

Motives

II. C. Characteristics and Motives of Students and Graduates

2. Motives of Students and Graduates

Findings

The description of students and graduates in the preceding section not only provides a profile of the typical D.Min. participant but also suggests factors that may influence a decision to enroll also in a D.Min. program. The D.Min. may, for example, especially attract pastors approaching mid-career who see themselves as innovative and who do not always find their current position offering them maximum opportunity for expressing their talents for ministry. For older entrants, as one director quoted above suggests, the motivation may be to get additional resources near the end of their careers. Denominational or congregational emphasis on educated or competent ministry may also be in play. These are, however, inferences drawn from the characteristics of students and graduates. The question of motivation was also addressed more directly in our surveys. In this section we consider what we have learned about factors that influence students and graduates to pursue a D.Min. and to choose the particular programs in which they enroll.

Section I of the student, graduate and clergy questionnaires asked a number of questions about continuing education and about motives for D.Min. involvement. Some of these questions were also asked in the Presbyterian panel survey (unless otherwise noted, only pastors' responses are reported in this section). Table I shows a comparison of the reasons rated as "very important." (For other ratings, see Graduates, Students and Clergy I, A, and Presbyterian Panel 3.)

Do clergy who decide to pursue the D.Min. degree have different motives from those who pursue continuing education in non-degree programs? To address this question, we asked all our clergy respondent groups to rank a number of reasons that a clergy person might engage in continuing education and to rate the importance of each (Students, Graduates and Clergy I, A). They were also asked to indicate the most important reason for engaging in continuing education. (For comparison, students and graduates were also asked to review this same list and select from it their chief reason for enrolling in a D.Min. program. The answers to this question are reported later in this section.) In all cases, the same item on our list rates highest as the motive for continuing education, and 60% or more of each clergy group rates it as very important: Improvement of practical skills such as preaching, counseling and administration. Different groups made different second choices. The D.Min. students and graduates give as their second reason updating theological knowledge, while clergy not engaged in the D.Min. and Presbyterian Panel pastors

choose spiritual growth. For all groups, the least important reason for engaging in continuing education is to broaden one's knowledge by studying in non-theological areas such as literature, economics or sociology, though 25% of the Presbyterian pastors rated this as very important, compared with only 9% of each of the other groups. When we sorted the clergy by various background variables, we found some differences. Graduates and students who had been ordained longer placed more emphasis on updating theological knowledge, and those ordained a shorter period of time on improving practical skills. Those who identified themselves as more liberal theologically emphasized updating theological knowledge and also broadening their knowledge in non-theological areas; conservative clergy were more likely to view the improvement of practical skills and spiritual growth as important.

TABLE I Percent Listing Various Reasons for participating in Continuing Education as "Very Important"

	<u>Students</u>	<u>Graduates</u>	<u>Non-.D.Min. Clergy</u>	<u>Presbyterian Pastors</u>
<u>Reasons:</u>				
To update theological knowledge in an area in which he/she has fallen behind	41%	44%	47%	46%
To pursue an area of theological interest	30	27	29	33
To improve practical skills such as preaching, counseling, administration, etc.	66	63	60	68
For spiritual growth	45	37	46	54
To broaden one's knowledge by studying in non-theological areas such as economics, literature, sociology, etc.	9	9	9	16

Although we have not pursued denominational differences in much of our analysis since our student and graduate samples were not drawn on the basis of denomination, resulting in a considerable denominational spread, we nevertheless crosstabulated denomination for several of these questions about reasons for engaging in continuing education, to see if differences in denominational norms or other denominationally-related factors can be discerned. To do so, we used only those denominational groups in our sample large enough for statistical comparisons. Note that the denominational information reported here is organized by actual denominations (such as Lutherans, Presbyterians, etc.), not the large religious tradition categories (mainline, evangelical) used in most of our data analysis. Denominational differences (tables not shown) prove sometimes significant. Roman

Motives

Catholics among our students and graduates samples vary the usual pattern, ranking first "updating theological knowledge" rather than the usual choice, "improving practical skills." Episcopalians among clergy not involved in D.Min. programs also make an unusual first choice: Spiritual growth, rather than improvement of practical skills. Episcopal D.Min. students and graduates make the usual choice, improvement of practical skills, suggesting the possibility that Episcopal clergy who choose to enter D.Min. programs have a different orientation to continuing education than do non-D.Min. Episcopal clergy.

Our comparison between motives given for engaging in non-degree continuing education and for enrolling in a D.Min. program yields an interesting result: The highest ranked reason in both cases is the same, the improvement of practical skills. This finding lends great weight to the widespread observation that most clergy enter D.Min. programs in order to pursue continuing education in a structured setting. It should be noted, however, that the second most important reason given for pursuing a D.Min. is different from the reason given for engaging in continuing education generally: Updating one's theological knowledge, the second-ranked motive for continuing education, is supplanted by "pursuing an area of theological interest" in the ranking of reasons to enroll in a D.Min. program.

Spiritual growth is also given less weight as a motive for the D.Min. than for continuing education. Presbyterian Panel clergy, asked a fairly similar question (Question 30: They were asked to rank the reasons they believe most clergy enroll in D.Min. programs), gave a similar ranking of reasons: improvement of skills for ministry was most important, broadening and deepening theological understanding and personal and spiritual growth were next most important. The pastors who replied to the Presbyterian Panel were offered the opportunity to rank in this list some of those reasons often imputed to D.Min. students as motives for enrollment: gaining a credential in order to move to a better job, making themselves eligible for higher pay, or providing themselves with an opportunity for fellowship with other clergy. The Presbyterian Panel clergy did not view any of these as important reasons why most clergy entered. We did not expect that students and graduates themselves would claim that a major motive for entering D.Min. programs was to increase their status and mobility. (The issue of status as a motive is discussed further below). We did think that fellowship with other clergy might be a major motive. As reported below, however, it did not rank high in any of the lists on which it was included in students' and graduates' questionnaires, confirming the Presbyterian clergy's estimation that it is not a major motive of those who enroll in D.Min. programs.

The importance of the focus of D.Min. programs on the practice of ministry was borne out by comments from seminary administrators, faculty members and students. Students especially appreciate programs that "build on ministry experience and recognize the value of that experience." Likewise, several comment that they were drawn to the

D.Min. because it seemed connected with their day-to-day ministry activities and ministry settings. "It did not require me to become divorced from my congregation" is a typical comment. Many students also value programs that emphasize organizational development, church growth and church renewal -- skill areas that had received little emphasis in their M.Div./B.D. programs. As we note elsewhere in this report, these are distinctive emphases in several of what we call "unique content or method" programs. In contrast, however, several graduates and students deliberately chose programs that they believed were more academic in focus and less practically oriented, and some would have preferred to pursue the Ph.D. or Th.D. had they been able to do so while continuing to work in a parish setting. Said one current student, "I think it is most unfortunate that seminaries so utterly neglect the academically oriented minister. I think more Th.D. programs are needed."

We also asked questions about the value of various modes of delivery of continuing education (Students, Graduates and Clergy I, D). The most noticeable difference in responses among the three groups is the more positive value both graduates and students place on degree or certificate programs, especially the D.Min. degree. For non-D.Min. clergy, greater value is placed on travel-study programs, independent study, and, to a lesser extent, non-credit seminars and workshops at a seminary or theological center. This difference in preference may also provide a clue to one important motive for entering a D.Min. program. Students' and graduates' preferences for a degree or certificate program -- each of which represents a structured, longer term experience -- is consonant with the theme we and others have heard from many clergy enrolled in D.Min. programs. These clergy place a high value on having a structure. They want "organized and intentional education," said one student about himself and others in his program. In an earlier evaluation of an experimental D.Min. program at Hartford Seminary, ("Pastor and Parish as Colearners in the Doctor of Ministry Program: An Experiment in Theological Education," Theological Education 16 [Winter 1980]: 198), researchers reported that almost all candidates:

Wanted and needed a structured program to help them do something they desired to do but could not accomplish satisfactorily on their own. Most had tried, somewhat unsuccessfully, an intensive personal study program or had taken several short-term continuing education seminars or programs. They hoped... to have the structured motivation and continuity of educational experiences that heretofore had been lacking in their postordination experience.

Obviously such experiences need not be degree-related, but degree programs currently provide a primary means for meeting the needs of those who want structure and discipline in their continuing education.

Thus far we have considered internal motivations. Are there external sources of encouragement that are also important? In recent years, for example, United Methodist clergy have been required to take

Motives

part in regular continuing education. Other denominations may strongly encourage such participation without making it compulsory. In addition, the recognition of the importance of continuing education has led in some cases to making denominational funds available to clergy to cover some of the costs of continuing education. In many judicatories, there is also strong encouragement for congregations to make both funds and study leave time available to their clergy as a part of their contract with the congregation.

Just over one-fourth of the students and non-D.Min. clergy and one-third of the graduates report that their denominations require a certain amount of continuing education annually (Students, Graduates and Clergy E, 1 and 2). In each group, over 70% believes that there should be such a requirement, though more current students (77%) and graduates (80%) affirmed this than did non-D.Min. clergy (72%), a statistically significant difference. In a similar question (4) in the Presbyterian Panel study, 77% of the Presbyterian pastors thought a denominational requirement was definitely or probably a good idea, and 69% of Presbyterian laity agree. A majority of Presbyterian pastors and laity also believe that, "all other factors being equal, a minister who regularly engages in some educational activity should be hired in preference to someone who does not" (Presbyterian Panel 20). Approximately two-thirds of the members and elders either strongly agreed or agreed with the statement, and almost 80% of the pastors agreed.

When asked whether there was any pressure, either from the judicatory or from the congregation/work setting, for them to take part in continuing education (Graduates and Clergy E, 3), graduates were slightly less likely than non-D.Min. clergy to report much or some pressure from their judicatories, but they were considerably more likely than non-D.Min. clergy to report much or some pressure from their congregations (39% and 27% respectively). Since these are D.Min. graduates reporting on their current congregation/ministry setting, we cannot be certain that similar expectations influenced the decision to enroll in the D.Min. In any case, whether by virtue of internal motivation or external pressure, 86% of the graduates report having taken part in some continuing education since completing their D.Min. program; and 90% of the non-D.Min. clergy report having participated in some form of continuing education in the past three years (Clergy F). Thus, although there are some differences in the groups' reports on pressure to participate, there is a very high involvement in some form of continuing education by all clergy surveyed.

Do available study leave time and continuing education funds make a difference in D.Min. participation (Students I, F; Graduates and Clergy I, G)? Current students are given substantially more annual study leave than non-D.Min. clergy, and somewhat more than graduates. While approximately the same proportion of each group reports at least two weeks study leave (about 45%), 21% of the students have more than two weeks as compared with 11% of the graduates and only 5% of the non-D.Min. clergy.

There were no statistically significant differences in amount of study time available to students when size of church was compared; for non-D.Min. clergy, however, the larger the church, the more study time was available. Almost half of the clergy in congregations of fewer than 100 members received no study time. There are also statistically significant differences in the amount of study time available to students and non-D.Min. clergy of particular denominations. For example, three-fourths of the Southern Baptist non-D.Min. clergy report receiving no study leave, while this is true for only 45% of the current Southern Baptist D.Min. students. Other denominations that we are able to compare show similar though generally smaller differences. Whether somewhat more study leave time was already available to students before they decided to enroll, or whether such leave was granted in conjunction with or in recognition of that decision, we do not know. One can infer, though, that having such additional study leave time available or potentially available makes participation in a D.Min. more likely and perhaps easier. As we shall note below, insufficient time was the most important reason for not enrolling in a D.Min. given by non-D.Min. clergy who have considered enrolling.

In spite of their greater amount of time, 35% of the students indicated that their study leave time is inadequate. Somewhat fewer graduates (31%) and non-D.Min. clergy (26%) complained of inadequate study leave time. As might be expected, most students (79%) used all of their available study leave, but this was true for only 52% of the graduates and 43% of the non-D.Min. clergy. Despite having study leave time three out of ten students and graduates report that D.Min. involvement was a great burden, and another two-thirds found it a moderate burden (Students and Graduates III, K).

There are no large differences in the proportions of congregations/employers providing funds for continuing education (76% for graduates, 75% for students and 71% for non-D.Min. clergy). The average amount received by different groups is, however, markedly different. For students it is \$662 and for graduates, \$493; for non-D.Min. clergy, the average amount is substantially lower -- \$371. For both students and non-D.Min. clergy, there is a relationship between church size and having some continuing education funds provided: The larger the church, the greater the likelihood of receiving some funds.

There are also differences by denomination in the availability of funds to students as compared with non-D.Min. clergy. As with study time, the differences in funds available are greatest for Southern Baptists. Approximately half of those enrolled in D.Min. programs receive some funding, while almost three-fourths of non-D.Min. Southern Baptist clergy receive no funds. Smaller but still substantial differences also appear for the two groups of Episcopal clergy; the differences are less, however, for Lutherans, United Methodists and Presbyterians.

Motives

It is interesting, too, that although Southern Baptists showed the greatest disparities in the proportions of students and non-D.Min. clergy receiving study leave time and funds, among both groups, Southern Baptists who do receive funds for continuing education receive some of the largest average amounts. The average for Southern Baptist non-D.Min. clergy is \$568, compared with the overall non-D.Min. clergy mean of \$371. For Southern Baptist students, the average amount available is \$1038, compared with an overall average for students of \$662. Only Lutheran Church (Missouri Synod) students received more on the average (\$1147). United Methodist students received twice as much as non-D.Min. United Methodist clergy, and lesser differences are evident for other comparable denominations.

Here, too, as with study leave time, it is probably the case that some D.Min. students' congregations/employers make more money available because the clergy person is enrolled in a D.Min. program; though, again, it is possible that such funds were already available. In either case, having the funds made available is important in making participation possible. And again as with study leave time, in spite of the larger amount of money available, slightly more students (53%) believe the funds provided are inadequate than graduates (46%) and non-D.Min. clergy (49%). Students were also considerably more likely to have used the allowance provided during 1984 (81%) than graduates (57%) and non D.Min. clergy (52%).

Thus far, we have considered a variety of factors that support D.Min. enrollment. What influences a person not to enroll? Thirty-six percent of our non-D.Min. clergy sample say that they have considered enrolling in a D.Min. but decided against it (Clergy I, I), and 49% say that it is at least somewhat likely that they will enroll in the future (Clergy I, J). For those who had considered enrolling, the most important reason for not doing so is time (41% said that time available made a great deal of difference in their decision). Cost is the second most important reason (32%), followed by the lack of a program within reasonable travel distance (28%). Fourth most important (20%) were doubts about the value of the D.Min. as a credential. Somewhat less important were inability to find a program that fit their interests (18%) and doubts about the quality of D.Min. programs. Doubts about one's own academic ability and inability to secure admission to a desired program were of little importance. Thus time, money and distance from available programs are most reported by non-D.Min. clergy as deterrents to D.Min. enrollment.

There has been considerable speculation -- often cynicism -- about other motives for pursuing the degree, notably a concern for career and/or status enhancement. In several institutions, faculty suspected that students enroll because they think it "will make some difference in how they are regarded or paid," as one faculty member expressed it. In the Presbyterian Panel, as earlier noted, we asked several questions (16-21) about the career and/or status enhancement potential of D.Min. involvement. We asked identical questions of students, graduates, and non-D.Min. clergy (II, A). From the answers, we can draw some

inferences about the possible influence on D.Min. enrollment of these factors. The responses are summarized in Table II.

TABLE II Respondents Indicating "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" to Various Consequences of Holding a D.Min. Degree*

	Percent Saying <u>Strongly Agree</u>	Percent Saying <u>Agree</u>
1. All other factors being equal, a minister with a D.Min. should be paid more than a minister who has a Masters of Bachelor of Divinity.		
Members	8%	51%
Elders	9	51
Presbyterian Pastors	7	31
D.Min. Graduates	24	49
D.Min. Students	23	45
Non-D.Min. Clergy	5	37
2. All other factors being equal, a minister with a D.Min. should be hired in preference to someone who has a Masters or Bachelor of Divinity degree.		
Members	5	35
Elders	5	31
Presbyterian Pastors	3	17
D.Min. Graduates	15	41
D.Min. Students	14	36
Non-D.Min. Clergy	2	18
3. A minister who has earned the D.Min. should be called "Dr." in public settings.		
Members	12	44
Elders	8	51
Presbyterian Pastors	5	37
D.Min. Graduates	17	56
D.Min. Students	12	50
Non-D.Min. Clergy	5	32
4. A minister who has a D.Min. degree is more likely to be respected by other community leaders than if he/she did not have the degree.		
Members	8	63
Elders	8	52
Presbyterian Pastors	7	51
D.Min. Graduates	18	60
D.Min. Students	12	57
Non-D.Min. Clergy	3	42

Motives

TABLE II continued

	<u>Percent Saying Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Percent Saying Agree</u>
5. All other factors being equal, a minister who regularly engages in some educational activity should be hired in preference to someone who does not.		
Members	18	57
Elders	14	64
Presbyterian Pastors	23	63
D.Min. Graduates	37	55
D.Min. Students	35	53
Non-D.Min. Clergy	20	54
6. All other factors being equal, regular participation in continuing education should be given more weight in a hiring decision than whether a person has a D.Min. degree.		
Members	16	64
Elders	16	65
Presbyterian Pastors	25	66
D.Min. Graduates	17	53
D.Min. Students	21	52
Non-D.Min. Clergy	24	54

* The Presbyterian member, elder and pastor data come from the Presbyterian Panel survey. The percentages shown in this table for Presbyterian respondents have been recomputed, taking out "don't know" and non responses, to make them comparable with the percentages from the three D.Min. surveys.

Although the proportions of students and graduates indicating strong agreement with any single item is not large, it is clear that both groups agree more strongly than Presbyterian lay and clergy respondents and non-D.Min. clergy that the D.Min. should bring additional status/rewards. The major exception is the final question about a D.Min. advantage in hiring. There, both Presbyterian pastors (some of who have the D.Min.) and non-D.Min. clergy are more likely to indicate strong agreement than graduates and slightly more likely to do so than students. Presbyterian laity are less likely to indicate strong agreement than the various clergy groups on any items; when strongly agree and agree responses are combined, however a majority of the laity are willing to grant D.Min. extra consideration in issues of hiring. Therefore, it seems clear that D.Min. students and graduates are more likely to believe that the D.Min. has status and/or career enhancing qualities, and, to a lesser extent, the laity surveyed tended to agree. In a later section, as we examine some effects of D.Min. participation, we will have occasion to examine whether D.Min. graduates find there are career and status rewards (including psychic

rewards such as self-esteem and improved morale) from earning the D.Min. We doubt that these factors are primary motives for most students; they are, however, by no means unimportant, and for some they may be dominant. With considerable candor one woman graduate indicated the degree's importance to her for career advancement:

As a woman, the extra degree opened a position that would not have been available otherwise. That was my hope when I began the degree, and it has been realized. The learnings were valuable and important, but my primary goal was career advancement. There were just too many shut doors and ability and performance were outweighed by my sex. (My perception.) In this congregation, the education level was a high priority and that prompted them to give me a chance, albeit with the help of the Holy Spirit who helped us to find one another.

We have not, of course, exhausted the various motives and factors that lie behind the decision to enter the D.Min. We believe, however, that those which we have highlighted in this section are primary for the majority of those who enroll. To sum up, it would appear that the dominant reason for pursuing the degree is to enhance one's skills in the practice of ministry, with a desire to pursue an area of theological interest as a distant second. Clergy do not typically enroll in a D.Min. program to bring themselves up-to-date, or for spiritual formation. The D.Min. is an attractive alternative to other forms of continuing education both because of its close relationship to the practice of ministry and the ministry setting and because it provides structure and discipline for continuing education. Career and/or status enhancement may also be a factor, though we suspect such factors are desired by-products rather than primary reasons for participation. Also enhancing the likelihood of participation are certain external supports, especially, it would appear, having study leave time and financial support made available by one's congregation or ministry setting. Conversely, the lack of time and adequate financial resources -- and to a lesser extent, geographic distance from any program -- are major factors hindering a number of clergy from enrolling.

Reasons for Choosing a Particular Program

Once a clergy person has decided to enroll in a D.Min. program, what are the factors that influence the choice of a particular program? We not only asked how many students and graduates investigated other programs before choosing the one in which they enrolled (Students and Graduates III, E), but we also provided a list of factors and asked them to rank the factors in degree of importance (Students and Graduates III, F).

In response to the question about investigating other programs before enrolling, most (75% of students and 63% of graduates) report they did some "shopping around." Among the factors important in making their choice, the content and focus of the program was most important

Motives

for students (53% saying "extremely important") and second most important for graduates (47%). Program reputation was first in importance for graduates (57% indicating "extremely important") and second in importance to current students (43%). Next in importance for both groups were reputation of particular faculty teaching in the program (37% "extremely important" for graduates and 30% for students) and ease of completing the program while working full time (32% for graduates and 31% for students). Also important was geographic access to a program, either one in a seminary located nearby or one offered nearby on an extension basis. Factors such as cost of the program, availability of financial aid, the seminary's denominational affiliation, the opportunity to join a colleague group being formed in one's area, and encouragement of a denominational official, were of less importance to most persons as reasons for enrolling in a particular program.

In a separate question (Students and Graduates III, G), we asked again about the importance of denominational affiliation for the choice of a particular program. For just over half of students (56%) and graduates (53%) denomination was not a factor in their choice; about 40% of each group preferred a seminary of their own denomination. Approximately one in ten of each group preferred a seminary of another denomination than her/his own.

When we compute correlations between these responses and selected individual or institutional factors, several significant differences emerge. Although the correlations are not strong, students enrolled in evangelical seminaries are more likely to emphasize the importance of the reputation of the program and reputation of particular faculty. For mainline students, the geographical accessibility of a program, whether at a nearby seminary or, especially, through availability of an off-campus program are significant factors. While this does not mean that reputation of a program or its faculty are unimportant for students in mainline seminaries or that location is unimportant for evangelicals, it does suggest that the latter are more likely to focus on program and faculty reputation than students attending mainline schools and, therefore, also probably willing to travel farther to do so. In fact, such travel will probably be necessary since there are considerably fewer evangelical programs. It may well be that it is the evangelical reputation of the schools or faculty that is most important to these students. That mainline students attribute significantly greater importance to the possibility of an off-campus program no doubt reflects the fact that several of the largest off-campus programs are those of mainline schools. We also found that the smaller the size of a program, the more likely students are to indicate that denominational differences were important in their choice. Students in larger programs are slightly more likely to emphasize the content and focus and reputation of the program. And, since several of the larger programs are offered by extension, it is not surprising that there is a relatively strong correlation between large size and the importance of being able to join a colleague group in one's area. Given the fact that some extension programs report that "borderline" students are

occasionally admitted to fill out a group, it is also not surprising that there is also a weak, but statistically significant, correlation between lower grade point average of students and the importance they place on joining a nearby colleague group.

Discussion

Several issues and conclusions stem from what we have learned about clergy motives for enrolling in D.Min. programs and for declining to enroll.

First, it is evident from the similarity between the list of reasons given for entering D.Min. programs and those for pursuing other kinds of continuing education that the structure and discipline a degree program uniquely offers is an important feature -- perhaps the most important feature -- for the significant number of clergy who choose the D.Min. route. Planners of non-degree continuing education programs should take note: many clergy welcome continuing education in a form that offers an order of inquiry, expectations and deadlines for the completion of work, and evaluation. Most non-degree continuing education programs are collections of short-term "events." There is no progression or order among these events, and usually they do not require that the person attending complete reading and writing assignments as preparation. Nor do most include structured evaluation of the contributions that participants do make. Our findings suggest that these elements excluded in most non-degree continuing education are important for, as we have said, substantial numbers of clergy. It is thus likely that more order and structure in non-degree continuing education programs would be welcomed by their clergy participants.

There also seem to us to be consequences from our findings that, though structure and discipline are the features of D.Min. programs that those who enroll in them uniquely seek, the educational resources they most hope to gain from the D.Min. are the same as those they most hope to gain from all kinds of continuing education, namely improvement in skills for ministry. We did not ask D.Min. students and graduates to rate their programs, but answers to many of our questions yield indirect measures of satisfaction, and in addition many students and graduates added comments to their questionnaires specifying what they do and do not like about their programs. The most frequent and persistent expressions of satisfaction came from students and graduates whose programs fall into the category we call "unique content or method programs." These programs are perceived as providing specific resources for ministry not offered in the participant's earlier education. Though we do not recommend that the special foci of these programs -- organization development and church growth, for instance -- be adopted by all programs, we do think that students benefit from the clarity of focus and purpose that such programs offer, and we would urge all programs to examine their offerings and to specify, for themselves and their students, what resources for ministry each program affords.

Motives

Last, we make a recommendation. We were somewhat surprised by the evidence we collected of a very high level of participation in continuing education of all the clergy we surveyed. It is quite clear that clergy have heard the message about the importance of continuing education and that most have responded. It is also clear, however, that the availability of study leave time and financial support are critical for more than cursory involvement in continuing education programs. Elsewhere in this report we recommend that seminaries seriously consider lengthening the course of study required for the D.Min. degree, from the equivalent of one year's work to two. This will only be possible, we believe, if church officials make a corresponding effort to change denominational and congregational policies on clergy continuing education. Though we believe that financial allocations could in many cases be more generous, our view is that time is the critical factor. Most D.Min. students, we believe, would greatly benefit from specified release time while they are enrolled in D.Min. programs. This release time might be made available in the form of a regular free period, each week or month, for concentrated work in the D.Min. program; or as a sabbatical leave period at some critical point, such as project writing. This matter is not incidentally important, but rather critical if the quality of work in D.Min. programs is to be enhanced. We therefore strongly recommend that denominational officials work, in the various ways required by different denominational systems, to make some period of release time for study, in addition to regular study leave, the norm for students enrolled in D.Min. programs. Seminaries can add force to this effort by requiring applicants to their programs to negotiate in advance such release time for study.

In making this recommendation we are not, however, necessarily advocating denominationally-mandated continuing education, even though large numbers of the clergy respondents to our surveys believe that there should be such requirements. We note, as have other observers (see, for instance, Patrick B. Storey, M.D., "Mandatory Continuing Medical Education," New England Journal of Medicine Vol. 298 [June 22, 1978]: 1416-18), the trivializing and abuses of continuing education that such requirements have fostered in other professions. Better, we believe, would be on-going advocacy for adequate continuing education time and funds for clergy, and attention by church executives to the individual minister, to see that such time and funds are used in creative and individually appropriate ways.