / 309.
61. Douglass, Harl R. Organization and Administration of Secondary Schools. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1945. Pp. xii / 660.
62. Draper, Edgar Marion. Principles and Techniques of Curriculum Making. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, Inc., 1936. Pp. xv / 875.
63. Dubuque Theological Seminary, 1950-1952. Catalog for 1950-52, The Theological Seminary of the University of Dubuque. Dubuque, Iowa: The University, 1950. Pp. 86.
64. Duewel, Wesley L. "The Implications of the Socio-Economic Background of the Christian Community in India for the Non-Theological Course Offerings in the Allahabad Bible Seminary." Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Cincinnati, 1949. Pp. v / 171.
65. Duewel, Wesley and Robbins, Irving. "A Progress Report on a Community Field-Experience Project," Educational Research Bulletin, 29 (April, 1950), 96-102, 112.
66. Dunbar, H. Flanders. "Standards for Clinical Training of Theological Students," The Ninth Biennial Meeting of the Conference of Theological Seminaries and Colleges in the United States and Canada, pp. 68-80. Bulletin 9. Rochester, New York: The Conference, July, 1934.

67. Dunsmoor, Clarence C. and Miller, Leonard M. Principles and Methods of Guidance for Teachers. Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook Company, 1949. Pp. x / 395.
68. Education for Professional Responsibility. A Report of the Proceedings of the Inter-Professions Conference on Education for Professional Responsibility held at Buck Hill Falls, Pennsylvania, April 12, 13, and 14, 1948. Pittsburgh: Carnegie Press, Carnegie Institute of Technology, 1948. Pp. x / 207.
69. "Field Work Policy for Theological Students," Christian Education, 27 (June, 1944), 241-3.
70. The Fifteenth Biennial Meeting of the American Association of Theological Schools. Bulletin 17. Lancaster, Pennsylvania: The Association, June, 1946. Pp. 131.
71. Fitch, Harry N. An Analysis of the Supervisory Activities and Techniques of the Elementary School Training Supervisor. Contributions to Education, No. 476. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1931. Pp. vi / 130.
72. Fitzgerald, Ruth. "Discussion of Doctor Brim's Paper," Educational Administration and Supervision, 18 (May, 1932), 347-52.
73. Flowers, John Garland. Content of Student-Teaching Courses Designed for the Training of Secondary Teachers in State Teachers Colleges. Contributions to Education, No. 538. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932. Pp. vii / 81.
74. Flowers, John G.; and Others. School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education. American Association of Teachers Colleges, 1948. Pp. 340.
75. Foster, F. C. "Field Work and Its Relation to the Curriculum of Theological Seminaries." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Columbia University, 1934. Pp. 103.
76. Froehlich, Clifford P. and Benson, Arthur L. Guidance Testing. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1948. Pp. viii / 104.
77. Gates, Arthur I., and Others. Educational Psychology. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948. Pp. xx / 818.
78. Good, Carter V., Editor. Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1945. Pp. xxxix / 495.
79. Grant, Frederick C. "Educating for the Ministry," Christendom, 13 (Summer, 1948), 360-72.



80. Grebe, Frank. "The Training of the Minister as Teacher," The Sixteenth Biennial Meeting of the American Association of Theological Schools, pp. 125-33. Bulletin 18. Lexington, Kentucky: The Association, June, 1948.
81. Guthrie, Edwin R. and Powers, Francis F. Educational Psychology. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1950. Pp. vi / 530.
82. Gwynn, J. Minor. Curriculum Principles and Social Trends. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950. Pp. xxii / 768.
83. Hahn, Walter. "Current Practices and Problems in Student Teaching," The Journal of Teacher Education, 2 (June, 1951), 118-21.
84. Harner, Nevin C. "The Reintegration of Christian Education Within the Christian Community and Its Relevance for Theological Education," The Seventeenth Biennial Meeting of the American Association of Theological Schools, pp. 99-107. Bulletin 19. Lexington, Kentucky: The Association, June, 1950.
85. Haskew, Laurence D. "Preservice Preparation of Teachers," Review of Educational Research, 19 (June, 1949), 201-09.
86. Henderson, Elisha Lane. The Organization and Administration of Student Teaching in State Teachers Colleges. Contributions to Education, No. 538. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932.
87. Herrick, E. C. "Clinical Training for Theological Students," The Ninth Biennial Meeting of the Conference of Theological Seminaries and Colleges in the United States and Canada, pp. 81-89. Bulletin 9. Rochester, New York: The Conference, July, 1934.
88. Hickerson, Frank R. Handbook of Supervised Teaching. Wichita, Kansas: Western Lithograph Company, 1936. Pp. 128.
89. Hildreth, Gertrude H. "Evaluation of a Workshop in Education," Teachers College Record, 46 (February, 1945), 310-19.
90. Hildreth, Gertrude. "The Role of Experiential Learning in the Education of Teachers," The Journal of Teacher Education, 2 (September, 1951), 180-84.
91. Hiltner, Seward. "Clinical Education in Religion and Mental Hygiene," Religious Education, 38 (May-June, 1943), 152-59.
92. Hiltner, Seward. Pastoral Counseling. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949. Pp. 291.

93. Holman, Charles T. Getting Down to Cases. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1942. Pp. 207.
94. Hopkins, L. Thomas and Others. Integration: Its Meaning and Application New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, Inc., 1937. Pp. xiii / 315.
95. Hopkins, L. Thomas. Interaction: The Democratic Process. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1941. Pp. v / 490.
96. Horner, Harlan Hoyt. Dental Education Today. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1947. Pp. vi / 420.
97. Hyslop, Ralph Douglass, "The Right Men for the Ministry," Religious Education, 40 (January-February, 1945), 3-7.
98. Institute of Social and Religious Research. The Education of American Ministers. New York: The Institute of Social and Religious Research, 1934. Four volumes.
99. Interseminary Commission for the Training of the Rural Ministry. The Relation of Student Field Work to Theological Education. The Commission, 1947. Pp. iii / 31.
100. Interview between the writer and Frank S. Rowley, Dean of the College of Law, the University of Cincinnati, at Cincinnati, March 14, 1952.
101. Jensen, Harry T. "Three Thousand Students Evaluate an Educational Course," The Educational Forum, 7 (January, 1943), 127-32.
- 101a and 101b. Jersild, Arthur T. (See end of bibliography)
102. Johnson, Paul E. "Clinical Education of the Pastor," Christian Education, 30 (March, 1947), 103-08.
103. Kelley, Alden Drew. "A Dean Looks at Clinical Training," The Journal of Pastoral Care, 5 (Spring, 1951), 61-65.
104. Kelley, Alden Drew. "Looking Ahead with the Seminaries," Christian Education, 28 (December, 1944), 103-11.
105. Kelley, Robert L. Theological Education in America. A Study of One Hundred Sixty-One Theological Schools in the United States and Canada. New York: George H. Doran Company, 1924. Pp. xix / 456.
106. Knapp, F. L. "The Preparation of Theological Seminary Students to Enlist and Develop Lay Workers in the Local Church," The Tenth Biennial Meeting of the American Association of Theological Schools, pp. 63-77. Bulletin 11. Chester, Pennsylvania: The Association, July, 1936.

107. Krug, Edward A. Curriculum Planning. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1950. Pp. xi / 306.
108. Lefever, D. Welty: Turrell, Archie M.; and Weitzel, Henry I. Principles and Techniques of Guidance. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1950. Pp. xvi / 577.
109. Leslie, Robert C. "Growth Through Group Interaction," The Journal of Pastoral Care, 5 (Spring, 1951), 36-45.
110. Letter to the writer from Carl H. Morgan, secretary for the Continuing Committee, the Conference on Field Work in Theological Education, and Dean of Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, dated June 5, 1950.
111. Letter to the writer from Charles Lynn Pyatt, executive secretary of the American Association of Theological Schools, national office at Lexington, Kentucky, dated December 20, 1949.
112. Letter to the writer from Karl E. Mattson, president of the Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois, dated April 5, 1951.
113. Letter to the writer from Nevin C. Harner, executive secretary of the American Association of Theological Schools, national office at Lancaster, Pennsylvania, dated January 5, 1951.
114. Linfield, A. W. "Field Supervision and Student Pastors," The Ninth Biennial Meeting of the Conference of Theological Seminaries and Colleges in the United States and Canada, pp. 90-96. Bulletin 9. Rochester, New York: The Conference, July, 1934.
115. Lynd, Helen Merrell. Field Work in College Education. New York: Columbia University Press, 1945. Pp. xi / 302.
116. Marshall, Edna M. Evaluation of Types of Student-Teaching. Contributions to Education, No. 488. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932. Pp. vii / 91.
117. Mason, Carleton D. Adaptations of Instruction to Individual Differences in the Preparation of Teachers in Normal Schools and Teachers Colleges. Contributions to Education, No. 793. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1940. Pp. xiii / 279.
118. Mathews, Shailer. "The Function of the Divinity School," The Eighth Biennial Meeting of the Conference of Theological Seminaries and Colleges in the United States and Canada, pp. 16-29. Bulletin 8. Gettysburg, Pennsylvania: The Conference, July, 1932.

119. McKee, William J. New Schools for Young India. A Survey of Educational, Economic, and Social Conditions in India with Special Reference to More Effective Education. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 1930. Pp. xxii / 435.
120. McGrath, G. D. "Philistine Deluders in Teacher Education," Edu-  
cation, 71 (November, 1950), 135-38.
121. Mead, Arthur Raymond. Supervised Student Teaching. Basic Principles; Illustrated and Applied Student Teaching Activities; and Organization and Administration. New York: Johnson Publishing Company, 1930. Pp. xxii / 891.
122. Members of the Faculty of the Divinity School of Yale University. Education for Christian Service. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1922. Pp. viii / 348.
123. Miel, Alice. Changing the Curriculum. A Social Process. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, Inc., 1946. Pp. xii / 242.
124. Monroe, Walter S., Editor. Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Revised Edition. Prepared under the auspices of the American Educational Research Association. New York: Macmillan Company, 1950. Pp. xxvi / 1520.
125. Moon, George R. How to Become a Doctor. Philadelphia: The Blakiston Company, 1949. Pp. ix / 131.
126. Mooney, Edward S. Jr., An Analysis of the Supervision of Student-Teaching. A Study Based on the New York State Teacher-Education Institutions for the Preparation of Elementary-School Teachers. Contributions to Education, No. 711. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1937. Pp. vii / 159.
127. Moore, George V. Student Services to the Churches. An Analysis of the Service which the College of the Bible Students are Rendering to the Churches. Lexington, Kentucky: The College of the Bible, 1951. Pp. 5.
128. Moore, George Voiers. "Values Discovered in the Supervision of College and University Student Leaders in Religious Education," Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Chicago, 1936. Pp. iv / 153.
129. Morgan, Carl Hamilton. The Status of Field Work in Protestant Theological Seminaries of the United States. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1942. Pp. x / 123.

130. Morison, Samuel Eliot. Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1936. Two volumes.
131. Morison, Samuel Eliot, Editor. The Development of Harvard University since the Inauguration of President Eliot, 1869-1929. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1930. Pp. xc / 660.
132. Morison, Samuel Eliot. The Founding of Harvard College. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1935. Pp. xxvi / 472.
133. Morris, Robert D. "Report to the Dean," The Journal of Pastoral Care, 5 (Spring, 1951), 27-30.
134. Morrison, Robert H. "Teacher Education--II. Organization and Administration," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, pp. 1378-83. Edited by Walter S. Monroe. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950.
135. Morse, H. N. "Supervision of the Training of Theological Students," The Eleventh Biennial Meeting of the American Association of Theological Schools, pp. 85-97. Bulletin 13. Louisville, Kentucky: The Association, July, 1938.
136. Morse, H. N. "The Integration of Education for the Christian Ministry," The Sixteenth Biennial Meeting of the American Association of Theological Schools, pp. 93-124. Bulletin 18. Lexington, Kentucky: The Association, June, 1948.
137. Mort, Paul R. Principles of School Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1946. Pp. xiv / 388.
138. Moulton, Warren J. "Regarding the Report on Ministerial Education in America," The Ninth Biennial Meeting of the Conference of Theological Seminaries and Colleges in the United States and Canada, pp. 20-32. Bulletin 9. Rochester, New York: The Conference, July, 1934.
139. Mursell, James L. Psychological Testing. New York: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1947. Pp. xiv / 449.
140. Myers, Alonzo F. "The Relation of Laboratory School Experiences to Courses in Education," Supervisors of Student Teaching Proceedings, Fifteenth Annual Session, Atlantic City, New Jersey., February 25-26, 1935, 9-18.
141. Nelson, Esther Marion. An Analysis of Content of Student-Teaching Courses for Educational of Elementary Teachers in State Teachers Colleges. Contributions to Education, No. 723. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1939. Pp. viii / 331.

142. The Ninth Biennial Meeting of the Conference of Theological Seminaries and Colleges in the United States and Canada. Bulletin 9. Rochester, New York: The Conference, July, 1934. Pp. 118.
143. Norton, John K. and Norton, Margaret Alltucker. Foundations of Curriculum Building. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1936. Pp. x / 599.
144. Ogden, Robert M. "The Nature of the Academic and Professional Preparation of Teachers," Current Issues in Higher Education, pp. 129-38. Edited by William S. Gray. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1937.
145. Olsen, Edward G. School and Community. The Philosophy, Procedures, and Problems of Community Study and Service Through Schools and Colleges. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1945. Pp. x / 422.
- 145a. Olsen, Willard C. (See end of bibliography)
146. Otto, Henry J. and Petley, Mary Clare. "Supervisory Organization and Administration," Review of Educational Research, 19 (October, 1949), 334-40.
147. "Our Merger," The Journal of Pastoral Care, 4 (Spring-Summer, 1950), 1-2.
148. Palmer, Albert W. The Minister's Job. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1949. Pp. vii / 113.
149. Palmer, Albert W. "Report of Committee on Supervision of Field Work," The Thirteenth Biennial Meeting of the American Association of Theological Schools, pp. 53-60. Bulletin 15. Lancaster, Pennsylvania: The Association, July, 1942.
150. Peik, W. E. "The Preservice Preparation of Teachers," Review of Educational Research, 16 (June, 1946), 217-27.
151. Peters, Charles C. The Curriculum of Democratic Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1942. Pp. ix / 367.
152. Prall, Charles E. State Programs for the Improvement of Teacher Education. Prepared for the Commission on Teacher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1946. Pp. xii / 379.
153. Prescott, Daniel A. The Training of Teachers. Studies in Education, No. 5. New Brunswick, New Jersey: School of Education, Rutgers University, 1933. Pp. 35.
154. Pryor, Hugh Clark. Graded Units in Student-Teaching. Contributions to Education, No. 202. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1926. Pp. vii / 114.

155. Remmers, H. H. and Gage, N. L. Educational Measurement and Evaluation. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1943. Pp. ix / 580.
156. Report of the Association of Seminary Professors in the Practical Fields, Naperville, Illinois: The Association, 1951. Pp. 88.
157. "Report of the Committee on Clinical Training," The Fourteenth Biennial Meeting of the American Association of Theological Schools, pp. 83-84. Bulletin 16. Lancaster, Pennsylvania: The Association, June, 1944.
158. "Report of the Committee on the Revision of the Constitution," The Tenth Biennial Meeting of the American Association of Theological Schools, pp. 36-38. Bulletin 11. Chester, Pennsylvania: The Association, July, 1936.
159. Report of the Conference on Field Work in Theological Education, held at the Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, January 12-13, 1946. New York: The Continuing Committee of the Conference, 1946. Pp. 42.
160. Retan, George. "Emotional Stability and Teaching Success," Journal of Educational Research, 37 (October, 1943), 135-41.
161. Rinsland, Henry Daniel. Constructing Tests and Grading. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1937. Pp. xvi / 323.
162. Ritchie, D. L. "Report of the Group Conference on Practical Theology," The Sixth Biennial Meeting of the Conference of Theological Seminaries and Colleges in the United States and Canada, pp. 7-9. Bulletin 6. Chicago: The Conference, September, 1928.
163. Ritchie, D. L. "The Function of a Theological College," The Sixth Biennial Meeting of the Conference of Theological Seminaries and Colleges in the United States and Canada, pp. 26-39. Bulletin 6. Chicago: The Conference, September, 1928.
164. Ross, C. C. Measurement in Today's Schools. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1947. Pp. xvi / 551.
165. The Seventeenth Biennial Meeting of the American Association of Theological Schools. Bulletin 19. Lexington, Kentucky: The Association, 1950. Pp. 180.
166. Shaver, Erwin L. "The Attitudes of Theological Seminaries and Other Training Schools Toward the Training of Directors," Religious Education, 42 (January-February, 1947), 16-24.

167. Sherrill, Lewis J. "Class Room Teaching Methods in Theological Seminaries," The Seventh Biennial Meeting of the Conference of Theological Seminaries and Colleges in the United States and Canada, pp. 27-53. Bulletin 7. Louisville, Kentucky: The Conference, April, 1931.
168. The Sixteenth Biennial Meeting of the American Association of Theological Schools. Bulletin 18. Lexington, Kentucky: The Association, June, 1948. Pp. 179.
169. Skinner, Charles E., Editor. Elementary Educational Psychology. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1950. Pp. xv / 592.
170. Smith, B. Othanel; Stanley, William O.; and Shores, J. Harlan. Fundamentals of Curriculum Development. New York: World Book Company, 1950. Pp. xvi / 780.
171. Smith, E. R. and Others. Appraising and Recording Student Progress. Progressive Education Association, Committee on the Relation of Schools and Colleges. Adventure in American Education, Vol. III. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1942. Pp. xxiii / 550.
172. Sorenson, Herbert. Psychology in Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1948. Pp. xiv / 535.
173. Stiles, Lindley J. "Contributions of the Commission on Teacher Education to Student Teaching," Educational Administration and Supervision, 33 (March, 1947), 141-48.
174. Stiles, Lindley J. "Internships for Prospective High School Teachers Being Trained in Universities," Journal of Educational Research, 39 (May, 1946), 664-67.
175. Stiles, Lindley J. "Student Teaching and Internships," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, pp. 1362-67. Edited by Walter S. Munroe. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950.
176. Stone, Mason S. "The First Normal School in America," Teachers College Record, 24 (May, 1923), 263-71.
177. Stratemeyer, Florence B.; Forkner, Hamden L.; and McKim, Margaret G. Developing a Curriculum for Modern Living. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1947. Pp. xiii / 558.
178. Strebel, Ralph F. The Nature of the Supervision of Student-Teaching in Universities Using Cooperating Public High Schools and Some Conditioning Factors. Contributions to Education, No. 655. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1935. Pp. vi / 155.



179. Student Teaching Bulletin. Minneapolis: College of Education, The University of Minnesota, 1923. Pp. 46.
180. Swift, Arthur J. and Others. "Field Work in Theological Education," The Fifteenth Biennial Meeting of the American Association of Theological Schools, pp. 88-101. Bulletin 17. Lancaster, Pennsylvania: The Association, June, 1946.
181. Tanruther, E. M. "The Role of the Campus Laboratory School in the Education of Teachers," The Journal of Teacher Education, 1 (September, 1950), 218-23.
182. Traxler, Arthur E. Techniques of Guidance. Tests, Records, and Counseling in a Guidance Program. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1945. Pp. xiv / 394.
183. Troup, Cornelius J. "Why Not a Teacher-Internship," Educational Leadership, 2 (February, 1945), 223-24.
184. Troyer, Maurice E. and Pace, C. Robert. Evaluation in Teacher Education. Prepared for the Commission on Teacher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1944. Pp. xii / 368.
185. Van Dusen, Henry P. "Report of the Committee on Clinical Training," The Thirteenth Biennial Meeting of the American Association of Theological Schools, pp. 47-52. Bulletin 15. Lancaster, Pennsylvania: The Association, July, 1942.
186. Watson, Goodwin; Cottrell, Donald P.; and Lloyd-Jones, Esther M. Redirecting Teacher Education. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1938. Pp. xi / 105.
187. Weiskotten, Herman G. and Others. Medical Education in the United States 1934-39. Chicago: American Medical Association, 1940. Pp. 259.
188. Weitzman, Ellis and McNamara, Walter J. Constructing Classroom Examinations. A Guide for Teachers. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1949. Pp. xvi / 153.
189. Westberg, Granger E. "Significant Developments in the Field of Pastoral Care," Augustana Seminary Review, 2 (Fourth Quarter, 1950), 13-17.
190. Wey, Herbert Walter. "Like the Real Thing," The National Education Association Journal, 39 (December, 1950), 679.

191. Whiting, Helen A. "Are We Overlooking Something?" Educational Administration and Supervision, 33 (February, 1947), 111-17.
192. Whitman, Howard. "New Horizons for Your Pastor," Women's Home Companion, 74 (November, 1947), 32-33, 109, 111.
193. Wickey, Gould. "Trends in Theological Education," Christian Education, 29 (December, 1946), 447-59.
194. Wise, Carroll A. "The Place of Clinical Training in the Department of Pastoral Theology," The Journal of Pastoral Care, 5 (Spring, 1951), 46-52.
195. Woodward, Ralph L. "Educational Values in Field Work," Religious Education, 40 (January-February, 1945), 18-22.
196. Wrinkle, William L. Improving Marking and Reporting Practices in Elementary and Secondary Schools. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1947. Pp. 120.
197. Yeager, William A. Administration and the Pupil. New York: Harper and Grothers, Publishers, 1949. Pp. xix / 483.
- 101a. Jersild, Arthur T. and Others. Child Development and the Curriculum. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1946. Pp. xi / 274.
- 101b. Jersild, Arthur T. Child Psychology. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1947. Pp. xi / 623.
- 145a. Olsen, Willard C. Child Development. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1949. Pp. xiii / 417.

## APPENDIX A

## BASIC PRINCIPLES DEVELOPED IN THIS STUDY

## The Nature of the Learner

1. The theological student is a dynamic, active being.
2. The theological student is a unique individual.
3. The theological student is a social person.
4. The theological student reacts intelligently.
5. The theological student reacts purposefully.
6. The theological student reacts creatively.
7. The theological student is ready for certain learnings.
8. The theological student learns as a whole being.

## The Nature of Learning

1. Learning is an active process.
2. Learning results in responses, controls of response, values, understandings, attitudes, appreciations, special abilities, and skills.
3. Learning is facilitated by responding to whole situations.
4. Learning is made more meaningful and permanent by integration.
5. Learning is facilitated by proceeding from the known to the unknown.
6. Learning is facilitated when the curriculum is adapted to the student.
7. Learning is facilitated when the learning experiences and content have meaning for the student.
8. Learning is facilitated by a problem approach.
9. Learning is facilitated by variety of experience.
10. Learning is facilitated by practice.
11. Learning is facilitated by consciousness of the goal.
12. Learning is facilitated by the proper amount of guidance at the right time.
13. Learning is facilitated by self-evaluation by the student of his efforts.
14. Learning tends to be better retained when it is reviewed or repeated at strategic times in ways which provide for new meaningful organization of the material.
15. Learning is facilitated by social interaction.
16. Learning is facilitated by an effective student-teacher relation.
17. Learning is facilitated by wholesome mental hygiene in the student.

## The Motivation of Learning

1. Learning is motivated by interest.

2. Learning is best motivated by an aspiration level which is reasonable for the learner.
3. Learning is motivated by the experience of success.
4. Learning is motivated by the stimulation of an attitude of self-responsibility.
5. Learning is motivated by a knowledge of results.
6. Learning is motivated by group approval.

#### Transfer in Learning

1. Transfer must be directly taught for.
2. Transfer is facilitated by developing an expectation of transfer values.
3. Transfer is facilitated by identical or common elements in the two situations.
4. Transfer is facilitated by pointing out relationships.
5. Transfer is facilitated by meaningful learning materials and experiences.
6. Transfer is facilitated by diversified illustration and application of the generalizations.

#### Curricular Objectives

1. The seminary curriculum must be based on comprehensive objectives.
2. The curricular objectives must be dynamic.
3. The curricular objectives of the seminary must be clear and stated in terms of the behavior of the student-minister.
4. The curricular objectives must be organized in a clear and careful way.
5. The statement of the curricular objectives of the seminary should be revised as needed.

#### The Content and Nature of the Curriculum

1. The curriculum should be based on a sound educational psychology.
2. The seminary curriculum should be based on a democratic philosophy.
3. The curriculum should provide the seminary student as much direct experience as is educationally feasible and economical.
4. The curriculum should provide for responsible experience for the seminary student.
5. The seminary curriculum should have real-life significance for the student.
6. The seminary curriculum should be comprehensive.
7. The seminary curriculum should be flexible.
8. The seminary curriculum should be an inter-related, integrated whole.
9. The seminary curriculum should emphasize social interaction at all points.

### The Organization and Utilization of the Curriculum

1. Basic content in the seminary curriculum should be selected by experts; details should be teacher-pupil planned.
2. The seminary curriculum should be cooperatively developed.
3. The seminary curriculum should be organized.
4. The curricular organization should facilitate learning in natural settings.
5. The seminary curriculum should be continuously evaluated.
6. The seminary curriculum should be continuously revised.
7. The sequence of the items in the curriculum should be determined by various factors.
8. The curriculum of the seminary should be enriched by adequate aids.

### The Administration of Field Work

1. The educational possibilities of all direct experiences of the student should, as far as is feasible, be utilized by the seminary.
2. Direct experience should be supervised.
3. Field experience of some kind should be provided throughout the seminary training period.
4. Field experience should be graded in sequence when this is feasible.
5. Each student should have as large a variety of types of field experience as is feasible.
6. Each seminary student should have field experiences with as many types of individuals as is feasible.
7. Field work experiences should provide some orientation to both rural and urban life.
8. Clinical experience is valuable, but it is not a substitute for other types of field experience.
9. Each seminary student should have some experience in responsible ministerial work.
10. Field-work requirements should be flexible enough to provide for individualization of the types, sequence, and amount of field experience.
11. A degree of continuity in field work is desirable, and where feasible the student should have one period of a year in some responsible field-work position.
12. The educational values of summer field work and of the intern year, where used, should be utilized just as in other types of field work.
13. The field-work program of the seminary should be adapted to its own objectives, philosophy, facilities, and church and organizational relations.
14. The field-work director should be carefully chosen.
15. The field-work director should give the major portion of his time to field-work direction, and should have only minor teaching responsibilities.

16. The field-work director should work in close cooperation with the seminary administration and faculty.
17. All faculty members should share in the integration of field work with other aspects of the curriculum, and where feasible, in field-work supervision.
18. Denominational supervision of student field work is desirable but can not take the place of seminary supervision.
19. The supervisory aid of local church and organizational officials should be used, but it should be subject to the over-all leadership of the seminary.
20. The field-work program should serve as an integrating factor in the total seminary curriculum.
21. It is not essential to organize field work as a subject area of the curriculum, but a field-work seminar or practicum is desirable.
22. Credit should be given for supervised field work.
23. Satisfactory field work under seminary supervision should be a requirement for graduation.
24. Field work should be adequately financed to permit a well-supervised and well-balanced program.
25. All field work and other remunerative employment of seminary students should be subject to seminary approval and supervision.
26. A limit should be placed on the amount of time a student may spend on field work per week.
27. Seminaries should guard the student against exploitation by local churches or organizations.
28. Seminaries should guard the churches or organizations served against exploitation by the students engaging in field work and against serious errors in the field service of the students.
29. Follow-up programs for graduates are desirable and should be under the direction of the field-work office or the graduate placement office.

#### Placement in Field Work

1. The field-work director should secure adequate background information about the student before placing him in field work.
2. The field-work director should secure adequate background information concerning the places available for student field work.
3. The field-work director should secure adequate background information concerning the cooperating supervisors from the church or organization.
4. Information gathered concerning students, places, and cooperating supervisors should be kept in appropriate files.
5. The field-work director should develop an acceptable list of criteria for a desirable field of service.

6. The field-work director should develop a check list of criteria to aid in deciding if a given field is desirable for a given student.
7. The field-work director should, as far as feasible, be personally acquainted with the field situation.
8. The field-work director should give orientation to all cooperating supervisors.
9. The field-work director should give orientation to all students participating in field work.
10. The field-work director should schedule or arrange for conferences at the seminary or on the field between the student and the representatives of the church, organization, or denomination.
11. The field-work director should schedule placement interviews with the student.
12. The field-work director should supervise a definite work agreement between the student and the employing group.

#### The Supervision of Field Work

1. Supervision should be democratic.
2. Supervision should be based on respect for the individual theological student.
3. Supervision should be creative.
4. Supervision should be scientific.
5. Supervision should be planned.
6. Supervision must lead to self-direction.
7. Supervision should be based on psychological principles.
8. Supervision should promote curricular integration.
9. Supervision should be an all-seminary responsibility.
10. The objectives of field-work supervision should be clearly formulated.
11. Supervisory visits should be made at least once a month by a seminary representative to each student participating in field work.
12. Supervisory conferences should be held by a seminary supervisor with each student at least once a month.

#### Qualifications for Supervisors

1. The supervisor should have had an adequate professional training for the ministry.
2. The supervisor should have a mature Christian experience.
3. The supervisor should have had an adequate background of successful ministerial experience.
4. The supervisor should have had an adequate professional background in education.
5. The supervisor should have a mature personality.
6. The supervisor should have a genuine interest in supervision.

### The Evaluation of Field Work

1. Evaluation should be a continuous process.
2. Field-work evaluation must be comprehensive.
3. Field-work evaluation should be a cooperative process.
4. Evaluation should be based upon an adequate statement of field-work objectives.
5. Evaluation should be according to the same scale of emphasis found in the objectives and in the curricular content.
6. Both objective and subjective evaluations are desirable and necessary.
7. Evaluation should reveal the student's performance analytically as well as compositely.
8. All evaluation is subject to error.
9. The evaluation should be valid.
10. The evaluation should be reliable.
11. Evaluation should emphasize and lead to self-evaluation.
12. A long-range evaluation program should be developed.
13. The field-work evaluation program should be practical.
14. The students should understand the over-all evaluation program.
15. The evaluation results should be used.
16. The results of evaluation should be checked with an outside criterion whenever possible.
17. The results of evaluation should be reported and interpreted to the student as soon as possible.
18. Student-supervisor rapport should be established and maintained.
19. The evaluation instrument should suit the purpose it is to serve.
20. The nature of the instrument must take into consideration the conditions under which it will be administered.
21. The evaluation device should provide for individual differences in ability and needs.
22. Provision should be made for a convenient written record of the student's responses.
23. Directions for administration should be clear, concise, and complete.
24. There should be adequate instructions detailing expected responses and the basis of interpretation of results.
25. In tests and printed instruments of evaluation, attention must be given that no clues as to the expected response are given.
26. Each separate thing to be evaluated will, in general, require a separate evaluation.
27. A test should include more than one type of item.
28. Test items of the same type should be grouped together.
29. The evaluation device should be as simple as is feasible.
30. The evaluation device should be critically revised as need is indicated.



### Field-Work Records

1. The field-work records should be as comprehensive as the stated objectives of the field-work program.
2. Field-work records should be cumulative.
3. The field-work records should be sufficiently detailed to provide information in a form adequate for aid in the individualization of instruction and in guidance.
4. The field-work records should be simple.
5. The field-work records should be well organized.
6. Each record form or procedure should be adapted to the function it is designed to facilitate.
7. Records should be made as reliable and comparable as possible through the use of as objective data as is available.
8. The record forms and procedures adopted should be such as to minimize the amount of time required in using them.
9. Record forms should be of uniform type wherever careful comparisons and summarizations are to be made.
10. There should be a minimum of repetition of items in the various record forms used by the seminary.
11. Careful attention should be given to mechanical details.
12. Record forms require a detailed manual of instructions to facilitate recording, summarization, and interpretation.
13. Record forms should be kept as few in number and simple in form as is feasible.
14. There should be a clear distinction between temporary and permanent records.
15. Field-work records should be centrally filed and should be accessible to all the seminary faculty.
16. There should be a regular calendar schedule for the completion and summarization of report forms.
17. A system of field-work records should be associated with a program of faculty and staff education as to the value, preparation, and use of these records.
18. There should be careful evaluation of the record system and provision for revision when need is indicated.
19. Field-work records should be kept as long as any records of the student are kept.
20. Field-work diaries should be regularly used by the student and checked by the seminary supervisor.
21. Field-work activity check lists should be prepared for specific types of field work.
22. Prepared forms should be used by supervisors in recording interviews.
23. Cumulative record forms must not be too elaborate, detailed, or complex.
24. All who cooperate in the educational leadership of the student should share in the preparation of anecdotal records.

25. Care should be taken that the incident is recorded objectively.
26. Each observer should be fair in his comments.
27. Anecdotes should be recorded as soon after the occurrence of the incident as is feasible.
28. The records should be kept as brief as possible.
29. Anecdotal records should emphasize those activities, attitudes, and relationships emphasized by the objectives of the field-work program and the seminary.
30. Anecdotal record forms should be used.
31. Anecdotal records should be filed in the field-work office.
32. A schedule for the submission of the records should be set up.
33. All information contained in anecdotal records should be kept confidential.
34. Summarization should be regularly and skillfully done.

#### Field-Work Reports

1. Field-work reports should be as inclusive as are the objectives of the field-work program.
2. The report form should be understandable to all who will use it.
3. Report forms should be cooperatively developed.
4. The report must take into consideration the student as an individual and as a member of the seminary group.
5. Report forms should be so designed that desire for growth and improvement is stimulated.
6. Reports to the public should be kept simple.
7. Each thing evaluated should be reported separately.
8. The report should state in simple terms the philosophy of the seminary and its field-work program.
9. The report should provide for inclusion of evidence and comments relative to the evaluations recorded.
10. The report should be constructed so as to require a minimum expenditure of time in its preparation.
11. The report should provide evaluations in terms which can be easily translated into other symbols of marking.
12. The number of report forms should be kept to a minimum.
13. Separate report forms should be used for separate purposes.
14. Teachers must be trained in the writing of informal comments if these are to be used.
15. Whatever forms are used in reporting to the student and to the public, a five-point scale should be maintained for administrative record purposes.

#### The Integration of Theory and Practice

1. The basis of integration must be the growth of the student, not the logic of the subject or the logic of the activity.
2. Integration must be definitely planned.
3. Integration must be continuous throughout the period of seminary study.

4. Integration must be cooperatively undertaken.
5. The extent of integration must be continuously evaluated.
6. Integration contributes to effective, economical, and permanent learning.
7. Field work is an integrating factor in the entire seminary curriculum.

#### Observation as an Integrative Technique

1. Observation is useful throughout the period of seminary training.
2. Observation can never be wholly separated from participation.
3. Observation cannot take the place of active field work.
4. A variety of observational techniques and aids should be used.
5. The student should be prepared for the observation.
6. The group to be observed should be given orientation.
7. Observation must be supervised.
8. Observation should be related to the total program of the seminary.
9. Observation should be evaluated.
10. Information received through observation should be recorded as promptly as is feasible.
11. Observation is most effective when it is built upon a background of direct experience.

#### The Integration of Field Work with Class Work

1. Field work should be integrated with all departments and courses of the seminary.
2. The courses of the seminary should be professionalized.
3. Field work provides basic materials of value in the regular courses.
4. Field work provides the best means, perhaps, of evaluating the effectiveness of the curriculum and the teaching methods used.
5. The more responsible and active the student's participation in adequately supervised field work, the more satisfactory his integration of theory and practice tends to become.
6. The teacher is the major factor in the integration of class work with field work.

#### The Integration of Field Work with Guidance

1. Every faculty member and field-work supervisor has a responsibility for guidance.
2. Each student should have one individual who has been assigned special guidance responsibility for him.
3. One individual should be assigned responsibility for coordinating the guidance program.

4. Guidance frequently requires the services of a specialist.
5. Guidance must be on the basis of adequate information concerning the student.
6. Guidance should be continuous.
7. Guidance should deal with the whole student.
8. Guidance should be provided for all students.
9. Guidance should lead to self-guidance.
10. The integration of guidance with supervision promotes the most adequate and economical program both in guidance and in field-work supervision.

## APPENDIX B

SURVEY OF FIELD WORK  
AMERICAN PROTESTANT THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES

General Information

1. Enrollment: 1950-51: Juniors \_\_\_\_\_; Middlers \_\_\_\_\_;  
Seniors \_\_\_\_\_; Others \_\_\_\_\_.  
Students in supervised FW \_\_\_\_\_; in unsupervised FW \_\_\_\_\_;  
in FW not under seminary control \_\_\_\_\_.
2. Place R if FW is required; O if optional:  

|                                        |                                             |
|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| _____ a. Junior year _____             | _____ e. Summer following Junior year _____ |
| _____ b. Middle year _____             | _____ f. Summer following Middle year _____ |
| _____ c. Senior year _____             | _____ g. Summer following Senior year _____ |
| _____ d. A year of _____<br>internship |                                             |
3. Which staff members supervise FW activities?

|            |          |                                                 |
|------------|----------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Type of FW | Official | a. % of Official's Time<br>Given to Supervision |
| _____      | _____    | _____                                           |
| _____      | _____    | _____                                           |

  - b. Which denominational officials share in FW supervision? \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Who else share in FW supervision? \_\_\_\_\_
4.
  - a. Does denomination outline your minimum FW program? \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. a complete FW program? \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Do you cooperate with the Council for Clinical Training? \_\_\_\_\_
5.
  - a. What is your minimum grade average for students to participate in FW? \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Is FW reduced if scholastic work suffers? \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Is class load reduced if student does continuous FW? \_\_\_\_\_
6. Do you plan student observation of church activities? \_\_\_\_\_

Supervisory Methods

7. Check supervisory techniques used (use R for regularly; S for sometimes):

|                                       |                                       |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| _____ a. Supervisory visits _____     | _____ f. Bulletins _____              |
| _____ b. Individual conferences _____ | _____ g. Practicums or seminars _____ |
| _____ c. Group conferences _____      | _____                                 |
| _____ d. Check lists _____            | _____                                 |
| _____ e. Rating scales _____          | _____                                 |

8. How often per semester is a student's FW observed by a seminary supervisor?

| Type of FW          | Times | Type of FW     | Times |
|---------------------|-------|----------------|-------|
| a. Preaching        | _____ | e. Counseling  | _____ |
| b. Teaching         | _____ | f. Social Work | _____ |
| c. Visitation       | _____ |                | _____ |
| d. Music Leadership | _____ |                | _____ |

9. What % of supervisory visits are followed by a supervisor - student conference? \_\_\_\_\_ b. Is a written criticism handed the student? \_\_\_\_\_  
 c. How many such conferences does a student average per year? \_\_\_\_\_
10. For which types of FW must student present a long-range plan before beginning his work? \_\_\_\_\_
11. Please indicate any plan used to insure each student a balanced variety of FW experiences: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

#### Placement in Field Work

12. Which subjects are prerequisite to FW by the student?

| Type of FW | Subject Prerequisites |
|------------|-----------------------|
| _____      | _____                 |
| _____      | _____                 |
| _____      | _____                 |

13. How else are students specially prepared for FW? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

14. How do you secure information about student before placement in FW?  
 Use R for methods regular used; S for those sometimes used.

- |       |                                  |
|-------|----------------------------------|
| _____ | a. Physical examination          |
| _____ | b. Intelligence examination      |
| _____ | c. Record of grades              |
| _____ | d. Interest inventory            |
| _____ | e. Diary or autobiography        |
| _____ | f. Self-rating scale             |
| _____ | g. Student rating scale          |
| _____ | h. Interview with student        |
| _____ | i. Personality test or inventory |
| _____ | j. Anecdotal records             |
| _____ | k. Record of previous FW         |
| _____ | l. Case study of student         |
| _____ | _____                            |
| _____ | _____                            |

15. How do you secure information concerning places open for student FW? Use R for methods regularly used; S for those sometimes used:
- |                         |                         |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| _____ a. Correspondence | _____ d. Visit to place |
| _____ b. Interview      | _____                   |
| _____ c. Telephone      | _____                   |
16. Is placement in FW preceeded by (use R for regularly; S for sometimes):
- |                                                                            |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| _____ a. Student's detailed statement of previous Christian service?       |
| _____ b. Student's conference with the FW director?                        |
| _____ c. Student's conference with a denominational supervisor?            |
| _____ d. Student's conference with a representative of group to be served? |
17. Does the seminary keep an information file of places offering FW? \_\_\_\_\_

#### Financial Aspects of Field Work

18. a. What % of students in FW receive remuneration from place served? \_\_\_\_\_  
 b. % who receive remuneration from seminary? \_\_\_\_\_ c. % who receive seminary scholarships for which no FW is required? \_\_\_\_\_  
 d. May students hold other paying job while engaged in FW? \_\_\_\_\_ e. Are students in remunerative FW eligible for scholarships? \_\_\_\_\_  
 f. Must students report yearly FW earnings? \_\_\_\_\_ g. Does seminary recommend a minimum scale for remuneration of student FW? \_\_\_\_\_ Please give scale: \_\_\_\_\_

#### Coordination of Field Work With Class Work

19. a. With which classes is student observation coordinated? \_\_\_\_\_  
 b. State and Practicums or Seminars and times they meet per semester: \_\_\_\_\_
20. Which classes use: a. Field trips \_\_\_\_\_  
 b. Case studies \_\_\_\_\_ c. Counseling people \_\_\_\_\_  
 d. Community surveys \_\_\_\_\_  
 e. Participation in community projects \_\_\_\_\_  
 f. Community resources \_\_\_\_\_  
 g. In which classes may a FW report take the place of a term paper? \_\_\_\_\_

21. With what other classes is FW integrated and by what means?
- |               |                      |
|---------------|----------------------|
| Name of class | Means of integration |
| _____         | _____                |
| _____         | _____                |
| _____         | _____                |

## Field Work Evaluation and Records

22. How many times a semester are the following types of reports used?
- |                              | By Student | By FW Director | By Church etc. |
|------------------------------|------------|----------------|----------------|
| Essay-type report            | a. _____   | b. _____       | c. _____       |
| Printed report form          | d. _____   | e. _____       | f. _____       |
| Check list of FW Done        | g. _____   | h. _____       | i. _____       |
| Summary of FW of student     | j. _____   | k. _____       | l. _____       |
| Summary of anecdotal records |            | m. _____       | n. _____       |
| Student rating scale         |            | o. _____       | p. _____       |
| Student self-rating scale    | q. _____   |                |                |
| Diary of FW submitted        | r. _____   |                |                |
- 
23. When a student completes FW with an organization is there (use R for regularly; S for sometimes):
- A detailed report by student \_\_\_\_\_
  - Student-FW Director conference \_\_\_\_\_
  - Student-Denominational supervisor conference \_\_\_\_\_
  - Student-local official (of church or organization) conference \_\_\_\_\_
  - Joint conference of student, FW director, and others? \_\_\_\_\_
  - How else do you review and evaluate completed FW? \_\_\_\_\_
- 
24. Are FW records used (use R for regularly; S for sometimes):
- By dean \_\_\_\_\_
  - By teachers \_\_\_\_\_
  - By outside people \_\_\_\_\_
  - By denominational official \_\_\_\_\_
  - In further student placement \_\_\_\_\_
  - When student seeks recommendation \_\_\_\_\_
  - How long are FW records kept? \_\_\_\_\_
  - Is permanent summary kept? \_\_\_\_\_
- 
25. a. For how long after graduation is FW Director responsible for follow-up? \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Is he closely associated with placement? \_\_\_\_\_



## CHECK LIST OF FIELD WORK ACTIVITIES

Directions: Check (✓) in the appropriate place to indicate the activities in which student participation is optional, required and/or where such participation is supervised (by seminary, church, or organization).

| ACTIVITY                                | PARTICIPATION<br>Optional | PARTICIPATION<br>Required | PARTICIPATION<br>Supervised |
|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <b>A. PREACHING</b>                     |                           |                           |                             |
| 1. Occasional supply                    | _____                     | _____                     | _____                       |
| 2. Assistant pastor                     | _____                     | _____                     | _____                       |
| 3. Pastor                               | _____                     | _____                     | _____                       |
| 4. Gospel Mission Work                  | _____                     | _____                     | _____                       |
| 5. Radio broadcasts                     | _____                     | _____                     | _____                       |
| 6. Street Meetings                      | _____                     | _____                     | _____                       |
| 7. Shop Meetings                        | _____                     | _____                     | _____                       |
| 8. Revival Evangelism                   | _____                     | _____                     | _____                       |
| <b>B. TEACHING</b>                      |                           |                           |                             |
| 9. Sunday Schools                       | _____                     | _____                     | _____                       |
| 10. Daily Vacation Bible<br>Schools     | _____                     | _____                     | _____                       |
| 11. Week-Day Church Schools             | _____                     | _____                     | _____                       |
| 12. Catechetical Classes                | _____                     | _____                     | _____                       |
| 13. Directors of Religious<br>Education | _____                     | _____                     | _____                       |
| 14. Teacher-Training<br>Institutes      | _____                     | _____                     | _____                       |
| 15. Settlement Houses                   | _____                     | _____                     | _____                       |
| 16. Kindergarten or<br>Nursery Schools  | _____                     | _____                     | _____                       |
| 17. Church Drama Production             | _____                     | _____                     | _____                       |
| <b>C. VISITATION</b>                    |                           |                           |                             |
| 18. Private Homes                       | _____                     | _____                     | _____                       |
| 19. Hospitals                           | _____                     | _____                     | _____                       |
| 20. Mental Hospitals                    | _____                     | _____                     | _____                       |
| 21. Penal Institutions                  | _____                     | _____                     | _____                       |
| 22. Homes for Aged and<br>Orphans       | _____                     | _____                     | _____                       |
| <b>D. SOCIAL SERVICE</b>                |                           |                           |                             |
| 23. YMCA Leaders                        | _____                     | _____                     | _____                       |
| 24. Club or Scout Leaders               | _____                     | _____                     | _____                       |
| 25. Leaders in Summer Camps             | _____                     | _____                     | _____                       |
| 26. Leaders in Adult Clubs              | _____                     | _____                     | _____                       |
| 27. Work with Social Agency             | _____                     | _____                     | _____                       |

|      |                                         |       |       |       |
|------|-----------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| 28.  | Social Case Work                        | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 29.  | Americanization Work                    | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 30.  | Social Forums                           | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 31.  | Work with Other Races                   | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 32.  | Work with Community<br>Organizations    | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| <br> |                                         |       |       |       |
| E.   | MUSICAL LEADERSHIP                      |       |       |       |
| 33.  | Choir Leaders                           | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 34.  | Choir Members                           | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 35.  | Soloists                                | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 36.  | Organists                               | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 37.  | Accompanists                            | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| <br> |                                         |       |       |       |
| F.   | MISCELLANEOUS                           |       |       |       |
| 38.  | Counseling                              | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 39.  | Survey Making                           | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 40.  | Court and Probation<br>Work             | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 41.  | Religious Journalism                    | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 42.  | Distribution of<br>Religious Literature | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 43.  | Gospel Teams                            | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 44.  | Home Missionary Work                    | _____ | _____ | _____ |
|      | _____                                   | _____ | _____ | _____ |
|      | _____                                   | _____ | _____ | _____ |
|      | _____                                   | _____ | _____ | _____ |

#### HAVE YOU INFORMATION TO SHARE?

A. Which types of FW have you been able to supervise most satisfactorily?

B. Which types of FW have you found most difficult to supervise?

- C. Which supervisory activities have you tried and found impracticable?
- D. How do you prepare local church or organizational officials for their share in the supervision and evaluation of the student's FW?
- E. How do you relate FW and guidance?
- F. What changes does your seminary contemplate in its FW set-up?
- G. Have you any suggestions concerning FW which you feel might be worthy of someone's experimental trial?

NAME OF INSTITUTION \_\_\_\_\_

SIGNATURE \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

Please return completed forms to:

Rev. Wesley Duewel  
4226 Delaney Street  
Cincinnati 23, Ohio

## APPENDIX C

## SEMINARIES INCLUDED IN THE SURVEY

The following seminaries were included in this survey:

Alfred University School of Theology, Alfred, New York  
 Andover-Newton Theological School, Newton Centre, Massachusetts  
 Asbury Theological Seminary, Wilmore, Kentucky  
 Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois  
 Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Austin, Texas  
 Bangor Theological Seminary, Bangor, Maine  
 Berkeley Baptist Divinity School, Berkeley, California  
 Berkeley Divinity School, New Haven, Connecticut  
 Bethany Biblical Seminary, Chicago, Illinois  
 Bexley Hall, Divinity School of Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio  
 Biblical Seminary in New York, New York, New York  
 Bloomfield College and Seminary, Bloomfield, New Jersey  
 Bonebrake Theological Seminary, Dayton, Ohio  
 Boston University School of Theology, Boston, Massachusetts  
 Brite College of the Bible, Fort Worth, Texas  
 Butler University School of Religion, Indianapolis, Indiana  
 Calvin Theological Seminary, Grand Rapids, Michigan  
 Candler School of Theology, Emory University, Georgia  
 Central Lutheran Theological Seminary, Fremont, Nebraska  
 Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary, Maywood, Illinois  
 Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois  
 Church Divinity School of the Pacific, Berkeley, California  
 Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, New York  
 The College of the Bible, Lexington, Kentucky  
 Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, Georgia  
 Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pennsylvania  
 Cumberland Presbyterian Theological Seminary, McKenzie, Tennessee  
 Drake University, The College of the Bible, Des Moines, Iowa  
 Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, New Jersey  
 Duke University Divinity School, Durham, North Carolina  
 Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  
 Eden Theological Seminary, Webster Groves, Missouri  
 Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Massachusetts  
 Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary, Capital University,  
 Columbus, Ohio  
 Evangelical School of Theology, Reading, Pennsylvania  
 Evangelical Theological Seminary, Naperville, Illinois  
 Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, California  
 Gammon Theological Seminary, Atlanta, Georgia  
 Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Illinois  
 General Theological Seminary, New York, New York

Gordon College of Theology and Missions, Boston, Massachusetts  
 Hanna Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio  
 Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Connecticut  
 Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge, Massachusetts  
 Hood Theological Seminary, Salisbury, North Carolina  
 Howard University School of Religion, Washington, D. C.  
 Iliff School of Theology, Denver, Colorado  
 Johnson C. Smith University, School of Theology, Charlotte, North Carolina  
 Lincoln University Theological Seminary, Lincoln University, Pennsylvania  
 Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky  
 Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania  
 Lutheran Theological Seminary of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  
 Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary, Columbia, South Carolina  
 Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota  
 McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois  
 Meadville Theological School, Chicago, Illinois  
 Mission House Theological Seminary, Plymouth, Wisconsin  
 Moravian Theological Seminary, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania  
 Nashotah House, Nashotah, Wisconsin  
 Nazarene Theological Seminary, Kansas City, Missouri  
 New Brunswick Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, New Jersey  
 New-Church Theological School, Cambridge, Massachusetts  
 New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, New Orleans, Louisiana  
 Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois  
 Northwestern Lutheran Theological Seminary, Minneapolis, Minnesota  
 Oberlin College Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, Ohio  
 Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, California  
 Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas  
 Phillips University, College of the Bible, Enid, Oklahoma  
 Pittsburgh-Xenia Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania  
 Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey  
 Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  
 Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Virginia  
 San Francisco Theological Seminary, San Anselmo, California  
 Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, Illinois  
 Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Washington, D. C.  
 Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky  
 Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas  
 Starr-Kind School for the Ministry, Berkeley, California  
 Theological Seminary of the Evangelical and Reformed Church in the United States, Lancaster, Pennsylvania  
 Theological School, St. Lawrence University, Canton, New York  
 School of Religion, Tufts College, Medford, Massachusetts

Temple University, School of Theology, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  
Union Theological Seminary, New York, New York  
Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Virginia  
University of Chicago, Divinity School, Chicago, Illinois  
University of Dubuque Theological School, Dubuque, Iowa  
University of the South, School of Theology, Sewanee, Tennessee  
University of Southern California Graduate School of Religion, Los Angeles, California  
Vanderbilt University School of Religion, Nashville, Tennessee  
Virginia Union University School of Religion, Richmond, Virginia  
Wartburg Theological Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa  
Western Theological Seminary, Holland, Michigan  
Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburg, Pennsylvania  
Westminster Theological Seminary, Westminster, Maryland  
Yale University Divinity School, New Haven, Connecticut

## APPENDIX D

## SEMINARIES AND INSTITUTIONS VISITED

The following seminaries and institutions were visited in person and/or interviews were held with their representatives:

Andover-Newton Theological School, Newton Center, Massachusetts  
 Asbury Theological Seminary, Wilmore, Kentucky  
 Berkeley Divinity School, New Haven, Connecticut  
 Bethany Biblical Seminary, Chicago, Illinois  
 Bexley Hall, Divinity School of Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio  
 Biblical Seminary in New York, New York, New York  
 Bloomfield College and Seminary, Bloomfield, New Jersey  
 Bonebrake Theological Seminary, Dayton, Ohio  
 Boston University School of Theology, Boston, Massachusetts  
 Butler University School of Religion, Indianapolis, Indiana  
 Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary, Maywood, Illinois  
 Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois  
 The College of the Bible, Lexington, Kentucky  
 Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pennsylvania  
 Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, New Jersey  
 Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  
 Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Massachusetts  
 Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary, Capital University,  
 Columbus, Ohio  
 Evangelical School of Theology, Reading, Pennsylvania  
 Evangelical Theological Seminary, Naperville, Illinois  
 Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Illinois  
 General Theological Seminary, New York, New York  
 Gordon College of Theology and Missions, Boston, Massachusetts  
 Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio  
 Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Connecticut  
 Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge, Massachusetts  
 Howard University School of Religion, Washington, D. C.  
 Lincoln University Theological Seminary, Lincoln University,  
 Pennsylvania  
 Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Louisville,  
 Kentucky  
 Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania  
 Lutheran Theological Seminary of Philadelphia, Philadelphia,  
 Pennsylvania  
 McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois  
 Meadville Theological School, Chicago, Illinois  
 Moravian Theological Seminary, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania  
 Nazarene Theological Seminary, Kansas City, Missouri  
 New Brunswick Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, New Jersey



New-Church Theological School, Cambridge, Massachusetts  
 Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois  
 Pittsburgh-Xenia Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania  
 Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey  
 Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church,  
     Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  
 Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Virginia  
 Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, Illinois  
 Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Washington, D. C.  
 Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky  
 Theological Seminary of the Evangelical and Reformed Church  
     in the United States, Lancaster, Pennsylvania  
 School of Religion, Tufts College, Medford, Massachusetts  
 Temple University, School of Theology, Philadelphia,  
     Pennsylvania  
 Union Theological Seminary, New York, New York  
 University of Chicago, Divinity School, Chicago, Illinois  
 University of Southern California Graduate School of Religion  
     Los Angeles, California  
 Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania  
 Westminster Theological Seminary, Westminster, Maryland  
 Yale University Divinity School, New Haven, Connecticut

## APPENDIX E

## INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED

One or more interviews were held with each of the following individuals:

Alderton, Walker M., Director of Field Work, Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois  
 Baughman, Harry F., Director of Field Work, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania  
 Blackmer, Franklin H., President, New-Church Theological School, Cambridge, Massachusetts  
 Bluntoen, Sankey L., President, Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pennsylvania  
 Chandler, John R., Graduate Assistant to the Field-Work Director, Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey  
 Clymer, Wayne K., Supervisor of Field Work, Evangelical Theological Seminary, Naperville, Illinois  
 Cotton, Jarvis M., Vice President and Director of Field Work, Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania  
 Deininger, Charles F., Director of Field Work, Bloomfield College and Seminary, Bloomfield, New Jersey  
 DeWire, Harry A., Director of Field Service, Evangelical School of Theology, Reading, Pennsylvania  
 Ebersole, Mark, Graduate Assistant to the Field-Work Director, Union Theological Seminary, New York, New York  
 Fairbanks, Rollin, Director, Institute of Pastoral Care, and Director of Field Work, Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Massachusetts  
 Faw, Chalmer E., Field-Work Director, Bethany Biblical Seminary, Chicago, Illinois  
 Fendt, Edward C., Dean, Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary, Capital University, Columbus, Ohio  
 Flack, Elmer Ellsworth, Dean, Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio  
 Garber, Helen L., Registrar and Director of Community Service, Biblical Seminary in New York, New York, New York  
 Gilliatt, David Harvey, Director of Field Work, Bonebrake Theological Seminary, Dayton, Ohio  
 Hall, Joseph M. III, Director of Field Work, Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  
 Hanna, C. Morton, Supervisor of Rural Church, Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky  
 Harner, Nevin C., Executive Secretary of the American Association of Theological Schools, Professor of Christian Education,

Theological Seminary of the Evangelical and Reformed Church  
in the United States, Lancaster, Pennsylvania

Hedrick, Sam, Director of Supervised Field Work, Boston Uni-  
versity School of Theology, Boston, Massachusetts

Hill, Daniel G., Dean, Howard University School of Religion,  
Washington, D. C.

Howe, Reuel L., Professor of Pastoral Theology, Protestant  
Episcopal Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Virginia

Howes, John Baxter, Supervisor of Field Work, Westminster  
Theological Seminary, Westminster, Maryland

James, M. Stephen, Professor of Preaching and Pastoral Theology,  
New Brunswick Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, New Jersey

Kortz, Elmer W., Director of Field Work, Moravian Theological  
Seminary, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania

Lazzaro, Ralph, Director of Field Work, Harvard Divinity School,  
Cambridge, Massachusetts

LeRoy, Jeanne L., Secretary, Field-Work Office, Eastern Baptist  
Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Lewis, Florence M., Professor of Christian Education,  
Pittsburgh-Xenia Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pennsylv-  
ania

Littorin, Frank T., Director of Pastoral Supply, Gordon College  
of Theology and Missions, Boston, Massachusetts

Lynn, Paul Ross, Counsellor in Field Work, Hartford Theological  
Seminary, Hartford, Connecticut

Mark, J. Burton, Director of Field-Work Department, Northern  
Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois

Melconian, Vartan D., Director of Field Work, McCormick Theo-  
logical Seminary, Chicago, Illinois

Miller, Richard W., Director of Student Relations, Garrett  
Biblical Institute, Evanston, Illinois

Moore, George Voiers, Director of Student Placement, The College  
of the Bible, Lexington, Kentucky

Moore, Joseph G., Director of Unit of Research, Seabury-Western  
Theological Seminary, Evanston, Illinois

Morris, Thomas H., Chaplain, Bellevue Hospital, New York, New  
York

Murray, Andrew E., Director of Field Work, Lincoln University  
Theological Seminary, Lincoln University, Pennsylvania

Nelson, John Oliver, Director of Religious Field Work, Yale  
University Divinity School, New Haven, Connecticut

Leitzel, Celso Vincent, Representing John Walter Doberstein,  
Director of Field Work, Lutheran Theological Seminary of  
Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Pemberton, Prentiss Lovell, Director of Field Work, Andover-  
Newton Theological School, Newton Centre, Massachusetts

Pyatt, Charles Lynn, Dean, The College of the Bible, Lexington,  
Kentucky

Ratcliff, John Moses, Dean, School of Religion, Tufts College,  
Medford, Massachusetts

Roberts, Edward H., Dean, Princeton Theological Seminary,  
 Princeton, New Jersey  
 Roberts, Walter N., Treasurer, American Association of Theo-  
 logical School, and President, Bonebrake Theological  
 Seminary, Dayton, Ohio  
 Robertson, James Douglass, Professor of Applied Theology,  
 Asbury Theological Seminary, Wilmore Kentucky  
 Rose, Lawrence, Dean, General Theological Seminary, New York,  
 New York  
 Rowley, Frank S., Dean, College of Law, University of Cincinnati,  
 Cincinnati, Ohio  
 Secretary to the Dean, Meadville Theological School, Chicago,  
 Illinois  
 Secretary to the Dean, University of Chicago Divinity School,  
 Chicago, Illinois  
 Secretary to the Director, Institute of Pastoral Care, Boston,  
 Massachusetts  
 Secretary to the Field-Work Director, University of Southern  
 California School of Religion, Los Angeles, California  
 Secretary to the Registrar, Andover-Newton Theological School,  
 Newton Centre, Massachusetts  
 Shelton, O. L., Dean, Butler University School of Religion,  
 Indianapolis, Indiana  
 Sittler, Joseph, Director of Field Work, Chicago Lutheran  
 Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois  
 Stalker, John R., Professor of Rural Church, Bexley Hall,  
 Divinity School of Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio  
 Stroh, Anne E., Secretary, Field Work Office, McCormick Theo-  
 logical Seminary, Chicago, Illinois  
 Swift, Arthur L., Director of Field Work, Union Theological  
 Seminary, New York, New York  
 Thomas, J. S. Ladd, Dean, School of Theology, Temple University,  
 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  
 Turkington, William D., Dean, Asbury Theological Seminary,  
 Wilmore, Kentucky  
 Urban, Percy L., Dean, Berkeley Divinity School, New Haven,  
 Connecticut  
 Weniger, Charles E., Dean, Seventh-Day Adventist Theological  
 Seminary, Washington, D. C.  
 Whitney, Arthur P., Director of Field Work, Drew Theological  
 Seminary, Madison, New Jersey  
 Williams, Albert G., Director of Field Work, Eastern Baptist  
 Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania  
 Ziegler, Jesse H., Director of Counseling, Services, Bethany  
 Biblical Seminary, Chicago, Illinois