II. E. The Impact of Doctor of Ministry Programs

Findings

What difference do Doctor of Ministry programs make? In three parts of this section, we summarize our findings about the impact of D.Min. programs on students in the programs and those who graduate from them, on the congregations or ministry settings in which these students and graduates work, and on seminaries that offer the programs.

To measure the effects of an educational program such as the D.Min. with any precision is not really possible, especially when the program objectives, emphases, structures and requirements of individual programs vary as much as they do for the D.Min: Further compounding the difficulty is the necessity of relying in large part on perceptions of effects rather than on direct measures of possible effects, and, since this is a cross-sectional study, the absence of "before" and "after" measures of effect. To compensate in part for the latter difficulty, we are able to report in several instances comparisons with clergy who are not engaged in D.Min. studies.

1. Effects on Students and Graduates

The Standards for the Doctor of Ministry program established by the Association of Theological Schools defines several objectives for the degree that broadly suggest possible effects of the program on those who complete it. The overall goal of the D.Min. is defined as equipping "one for the practice of ministry at a higher level of competence than that achieved in the foundational work in the M.Div. where the primary purpose is preparation for the beginning of professional ministry." More specifically, the content of the program should "deepen...basic knowledge and skill in ministry [acquired in the M.Div. program], so that one can engage in ministry with increasing professional, intellectual and spiritual integrity." Three educational outcomes are then listed as indicators of increased competence beyond the M.Div. All are expressed in terms of "growth" in capacities "to understand and interpret the church's ministry in relation to biblical, historical, theological and pastoral disciplines;...to articulate and refine a theory of ministry while engaging in ministry and to bring practice under judgment by that theory;...to function in an appropriate manner in the skill areas of ministry and to manifest the personal qualities normally considered essential at an advanced level of ministerial competence." As we have argued elsewhere, these standards invoke the language of "advanced competence" without defining it. Further, by stating objectives in terms of "growth," they suggest, but do not specify, a relative rather than absolute standard of achievement. Thus they do not give a great deal of guidance to our effort to discover the effects of D.Min. programs, but nonetheless we have tried in various ways to identify "effects" that bespeak these broad goals. We have asked those who observe D.Min. holders whether advanced competence in the practice of ministry has been achieved and

have tried to find other indicators of competence as well. We have also studied the personal and social consequences for students and graduates of involvement in a D.Min. program, both during and following enrollment -- for instance, the effect of participation on commitment to the ministry setting, the frequency of conflicts among the demands of the program and responsibilities within the ministry setting, and the incidence of personal or family problems. In particular, based on information gathered during our case study visits, we sought to measure the effects of D.Min. participation on participants' commitment to the ministry, self-esteem and morale. Time and time again during case study visits, we heard these themes expressed so frequently that we came to refer to them as the "litany" of most-observed effects on those who participate.

Assessments were solicited from seminary administrators (chief executives and D.Min. directors) and faculty members, from laity (participants in the Presbyterian Panel study), and, finally, from students and graduates themselves. In most cases, the responses of chief executives are not reported, since they closely resemble those of D.Min. directors and since they have the fewest opportunities for direct observation of D.Min. students and graduates.

a. What Happens to Students While Enrolled

The average D.Min. student spends between three and four years enrolled in the program. Many students' programs take longer. Thus the period of D.Min. enrollment is a substantial portion (perhaps 10%) of a minister's total career. It is also a significantly long period in the life of a congregation. Thus it is worth assessing the effects of the D.Min. on students while they are enrolled.

Unlike many other programs of advanced professional preparation, D.Min. students in in-ministry programs are almost always part-time students, working full-time in congregations or other ministry settings while they pursue the degree. The multiple demands of job and study may prove difficult to handle. At the same time, it should be noted that in-ministry programs are typically designed to integrate students' work experiences with classroom and other elements of the degree program. Thus, the disjuncture between work and study may not be as great for clergy in D.Min. programs as it might be for other working students. We asked seminary administrators, faculty members, and students and graduates to reflect on these issues and to report the consequences of D.Min. enrollment that they have observed. The perspectives of administrators and faculty members are reflected in Table I.

TABLE I Effects of the Degree on Students while they are in the Program (Director and Faculty Perceptions)

		MEAN	Regularly	Frequently	Occasionally	Seldom, Never
Become distracted from their jobs by the demands of the program.						
	Director	3.3	2%	4%	53%	41%
	Faculty	3.2	2	10	51	37
Show renewed commitment to their present job						
	Director	1.8	35	51	11	3
	Faculty	2.2	13	60	25	2
Have difficulty meeting academic demands and requirements						
	Director	3.0	0	16	70	14
	Faculty	2.8	3	22	66	9
Discover new capacities for critical inquiry						
	Director	1.8	30	62	8	0
	Faculty	2.3	12	48	36	4
Develop personal or family problems						
	Director	3.5	0	4	38	58
	Faculty	3.6	1	2	35	62
Discover new depth of collegial support with other pastors						
	Director	1.7	49	36	13	2
	Faculty	2.1	27	44	25	4
Develop conflicts in their ministry settings traceable to their involvement in the D.Min. program						
	Director	3.7	0	2	22	73
	Faculty	3.6	1	2	29	68
Develop creative solutions to significant problems or conflicts in their ministry settings.						
	Director	1.9	28	52	19	1
	Faculty	2.4	9	43	45	3

Effects on Students and Graduates

All respondents report that positive effects of the D.Min. occur quite frequently and minimize negative effects. As is the usual pattern in our data, D.Min. directors (and the chief executives, whose responses are not shown) are more likely to report positive effects and less likely to report negative ones than are faculty members. Since in responses to other questions faculty members who teach in practical departments have been more likely to make positive assessments than those who teach in the so-called classical areas, we tested responses to this question to see whether field or department affiliations made any difference. The result was a little different than expected. Faculty who teach in practical areas are, indeed, more likely to report positive effects, but they are also more likely to report negative effects. Since this (the practical faculty) is a group more likely than other faculty members to say that they know more about their institution's D.Min. degree, it seems to be the case that observation of the effects of being enrolled, positive and negative, correlates with how much one knows about the program rather than with teaching field.

Several of the specific consequences about which we asked have to do with students' ministry settings or personal or family relationships. With only slight variations, all respondents agreed that students are unlikely to become distracted from their jobs by the demands of D.Min. programs, but instead are more likely to show renewed commitment to their jobs. Indeed, in one of the schools we visited, both the director and the graduates we interviewed believed that one of the program's chief benefits was enabling students to develop renewed commitment to and new resources for their present situation. (In our survey data, these particular positive effects are observed more frequently by faculty members associated with extension programs than by those associated with other types, reflecting the usual pattern of response in which faculty in schools that have extension programs are more positive about the D.Min.). When during our visits we asked for other comments on effects of D.Min. enrollment, one of the most frequently noted was also a positive one: "A new rapport with and support from laity," as one faculty member expressed it. There were almost no reports of personal or family problems developing during D.Min. enrollment (an observation confirmed in the survey), nor of conflicts or difficulties that developed in the students' ministry settings traceable to the D.Min. program.

Students do, according to D.Min. directors and faculty members, have some academic struggles. Faculty members are somewhat more likely than administrators to believe that students have frequent difficulty meeting academic demands and requirements. Those who added written comments to their questionnaires sometimes expressed concern about difficulties caused by students' considerable distance from libraries as well as those that are a function of having to juggle course work and job responsibilities. D.Min. directors, as earlier reported in detail (see section q, Progress Toward the Degree) report that if difficulties are experienced, they will more likely be at the end than

the beginning of programs, during proposal preparation or project writing. Students are most likely to drop out of programs during the project-writing phase. About one-quarter of all D.Min. students do not finish. According to directors, when students do run into difficulty or drop out, the reason is more often the tension between job and academic demands than it is inability to do the academic work. Our survey of those who have dropped out of D.Min. programs was inconclusive, but since, as we report below, one of the major positive effects of completing the D.Min. degree seems to be heightened morale, we strongly suspect that there is a corresponding strong negative effect on the morale of those who fail to complete D.Min. programs.

Faculty members and administrators differ somewhat in their estimations of the amount and kind of educational progress students make during their D.Min. programs. Only half of all faculty members judged that students "regularly" or "frequently" develop increased capacities for critical inquiry. About the same number think that students develop creative solutions to significant problems or conflicts in their ministry settings (such problem-solving is often an assignment for D.Min. courses and projects). They are also less likely than administrators to observe that students discover new depths of collegial support with other pastors, though almost three-quarters of faculty members do observe this effect. Again, faculty members in institutions that offer the D.Min. by extension are considerably more likely to observe some of these effects, most notably the development of collegial support and of solutions to problems in the ministry setting -- than are faculty associated with other kinds of programs. Faculty who teach in local/regional programs, those in which D.Min. students most often take courses together with students enrolled in other programs, were quite logically least likely to observe the development of collegial support.

Table II adds to these observations of the effects of D.Min. enrollment the view of a group of laypersons, the church members and leaders (elders) from the Presbyterian Panel survey. Those laypersons who reported that they knew at least one person who had taken part in a D.Min. program (about 43% of all laity in the Panel) were asked to note which of a list of effects they had observed while the clergy they knew were enrolled in D.Min. programs. The list of possible effects given to members and elders was quite similar to the one given to seminary personnel, though not exactly the same. Though elders in the Presbyterian system are members of the church's governing board and likely to have more opportunity to observe the pastor than other members, members' and elders' observations are actually quite close. The pattern of the observations is also much like that of seminary administrators and faculty members. Most often observed are renewed commitment and enthusiasm for the present job -- two items in the "litany" of positive effects on morale and vocational commitment. Like the faculty members and D.Min. directors, the Presbyterian laity are unlikely, to any great degree, to observe negative effects of D.Min. enrollment.

Effects on Students and Graduates

TABLE II Percentage of Presbyterian Lay Member and Elders Observing Various Effects on Clergy During Involvement in a D.Min. program.

Effects	Members	Elders
Became more interested in and committed to their jobs in their ministry	47%	44%
Showed renewed enthusiasm for their present job	36	36
Became restless in their current position	20	20
Became more efficient: used time better	19	20
Had trouble managing claims on their time	17	25
Became distracted from things required in their ministry	17	13
Developed family problems	9	5
Dropped out of the D.Min. program because it was too demanding	2	1
None of the above	10	14

Our samples of D.Min. students and graduates were given a list of possible effects similar to the one provided for seminary personnel, with only slight wording differences to make some statements applicable. To help us estimate how different were the experiences of those enrolled in D.Min. programs from clergy not enrolled, we provided the non-D.Min. clergy sample with a parallel list, asking them not about program effects but about "experiences in ministry" during the past two years (see Students and Graduates V, A; Clergy III, A.) The magnitude and pattern of responses of students and graduates are so similar that we treat them together. Like the other assessments noted above, the various positive effects were more frequently reported than the negative ones. Again, renewed commitment to the present job ranks very high. Discovery of new capacities for critical inquiry is ranked second. (About half of all faculty members, as just noted, do not agree that capacities for critical inquiry are regularly or frequently enhanced.) Developing the ability to solve problems in the ministry setting and discovering new collegial support are ranked third and fourth. Interestingly, clergy who have <u>not</u> been involved in D.Min. programs report quite similar "experiences" during the recent period, though most of these effects are slightly less likely to be reported to have occurred for them. Students are a little more likely than graduates to have difficulty meeting academic demands (26% versus 21%; no parallel question was asked of non-D.Min. clergy). Like the directors cited above, both students and graduates report most difficulty keeping on schedule in the project or thesis writing stage, followed closely by the stage of proposal development (Students and Graduates IV, Y).

We asked graduates and current students how much of a time burden the D.Min. creates (Students and Graduates III, K). The responses of both groups were nearly identical: Approximately three of ten said it was a great burden, and two-thirds said it was a moderate burden. Further insight into what activities were affected by program involvement comes from current students who were asked to indicate whether, since enrolling, they spend more, less or about the same amount of time in several activities (Students III, H). Overall, with one exception, the majority of students indicated spending about the same amount of time in the areas listed as before enrollment. The exception was "hobbies and recreation, other than vacation." Fifty-five percent indicated that they spent less time in this area than they did before enrollment. Vacations also suffered to some extent (40% saying they spent less time; between 30% and 35% indicated that denominational activities, family activities, and community service (in ascending order) received less time than before enrolling. On the other hand, 16% responded that ministerial duties were given more time, while 71% said "about the same."

There are notable differences between the observations of chief executives, directors and faculty members on the one hand, and those of students and graduates. While collegial support was the effect most frequently observed by the seminary personnel, it was ranked fourth highest by graduates and students. The two sets of respondents reversed the order of "new capacities for critical inquiry" -- it was second most frequently reported by students and graduates and third by faculty members. The percentage distributions for the two sets of respondents show the differences more clearly than do the means. Graduates and students are much less likely to report experiencing new depths of collegial support "very much" than directors. Similarly, they are much more likely to emphasize new capacities for critical inquiry than do seminary officials or faculty members.

When we compare the mean scores of students by the type of program in which they were enrolled, there were several statistically significant differences. The educational philosophy type of the program was important in several instances. Students in programs of the "unique content or method" type are significantly more likely to report renewed commitment to their job during the program. They are also very much more likely to report developing creative solutions to significant problems or conflicts in their ministry settings as well as the discovery of new depths of colleague support. The latter is also true, not surprisingly, for students enrolled in programs offered in an extension format. Further, students in extension programs are somewhat more likely to indicate that they have discovered new capacities for critical inquiry. This is also more likely to be reported by students in evangelical than in mainline schools. Finally, to return to comparisons by educational philosophy, the one statistically significant negative effect was strongest in what we have called extended M.Div. programs. Students in these programs are slightly more likely to report having developed family problems while enrolled. Why this is the case, we cannot say.

Effects on Students and Graduates

Most of the comments we recorded during case study visits reiterated the "litany" of positive effects on confidence and professional outlook. Most positively and frequently, we heard over and over again of the importance of the D.Min. in renewing the student's commitment to ministry: "It gave me the incentive and tools to re-evaluate my professional and personal goals. It led me to reaffirm my commitment to the ministry and to a more honest and, I think, courageous approach to dealing with the problems of ministry." One who graduated at the age of 69 wrote:

> This accomplishment has been satisfying more for the joy, pleasure, surprise and amazement which it has given my family, friends, associates and former parishioners than it has been for me, though the stimulus and disciplines involved have contributed to my continuing growth in insight, ability and skill. It is a temptation to go for a Ph.D.

Studies of D.Min. programs carried out by institutions of their own programs give further evidence of this positive effect. At Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, the development of a positive self-image was the most important benefit reported by students (Self-Study, 1982 [?], p. 220). Similarly, a study by the Lutheran School of Theology in Chicago reported that "at least one of our bishops saw an immediate causal relation between the D.Min. program and improved morale (p.76)."

For one student who wrote to us, the experience did not reaffirm the commitment to the present job, though apparently the experience was quite potent:

> Due to the research for the dissertation I have changed political parties from Republican to Democrat, experienced a marked increase in social and economic justice, become less enthusiastic about the potential of the church I serve, looked for ways of expressing my ministry outside the local church,...and will make a critical career decision...this summer. A little education may be dangerous.

Numerous comments were also made about academic experiences. One student highlighted the challenge which he has experienced through encountering "a central core of theory (biblical, theological, sociological)," with which to assess his ministry. A rabbi wrote that he could not "imagine being able to study and do research in an area separate from my work while I had to work full-time. The academic requirements of my work gave structure to my D.Min. project and kept me on schedule in completing my program. The interaction between seminary learning and my work was a consuming and demanding process, but it was also a high point of my teaching career and ministry." Wrote another, "I feel that the most important part of the D.Min. program was the discipline of having to organize time and material, to do the research and evaluate the results. This ability can be transferred to almost any other field of endeavor." Echoing this theme, one graduate

interviewed noted that "designing, carrying out, and evaluating the [D.Min.] project has provided me with a paradigm that I will use throughout my ministry."

Not all, however, were positive about their academic experiences. We had a number of comments about poorly prepared faculty who "placed the program on the very back burner." Another complained about "a careless advisor [who] failed to provide the support and guidance needed and nearly caused me to be disqualified." A student in an extension program complained that "the teachers...placed too much emphasis on collegial experience [and were not equipped to deal with theology. I would have liked a heavier theological emphasis." Almost the opposite was experienced by another student in an institution with a strong Ph.D. program. "There is a struggle in [my institution's] program as to whether [it] is actually practice-based or not. The subtle expectations of academic/Ph.D. thinking appear after the assumptions of peer/colleague relationships have been asserted. This is a serious problem and sends double messages to participants."

Developing creative solutions to pressing issues of ministry was also the subject of several comments. "My D.Min. was a cornerstone to equipping me for a new ministry to singles," one student commented. A student in a program with what we have referred to as a "unique content or method" educational philosophy wrote: "My studies and research in church growth challenged me to take a good look at my church and see it realistically. As a result I learned through my studies how to focus in on the reality, pull things together, and lead the church to real growth on all levels." Several other students highlighted learning to share ministry with laity in their congregations as an important consequence of their program.

Finally, a number of comments have to do with colleague relationships. One student, typical of several others, commented, "One reason I'm in this program is to have someone else to talk to. When I finish, I will work to find some others. One of my biggest problems in the ministry is loneliness." Another student wrote that "spending three years with a peer group of 14 ministers was enriching. We shared many joys and much sorrow, losing three of our members to untimely deaths." At the same time, there was not unanimity among students regarding colleague relationships in the program. One student wrote: "My group was not compatible. I was also the only woman and not treated as a colleague or equal except by one person (and not the profs necessarily)." A few students wrote that they wished that the kinds of peer relations which some programs encourage among students would also carry over to student-faculty relationships. They complained that faculty often keep students in a dependent relationship rather than an interdependent one.

b. Effects of the D.Min. on Those Who Complete the Program

Now we turn to what might be called the educational outcomes of the D.Min. and its other effects on those who complete the program.

Effects on Students and Graduates

Some effects of D.Min. participation are, obviously, continuous; in other words, some of the lasting effects of the D.Min. will be seen to have their roots in changes first observed while students were enrolled. Here we shall look more closely, however, at knowledge gained, skills developed, and changes in professional functioning, as well as at such topics as the relationship between earning the D.Min. and career mobility. As before, we shall examine the views of various seminary officers and teachers, of the group of laity we surveyed in the Presbyterian Panel, and the self-reports of graduates. Responses from our sample of non-D.Min. clergy will also be used for comparison where appropriate.

Table III shows the responses of D.Min. directors and faculty members to a list of possible effects of the D.Min. program on students who have completed it.

TABLE III Effects of the Degree on Students who have Completed the D.Min. Program (Director and Faculty Perceptions)

	MEAN*	Regularly	Frequently	Occasionally	Seldom, Never
Increased intellectual sophistication					
Director	2.0	21%	58%	19%	2%
Faculty	2.4	10	44	38	8
Increased capacity for critical theological reflection					
Director	1.8	27	63	10	0
Faculty	2.4	13	42	37	8
Clearer understanding of their theology of ministry					
Director	1.4	57	41	2	0
Faculty	2.0	28	51	19	2
Increased spiritual depth					
Director	2.1	27	35	36	2
Faculty	2.6	8	33	50	9
Increased self-awareness					
Director	1.7	44	47	7	2
Faculty	2.0	25	56	18	1
Increased competence in the functions of ministry					
Director	1.6	41	57	2	0
Faculty	2.0	25	53	21	1

TABLE III (continued)

		MEAN*	Regularly	Frequently	Occasionally	Seldom, Never
Increased enthusiasm about the ministry as a profession						
	Director	1.5	54	39	7	0
	Faculty	1.9	28	54	18	2
Renewed commitment to their present job						
	Director	1.8	33	50	15	2
	Faculty	2.1	15	58	25	2
Become restless and seek new position						
	Director	3.3	4	7	55	35
	Faculty	3.2	2	8	55	34
Become weary of study						
	Director	3.2	0	4	59	37
	Faculty	3.2	1	13	54	32
Greater appetite for reading and study						
	Director	2.1	10	73	15	2
	Faculty	2.4	7	51	39	3
Greater self confidence						
	Director	1.7	38	57	3	2
	Faculty	2.0	20	62	17	1
Greater involvement in ecumenical or denominational activities, or consulting with other churches						
	Director	2.3	15	41	39	5
	Faculty	2.5	9	42	40	9

*1 = regularly, 4 = seldom,never

As before, mostly positive effects are observed. As usual, D.Min. directors are most positive and faculty members least. Not shown in the Table is a comparison we made between faculty members in practical and "classical" fields. As expected, faculty members in practical fields were more likely to observe positive effects. There was no difference between the two groups in the observation of negative effects. Again, effects on morale and vocational commitment are most likely to be observed. Survey findings confirm the persistent message during our case visits: The D.Min. is highly effective, in the view of

many, most effective, in increasing enthusiasm about ministry as a profession, in increasing self-awareness, and in fostering greater self-confidence. Almost as widely observed in the survey are what we might call competence outcomes, a clearer understanding of one's theology of ministry and increased competence in the functions of ministry. Again, there is a difference between directors and faculty members: Faculty members are not as likely to observe that students frequently or regularly develop a greater appetite for reading and study, increased intellectual sophistication, or enlarged capacities for critical theological reflection.

A majority of all groups believe that the D.Min. is likely to result in a renewed commitment to the present job, though about two-thirds observed that, at least occasionally, the D.Min. results in some restlessness and disposition to move to a new position. Those we interviewed during our visits agree that, on balance, D.Min. participation is more likely to increase job satisfaction than to create a desire to move, chiefly because of its effectiveness in helping students to deal with difficult parish situations.

There are few marked differences by program type. Faculty members who teach in mainline seminaries are somewhat more likely to report positive academic effects of the degree and, as is often the case in our data, faculty associated with extension programs are more likely to report positive effects overall.

In addition to the list of more specific program effects on graduates, we also asked directors and faculty members to estimate the percentage of their D.Min. students for which their program either:

Enables them to advance to a <u>distinctively</u> higher level of professional competence than is obtained in the M.Div.

OR

May provide an opportunity for them to engage in structured continuing education, but does <u>not</u> raise their level of competence distinctly higher than that of most non-D.Min. clergy.

Directors (IV, 3) believe that, on the average, 72% of their students advance to a distinctively higher level of competence as a result of D.Min. participation. For faculty members (III, 3) the percentage drops to 56%.

The type of program makes some difference in these assessments. Those associated with campus-based intensive programs are more likely to believe that their students advance to a higher level of competence. Differences are also evident when educational philosophies of programs are compared. Least likely to believe that D.Min. students advance to higher levels of competence are respondents in specialized-independent

programs. Respondents in unique content and extended M.Div. programs are considerably more positive. Finally, when programs are compared by denominational type, those in evangelical schools are considerably more likely than their mainline counterparts to believe that their students advance to a higher level of competence. Faculty members in the two types of schools are, however, roughly similar in their estimates.

Presbyterian laity were also asked about effects on graduates (25). Their responses are summarized in Table IV. Perhaps most notable among the responses is the fact that none is observed by more than 36% of either lay respondent group. This is true for both positive and negative effects, and when combined with the low response rate for Presbyterian laity (almost three-fifths did not know a minister with a D.Min. and thus did not answer this question), suggests that any impact of the D.Min. on the lay members of congregations has been slight.

TABLE IV Percentage of Presbyterian Lay Members and Elders Observing Various Effects on Clergy Who Have Completed the D. Min. Program

Effects	Members	Elders
Gained additional prestige and respect because they have the degree	32	36
Gained a new theological depth	33	26
Became better preachers	31	25
Became more efficient administrators	25	22
Exercised pastoral and spiritual care more competently	24	20
Generally moved to a new position	20	17
Were more likely to attend continuing education programs than before	15	16
Were usually anxious to find a new job	12	16
Spent more time in study each week than they did before	10	16
Were tired of educational programs, at least for the time being	5	3
Spent less time in study than they did before	2	-
None of the above	8	12

The effect Presbyterian laity are most likely to report they observe among clergy who have earned the D.Min. degree is that such clergy have gained additional prestige and respect because of the degree. Perhaps, we speculate, some of the renewed self-confidence and higher moral reported in the "litany" of positive effects by seminary personnel and graduates grows in part out of the new esteem and social support graduates receive from parishioners or others in their ministry settings. The comment of a graduate whom we interviewed makes this

point effectively. He is a hospital chaplain and spoke with enthusiasm about the new esteem he experienced:

> Because of my project [which necessitated the cooperation of physicians and nurses in the hospital] I stand taller with them. My organizational development training helped me negotiate with the M.D.s. Also, they became genuinely interested in my project for professional and personal reasons.

Several intellectual and functional competencies rank just below prestige and respect. Both members and elders believe that D.Min. graduates they knew have gained a new theological depth, become better preachers, become more efficient administrators, and exercise pastoral and spiritual care more competently. Smaller percentages of members and elders believe that D.Min. clergy are more likely to attend continuing education programs than before (15% and 16%, respectively) or to spend more time in study each week than they did before (10% and 16%). As for the effects of D.Min. involvement on career mobility, approximately two of ten members and elders believe that D.Min. graduates move to a new position.

Lay perceptions of the effects of D.Min. participation have also been the subject of several other studies of D.Min. programs at individual institutions. A survey by Bethany Theological Seminary of some 90 laity who had participated in congregational/institutional supervisory groups for Bethany D.Min. graduates asked respondents if they noticed any difference in the effectiveness of the minister that could be attributed to the D.Min. program ["Questionnaire for Congregations/Institutions," n.d.]. Sixty-two percent responded that the minister was moderately or greatly more effective. Just over one-third of the respondents indicated that the congregation/institution's relationship with the minister was slightly or much more positive and another third indicated no change. Just over 5% were more negative, with the remainder not responding or unable to judge.

Similar results were obtained by Northern Baptist Theological Seminary in their 1982 self-study. As at Bethany, respondents were lay members of the D.Min. students' Congregational Supervisory Group (n=37, or 62% of those surveyed). The Northern Baptist program is described as a "generalist program," in which students have only modest opportunity to specialize in a particular area. Asked about changes in pastoral performance in four professional skill areas (preaching/worship, teaching, pastoral care and church administration), between 50% and 66% of the respondents believed that their pastors were moderately or greatly more effective than before D.Min. involvement. Improvement in preaching and worship leadership was most often noted (Presbyterian laity also noted improvement in this skill area.) Northern Baptist laypersons were also asked about the effect of D.Min. involvement on ministerial mobility. In no instance in which a pastor left the congregation was the departure attributed to the D.Min. program; several respondents, however, believed the D.Min. program was responsible for their minister's decision to stay, and there was

considerable overall satisfaction expressed with the role of the D.Min. program's impact on their pastor's tenure. One layperson believed that the pastor stayed because "he [wanted] to experience the 'real' growth of the seed he has planted through his behavioral change initiated by the D.Min. program." Another believed that positive changes in pastoral performance reduced potential congregational opposition: "I doubt that the minister would have remained as effective had he not entered the program. It is quite possible his continued presence would have been increasingly uncomfortable" (Northern Baptist Study, pp. 248-49).

One additional study of lay perceptions of pastoral change as a result of D.Min. participation is the comparative study of Hartford Seminary's two program options reported in Theological Education in 1980 [cited earlier]. The study found that laity in both program tracks (one that involved them a great deal and one that did not) perceived "greater than average pastor change in the area of personal spiritual/theological depth, preaching, and goal-setting." Both faculty members' and graduates' views supported these lay perceptions. The Hartford study also correlated change in the pastor traceable to D.Min. participation with parish change during the same period. Parish change was measured by a questionnaire to lay members at the start and conclusion of the pastor's D.Min. participation. Change in a number of areas of congregational life correlated highly with average change for 15 areas of pastoral performance. The authors comment: "Individual parish change and individual pastor change are as strongly related to each other as either is to any other factors identifiable in our study" (pp. 230-34). Though correlations do not prove a causal relationship, this finding still suggests the importance and likely effectiveness of efforts to make connections between students' experiences in their ministry settings and their work in D.Min. programs.

The longest list of possible changes and effects stemming from D.Min. participation was sent to the graduates we surveyed. The list included 25 items (Graduates V, B). A similar list was included in the survey of non-D.Min. clergy, though the wording of course was different: "To what extent have you experienced the following during the last few years?" (Clergy III, B).

Because the list is lengthy, it seemed appropriate to combine individual items into scales expressing common themes. The technique of factor analysis were used to do this. (The research report to follow will provide details of this procedure.) From the 25 items, the following scales were constructed:

1. Critical Theological Thinking, which includes items having to do with growth in intellectual sophistication, increased capacity for theological reflection, and clearer understanding of one's theology of ministry;

2. Pastoral Care, which includes a combination of personal-spiritual growth and pastoral functioning; increased

spiritual depth and self-awareness; and improved abilities in counseling and serving as a spiritual guide;

3. Preaching and Worship, which includes becoming a better worship leader and preacher;

4. Organizational Leadership, which includes becoming better at management; gaining a deeper understanding of how congregations and organizations work; improving skills in program development and evaluation; and increasing ability to set priorities, analyze problems arising in one's ministry, and evaluate one's performance;

5. Ministries Beyond the Congregation, which includes becoming a more effective community leader; increased involvement in ecumenical or denominational activities, or consulting with other churches; and increased ability to relate to other professions.

From the list of 25 items several single items that did not form scales are also used:

1. Became a better teacher;
2. Have a renewed commitment to your present job;
3. Became restless and sought (or are seeking) a new job;
4. Became weary of study;
5. Have greater appetite for reading and study;
6. Have greater self-confidence;

Two other scales have been constructed from additional items.

1. Commitment to the Ministry, formed from several items asking about the respondent's commitment to the ministry as a vocation (Graduates VI, F-I; Clergy IV, F-I); [These items were used in a previous study by Dean R. Hoge, et al. "Organizational and Situational Influences on Vocational Commitment of Protestant Ministers," Review of Religious Research Vol. 23 (December 1981): 143-49.]

2. Sense of Accomplishment, formed by summing two items (Graduates VI, C, 1 and 2; Clergy IV, C, 1 and 2), having to do with self-perception of accomplishments in one's ministry.

We have also included a set of scales and individual items which we have called "resources for practice." These are constructed from questions that asked D.Min. graduates and non-D.Min. clergy to identify the resources on which they draw when they face difficult situations in their practice. And finally we have examined several different measures of career mobility.

Table V summarizes the mean scores for graduates and non-D.Min. clergy on various measures of effects.

TABLE V Effects of D.Min. Participation: A Comparison of Graduates and Non-D.Min. Clergy (Mean Scores, based on 1 = Great, 4 = Not at All)

Effects	Graduates	Non-D.Min Clergy
Critical Theological Thinking	1.80	2.20 *
Pastoral Care	1.82	1.81 (ns)
Preaching & Worship	2.45	2.01 *
Organizational Leadership	2.01	2.35 *
Teaching Ministry	2.12	2.38 *
Ministries Beyond the Congregation	2.41	2.57 *
Renewed Commitment to Present Job	2.02	2.26 *
Became Restless and Sought New Job	3.36	3.04 *
Became Weary of Study	3.29	3.45 *
Greater Appetite for Reading & Study	2.21	2.25 (ns)
Greater Self-Confidence	1.74	2.07 *
Commitment to the Ministry	1.49	1.51 (ns)
Effectiveness	1.97	2.23*

* = Statistically Significant Difference at <.0001

As we inspect this Table we must remember that graduates and non-D.Min. clergy were asked somewhat different questions: Graduates to cite the effects of D.Min. participation, and other clergy to cite "recent experiences." If we assume, however, that the primary difference between these two groups is D.Min. participation, we have the means for at least crude measurement of possible effects of D.Min. participation. There are, the Table shows, statistically significant differences between the two groups, as well as differences in the rank order of items. On morale and career-related measures, for instance, graduates are significantly more likely than non-D.Min. clergy to report an increase in self-confidence and a renewed commitment to their present job. At the same time, they are less likely to report job restlessness. Self-confidence also ranks higher on their list of mean scores (second) than it does for clergy (fourth). There are also differences in self-reported change in both intellectual and practical skills. Graduates rate themselves significantly higher than non-D.Min. clergy rate themselves in three areas: Critical theological thinking, organizational leadership and the teaching ministry. On the other hand, non-D.Min. clergy scored themselves significantly higher on the preaching and worship measure. (Preaching and worship, it may be remembered, is an area where laity typically see most progress among pastors involved in D.Min. programs.) There is no significant difference between the two samples on the measure of pastoral care.

Nor is one group significantly more likely than another to report an increased appetite for reading and study. Graduates are slightly and significantly more likely to report a weariness with study. The Table also shows the mean scores for two other scales: Commitment to ministry and sense of accomplishment in ministry. Both groups are highly committed, though D.Min. graduates are somewhat more likely than non-D.Min. clergy to report a sense of accomplishment in ministry.

To explore these various differences between graduates and non-D.Min. clergy in greater depth, testing whether they are attributable in fact to the D.Min. participation of the graduates or rather to other differences between the two groups, we used multiple regression analysis, a statistical technique that permits considering the contribution that one variable makes to change in another while controlling for several other variables simultaneously. The steps we took to make this analysis are described in detail in the research report to follow. For those interested in such analysis, we should note that the r-square coefficients produced in our analysis are, in every case, relatively small, due, we suspect, to both unmeasured factors and random errors in the data. In spite of the small r-squares, however, we believe that the analysis is useful in showing the relative weight of D.Min. participation as a contributor to observed changes after other variables have been taken into account. Our model included seven independent variables: Respondent's age, seminary grade-point average, denominational type (evangelical, or mainline), personal theology (very liberal to very conservative), self-defined ministry style (innovative to traditional), congregational size on entry to the program or size of immediate past parish (small to large), and D.Min. graduation (no or yes).

The analysis shows that D.Min. graduation is a relatively important contributor to self-perceived growth and the capacity for critical theological thinking, organizational leadership, teaching ministry and involvement in ministries beyond the congregation. It also contributes to renewed commitment to one's present job, to self-confidence, to a sense of accomplishment in one's ministry, and also to weariness with study. Not graduating from a D.Min. program, on the other hand, contributes to self-reported improvements in preaching and worship leadership and to restlessness with the present job.

Other of the independent variables are also important in various ways: Self-reported ministry style is next most influential. Those who style themselves innovative are, as might be expected, more likely to perceive more positive changes. Theological conservatism, with other independent variables controlled, is also somewhat likely to contribute to most of the measures of effects, with the exception of critical theological thinking, and increased appetite for study and self-confidence. Self-styled theological liberalism, on the other hand, is slightly more positively associated with change in the areas of pastoral care, ministries beyond the congregation and restlessness with the present job. After D.Min. graduation, ministry style and theological position, age is the most important among the other vari-

ables. Also significant for some measures, to a more modest degree, are seminary grade-point average and congregational size. Denominational type (mainline or evangelical) has an impact on only one change measure: Increase in skill in pastoral care. Mainline clergy are more likely to report changes on this measure. This, it should be remembered, is one of the few variables for which D.Min. graduation made no significant difference.

In summary, the regression analysis shows that the statistically significant effects of D.Min. graduation hold for the self-reported change measures reported in Tables VA and VB, even when a number of other variables are held constant. Indeed, D.Min. graduation is the strongest overall predictor of difference. The multivariate model also helps to clarify some other relationships. A large number of changes are related to self-reported ministry style and, to a lesser extent, to theological conservatism and to youth, though some of the improved morale and increased commitment effects frequently reported for the D.Min. are more highly associated with older clergy.

We also analyzed reported changes in D.Min. graduates by the types of programs they had attended. A few significant differences emerged. Growth in preaching and worship abilities was more likely to be reported by those who had attended evangelical seminaries. An increase in capacities for organizational leadership was reported by graduates of extension programs, and, to a slightly lesser extent, graduates of campus-based intensive programs. Programs with "unique content" educational rationales are also strongly associated with this measure, as is graduation from an evangelical seminary. These differences are traceable to particular programs, usually large, that place special emphasis on organization development. Unique content programs are also correlated, positively and significantly, with renewed commitment to the present job. At several other points in this report we have included comments from students and graduates that testify to the especially strong effects of such programs on morale and vocational clarity.

On the premise that immersion in a D.Min. program should provide participants with new ways of reflecting on issues and new resources on which to draw, we included on questionnaires of graduates, students and non-D.Min. clergy (Graduates and Students VI, E; Clergy IV, E) a number of items that we have combined into scales. Nine of the twelve items formed scales; the other three items were used individually. The resources scales are:

1. The Christian Tradition, which includes the use of the Bible, prayer, and examples/ideas from the history and traditions of the church;

2. Theory and Methods from Theology, Ethics and Secular Disciplines;

3. Consultation with other professionals, including clergy, and with laity in one's ministry setting.

In addition, three individual items were included:

1. Personal commitments and values;
2. Past experience;
3. Analysis and understanding of the context.

Table VI shows mean responses for graduates and non-D.Min. clergy (students' responses are not used in this comparison).

TABLE VI Resources for Ministry Practice, D.Min. Graduates Compared with Non-D.Min. Clergy (Means, based on 1 = Very Often to 5 = Rarely or Never)

	Graduates	Non-D.Min. Clergy
Resources:		
Christian Tradition	1.94	1.90(ns)
Theory & Methods from Theology, Ethics & Secular Disciplines	2.69	2.87*
Consultation	2.39	2.49*
Personal Commitments & Values	1.44	1.67*
Past Experience	1.72	1.82*
Contextual Analysis/ Understanding	1.57	1.85*

* = statistically significant differences at <.0008

The only resources scale on which there is no significant difference between graduates and non-D.Min. clergy is the one we have called the Christian tradition scale. Non-D.Min. clergy are in fact slightly, but not significantly, more likely to report drawing on the tradition in difficult situations. With this exception, graduates report making significantly more use of other resources than do non-D.Min. clergy. Three of the areas in which this is the case -- theory and methods from theology, ethics and the secular disciplines; consultation; and contextual analysis -- are major emphases in a number of D.Min. programs. It should be noted that, though differences between the two groups exist, the relative rankings of the importance of different kinds of resources are rather similar. Personal commitments and values are most often called upon by both groups; contextual analysis and past experience rank next, though in different orders for the two groups; and after that, in descending order, tradition, consultation, and theory and methods of various disciplines. Resources external to the minister, in other words, are less often

called upon in critical situations by clergy than "personal" resources such as values and experience. This is probably an accurate description of much human decision making. Clearly, whatever the effects of the D.Min., it does not make those who complete it so highly analytical or consultative that they give either theory or the advice of others priority over their own insights and practiced intuitions.

We used multiple regression analysis again to determine whether the differences between the two groups are attributable to D.Min. graduation or, rather, to one of the other independent variables we identified as potentially significant. D.Min. graduation emerged as modestly important, except for the amount of use made of the Christian tradition (a scale on which there was no significant difference between groups) and the use of "past experience." A self-identified innovative ministry style and conservative theology remain significant in this analysis, as in the previous one. Most of the relationships that emerged are fairly predictable. Conservatism in theology and enrollment in an evangelical school are both positively related to the use of the tradition as a resource (a liberal self-description is related, though weakly, to use of theory from various disciplines and use of consultants). A higher seminary grade point average is positively related to the use of theories and methods from various disciplines, and, the larger the congregation, the more likely one is to use consultants as a resource. Again, the r-square coefficients are relatively small and much of the variance thus remains unexplained.

Perhaps the major topic in casual conversation about the D.Min. is clergy mobility. Those not associated with D.Min. programs often express their suspicion that a major motive of those who enroll in D.Min. programs is to obtain a credential that will lead to a new, more responsible or higher paying job. Do clergy who obtain the D.Min. in fact frequently leave the position they had during the program to obtain a "better" position? Here we examine data on types of positions held, characteristics of congregations served and salary of D.Min. graduates and non-D.Min. clergy, in an attempt to derive at least tentative answers to these questions.

In the discussion that follows, it must be kept in mind that not all our data are easily compared. In retrospect, the year (1982) we asked non-D.Min. clergy to use as their basis for comparison with their current situation (position, salary and congregational characteristics) was not the best for these purposes. We would have been better served by information about a longer time period, since we asked graduates to compare their situation at date of entry into the D.Min. program with the present. Because some graduates entered their programs as many years ago as fifteen, we have a problem of establishing comparability that we can not entirely overcome. Nevertheless, we have tried to make the two samples as comparable as possible.

Table VII displays some of the results of this effort. The first column of the Table reports the figures for non-D.Min. clergy using 1982 as the basis for comparison. The graduates' situation is reported

first (middle column) for all graduates using year of entry into the D.Min. program as the basis for comparison with their current situation. In the third column is a second set of graduate percentages, using only those who have graduated from a D.Min. program in 1982 or subsequently and who are in the same denominations as the non-D.Min. clergy. When non-D.Min. clergy are compared with all graduates, there is considerably more change of position and congregation/ministry setting evident for graduates. That is to be expected given the different time periods involved; the more comparable graduate figures, however, suggest that graduates are more likely to have changed positions and churches/ministry settings than non-D.Min. clergy even when year of graduation is controlled. Thus, it would appear that earning the D.Min. degree is, in fact, often associated with a change of position and ministry setting in spite of the renewed commitment to one's current position that occurs.

TABLE VII Changes of Position: D.Min. Graduates and Non-D.Min. Clergy

	Non-D.Min. Clergy	All Graduates	Graduates Since 1982*
Same position, same church or ministry setting	54%	30%	40%
Same position, different church or ministry setting	20	27	26
Different position, same church or ministry setting	4	5	5
Different position, different church or ministry setting	22	39	29
	100	100	100 (n = 97)

*Graduates in comparable denominations to non-D.Min. clergy who since 1982.

In Table VIII we examine the average (mean) change in parish characteristics for non-D.Min. clergy who have changed parishes (current vs. 1982) and for graduates who have changed parishes (selecting only those who have graduated since 1982 and are members of the same denominations as the non-D.Min. clergy). The greater the size of the mean, the larger, more urban, more "healthy," and better educated the congregation. The figures represent only those respondents who are serving in a parish position. As compared with non-D.Min. clergy who have changed parishes since 1982, graduates who have changed parishes since 1982 are substantially more likely to be in larger congregations, larger communities, and more educated parishes, and somewhat more likely to be in churches with stable or growing memberships than at the time they entered the D.Min. program.

TABLE VIII Comparison of Church Characteristics, D.Min. Graduates and Non-D.Min. Clergy (Mean Changes)

	Non-D.Min. Clergy*	Graduates Since 1982
Membership size (small = 1, large = 4)	.135	.410
Community size (small = 1, large = 6)	.140	.346
Health (declining = 1, stable = 2 growing = 3)	.214	.275
Educational level of members (low = 1, high = 5)	.332	.430

*mean change between past and current church characteristics of those who have changed churches since 1982.

While both Tables indicate that D.Min. graduation is associated with mobility, they still do not provide precise comparability. For the non-D.Min. clergy, we are limited to comparisons with 1982; while with graduates since 1982, we are comparing their current situation with time of entry into the program which may have been several years prior to 1982. Another approach to the comparability problem is to compare the current situation of non-D.Min. clergy and graduates while controlling for ministry experience, represented by the number of years since ordination.

First, we look at church characteristics of current parish clergy (non-D.Min. clergy and graduates), controlling for year of ordination. The complete table is too complex to include; thus, in Table IX, we report only the coefficient of a measure of association (Kendall's tau C) between the two groups of clergy and various church characteristics, controlling for year of ordination. As can be seen, for three of the four measures of church characteristics there are statistically significant differences between the two groups of clergy for at least three of the four year-of-ordination cohorts. The positive signs of the coefficients throughout mean that D.Min. graduates are more likely to be in larger congregations, larger communities, and congregations with a higher proportion of college educated persons. D.Min. graduates, with the exception of the cohort ordained less than 10 years, are no more likely than non-D.Min. clergy to be in congregations that are stable or growing. While, overall, the coefficients are not large, they do suggest that D.Min. graduation is associated with serving congregations that, in contemporary American church culture, are considered "more desirable."

TABLE IX Correlations of Church Characteristics of D.Min. Graduates and Non-D.Min. Clergy, Controlling for Years Ordained (Tau C)

	Years Ordained			
	30+	20-29	10-19	≤10
Church Characteristics				
Membership Size	.17*	.19**	ns	.11**
Community Size	.13*	.20**	.15**	.16**
Health (Declining/Stable/Growing)	ns	ns	ns	.14**
Educational Level of Members	.16*	.20**	.13*	ns

*Significant at <.05
**Significant at <.001

One other measure of career mobility can be considered: salary. Here, too, we have all of the problems of measurement comparability referred to above, plus that of inflation. Overall, when the current salary of all graduates is compared with non-D.Min. clergy, the average salary (including housing allowance if provided, or fair rental value of a parsonage) of graduates is $30,217; for non-D.Min. clergy it is $26,102. When only parish clergy are compared, the amounts are $28,681 for graduates and $25,561 for non-D.Min. clergy. When parish clergy in the two groups are further compared, controlling for the number of years they have been ordained, the differences persist, as is shown in Table X. D.Min. graduates receive, on the average, higher salaries than their non-D.Min. clergy counterparts. The differences are greatest for the two extremes in length of ordination. When we controlled not only for years of ordination but also for the various congregational characteristics (table not shown), we found no statistically significant differences between graduates and non-D.Min. clergy in churches of comparable size and in comparable sized communities. But, as we have previously noted, graduates are more likely already to be in larger congregations and communities. When the "health" and educational level of the congregation are controlled, graduates still earn somewhat higher salaries than non-D.Min. clergy.

TABLE X Average Current Salary by Years of Ordination, D.Min. Graduates and Non-D.Min. Parish Clergy

Years of Ordination	Graduates	Non-D.Min. Clergy
30+ years	$28,661	$25,561
20-29 years	29,592	28,689
10-19 years	27,804	26,750
Less than 10 years	26,201	22,183

In summary, even though we have some measurement problems as described, it seems clear that D.Min. graduation has some effect on career mobility. Whether this is a causal relationship, we cannot say with certainty; we can, however, show that there are statistically significant associations between D.Min. graduation and most of our mobility measures.

Discussion

It has been evident throughout this review of our findings about the impact of D.Min. programs on students and graduates that, in general, the effects of the D.Min. are almost all positive and the negative consequences are minimal. This is true for students while they are enrolled in the program and for graduates afterward. It is also the report of the majority of every group we had an opportunity to consult, by either interview or survey. It is even the general report of seminary faculty members who, though more negative in their observations about and assessments of the D.Min., are still, on balance, more positive than negative.

In taking note of all these generally positive reports, it is again evident, as it has been on many other questions and measures in this report, that faculty members and sometimes administrators associated with extension programs are significantly more likely than others to make highly positive reports. In this case, it is program effects, positive ones, that are more likely to be reported: Commitment to the present job, development of creative solutions to problems in the ministry setting, and development and deepening of collegiality with other pastors. The last item is easily understandable, since extension programs invariably use a colleague learning group in some way, and the members of this group usually live in close proximity, making continuing meetings, even after the end of the program, more feasible. We can only speculate about how other structures and emphases of these programs are related to the highly positive evaluations they receive. Are, for instance, these programs more likely than others to focus on the practice of ministry, given their location near the ministry setting of the participants? Or might the positive reports be attributed to a possibility suggested earlier: Faculty members are defensive about extension programs, which have often been attacked by other theological educators of lacking in rigor and deficient in quality control.

As faculty members champion extension programs, students repeatedly give highest ratings to those we have called "unique content or method" programs, those that have a special focus around which the whole program is shaped. The findings reported in this section add further to the list of positive evaluations of these programs by their students and graduates. In comparison with independent/ specialized programs and those that are essentially extensions of the M.Div. curriculum, these "unique content" programs are more likely to be

judged by students and graduates to make important positive contributions to their practice of ministry.

It is also interesting to note amid so many positive reports that although seminary personnel and students and graduates themselves are all likely to report salutary effects of the D.Min., they disagree about which effects most often occur. Most marked are their different reports about two effects: The development of new capacities for critical inquiry and the development of close colleague relationships. Faculty are more likely to observe that colleague relationships have developed; students and graduates are more likely to report that they have become more proficient at critical inquiry. It may be that students can attribute their colleague relationships to factors other than their D.Min. participation, or that faculty members and seminary administrators overestimate the significance of what occurs in colleague groups. It is probably also the case that faculty members have different or more rigorous standards for assessing depth of critical inquiry; thus they do not report it as an effect to the extent that students and graduates do.

Our own judgment is that, though no doubt D.Min. students do gain some added skill or facility in critical reflection, the overall standard is not high. We base this judgment on the large number of D.Min. projects we read: As elsewhere recounted, very few give evidence of capacities to analyze a ministry situation, reflect on it theologically, apply relevant theories from the social sciences and other disciplines, or to make sound evaluative judgments. This is, we believe, a judgment more on D.Min. programs than on those who complete them. Most programs seemed to us simply not to be doing an adequate job of teaching students to think rigorously and critically about the practice of ministry.

Among all the positive reports of the effects of D.Min. participation, most notable are those that point to improvements in morale, self-esteem, self-awareness and renewal of commitment to the ministry. D.Min. programs came into being in a period (the 1960s and early 1970s) when morale problems were severe among clergy. (Several studies documented this, for instance, Gerald Jud, Edgar Mills, and Genevieve Burch, Ex-Pastors, New York: Pilgrim Press, 1970.) The D.Min. seems to have been not only a response to the problem of low morale but an important factor in its alleviation. It is clear that the D.Min. has had an important salutary effect on most participants' morale and self-image as ordained ministers, an effect that should not be taken lightly nor ignored. Though we have some sympathy with a faculty critic who questioned whether the positive effects on morale and self-confidence alone are sufficient justification for the granting of a doctorate, we are nonetheless struck by the consistency with which all our respondent groups observe that these are the D.Min. program's most marked effects. And we do not agree with the implication of the remark of the faculty critic, that effects on morale and vocational outlook are the only benefits of D.Min. participation, for our data suggest otherwise. Further, we believe that these effects on what

professional educators in other fields have sometimes called "professional orientation" are necessary ingredients of a professional doctoral program. It seems to be essential for effective professional functioning that a person have a sense of efficacy, and this is a matter not only of knowledge and skillfulness, but also of self-esteem and self-confidence.

Our data, especially the multiple regression analyses cursorily reported in the foregoing synopsis of findings, makes clear that completion of a D.Min. program is an important predictor of self-reported changes, mostly in desirable directions, in the ministry skills and functioning of D.Min. graduates as compared with non-D.Min. clergy. What we do not know is whether or not this overall positive effect reflects actual changes. This is not simply an issue of the accuracy of the respondents' self-reports, though the accuracy of self-reported changes is by no means assured. The fact that chief executives, directors and faculty members were also generally positive in reporting perceived changes helps to confirm graduates' perceptions. There is the further possibility that the overwhelmingly positive accounts of D.Min. participation represent a kind of "halo" effect; that is, it may be that general positive feelings that graduates have about their D.Min. programs create a glow that illuminates most or all aspects of the program. The possibility that this has occurred is heightened by the fact that respondents no doubt assumed that D.Min. programs -- including their own -- are being "evaluated" in this study and were therefore, out of loyalty, disposed to give positive responses. Most of us prefer to avoid negative evaluations of activities or programs in which we have made a heavy investment. We suspect that something like this is also the case with other groups of respondents, especially D.Min. directors who so often appear as "cheerleaders" for the program.

We cannot finally discount these shortcomings of our measures of changes nor resolve the issues of assessment that they raise. We are left, therefore, to weigh the evidence that we have about possible changes that accrue from D.Min. involvement, while remaining aware of its limitations. On balance, based on case study interviews and the multiple sources from which we secured our questionnaire data, we are inclined to accept the overall positive direction of the findings. We believe that D.Min. participation makes important contributions to the professional functioning, morale and self-esteem of participants, and that <u>some</u> graduates are, indeed, raised to a higher level of professional functioning than is possible with the M.Div. degree.

In large part, we think, this is due to differences in the timing of the two degree programs. Most M.Div. students have not had exposure to issues in the practice of ministry. We doubt that the ministry experience as laity which many older M.Div. students bring to seminary is equivalent to what practicing clergy bring to the D.Min. program. The opportunities to use that experience as grist for reflection on practice, to examine the relationship between what some have called one's "espoused theories" and one's "theories in use" [Chris Argyris

and Donald A. Schon, Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974], and to develop more adequate theories and theologies of ministry practice, are present for D.Min. students as they cannot be for students in a first theological degree program. Of course, such reflection on practice is not by definition restricted to degree programs such as the D.Min., but can also be experienced in various forms of continuing education; the D.Min. program, however, offers both structure and reward for such reflection. And despite all of the questions we have raised about various aspects of D.Min. program structures and practices, we believe that program participation contributes in important ways to more effective ministry practice. It does so by bolstering morale, by introducing new theoretical content and by sharpening ministry skills, though we note that ministry skills development -- the major motive for entering D.Min. programs -- has only middle rank on the list of effects, well below increased morale, for instance.

An additional factor that facilitates professional development for D.Min. participants is the interplay between the parish/ministry setting and the course of studies that is necessitated in most programs. Full-time ministerial employment while the student is enrolled increases the likelihood that knowledge and skill development will be accomplished in relation to ministry practice. In addition, our data suggest that graduates often experience greater commitment to their parishes and become less interested in moving when program participation enables them to address knotty issues that exist within the parish.

Thus we do believe that positive benefits accrue to participants in and graduates from D.Min. programs. At the same time, however, we are struck by the estimates of seminary respondents, especially faculty members, who judge that a substantial proportion of their students -- as many as 44% according to faculty members -- do not advance to a distinctively higher level of professional competence. This gives us pause. It undercuts the claim of most institutions that the degree marks advanced competence. It also raises a question. The faculty members who make this judgment are the persons responsible for awarding the degree. Why, if they believe that so large a proportion of their students fail to meet core standards, do they nevertheless award the degree to those students?

There is some evidence, as we have shown, that D.Min. graduation is not only professionally and educationally beneficial, but also positively associated with various aspects of career mobility. The data, limited as they are by comparability problems, suggest that D.Min. graduates have changed positions since graduating from the program at a somewhat higher rate than non-D.Min. graduates -- confirming the view of critics who say that clergy often view the D.Min. as a "ticket" out of their present ministry position, hoping to move to a better one. Whether that attribution of motive is accurate or not, our data confirm that D.Min. graduates who do change positions are more likely to move to somewhat "better" positions (larger

congregations, larger communities, congregations that are stable or growing and that have a somewhat higher educational level). Furthermore, when compared with the current situation of non-D.Min. clergy of comparable years of experience, D.Min. graduates tend to have achieved a somewhat higher level of career status. Thus, apart from its value as an educational and career renewal, the D.Min. does seem to provide a career mobility dividend as well. In our reflections on the future of the D.Min. in a subsequent section, we return to this topic. There we raise a question: If the D.Min. does not, in the future, signify the "advanced competence" of the holder more uniformly than it does now, will it continue to be a valuable credential for job enhancement?

II. E. The Impact of Doctor of Ministry Programs

2. Effects on Congregations and Other Ministry Settings

Findings

The character of the D.Min. as a professional doctorate and the explicit focus of most programs on ministry mean that the linkage of program participation with the on-going life of the student's ministry setting, congregation or otherwise, is highly likely. Experiences from the ministry setting become, as we have noted, "grist" for reflection in classes and seminars. In some programs, there are requirements that a student learn to do an analysis (organizational and/or contextual) of her or his ministry setting. Some D.Min. courses involve "mini-projects" that require the subject matter of the course to be related to some aspect of congregational life. Finally, the D.Min. project typically includes an intervention -- often quite substantial -- into the congregation or other ministry setting. (See section II. B. 2. h, Ministry Site Analysis, for a fuller description of ways programs are linked to ministry settings.) Thus, it is important to attempt to assess the effects of program participation on the student's ministry setting.

Unfortunately, cost and logistics made the direct study of participants' congregations or ministry settings impossible. We did, however, ask a number of questions of D.Min. participants about the impact of programs on the ministry settings, and we have data from the Presbyterian Panel about effects on congregations and ministry settings, including some from laity. In addition, several studies other than ours of individual D.Min. programs gathered data from congregation members concerning the effects of a pastor's involvement in a D.Min. program on the congregation.

In the preceding discussion of effects of the program on students, we saw that there was considerable agreement among all types of respondents that students frequently were able to develop creative solutions to significant problems in their ministry settings as a result of their program involvement. Further, the majority of these respondents believe that only occasionally do students develop conflicts in their ministry settings as a result of their D.Min. program participation. Thus, all types of respondents were generally positive about program effects on their ministry setting. The fact that there were positive effects reported does not, of course, imply that all programs intentionally include the ministry setting as a vital part of student learning.

We asked graduates (V, D) to estimate the proportion of the persons in their congregation or ministry setting who knew of their D.Min. involvement. The majority (83%) said that all or most knew of their involvement. Only 3% said that few knew, and less than 1% that no one knew. In one of the large programs that does not deliberately

or directly involve congregations, a student told the case study writer that the executive committee of his church board knows about his work in the program, but the congregation "doesn't have a clue." He says that he uses the materials from the program all the time in the congregation, but rarely talks about the program itself. An associate pastor in the same program says that her boss was in favor of her participation but felt that it should be kept quiet lest the congregation think she was "robbing the church." Another graduate wrote on his questionnaire that he avoided enrolling in a program that required extensive involvement of the ministry setting:

> in light of my experience with a couple of our local leaders who have been non-cooperative in important aspects of the church's life. I thought if they were willing to sabotage the life and witness of their congregation, they might enjoy doing it to my D.Min. program also.

In general, however, such reluctance to make involvement public is the exception. Indeed, the experience of 70% of the graduates is that those persons in the ministry setting who knew of their involvement were enthusiastic (Graduates V, C). Only 1% report that most persons would have preferred they not be involved. The remainder report indifference or mixed opinion. In the Presbyterian Panel, as Table I shows, from half to two-thirds of the three groups of clergy respondents believe that most people in the ministry setting "are proud that their clergyperson is in the D.Min. program." The two lay groups are slightly less likely to report congregational pride (45% of the members and 50% of the elders). Less than 10% of all Presbyterian respondents believe that members have felt neglected and resentful because of their minister's involvement.

Beyond enthusiasm, pride or resentment because of the clergyperson's involvement in a D.Min., there are questions of the kind and extent of effects on the ministry setting of such involvement. As Table I shows, for Presbyterian lay members and elders, the second most frequently mentioned effect is "no effect on the ministry setting" (mentioned by one-fourth to one-third of each group). On the other hand, one-fifth of the two lay groups and 24% to 46% of the clergy groups believe that there have been measurable improvements traceable to the pastor's D.Min. involvement. Among negative effects, the one most frequently mentioned is conflict due to the clergyperson's involvement (ranging from 9% to 19% among the various respondents). Although the response categories are somewhat different from the Presbyterian panel questionnaire, our surveys of seminary administrators, faculty members, current students and graduates reported above also indicate that involvement in the D.Min. only occasionally results in conflict in the ministry setting. Again we should note that half of all Presbyterian laity surveyed did not know a minister who holds a D.Min., and thus did not answer these questions about effects on the congregation. Percentages of those who did answer who noted any single effect were fairly low, always less than half. Thus it appears that the D.Min. involvement of pastors, even in the Presbyterian Church

whose clergy are more involved in the D.Min. than those of any other denomination, has had relatively limited effects on congregations that laypersons can observe.

TABLE I Presbyterian Panelists' Perceptions of the Effects of D.Min. Involvement on the Ministry Settings of D.Min. Participants (Percentages observing the following effects.)

Effects	Members	Elders	Pastors	UPC Spec Min	Non-UPC Spec Min
Most people in the ministry setting are proud that their clergyperson is in the D.Min. program	45%	50%	54%	66%	50%
The minister's enrollment in the D.Min. program and not had much effect on the ministry setting	28	32	32	26	30
There have been measurable improvements in the congregation or ministry setting because the minister enrolled in the D.Min. program	22	22	33	46	24
Morale in the ministry setting has improved because of the minister's enrollment in the D.Min. program	13	14	27	38	27
There has been conflict in the ministry setting resulting from the minister's involvement in the D.Min. program	10	9	19	15	17
Most people in the setting have felt neglected and resentful because of their minister's involvement	4	7	8	5	5
Morale has suffered because of the minister's enrollment	4	2	6	7	2
The congregation has declined measurably because the minister has been enrolled in the D.Min. program	2	2	3	2	3

We also listed several specific aspects of life in the congregation or ministry setting and asked graduates to indicate whether each had improved and increased, stayed the same, or declined and worsened. Note that respondents were not asked to attribute the changes to D.Min. involvement; it is probably the case, however, that the respondents made such an attribution. The responses are in the Graduates questionnaire (V, F). Only a small percentage of the respondents (4% or fewer) indicate that things had declined or worsened. Just under two-thirds indicate that both "quality of program" and "clarity of purpose in the ministry setting" had improved or increased. On the other hand, approximately two-thirds indicate that the "amount of program" has remained the same, while just over one-third believed it has increased. Of the remaining aspects of congregational life, 50% or more indicate improvement or increase during involvement in their D.Min. program, with "lay involvement" highest at 59%.

We speculated that program types might be associated with reports of changes in the various aspects of the congregation/ministry setting during D.Min. involvement. Program format types and the types of educational philosophies did prove to be significant, though there was no significant difference when the programs in mainline and evangelical schools were compared. The program type differences are summarized in Tables II and III. As is evident and somewhat consistent with previous comparisons, graduates of extension programs are the most likely to indicate improvement/increase in the listed attributes, followed in most cases by those who participated in campus-based intensive programs. In all but one instance, local/regional graduates are less likely to report change. For five of the seven attributes compared by program format, the differences are statistically significant.

TABLE II Effects of D.Min. Participation on Graduates' Congregations by Program Format (Mean Scores)*

	Program Format Types			
	Local/ Regional	Campus-based Intensive	Extension- Colleague	Two or More Option
Morale in ministry setting	1.63	1.58	1.45	1.58 **
Quality of program	1.48	1.37	1.32	1.42 **
Amount of program	1.76	1.64	1.62	1.74 **
Lay involvement	1.51	1.40	1.36	1.47 **
Organizational effectiveness	1.58	1.53	1.37	1.47 **
Clarity of purpose	1.45	1.43	1.33	1.40 (ns)
Quality of Relationships	1.50	1.51	1.46	1.53 (ns)

*Means based on scores from 1 (improved or increased) to 3 (declined or worsened)

**Differences significant at <.001

Effects on Congregations

Differences in educational philosophies of programs also account for statistically significant differences in mean scores for perceived changes in five of the seven congregation/ministry setting attributes. Uniformly, graduates of unique content programs are most likely to indicate change, and those of extended M.Div. programs were least likely to do so.

TABLE III Effects of D.Min. Participation on Graduates' Congregations By Program's Educational Philosophy (Mean Scores)*

	Educational Philosophy		
	Extended M.Div.	Unique Content	Specialized
Morale in the Ministry Setting	1.58	1.47	1.56 (ns)
Quality of program	1.4	1.28	1.39 **
Amount of program	1.74	1.52	1.72 **
Lay involvement	1.52	1.30	1.43 **
Organizational effectiveness	1.58	1.29	1.53 **
Clarity of purpose	1.48	1.29	1.42 **
Quality of relationships	1.54	1.44	1.48 (ns)

*Means based on scores from 1 (improved or increased) to 3 (declined or worsened)
**Differences significant at <.001

Several studies undertaken by individual D.Min. programs tried to assess effects on congregations/institutions in which students were serving. At Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, whose program has as an objective increasing the effectiveness of the mission of participants' congregations/institutions, several questions were asked of members who had been involved in lay supervisory groups [Self-Study, pp. 239-49]. Of the 37 respondents, almost 95% report that their pastors' involvement in the program was of moderate or great benefit to the congregation/institution. Written comments included this one:

> We have seen growth and new families come to the church because of this program. It helped the church identify appropriate professional abilities of the pastor. Roles of professional leadership have become clearer (p. 241).

Two-thirds reported that the program created no special problems. The most common complaint (9 respondents) is that the program took too much of the pastor's time. When asked about changes in the congregation/institution as a result of their minister's involvement, three-fourths of the respondents report improvement in the life and

mission of the institution. Where specific positive changes are mentioned, they have to do with more intentional planning, quality of ministry, congregational participation, improved educational programs, church growth and community involvement.

Findings quite similar to those of the Northern Baptist study were reported in a self-study conducted at Bethany Theological Seminary in 1983 ["Questionnaire for Congregations/Institutions"]. Ninety-one persons involved in congregational/institutional supervisory groups responded. For these respondents, too, the majority (71%) believe the D.Min. was of at least moderate benefit to the congregation, and, as before, the majority of those who have complaints about the program are critical of the demands the program made on the pastor's time in relation to his/her responsibilities. Approximately one-third of the respondents believe the program had a positive effect on their congregation's/institution's life and mission and overall effectiveness. One out of five believe there was no effect.

The Hartford study [reported in Theological Education 16, Special Issue No. 2, Winter, 1980; cited earlier] also provides some insight into congregational changes as a result of D.Min. involvement. As recounted in Section II. B. 2. h of this report, the study compared graduates and their congregations in two program options, a parish option in which the congregation actually participated formally in the program and a professional option where only the pastor formally enrolled. Using a variety of methods to gather data, including an extensive congregational survey administered before and after the congregations'/ministers' program involvement, the researchers found "significant positive change in member satisfaction in all six core ministry [program] areas, greater perception of effectiveness in all four organizational functions, a significant increase in morale, and in a variety of indicators of mutual ministry," regardless of D.Min. program option (p. 223). There was more change, however, in organizational functioning than in performance in the core ministry areas, especially in the area of congregational mission. The researchers note also that three of the congregations experienced negative changes at the end of the program, and one evidenced no change. Finally, when they compared effects on congregations in the parish option with those whose pastors were enrolled in the professional option, the differences in amount of congregational change were small. There were, however, slightly more positive changes in parish option congregations in the core ministry areas and in their understanding of the ministry of the laity -- two areas that received special emphasis of the faculty-consultants who worked with congregations in the parish option. Professional option congregations tended to show a slightly greater improvement in organizational effectiveness.

Thus, both our data and those from other studies indicate that there are important relationships between D.Min. programs and the congregations/ministry settings of D.Min. participants. As we have seen, programs vary considerably in how much emphasis they place on linkages with a student's ministry setting and in objectives for

effecting change in these settings. Some require clear linkages and have explicit expectations for the congregation/ministry setting. Some apparently have no explicit requirements or expectations. Others, while requiring an indication of approval of the pastor's involvement, have no expectation that the program should effect change in these settings as a result of the pastor's program involvement. Regardless of differences, however, the general perception is that changes do occur in the ministry settings, and most of these are viewed positively by program participants and by persons in the settings. Furthermore, we found that positive changes in the participants' ministry settings are more likely to be reported by graduates of extension programs and of those of the "unique content" educational philosophy type.

Discussion

We were impressed with the generally positive nature of reported effects on students' ministry settings. We believe that given the nature of D.Min. programs as professional doctorates, the positive benefits of program participation should extend to the ministry settings of participants. We do have some reservations about programs that have as explicit objectives effecting change in the student's ministry setting, unless that is an objective accepted by all parties at the outset.

This issue, and the fact that some programs do not make analysis of or linkage with the ministry setting a formal program element, lead us to suggest that agreements between the seminaries that sponsor D.Min. programs and the congregations or other church agencies that employ students should probably be more explicit than often they are. It is difficult to see how the item in the Standards that requires "careful utilization of the student's ministerial context as a learning environment" can be met responsibly without the formal agreement of those who represent the "context." Without such agreement, a congregation may find itself being used without its permission and the student may be set up for potential conflict. As we noted when we raised similar concerns in the course of our earlier description of program elements that involve the ministry site (see II. B. 2. h), our data do not suggest that there are prevalent problems in this area. We simply note the possibility for those schools that do not establish a clear contract with the participant's ministry setting. Beyond the issue of formal agreements, we believe that there is a need to clarify the meaning of the requirements in the Standards for "utilization of the context" and "adequate supervision."

Finally, we note again the apparent potency of two program types: Extension programs and those that offer unique content or methods as their main objective. Those types are positively associated with reported changes in participants' ministry settings. We speculated earlier about why this is the case. Apart from our suspicion that a certain amount of "cheerleading" for extension programs may stem from defensiveness about the criticisms to which they have been subjected,

the only explanation that occurs to us is that both types are more intently focused on the interdependence of the student's program of study and his/her ministry setting. This interdependence may stem either from the proximity of the program to the setting (probably the case in many extension programs) and thus the greater likelihood of their significant relationship, or from this focus of the program on specific issues or aspects of professional practice not typically part of the M.Div. program.

II. E. The Impact of the Doctor of Ministry Programs

3. Effects on Seminaries

Findings

In our preliminary studies for this project, certain hypotheses were advanced about reasons for the rapid growth, in a short period of time, in the number of seminaries offering D.Min. programs. The view most widely held is that a major interest of many institutions in the D.Min. is financial, that the degree is a way of bolstering revenues that are declining because M.Div. enrollments, in some schools, have declined or have not grown sufficiently to support operations. Two other views are often advanced: That seminaries view the D.Min. as a means of reestablishing a connection with congregations and denominational structures from which they have grown distant; and that many D.Min. programs come into being without a specific motive, such as finances or public relations, but rather out of a general sense that the successful seminary must do more, and more varied things, to survive in the future. In a section of our fuller research report, to appear in 1987, we shall comment at greater length on what appear to have been seminaries' interests and motives in establishing D.Min. programs. In this section, we examine the various kinds of evidence we have collected of the actual impact of programs. Here too, we have heard various theories, usually connected to judgments about seminaries' motives: That the D.Min. has "saved" a number of institutions that might otherwise have collapsed financially; that by bringing faculty members into contact with practitioners it has greatly improved M.Div. teaching; and that it represents a substantial drain on resources, including faculty time, and has distracted from attention to other programs the institution offers and from faculty research and scholarship. To address these possibilities we shall examine both the opinions of administrators and faculty members about these matters and the evidence we have collected about the actual impact, especially the financial impact, of D.Min. programs on seminaries.

We asked each of the three groups of respondents from the seminaries about several possible effects of the D.Min. on the institution. Responses are shown in Table I.

TABLE I Effects of the D.Min. program on the Seminary

		MEAN	Great	Moderate	Little	None
The D.Min. has given core faculty experience which enriches M.Div. teaching						
	CEO	1.8	31%	55%	12%	2%
	Director	1.7	35	62	3	0
	Faculty	2.3	16	46	32	6
The D.Min. has drained attention and faculty energy from the M.Div. and other programs	CEO	2.7	5	30	52	13
	Director	3.1	0	21	51	28
	Faculty	2.6	7	36	47	10
It has enabled us to make good use of fixed resources that were not being fully utilized before.						
	CEO	2.5	22	28	26	24
	Director	2.8	8	43	34	15
	Faculty	2.6	13	32	32	23
It has stretched teaching and advising loads beyond optimum.	CEO	2.8	4	32	46	18
	Director	2.8	8	28	43	21
	Faculty	2.4	16	35	36	13
It has provided new research areas and opportunities for some faculty.	CEO	2.5	8	42	44	6
	Director	2.4	9	47	36	8
	Faculty	2.6	6	41	40	13
It has consumed faculty time that should have been used for research and writing.						
	CEO	3.0	1	25	49	25
	Director	3.0	2	23	52	23
	Faculty	2.6	9	33	47	11
It has helped our institution to improve its financial situation through providing additional revenue.						
	CEO	3.0	1	32	31	36
	Director	2.8	6	31	35	28
	Faculty	2.6	11	36	35	17

Effects on Seminaries

The most positive benefit identified by all respondents is improvement in the quality of advanced continuing education for ministry. All groups of respondents also believe that the public relations benefits of the programs have been high, not only with graduates directly but also with sponsoring denominations. Whether this translates into greater financial support is not known, as we note below, though officials at several programs offered in extension formats believe that their programs help to increase their institutions' visibility among denominational constituents in regions of the country other than their own. such visibility may aid their recruiting for other programs.

Another arena of impact is teaching. Both chief executives and directors believe that the D.Min. has given core faculty experience that enriches M.Div. teaching. This view is not so strongly shared, however, by faculty members. One-third of the faculty members (contrasted with 12% of students and 3% of directors) believe that D.Min. involvement has had little effect on their M.Div. teaching. Faculty members in practical fields were more positive about the effects on M.Div. teaching than those in the classical fields.

In a related question on the faculty questionnaire (V, 10), we asked respondents to indicate, for themselves, "To what extent has teaching in D.Min. courses changed your methods or style of teaching in M.Div. courses?" Only 6% say that it has done so to a great extent; 53% say "to some extent"; and 34% say not at all. (Seven percent do not teach D.Min. courses.) Of those who say their M.Div. teaching has been affected, almost two-thirds report drawing more on students' experiences, 59% report using more varied methods, and 41% use more practical illustrations. The use of case studies was mentioned in marginal comments by several faculty members and another illustrates M.Div. lectures using case material reported by D.Min. students. Several also report greater sensitivity to group dynamics as a result of D.Min. teaching. Also, at one institution, our case writer was told that the new M.Div. curriculum includes a senior seminar on theological reflection (following a required intern year) that probably came into being as a result of experiences in the D.Min.

Our case studies suggest that teaching methods for D.Min. courses changed as faculty members gained experience in the program. In particular, teaching for a number of faculty members has come increasingly to involve drawing on students' ministry experience. In one of our case study institutions, however, this is viewed as having both positive and negative consequences. While faculty members are generally stimulated by being pushed to relate their teaching to the in-ministry issues confronted by students, they are sometimes frustrated when this prevents first taking seriously the concepts or historical situations under discussion.

A number of written comments from faculty members indicate that the D.Min. has led them to a more collegial style of teaching; this

too, however, is viewed with some ambivalence by some faculty members, especially when the teaching is done in field colleague groups. As they expressed it to our case writer, colleague groups become a community of learners in a way that a seminary class seldom does. This makes it difficult for faculty members to disrupt the fellowship of the student group by indicating that one or several in the group are not doing adequate work. Among other effects on teaching styles, it is reported in the Hartford study (Theological Education 16, Special Issue No. 2, Winter, 1980, p. 238) that faculty learned to incorporate consulting into their teaching style, especially in their teaching in parishes, but also with D.Min. students.

Approximately four out of ten of each group, as shown in Table I, believe that the D.Min. has been of moderate importance in providing new research areas and opportunities to faculty members, with roughly equal proportions indicating that it has been of little importance. No specific examples were cited. Both faculty members and chief executives are slightly more likely than directors to believe that the D.Min. has drained attention and faculty energy from the M.Div. and other programs, though the majority of all groups say that the D.Min. has had little or no effect in this regard. Faculty members are somewhat more likely than chief executives or directors to say that D.Min. involvement has consumed faculty time that should have been used for research and writing. This was especially true for faculty members in classical fields. Likewise, they were slightly more likely to say that the program has stretched teaching and advising loads beyond the optimum. One faculty member we interviewed expressed considerable concern about this problem, especially its impact on junior faculty.

> There are no real institutional rewards for this work [the D.Min. and other continuing education involvements]. We do get paid and we need the money from this institutionally-approved moonlighting, but we simply do not have the horses for all these programs. We are too extended. I worry about junior faculty who cannot say no but who at tenure time are judged only on publication. I can think of people who have not gotten promoted because they got mixed signals about what was wanted and took the wrong ones.

Finally, for all of the questions relating to the D.Min.'s impact on faculty time and energy, we note that faculty whose institutions offer extension programs were significantly less likely to report a negative effect on their time.

Several items in Table I refer to the impact of the D.Min. on institutional resources. Presumably, such resources include not only buildings and libraries, but also full-time faculty members. The majority of all respondents (chief executives and faculty members slightly more than directors) believe that the D.Min. has greatly or moderately stimulated the use of fixed resources that were not being fully utilized before. This is particularly true for faculty members in extension programs (65% reporting great or moderate effect). Also,

the larger the program, the more likely that faculty members view it as benefitting their institution's financial situation.

Slightly more faculty members than chief executives or directors believe the D.Min. program has helped improve their institution's financial position by bringing in additional revenue, though a majority of each of the three groups believes that the program has had little or no effect in this connection. Faculty members in schools with an extension program were significantly more likely to believe that the program has helped improve their institution's financial situation (68% indicating a great or moderate effect, as compared with less than 50% of the faculty members in the other program format types).

In a related question, all three groups were asked if the D.Min. is more or less "profitable" than other programs, or whether they believe it has about the same financial impact as the others. Faculty members and directors are quite similar, with the majority (56%) believing the D.Min.'s financial impact is about the same as that of other programs. Just over one-fourth of each group believes the D.Min. is more "profitable." Chief executives, on the other hand, were much more likely to assess the program's financial impact as essentially the same as that of other programs (71%), with only 14% saying it was more "profitable." Several respondents commented that their "more profitable" reply was based primarily on the fact that little or no financial aid is offered to D.Min. students. Several others commented that their institutions had not done a cost analyses of their various programs.

We previously noted that most respondents believe that offering a D.Min. program has benefited their institution by providing good public relations with sponsoring denominations, graduates and others. It may be that this heightened good will also affects the financial support given the institution by these constituencies. We asked whether offering the D.Min. has provided a D.Min. alumni/ae group that is helpful in fund raising. Approximately 30% of each group say that the D.Min. has had either a great or a moderate effect in this area, but the large majority see little or no positive benefit. Again, faculty members in schools with extension programs were most likely to see positive benefits (almost three-fourths indicating a great or moderate effect, as compared with one-fourth to one-half of faculty members in the other format types). In one such program, the president and dean commented to our case writer that D.Min. graduates were becoming an increasingly important source of alumni giving, and equally important, they frequently encourage contributions to the institution by their congregations.

Finally, little negative impact is reported by any of the three groups of respondents on their institution's reputation for academic rigor. That no significant group of faculty members thinks this has happened is a surprise. As we have reported elsewhere, especially in connection with our descriptions of extension programs and large programs, such charges are frequently made by persons in institutions

that do not grant the D.Min. and those in schools whose programs are small or offered in other than extension formats. One might expect that faculty members, known to be sensitive to such charges, would be concerned about their effect. This is not, however, the case.

To sum up administrators' and faculty members' views and opinions about the impact of the D.Min.: The greatest perceived effects are the improvement of advanced continuing education for clergy and of the seminary's relations with the public. The enrichment of M.Div. teaching is also seen as a positive benefit by chief executives and directors, but slightly less so by faculty members. There is not great dissatisfaction, overall, because of time demands made on faculty members by the D.Min.; but faculty members more than other observers do see D.Min. programs as "stretching them thin" and consuming time that should have been used for research and writing. The D.Min. is viewed by all as having a moderate, positive effect in helping the institution to make better used of fixed resources, but most view the program as having only moderate impact or less, on their institution's financial health. Chief executives, who probably have the most information about such matters, are less likely to view the D.Min. as more "profitable" than other programs. (Here again we see a familiar pattern: Groups that have less data, in this case faculty members with respect to the financial effect of D.Min. programs, often give more positive and optimistic estimations than those who have more first-hand information. We take this as a sign of the widespread good will toward D.Min. programs and institutions that offer them.) The most positive benefit identified by all respondents is improvement in the quality of advanced continuing education for ministry. All groups of respondents also believe that the public relations benefits of the programs have been high, not only with graduates directly but also with sponsoring denominations. Whether this translates into greater financial support is not known, as we note below, though officials at several programs offered in extension formats believe that their programs help to increase their institutions' visibility among denominational constituents in regions of the country other than their own. Such visibility may aid their recruiting for other programs. Finally, there is little evident concern that D.Min. programs weaken an institution's reputation for academic rigor.

The two studies we conducted of financial dimensions of D.Min. programs provide information about their actual financial impact. (Reports on these two studies are available separately. They are summarized briefly here.) There are, of course, several ways to measure financial impact. We have looked at tuition rates for the D.Min., the proportional importance of D.Min. tuition revenues, and at the relation of D.Min.-related income to D.Min.-related costs.

Table II shows total instructional fees charged to obtain a D.Min. degree, at 1983-84 rates. Since in some programs the total cost of the degree to the student varies with the length of time it takes a student to finish, we asked business officers in such institutions to assume

"normal academic progress." The average total tuition, about $3,300, is, in our view, quite low. Though we have not made comparisons with doctorates in other fields, we would venture that tuition for one year's full-time equivalent doctoral work elsewhere is almost invariably higher than the average figure for the D.Min. Further, more than half of all programs charge less than this amount, one charging as little as $1500; no program charges more than $5500. A chart of program fees (not shown) reveals a bi-modal pattern: The two points around which the largest numbers of programs cluster are $3000 (12 programs) and $4000 (8 programs). This suggests an attraction for round numbers in the setting of D.Min. tuition fees.

TABLE II Total Instructional Fees Charged to a Student to Obtain a D.Min. Degree, at 1983/84 Rates, Assuming Normal Academic Progress

N =	54
Average total fee (mean)	$3,338.94
Smallest total fee reported	1,500.00
Largest total fee reported	5,520.00
Standard deviation in total fee	782.49
25th percentile	2,965.00
50th percentile	3,175.00
75th percentile	3,918.75

There are almost no differences in tuition rates among program philosophy types, but as Table III shows, mainline programs have, on average, higher tuition and fees than programs in evangelical institutions; and among program philosophy types, the tuition level of local/regional programs is set higher. We suspect that local/regional programs, whose students take many of their courses together with students enrolled in other programs, are more likely to have tuition rates on a par with the (probably higher) tuition charges for other advanced programs. Various statistical tests, including a regression analysis, confirm that there is no relationship between D.Min. tuition and program size.

TABLE III A. Total Instructional Fees Charged to a Student to Obtain a D.Min Degree at 1983/84 Rates, Assuming Normal Academic Progress, by Denominational Type

Type	Average Total Fee	Standard Deviation	Number of Schools
Mainline	$3442.97	806.44	37
Evangelical	3112.53	696.73	17
All Programs	3338.94	782.49	54

TABLE III B. Total Institutional Fees Charged to a Student to Obtain a D.Min. Degree at 1983/84 Rates, Assuming Normal Academic Progress by Program Type

Program Format	Average Total Fee	Standard Deviation	Number of Schools
Local/regional	$3565.00	1111.38	17
Campus Intensive	3187.96	609.11	23
Extension College	3295.00	501.37	5
Two or more options	3322.22	514.27	9
All programs	3338.90	782.49	54

Since all in-ministry D.Min. programs are part-time programs, payment of the total tuition amounts shown above may be stretched out over a period of several years. Several directors told us that, when their programs first started, their practice was to bill the student for the total amount of D.Min. tuition when the student first matriculated. This practice was discontinued because of the complications in making refunds to students who dropped out of the program at an early stage. Our survey suggests that few institutions still use this method of charging tuition. Half of the institutions that provided financial data for our study charge students for each course or unit taken. Thus, in a time period in which a student is not taking any work for credit, there are no charges. About 40% of our respondents charge a flat instructional fee per quarter, semester or year, until the total D.Min. tuition has been paid. The remaining few institutions use some other system, including the single, one time charge at the beginning of the program. The feature all these systems have in common is the tendency to assess charges early in the student's enrollment. On average, 40% of all tuition due has been paid by the end of the first year, 75% of all tuition due by the second, and 93% by the end of the third. Thus, however long it takes a student to complete the program, in most programs tuition is almost fully paid by the point that students on average complete the D.Min., 3.6 years after beginning.

Table IV shows similar data in a different form. Here we have computed, for 1983-84 financial information we collected, D.Min. tuition and fee revenues per student divided by total instructional fees charged to a student who obtained the degree, again assuming "normal academic progress." As the Table shows in that year, on average, schools received from each student 27% of the total D.Min. tuition that student would eventually pay. What is most interesting in the Table are the outlying figures and the distribution of figures. One school received from its D.Min. students in that year only 5% of the total tuition due from those students (in other words, if this same rate were maintained, it would take students 20 years to pay their total tuition); half of all schools received 24% or less of total

tuition. A number of factors can explain these low percentages, including fluctuations in enrollment and differences in policies for making tuition charges, as well as the expected duration of the program. A program whose students are expected to take five years for completion might expect, for instance, to receive only 20% of total tuition fees due in any one year, depending on its system of making charges. Another possible factor is the presence of inactive students who are not paying tuition. Any program whose annual per student revenue is significantly lower than what that revenue should be, given the expected duration of the program and the institution's charging policies, should examine its student records to see whether it may have an excessive number of students enrolled but not making progress toward the degree.

TABLE IV 1983/84 D.Min. Tuition and Fee Revenues per Student Divided by the Total Instructional Fees Charged to a Student to Obtain the D.Min. Degree, at 1983/84 Rate, Assuming Normal Academic Progress

Mean	.27
Standard Deviation	.16
Minimum	.05
Maximum	.92
25th percentile	.15
50th percentile	.24
75th percentile	.32
N =	52

Per student revenues differ to some extent by program type. The average per student revenue is higher for evangelical programs than mainline programs ($966 vs. $822). Though total tuition charged influences per student revenue, that is not the explanatory factor in this case, because as shown earlier, mainline total tuitions are higher than evangelical ones. Evangelical schools, therefore, either front-load more of their tuition charges or have faster program completion rates than mainline programs. Local/regional average per student revenue is also higher, though that difference can be explained by the fact that tuition for these programs is higher overall. There are also marked differences among program philosophy types: $993 for independent/specialized programs, $689 for unique content or method programs, and $754 for extended M.Div. programs. Differences can not be explained by differences in total D.Min. tuition rate, since the average total rate for all program types was almost the same. Thus it must be the case that independent/specialized programs demand payment earlier in the program and/or move students through more quickly than, in descending order, extended M.Div. programs or those in the category we have called unique content or method.

All these differences among types are, however, relative. The overarching fact is that, in almost all institutions from which we

obtained information, the Doctor of Ministry program is not a very significant element in the institution's finances. As we have already shown, D.Min. tuitions are quite low, and in most institutions considerably less than half the total tuition amount due from a student is received in any budget year. Table V documents that this combination of relatively low tuition and slow rate of payment means that for almost all institutions, D.Min. tuition income is a small percentage of tuition income. The Table shows that, on average, D.Min. tuition is only 5% of the total tuition and fees collected by institutions that give the degree, and only 2% of the amount of educational and general expenditures. For three-quarters of all schools, D.Min. tuition is only 10% or less of tuition revenue and a little more than 3% of educational and general expenditures. As Figure I shows, there are a few exceptions. Four schools receive over 20% of their tuition revenue from D.Min. tuition and fees, and two institutions receive more than one-third of their tuition income from this source. For most schools, however, D.Min. tuition is a very small proportion of total tuition revenue and covers an even tinier proportion of the total educational expenses of the school. Even, for instance, in the institution where almost half of tuition and fees revenue comes from the D.Min., only 13% of educational and general expenditures are covered by this tuition. Thus for almost all institutions, tuition from other programs as well as income from endowment and annual gifts are far more important revenue sources than the D.Min.

TABLE V D.Min. Tuition and Fees as a Percentage of Total Tuition and Fees, and D.Min. Tuition and fees as Percentage of Educational and General Expenditures

	D.Min. Tuition as a Percentage of:	
	Total Tuition & Fees	Educational & General Expenditures
Mean	4.84%	2.06
Minimum	0.09	0.06
Maximum	48.65	12.81
25th percentile	3.22	0.99
50th percentile	5.52	1.63
75th percentile	10.05	3.39
Valid Responses	48	47

The question remains, of course, whether D.Min. programs, as small a part of most seminaries' total revenue picture as they are, are financially productive or not. In our survey, we asked business officers to provide the total amount of costs charged directly to the D.Min. and we compared this figure with the revenue for tuition and fees. In two out of three cases, tuition revenue covers or exceeds budgeted D.Min. expenditures. The problem with this information, of course, is that institutions use different systems for assigning costs

to programs. An institution with a very small D.Min. program, may, for instance, use only personnel for the D.Min. who also function in the school's other programs. These institutions may show no "costs center" for the D.Min., or only a very small amount that covers such things as postage and supplies. Another institution in an identical situation may assign the costs of shared staff to the D.Min. costs center. Thus the information from our survey about costs of the D.Min. program is not very reliable.

In order to gain a more accurate sense of the relationship between D.Min.-related revenues and D.Min.-related costs, we asked our financial consultants, Anthony Ruger and Badgett Dillard, to visit five seminaries to do a full cost analysis of their D.Min. programs. We chose five programs of different sizes and types. While these five programs are not representative of other D.Min. programs in any proportional way, they do cover the range and variety of program sizes, administrative arrangements and formats. Using standard formulas for assigning costs to the D.Min., our consultants produced information that makes it possible to compare these five programs with each other. The results of the analysis are presented in a separate paper and summarized only briefly here.

In this full cost analysis, only one program was shown to cover its full costs from revenue from D.Min. tuition and fees. The program that achieved this is a large program that takes in revenue that represents 106% of the program's full (that is, direct, indirect or shared, and overhead or allocated) costs. Three other programs show a "deficit" on a full cost basis, taking in 51%, 38%, and 29% of their full costs in D.Min. tuition and fee revenue. (One program, whose costs for the D.Min. are entirely shared and almost impossible to calculate accurately, was excluded from this comparison.) Though the only program that covered its full costs is a large one, size does not determine financial productivity, since another very large program was found to cover only 38% of its costs. The difference between these two large programs, in the view of our consultants, was what they called "institutional will." The financially productive program, in other words, was one required by institutional policy to pay not only all the direct costs of the program, but a generous allocation for indirect and overhead costs as well. The program includes arrangements such as relatively large D.Min. classes (the target is 40 students in each class) that make financial productivity possible.

The analysts also determined in each case the D.Min. program's incremental cost. Incremental costs are those that would not be incurred if the institution ceased to offer the D.Min. program. They found that four of the five programs covered incremental costs of the D.Min. from D.Min. tuition and fee revenue. One program, the large one referred to above whose D.Min. tuition and fees is 38% of full program cost, did not quite cover its incremental D.Min. cost either.

Combined survey and case study data suggest the following conclusions, which must be offered as tentative because comparable cost

data are not available from all institutions. For almost all institutions, D.Min. tuition and revenues represents a small percentage of total tuition and revenues, and an even smaller percentage of education and general expenditures. If the full cost of offering the D.Min. program is figured, allocating to it its portion of shared expenses and general institutional overhead, almost all D.Min. programs will be shown to earn in revenues substantially less than the full amount they cost the institution. On a full cost basis, in other words, very few D.Min. programs "make money." Most programs, however, probably do cover their incremental costs, and some probably do better than that: They also partially cover some of the cost of "fixed" seminary resources that are used in the D.Min. program. Thus it is possible to say that D.Min. programs, though they usually do not "make money" for the institution on a full cost basis, do cover the costs they bring with them and in some situations produce income that partially covers such expensive fixed resources of the seminary as plant, utilities and tenured faculty.

Discussion

Most of our findings about the impact D.Min. programs have had on seminaries can be summarized with the statement that D.Min. programs have had limited impact on the institutions that offer the degree. This discovery was a surprise. We had expected that faculty members in D.Min.-granting institutions would report that D.Min.-related responsibilities had "stretched them thin" and taken time from their work in other programs and their research and writing. We expected that financial data would show a considerable financial impact of the D.Min. in many institutions. As just recounted, neither of these expectations was borne out in the data we collected. The faculty view of the D.Min. is positive. Most faculty members like their D.Min. teaching and want to continue it, though they do not generally report that it has had marked impact on their other teaching or their research. The financial benefits of offering the degree, in almost all institutions we surveyed, turn out to be far more limited than we expected. But neither are D.Min. programs a substantial financial drain. The effects of D.Min. programs on seminaries, in other words, are not dramatic, in either a negative or a positive direction.

This limited impact may be traceable in part to the way D.Min. programs are constructed. As we have shown at other points in this report, they tend to be conducted on the margins, somewhat isolated and insulated from the seminary's other activities. For many faculty members, they are optional undertakings, often bringing with them additional honorarium income. Many programs are administratively segregated as well. If our recommendations in this report for bringing D.Min. programs into the mainstream of seminary activity are taken seriously, it is possible that the impact of D.Min. programs will be more widely felt.

Our particular concern is the impact of this move on one of the seminary's most valuable resources: Faculty time. It seems to us that

Effects on Seminaries

D.Min. programs that become more central in the seminaries that house them can have either a positive or negative effect, or perhaps both. They may, for instance, exacerbate a continuing tension in theological education that is rooted in its double accountability to the churches and the academic world. A D.Min. program, especially one that involves all members of an institution's faculty in teaching, advising and oversight, will almost inevitably demand more attention to issues rooted in the life of churches, since D.Min. students bring such issues with them. Faculty members whose research and advanced teaching has been oriented to issues of importance in academic circles may feel some tension or dissonance between the two sets of demands. In some cases the difficulty may be created not by different foci -- church and academy -- but simply by the demands that conscientious D.Min. teaching and advisement place on faculty time. Some faculty members, in other words, may feel that the time demanded by D.Min. involvements must be subtracted from that formerly allocated to research and writing.

But there are positive possibilities as well. The D.Min. can help to orient some faculty members' teaching and research to issues that arise in church life. This reorientation may have beneficial effects on M.Div. programs and may also help to heal what many view as a serious split between most theological research and the issues of contemporary church life. We believe that such developments are possible, however, only in D.Min. programs that set relatively high standards for admissions and student academic work. Faculty members are unlikely to find either their D.Min. students or the issues these students bring to be sources of intellectual stimulation if faculty members must in their D.Min. teaching give substantial amounts of "remedial" instruction or coach weak students through the program. This is one important argument for conceiving the D.Min. program as an opportunity for a limited, very able group of clergy rather than as a program potentially for all clergy: The more limited program is more likely to attract and hold faculty attention to church issues, and to afford the opportunity for able clergy to form an productive collegial relationship with seminary faculty members.