II. B. 1. Program Types

a. Introduction

There have been several earlier attempts to create typologies among which D.Min. programs can be sorted. In a 1977 dissertation, William Hugh Tucker [Doctor of Ministry: Non-Traditional Models of Advanced In-Service Professional Education, University of Michigan] uses four categories which he labels administrative-facilitation, extended campus, adult degree, and individualized study. D.Min. programs in the first category are those built on the school's standard curriculum. Students in these programs choose courses from the range of electives the school offers (only a few of which, probably, will have been designed especially for D.Min. students). Since this battery of electives must serve students in many programs, D.Min. programs of this type necessarily operate on a standard academic calendar. In the second category are programs that operate by extension, bringing a special curriculum of courses to sites near where the students live and work. In the third category, the adult degree model, are programs whose curricula are especially created for D.Min. students, and often scheduled for their convenience; and in the last category are highly individualized programs that may involve extensive study at other institutions or independent study outside of the framework of particular courses. Marvin J. Taylor in "Some Reflections on the Development and Current Status of the D.Min.," [Theological Education 12, Summer, 1976: 271-278], suggests four other types. (His typology was published before but actually developed after Tucker's.) Taylor's first type resembles Tucker's: It operates on the usual academic calendar. A second type is made up of courses offered in intensive units. This type Taylor subdivides into two: An "academic" version that requires specialization in a particular discipline, and an "experiential" type that focuses on the analysis of practice. Taylor's fourth category, like Tucker's second, is the extension program.

We collected materials from the 77 programs we found to be in full operation in 1983-84, and then sought wherever possible to augment these with the materials for 1984-85. In the content analysis of these materials, we attempted to test whether either Tucker's or Taylor's types would serve as a means to sort the programs; or if they would not, to develop our own typology. The attempt to create a single set of types or categories into which all programs could be sorted was a failure. It soon became evident that both Taylor and Tucker had, in creating their types, combined several variables: The location of course offerings; the schedule of course offerings; the balance of required program units to elective ones; the balance between generalization and specialization; the educational methods employed; and -- harder to specify, but present in both typologies -- the

older programs in the category. In our interviews we found that several of the
programs in this group are widely known and noticed. We have called the program type unique content or method.

TABLE II General or Parish Ministry Program Philosophy Types

	Percentage	N =
Independent/specialized	50%	(38)
Extended M. Div.	38	(29)
Unique content or method	12	(9)
	100%	(76)

The public significance of this unique content and method type of D.Min. degree is, again, distinctly different from the other types. Unlike the "extended M.Div." D.Min. programs, it focuses in areas not included in the student's previous studies; unlike the "independent/specialized" programs, it does not allow a student to choose from a wide range of possible specialities and to construct a highly individualized program. It resembles the "specialized track" programs in that it provides exposure to a body of materials and/or methods that ministers who have not completed such programs are not likely to be acquainted with, but unlike the specialized track programs, the small group of programs in this category are intended for persons in general or parish ministry. The method or subject matter on which they focus, in other words, is deemed to be valuable for any minister, regardless of particular professional focus, who wants to achieve advanced competence in ministry. Thus this type of program says to the public: the holder of the degree has learned a method or a body of material potentially useful in most kinds of ministry, but not generally known to ministers who hold only the M.Div. or the other types of D.Min. degrees.

Differences Among Program Philosophy Types: Limited and Broad Options

The most striking difference among program philosophy types is the range and variety of program offerings required to support them.

As mentioned earlier, we tabulated the proportion of total program credits that must be taken in the form of required courses; and those that were to be taken as electives or independent study (for the purpose of this calculation, we excluded the units or credits awarded for the Doctor of Ministry project). The results are shown in Table III.

TABLE III Flexibility of Requirements Within General and Specialized Programs

	General Programs		Specialized Tracks	
		N=		N=
Mostly or wholly required	18%	(13)	42%	(15)
Half and half	32	(23)	42	(15)
Mostly or wholly elective	50	(30)	16	(6)
	100	(72)	100	(36)

As is evident in the Table, programs of the specialized track type are much more likely to have a high percentage of required or prescribed courses and other educational activities than are general ministry programs. Since logically there would also be striking differences among the different types of general or parish ministry programs (independent/specialized programs would no doubt have a much higher level of electives than extended M.Div. programs, for instance), we set out to tabulate level of requirements by program philosophy type. In so doing it became evident that, although half of the general or parish ministry programs were mostly or wholly elective, there were great differences in the range of electives available in particular programs and schools. In some cases, elective courses could be drawn from the full program offerings of the seminary or, even more broadly from the curriculum of a consortium or university with which the seminary is allied. In others, though the program nominally allowed a high percentage of electives, these had to be selected from a limited menu designed for D.Min. students alone. An extreme example of this was a program that required students to choose eleven courses from a standard list of 15. Though that program was "wholly elective" in a formal sense, the educational experience of a student enrolled in it was vastly different, even the opposite, of the experience of a student in a "wholly elective" program that permitted choice among hundreds of seminary and university courses. Thus it seemed fruitless to tabulate the extent to which work for various types of general or parish ministry programs was "required" or "elective." Instead, we developed the categories of limited and broad options. Programs in which students could select half or more of their courses from a wide range of electives were categorized as "broad option." Those that restricted the student to a series of required courses, or that allowed choices among a relatively small number of elective courses developed especially for D.Min. students, were designated "limited." When limited and broad option programs are cross tabulated with the program philosophy types, a dramatic picture results.

Program Philosophy Types

TABLE IV Program Philosophy Types by Limited and Broad Options

	Independent Specialized		Unique Content/ method		Extended M.Div.		Specialized Track	
Options		N=		N=		N=		N=
Limited	13%	(1)	66%	(6)	100%	(29)	75%	(27)
Broad	97	(37)	33	(3)		(0)	25	(9)
	100%	(38)	100%	(9)	100%	(29)	100%	(38)

Virtually all independent/specialized programs are broad option programs. The purpose and structure of this degree type virtually require a wide range of choice: If the student is to choose a point of specialization related to that student's "gifts and graces," the range of choice must be wide to accommodate many and various student interests and aptitudes. Furthermore, specialization -- the main activity of the degree -- requires that several courses be offered in each area in which a student might specialize. No limited menu of offerings can accommodate this need for depth. (No seminary, even one related to a consortium or university, has sufficient offerings in every area a student might choose. Many independent/specialized programs, therefore, admit only students whose interests fall in areas the seminary feels it can accommodate. One program, for instance, requires that two faculty members "endorse" a student's application, thereby agreeing to serve as advisors. Students who are not so endorsed are not admitted.) By contrast, all extended M.Div. programs are limited option programs. This also stems from the nature of that program type. As earlier mentioned, the extended M.Div. type of D.Min. program must add something at the D.Min. level that the M.Div. did not already cover or complete. It is therefore usually necessary to develop new, additional courses for D.Min. students, and since most D.Min. programs are not large, only a limited number of such courses can be sustained by D.Min. enrollment. The unique content and method programs are divided between the limited and broad option types. Such programs do not in themselves require either a broad range of options or restriction of the student to a limited list of specially-designed, advanced courses. Some of these programs offer only their distinctive method or subject matter, but others offer this method or content as a core and make a wide range of electives available to students who have completed the required sequence. Likewise, the specialized track programs, the ones with which we do not deal extensively in this report, are divided: The majority of them, like extended M.Div. programs, are mostly or wholly required or direct their students to choose from a limited number of specially developed courses in the specialty area. But others offer a core of such courses and a broad range of electives in other areas.

It is difficult to specify with any certainty how these strong relationships between program philosophy type and broad or limited option type developed. The director of a program of the broad option, independent/specialized type explained his school's gravitation to that model as a product of an historical moment: The degree came into being in the early 1970s at a time when the faculty was dissatisfied with the school's core curriculum. Thus the notion of a limited core of courses was rejected for the D.Min. as it had been for the M.Div. The director added that the choice of this program type was also a matter of necessity: The school offered a variety of other degrees and did not have a faculty large enough to offer a special palate of D.Min. courses. Those explanations are plausible, though it should be noted (and will be further explored in the section on program age) that both the independent/specialized and extended M.Div. types of D.Min. programs have been in evidence since the early days of the D.Min. In fact, the average age of independent/specialized programs and extended M.Div. type programs is almost exactly the same: In both cases the mean starting date is 1975. Some programs of the extended M.Div. type began, quite literally, as extensions of M.Div. programs, that is as in-sequence D.Min. programs -- an additional year of full-time study intended to be taken immediately after the initial three-year sequence was completed. Schools that developed special courses for an in-sequence program could continue them, sometimes in modified form, as the core of the offerings for an in-ministry program. Unfortunately, neither ATS nor many schools distinguished in the early days of the D.Min. between in-sequence and in-ministry programs, so the relationships between early in-sequence programs and current programs of the extended M.Div. type are difficult to trace.

Differences among Program Philosophy Types: Size

Variations among the sizes of programs are explored extensively in a section below. Here, however, it should be noted that independent/specialized programs are generally small, programs of the extended M.Div. type are generally larger, and unique content and method type programs also tend to be large, though since the category is small it is difficult to identify the "typical" size of programs within it. Table V shows these differences.

TABLE V Program Philosophy Types (General or Parish Program) by Size of Program

	General of Parish Program Philosophy Type							
	Independent Specialized		Unique content or Method		Extended M.Div.		All	
Size		N=		N=		N=		N=
10 - 86	87%	(32)	66%	(6)	76%	(22)	78%	(54)
87 - 177	13	(5)	11	(1)	17	(5)	16	(11)
178 - 721	--	(0)	22	(2)	7	(2)	6	(4)
	100%	(37)	100%	(9)	100%	(29)	100%	(69)

Again, the relationships are logical. Since independent/specialized programs can be mounted with relatively few new educational offerings, smaller programs are financially feasible. Further, since such programs often require faculty to spend substantial amounts of time advising students on the design of their programs, many institutions have deliberately limited the size of this kind of D.Min. program. On the other hand, programs of the extended M.Div. type require a certain minimum number of students to make it worthwhile for the institution to develop and conduct the special series of advanced courses that these programs almost by definition require. Unique content and method programs, too, offer at least some courses for D.Min. students alone, and thus require substantially larger-sized program groups than do independent/specialized programs.

Differences Among Program Philosophy Types: Teaching Arrangements

Differences among the types of general or parish ministry programs are evident in patterns of faculty deployment. As might be expected, programs of the independent/specialized type are more likely to report that they have used more members of the seminary's core faculty and fewer adjunct teachers or advisors in the last few years. Directors of such programs are also more likely to say that they make no use at all of adjunct teachers and advisors. By contrast, directors of programs of the unique content and method type are least likely to have used more core faculty and fewer adjuncts in recent years, and also to report the use of adjunct teachers or advisors. (Programs of the extended M.Div. type fall in between the other two types on both measures.) These data make sense. Most of an institution's core of elective courses, the bread-and-butter of independent/specialized programs, are taught by members of the core faculty. Almost by definition, some materials taught in programs of the unique content and method type are not well-known to most members of seminary faculties. Thus adjunct teachers may be needed at least when such programs are young, to teach unfamiliar material. Perhaps because more of the load is borne by adjunct teachers, faculty members (and program directors) in institutions that have programs of the unique content and method type are substantially more likely than those from institutions that have other types of programs to say that the D.Min. program in their institution should be larger. Faculty in institutions that have extended M.Div. programs, programs that presumably draw quite heavily on members of the core faculty to teach courses that were not, before the advent of the D.Min. program, in the curriculum, are <u>least</u> likely to say that the program should grow.

Differences Among Program Philosophy Types: Other Issues

In the remainder of this report, the program philosophy types described in this section will often prove useful in explaining differences among programs with respect to particular program features, and sometimes association with one of these program types or another will help to explain differences in respondents' attitudes toward the D.Min. A few of these differences will be described here, to help establish the distinctions among the types; most will be explored in greater depth later in this report.

Generally, programs of the unique content and method type are described by students, graduates, faculty and seminary administrators as having fewest traditional academic features. Both faculty members and those who are or have been D.Min. students report that systematic theology, Biblical studies, ethics and church history are less likely to be emphasized in such programs than in the other two general or parish types. Nor do these programs especially emphasize traditional "practical" studies, such as preaching and counseling, though such programs are far more likely than others to stress sociological theory and organizational development. A similar pattern appears in reports on the use of educational structures and methods. Generally programs of the unique content and method type are least likely to be reported as using forms traditionally associated with academic programs (for instance, course exams, qualifying exams and library research). By contrast, the independent/specialized programs are most likely to be viewed as using traditional academic forms, but least likely to be seen as using such devices as evaluations of the ministry setting and peer learning that are most evident in programs of the unique content and method type.

Generally, programs of the extended M.Div. type fall between the other two types in the extent to which they are described as making use of various traditional and non-traditional educational methods and structures. Quite logically, these programs (of the extended M.Div. type) are viewed as placing the most emphasis on the subject matter of the seminary M.Div. curriculum: Systematic theology, Biblical studies, ethics, church history and practical studies. (As the reader will be able to examine in subsequent sections describing the content and teaching methods of D.Min. programs, there is some variation among the reports of faculty, students and graduates on these matters, but there are also strong and highly consistent patterns in the reports.)

The tendency to view the unique method and content programs as "less academic" is also evident in the responses of faculty and administrators to a question about what features of D.Min. programs they would like most to change. Those who teach in programs of the unique content and method type were far more likely than those who teach in other types of programs to call for more academic content or more academic rigor (21% of faculty and administrators involved in such programs made such comments, as compared to 6% of those from independent/specialized programs and 9% of those who teach in or administer

programs of the extended M.Div. type). There were no substantial differences among program types in the percentages of faculty and administrators who want more rigor in the selection process: Almost one-third in every case want to see change in this direction. Overall, there is a slight tendency among faculty members to evaluate extended M.Div. type programs slightly more generously, and of directors, students and graduates to do the same for programs of the unique content and method type. But even independent/specialized programs, the least widely approved and least generously evaluated overall, evidently have their strong points: For instance, directors, faculty members and students and graduates associated with independent/specialized programs are all more likely to judge the students in such programs as well prepared to carry out the major project without undue difficulty. Comments volunteered by graduates about different program types varied: The tendency was to express gratitude for programs that had allowed for the pursuit of individual specialized interest and to criticize those that seemed in retrospect "too broad" or not sufficiently focused.

Discussion

A major finding of this study, perhaps the primary one, is that there are four greatly different conceptions of the D.Min. degree, each represented by a substantial number of programs. Though we share the general view that variety and diversity among D.Min. programs is healthy, and that students who seek advanced competence in ministry should have opportunities to study in different types of institutions, to explore different topics in depth, and to enroll in programs that espouse different learning theories and use different educational methods, we question whether a degree program can become established and win public trust if its public meanings vary as greatly as do the various significations of D.Min. degrees offered by different institutions. The differences among various program types mean that the degree does not uniformly signify either that an advanced general level of competence has been achieved or that an area of specialization has been mastered; nor does it dependably signify that the student has followed a prescribed curriculum deemed appropriate for this degree or has demonstrated independence and initiative in devising an educational program that conforms to that student's ability and interests. A D.Min. degree <u>may</u> mean any combination of these, but it necessarily signifies none of them. Without explanations and qualifications, it is really not possible to say what has been accomplished when the D.Min. degree is awarded except the successful completion of the equivalent of one year of graduate study beyond the Master of Divinity degree.

We question whether the D.Min. will survive unless some greater consensus is reached than is evident among the program types just described. Though advanced degree programs are undertaken, in the

ideal, chiefly for the benefit of the student who enrolls, a degree is also, as we have said, a public credential. In the case of ministers, congregational and denominational assent and support is often important in securing the freedom and resources to pursue a D.Min. Further, even if the motives for taking the degree are personal and high-minded, if the degree does not come to serve as a trusted signifier that something particular has been accomplished that is an ingredient of "advanced competence," we wonder whether clergy enthusiasm for the D.Min. will continue.

Which program type should prevail? This is a matter for the community of theological institutions to decide, with reference to the views and needs of others in church communities. We cannot comment on whether the D.Min. credential and structure are really necessary for advanced programs in pastoral care and counseling, since we have not studied this type of D.Min. program. As for the differences among the three types of general or parish-oriented programs, we believe that those who conduct programs of each type should ask themselves searching questions that might lead to a clearer rationale for each type and the possibility of some negotiation among them. Programs of what we have called the unique content and method type have the most straightforward rationale. Their aim is to provide ministers with perspectives, materials and methods in areas they have not heretofore explored. These programs should, we believe, ask themselves whether there is not some additional body of general knowledge that should be added to the "unique content or method" to lead to a doctoral level of competence (as compared, for instance, with an additional masters degree that might in some fields be obtained in a special subject area). Independent/specialized programs should, similarly, ask themselves whether there is not some core body of material to be mastered or basic level of knowledgeability and competence to be demonstrated in addition to the individualized, specialized pursuit that dominates such programs. Is course-taking toward and the conduct of a single specialized project sufficient measure of professional doctoral competence? Those associated with programs of the extended M.Div. type also should engage in self-scrutiny: Do these programs allow sufficient exercise of individual interest and capacities? Should the professional doctoral degree be awarded to those who have not demonstrated their capacity to identify and pursue in a disciplined manner a topic of specialized professional interest?

The lack of a clear identity for the D.Min. degree stems from a deep problem. Sufficient clarity has not developed about what should be the form, goals, content and methods of professional doctoral study for ministry. This problem existed at the inception of the D.Min. degree, and substantial progress has not been made since then. The questions we suggest for the self-examination of those involved in promoting programs of different types are attempts to re-open the discussion about the meaning of the professional doctorate. Unless this discussion is pursued with vigor, we fear that the multiple identities of the D.Min. degree, as embodied in various programs, may be the degree's undoing.

II. B. 1. Program Types

c. Program Format Types

Findings

As Taylor's and Tucker's typologies suggest, the location and scheduling of courses and other program offerings is an important feature of D.Min. programs and a dimension along which programs differ from each other.

Our analysis of D.Min. program materials and the responses to certain questions asked in our survey about geographical and schedule arrangements for D.Min. programs uncovered three major types of schedule and location arrangements for the D.Min., which we have called program format types. In addition, we have assigned to a fourth category those programs that are offered in more than one format. (As noted in the previous section, we have not typologized by format or by the other features that follow -- denomination, size, age, etc. -- the specialized track programs described in the preceding section. Most of these are counseling programs that our report does not cover. The format types given here thus are a way of redividing the general or parish ministry programs divided in the previous chapter into three "philosophy" types.

One prominent format type we have called local/regional. The programs of this type offer most or all of the courses and other educational activities required for the D.Min. on the seminary campus. These offerings are made available on a schedule that virtually requires that D.Min. students live within reasonable commuting distance of the campus. In many cases, this means that D.Min. students take most or all of their work from an array of courses offered as electives for several different degree programs. A minority of local/regional programs, however, do not make use of the school's broader curriculum and the schedule of its other course offerings, but offer special courses and activities for D.Min. students alone on some schedule (for instance, one full day every week) that requires participants to commute frequently to campus. The essence of the local/regional program type is that its student body draws from and is largely restricted to church professionals who live in the local area or region. In our 1984-85 classification, we found 26 programs of the local/regional format type, or 34% of the 76 programs we classified that year.

Slightly more prominent that year was a format type we called campus-based intensive. Like local/regional programs, programs in this category offer most courses and other educational activities on the seminary campus. The schedule, however, is different. Courses and other activities are offered in "intensive" units or modules, periods of one, two, or three weeks or longer, that are scheduled infrequently enough so that travel from distances beyond the seminary's immediate

commuting area is feasible. Since these intensive sessions usually require more on-campus housing than can be made available during academic terms, many of these programs are offered during January, the summer months or other periods when other seminary programs are not in session. Some of the larger programs, however, have housing available to permit a group of D.Min. students to be on campus at all times, and thus operate year-round, relenting only in those periods (late summer, early September, before Christmas and before Easter) when ministers are not generally available. But whether the intensive courses are offered when the campus is otherwise empty or during regular sessions, the intensive course form does not usually fit into the schedule of regular seminary programs. Therefore most campus-based intensive programs organize their courses and other activities mostly or exclusively for D.Min. students. (This suggests some affinity between this format type and the extended M.Div. program philosophy type -- a relationship that will be explored below.) In the year we developed this classification, 29 of 76 programs, or 38%, were of the campus-based intensive type.

There is evidence to suggest that the campus-based intensive program type is becoming more prevalent quite rapidly. This most recently developed type (as will be further explored, campus-based intensive programs are, on average, "younger" than programs of other format types) is already, by a small margin, most common. Some reasons that institutions would adopt such a format became clear in our case visits. We interviewed several program directors whose local/regional D.Min. programs were, they thought, of sufficiently broad interest to attract students from beyond the seminary's local area. These directors said that their institutions were considering moving to intensive offerings that would attract a broader group. One program director told us that such a move would be wise because already students were exerting far too much effort, and spending too much money, to travel from considerable distances to attend weekly class meetings. Our guess is that a number of programs, as they have developed a particular focus or character that might appeal to a national clientele, have moved toward a campus-based intensive format from the local/regional format, either as an additional format or as a replacement.

The third program format type, which we have called the extension/colleague group type, is widely discussed but is actually in place at a fairly small number of institutions. (Only six institutions, or 8% of the 76 we studied, offer their general or parish ministry program in <u>only</u> the extension-colleague group form.) We classified as extension programs those that <u>require</u> that students who want to enter the program be part of a pre-formed group that, in effect, all of whose members make application to the program at the same time. Most of these groups are located at some distance from the campus (though usually a group is also formed in the immediate area of the campus), and most courses and activities are taken to the groups at a site convenient for the group's members. The groups' schedules of activities vary: some, especially those that make use of adjunct faculty who live in the group's immediate area, may meet with some frequency, as do

students in local/regional programs. Others, especially those who rely heavily on the regular faculty members of the sponsoring seminary, may meet mostly in intensive sessions, like the students in campus-based intensive programs. All programs require at least one extended period, usually during the summer, for the student to be in residence on campus. (The timing of these periods and the various uses to which they are put in different programs are described in section II. B. 2. j, Residency Periods and Off-Campus Program Activities.)

In our classification we distinguish between extension/colleague group programs, which require membership in a group to enter the program and usually require that the student remain with the group to take most courses, and the various satellite sites that some programs have established. The programs most likely to establish what we have called satellites, which are fixed sites at which courses and other program activities are from time to time offered for whomever wishes to take them, are those whose basic program format is campus-based intensive. A satellite may serve one of two purposes. It may be more convenient for some students who usually have to travel from a great distance to a campus-based intensive program to take some courses at a satellite center closer to home. It also may be most pleasant, regardless of distance, because satellites are occasionally established in an especially attractive surroundings -- mountains in summer, warm climates in winter. In our view, the presence of the satellite does not vary the basic form of a campus-based intensive program; nor does it amount to extension education, since satellites do not usually offer the full-range of program activities. Even if they do, they do not require colleague group membership, they are not established because of their convenient closeness to the student's place of work, and thus they do not fit our definition of a genuine extension program. It should be noted, however, that some institutions use the term "satellite" to mean extension group, and others use phrases such as "extension center" to mean what we mean by the term satellite. Thus, though terms are carefully distinguished in this report, they have a variety of meanings in the wider D.Min. literature.

The last format category we have created is for those programs that make use of two or more of the three format types just described. We discovered every combination of two format types and at least five programs that make use of all three. We also found two programs that require a period of full-time residency of at least one semester in length. We included those programs in this final, mixed category. As Table I shows, this last category is not large. It should, however, be noted that about two-thirds of the programs in this category have an extension/colleague program as one of the formats they offer. If this number were added to the six institutions that offer their general parish ministry program only in the extension/colleague group form, the extension format category would more than double in size.

TABLE I Program Format Types

	Number	Percentage
Local/regional	26	34%
Campus based intensive	29	38
Extension/colleague group	6	8
Two or more options	15	20
	76	100

Differences Among Program Format Types: Relationships to Philosophy Types

As suggested above, there are relationships between particular program format types and particular program philosophy types. Table II shows what percentage each type is of the other. Most often associated are local/regional programs and independent/specialized programs. The connection here between program purpose and program format is quite clear. The philosophy of an independent/specialized program requires a wide range of course offerings available to the student. Usually such a range is available only on the regular academic schedule intended primarily for full-time students. The pattern of such course meetings virtually requires that the participant live nearby in order to attend classes one or more times a week. As the Table suggests, independent/specialized programs can be offered in a campus-based intensive format (28% of them are). This is accomplished in several ways. One device is the use of independent study while the student is present on campus for intensive periods: Often this approach is combined with course-taking at other institutions. Several institutions are part of clusters or related to universities that have extensive summer school or intersession offerings, and thus have a wide range of intensive courses to make available. Perhaps the most ingenious arrangement for offering an independent/specialized program in the campus-based intensive format is one we discovered at a single institution: That school, which has an M.Div. curriculum with many required courses, offers M.Div. electives only in month-long intensive periods (September, January, and June) when D.Min. students are also on campus. The total number of both groups makes it possible to offer an even broader range of electives than the institution would make available during its regular term. Independent/specialized programs can even be accommodated in the extension/colleague group format. One of the two programs that fall into both categories allows the colleague group to design its own electives. This gives a broad range of elective choice and the opportunity for the group to specialize in a particular area. The constraint, of course, is that the whole group, or the majority of it, must agree on the focus of the course. Individuals whose interest cannot be accommodated are allowed to make separate arrangements. In the other case, the group serves as a center for guidance and integration for students pursuing independent specialized studies under faculty guidance. As the Table suggests, the

extension/colleague group format more comfortably accommodates the program type the larger part of whose offerings form a fixed curriculum. Thus it is not surprising that the largest extension/colleague group programs are of the extended M.Div. type or the unique content or method type.

TABLE II Relationship of Program Format Types and Program Philosophy Types

	Program Format								
	Local Regional		Campus-based Intensive		Extension/ Colleague Group		Two or more Options		
Program Philosophy									
Ind/spec	(19)	73%	(8)	28%	(2)	33%	(9)	60%	(38)
		50%		21%		5%		24%	100%
Unique content or method	(0)	0	(7)	24	(1)	17	(1)	7	(9)
				78		11		11	100%
Extended M.Div	(7)	27	(14)	48	(3)	50	(5)	33	(29)
		24		48	(3)	10		17	100%
	(26)	100	(29)	100	(6)	100	(15)	100	

*Note: The numbers in parenthesis indicated the number of programs. The first percentage figure in each cell is the Column percentage; the second is the row percentage

The Table also shows an affinity between programs of the extended M.Div. philosophy type and the campus-based intensive format type. Each category is half of the other. The structure of the association is easy to discern. Extended M.Div. type programs almost always require program offerings primarily or exclusively for D.Min. students. Campus-based intensive arrangements, held in most cases during times when students in other programs are not on campus, can most easily accommodate programs that place emphasis on courses and activities for D.Min. students alone. For the same reason, the majority of unique content or method programs are also offered in the campus-based intensive format. As the Table shows, it is possible to offer extended M.Div. programs in the local/regional format (one-quarter of all extended M.Div. programs take that form). These are, for the most part, the programs that make minimum use of the regular curriculum and instead organize fairly frequent on-campus course meetings, usually for D.Min. students alone. It is these programs that are both local/regional and extended M.Div in type that are easiest to convert into campus-based intensive programs. The independent/specialized form is more resistent to such conversion, because of the requirement that a wide range of courses be available to support the student's specialized interest. There is no strong affinity between a particular program philosophy type and the likelihood that the program will be offered in two or more format options. The highest correlation is with

independent/specialized programs, but this is largely an artifact of the fact that both categories contain the small number of programs that require a period of full-time residency. If these were omitted, the percentage of each program philosophy type that is offered in two or more format options would be less than 20.

Table II demonstrates that there are, as Tucker's and Taylor's typologies that mixed factors of program rationale and program format would suggest, some strong affinities between particular conceptions of the D.Min. degree and particular formats for offering it. No conception is, however, completely associated with a particular format. Thus we think that it is critical in analysis to keep the two dimensions distinct.

Differences Among Program Format Types: Limited and Broad Options

It stands to reason that certain program format arrangements will be more or less likely to permit a broad or limited range of course options to be offered. Table III shows these relationships.

TABLE III Relationship of Program Format and Limited and Broad Curricular Options*

	Options		
Program Format	Limited	Broad	
Local/regional	(7) 19% 27%	(19) 48% 73%	(26) 100%
Campus based intensive	(21) 58% 72%	(8) 20% 28%	(29) 100%
Extension/ colleague group	(3) 8% 50%	(3) 7% 50%	(6) 100%
Two or more formats	(5) 14% 33%	(10) 25% 66%	(15) 100%
	(36)100%	(40)100%	

*Note: The numbers in parenthesis indicated the number ofprograms. The first percentage figure in each cell is the Column percentage; the second is the row percentage.

As one would expect, there is a strong association between local/regional programs and the availability of a broad range of course options. Local/regional programs are organized in a way that gives their students access to the full range of the institution's offerings.

Program Format Types

(Note the similarity between local/regional programs and independent/specialized programs with respect to broad and limited curricular options. See Table II, column 1.) It is also the case that campus-based intensive programs are very likely to be limited option programs. This too is predictable: Most such programs are offered at times when only those courses and other activities developed especially for D.Min. students are available. Thus offerings are almost by definition limited. (Again the complex relationships among format type, philosophy type and option type are evident: The percentage of campus-based intensive programs that offer broad course options is identical to the percentage of campus-based intensive programs that are of the independent/specialized philosophy type. See Table II, column 2.) Extension/colleague group programs are divided about equally between limited and broad option programs. Broad option in this case means, usually, that the colleague group is free to design whatever electives it chooses, or the members are permitted to earn a substantial number of credits in independent study, using the group as a base for reporting, support and integration.

Differences Among Program Format: Size

Almost all D.Min programs (80% of those shown on Table IV below) are relatively small -- that is, have fewer than 87 students -- but, as Table IV shows, local/regional programs are much more likely than others to fall into the smallest size category.

TABLE IV Program Formats by Size

	Formats							
	Local Regional		Campus-based Intensive		Extension/ Colleague Group		Two or more Options	
All		N=		N=		N=		N=
	92%	(23)	84%	(25)	60%	(3)	60%	(9)
87 - 177	8	(2)	10	(3)	(0)	(0)	40	(6)
178 - 721	0		6	(2)	40	(2)		
	100	(25)	100	(38)	100	(5)	100	(15)

As we noted with respect to independent/specialized programs, their related program philosophy type, such programs can be small and still remain financially feasible, since relatively few resources unique to the D.Min. program need to be developed to sustain programs that rely so heavily on a common core of course offerings that support a number of programs. At the same time, however, many of the local/regional programs that are also independent/specialized in approach consume

considerable amounts of faculty time in advisement. Thus there is a positive motive for keeping such programs small.

Campus-based intensive programs, though they must usually achieve a certain minimum size in order for the specially-designed courses and other activities devised for them to be affordable, also are subject to conditions that limit their size. Such programs usually require special administrative as well as instructional resources. Thus they must be large enough to be affordable but not so large that they strain a school's capacity to mount a program quite distinct from its other degree offerings. Extension/colleague group programs appear on this table to be more likely to be large than the other two types. This is true because the category is small and two of the largest of all D.Min. programs are extension/colleague group programs. As will be explored in the section below on program size, however, the extension/colleague group programs that are not very large are quite small. Again, as for intensive programs, there are double pressures: Minimum numbers are required to make these quite separate program formats cost effective; but there are also considerable costs associated with the format, especially administrative costs because extension programs are so different from the school's usual activity and thus require special attention and handling.

Differences Among Programs: Other Issues

Campus-based intensive programs seem not only to have experienced the most recent growth, but also to have the best immediate prospect of growth. Directors of such programs are considerably more likely than directors of programs of other types to say that the pool of potential recruits is increasing, that the number of applications is increasing, and that the number recently admitted has increased. (Interestingly, however, they are least likely to say that the quality has increased.) Directors of extension/colleague group programs, a group so small that trends within it are hard to spot, do not report increases in the size of the recruitment pool, the number of applications or the number of admissions. They do, however, report some increases in the quality of applications. Directors of the extension programs are, by contrast, most likely to report decreases. These data are hard to evaluate, not only because the number in the group is so small but also because applications to extension programs are usually stimulated by the seminary taking initiative to organize a local colleague group. In several cases where we have inquired, applications and admissions have declined because of a policy decision at the school to limit the number of new colleague groups. It is, however, evident that the recruitment pool for and applications and admissions to local/regional programs are not increasing at the same rate as for campus-based intensive programs. More decreases are reported than for the extension/colleague group programs, and the figures for decreases are more than twice as high as those for campus-based intensive programs. These data corroborate the popular view, which is that many local/regional programs may have "used up" much of the pool of potential recruits in their immediate local

area. The structure of such programs does not permit recruitment beyond that area. A campus-based intensive program, on the other hand, has, at least potentially, national scope (and, since there are so few Canadian programs, bi-national scope). Such a program can look almost anywhere for students who might be attracted to a D.Min. with the special characteristics and features that institution offers.

It is evident that format arrangements have effects on the kinds of teaching methods and educational structures employed in various programs. Faculty, current students and graduates agree that programs of the extension/colleague type are much less likely than the other types to include elements of supervised practice. Course exams and qualifying exams are also, by report of faculty, students and graduates, less likely to be used in extension/colleague group programs. Faculty members believe that library research is also less emphasized in such programs (but in the graduate responses the differences among types are not marked and students enrolled in extension/colleague group programs are more likely than students in other programs to believe that library research is emphasized in their programs). All three groups, if they are associated with extension/colleague group programs, are more likely to report that support groups, peer learning, learning contracts and, quite naturally, off-campus courses, as well as involvement of laity are strongly emphasized. Faculty and students associated with campus-based intensive programs are least likely to report that their programs emphasize this list of methods and structures, and most likely to report that course and qualifying exams are used. This "traditional" tendency also marks programs offered by evangelical schools, who favor the campus-based format. The only clear association, then, between format and pedagogy seems to be the disposition of those who design extension programs to make use of what are often called "experiential" methods and to avoid what are sometimes identified as traditional forms such as examinations.

Interestingly, there are few significant differences among program types with respect to the difficulties students have had in keeping on schedule in various program stages. Those associated with campus-based intensive programs are a little more likely to have had trouble keeping on schedule in the course-taking phase -- understandable, since usually the institution is not close at hand, as it is for students in local/regional programs, and there is no colleague group taking courses together to exert its influence to keep each student on course. Differences at the thesis or project phase were not marked. We had expected that students located at some distance from the campus would have more difficulties with the project, since neither the library nor the adviser is immediately accessible. Many students experience such problems, but the program format in which they are enrolled does not correlate significantly with such difficulties or lack of them.

A striking pattern does emerge in various measures of attitudes toward programs of different format types. Seminary faculty members, the group most likely to have negative attitudes toward and to make

negative evaluations of various features of the D.Min., are consistently more positive in their views if they are associated with extension/colleague group programs than if they teach in institutions that offer programs of other types. The faculty are more likely to say that they are very positive about their institution's program, that students are for the most part well prepared to carry out the major project, and that the resulting project is good or excellent; and they are invariably more likely to observe positive effects on D.Min. students (such as renewed commitment to their present jobs and development of creative solutions to problems in the ministry setting), to observe positive effects on graduates (such as increased self-awareness and increased competence in the functions of ministry, and less likely to observe the emergence of negative effects in both groups. Such faculty also more frequently report that the D.Min. program has had positive effects on the seminary, providing new research areas and opportunities, helping the institution improve its financial situation, improving public relations, and providing better quality continuing education. Correspondingly, they are less likely to observe such negative effects as the stretching of teaching and advising loads beyond bearable limits, the consuming of time in D.Min. activities that should be reserved for research and writing, and the weakening of the institution's reputation for academic rigor. Criticisms of extension/colleague group programs are likely to emerge from within an institution that has such a program on only two topics. Faculty and administrators in such institutions are more likely than those in institutions with programs of other format types to call for more rigor in the selection process. The problem of admissions for extension programs -- especially the necessity, in some cases, of accepting marginal students in order to create a group of sufficient size -- is treated elsewhere in this report. Faculty and administrators are also slightly more likely to be critical of and call for changes in the administrative arrangements for such programs, though the total number of comments we received on this point is quite small. On the whole range of measures just cited, campus-based intensive programs are second-most-likely to be positively evaluated. The lowest ratings usually go to programs of the local/regional type.

What accounts for these patterns in attitudes toward and evaluations of programs of different format types? What seems to us the most plausible explanation for the uniformly positive attitude of faculty in institutions that have extension/colleague group programs is the fact that such programs have been widely criticized in theological education and closely scrutinized by ATS. The reasons given for such critical attitudes are varied: Some institutions resent the presence of extension program groups in their own geographical area; others are suspicious of the heavy use of adjunct faculty that some such programs have made. Some criticisms seem to attach more to the large size of a few such programs than to the extension format itself. All these criticisms will be explored at greater length in subsequent sections of this report. Here they are relevant because, we suspect, institutions that offer extension programs have heard these criticisms, have examined their own programs and improved them where they found them

weak or wanting, and now have become thoroughgoing supporters of this form of education. Because of the number of criticisms of and questions about extension education, a relatively new form in continuing education, faculty members in institutions that harbor such programs may also be slightly defensive. This combination of thorough knowledge of and affection for the programs, on the one hand, and a tendency to defend them against possible criticism, on the other, may well lie behind the strikingly high ratings faculty members accord such programs. Another factor may be the somewhat lower expectation faculty and administrators associated with extension/colleague group programs report they have of the D.Min. Directors and faculty associated with such programs are less likely to say that the D.Min. should be a "mark of distinction" (as opposed to structured education open to all).

The difference in attitudes towards local/regional programs and campus-based intensive programs is, we believe, a reflection not of judgments about the relative merits of these two formats, but rather of faculty and administrative attitudes toward the program philosophy types with which each is associated. As was evident earlier, independent/specialized programs rank lower, in the esteem of faculty and administrators, than programs of the extended M.Div. type. Local/regional programs are rated lower because of their association with the first of these program philosophy types; campus-based intensive programs higher because of their association with the second.

Last, it should be noted that teaching arrangements for the format types are somewhat different. Almost all teachers and advisors in local/regional programs are members of the institution's core faculty, and such programs are far more likely than the other types not to use adjunct teachers and advisors at all. All extension programs use adjuncts to some extent, and campus-based intensive programs fall between these two. Reflecting these arrangements, a much higher percentage of the faculty associated with local/regional programs (60%) identified themselves as highly involved or very highly involved in D.Min. advising and teaching than the faculty associated with other program types (campus-based intensive, 45%; extension/colleague group, 47%).

Discussion

In the last section, in which we discussed different conceptions of the D.Min., we portrayed the variety we found as a sign of the failure of the D.Min. to assume strong enough character and identity. Variety in format is another matter. Though, as we have shown, format to some extent follows and must conform to program rationale (or perhaps in some cases, historically, a rationale or concept of the degree is adopted to fit the format that is easiest for an institution to organize), some of the variety of what some have called "delivery systems" for the D.Min. is, we believe, very healthy. Part-time students who are employed full-time are difficult to serve. Institutional flexibility and ingenuity in devising programs and forms that attract and hold such students are to be applauded. We have noted the

limits of such flexibility: Certain forms do not serve certain program concepts or structures very readily or well. But within these limits, we believe that the tendency to flexibility and diversity of forms is a good thing.

We would urge caution at two points: Care should be exercised with respect to the number of different formats in which a single institution can offer the D.Min. degree. A small number of institutions is attempting to offer their general or parish ministry program in two different formats, and a group of at least five institutions is using all three formats. Since each format places distinctly different demands on an institution, requiring different pedagogical approaches and administrative resources, we question whether any but the largest or best equipped institutions can offer the D.Min. program in several different schedule and location formats. We are also concerned about the negative reputation of extension programs, not because we think that the format is automatically a source of program weakness, but because public mistrust of any feature of the degree weakens it. We discuss this matter thoroughly below in connection with the closely related issue of program size.

II. B. 1. Program Types

d. Denominational Types

Findings

Denominational analysis of phenomena in theological education is always difficult. With the exception of Roman Catholic institutions, there is no denomination that sponsors more than a dozen or so seminaries, and a number of church groups sponsor only a single institution. Further, there is a substantial number of non-denominational and inter-denominational institutions of various kinds. The total number of seminaries is small enough and the number of denominational sub-groupings so small that statistical analysis based on denominational affiliation is nearly impossible. And even institutions with strong denominational affiliations and sponsorships now enroll many students of other denominations. Most institutions now also have denominational variety among the members of their faculties. Thus the search for denominational differences must be conducted with great care, since many features of contemporary Protestant seminaries are, in effect, inter-denominational.

In previous research on theological seminaries, analysis based on individual denominations or even larger "families" of denominations linked by theological tradition has proved unproductive. What have proved useful are three large categories: Roman Catholic, mainline Protestant and evangelical/conservative Protestant.

In some cases, the two Protestant categories are further broken down between denominationally-sponsored and independent institutions. These classifications are somewhat rough. In the case of denominationally-affiliated institutions, Protestant institutions have been divided between the mainline and evangelical/conservative (shortened, in this report, to "evangelical") based chiefly on the relationship of the sponsoring denomination to the National Council of Churches. If the sponsoring denomination belongs, the institution is classified as mainline. Liberally oriented non-member denominations are also classified as mainline. Non-denominational institutions are classified by character. The resulting divisions are not highly refined, but they do in most cases bring together institutions that resemble each other in outlook. These large categories have proved extremely useful in the analysis of various phenomena in theological seminaries, and their utility has been further proved in this study of the Doctor of Ministry degree.

The use of such broad denominational types does not, of course, mean that denomination is unimportant. In the foregoing section on the history of the D.Min. degree, we showed that certain denominations have led the way, and are much more heavily engaged than others, in the conduct of the D.Min. degree. But, again, individual denominational

categories are too small to be useful in statistical analysis. A special problem in analysis is presented in the case of the D.Min.: In 1983-84, when the majority of our data was gathered, there were only two Roman Catholic programs in operation. For purposes of analysis we have, therefore, folded Roman Catholic responses into the mainline category.

As the foregoing section on the history of the D.Min. degree recounted, more than twice as many mainline institutions as evangelical ones had established D.Min. programs by 1984. Thus, as Table I shows, 70% of all programs are found in mainline (including Roman Catholic) institutions.

TABLE I D.Min. Programs by Denominational Types

	Number	Percent
Mainline	53	70%
Evangelical	23	30
	76	100

It should be noted, however, that D.Min. programs in evangelical institutions were, on average, established later than those in mainline institutions; recently evangelical institutions have been opening D.Min. programs at a faster rate than mainline (and Roman Catholic) institutions.

Differences Among Denominational Types: Relationship to Program Philosophy Types

As Table II demonstrates, institutions of different denominational types favor different basic program concepts.

TABLE II Denominational Types by Program Philosophy Types

	Mainline		Evangelical	
Program Philosophy Types		N=		N=
Independent/specialized	62%	(33)	22%	(5)
Unique content or method	6	(3)	26	(6)
Extended M.Div.	32	(17)	52	(12)
	100%	(53)	100%	(23)

The majority of mainline programs are of the independent/specialized type. The majority of evangelical programs are the extended M.Div. type. The evangelical institutions are also far more likely to establish programs whose rationale is to provide unique content or method. The reasons for these strong associations are a matter of speculation.

Denominational Types

Our guess is that evangelical institutions establish the latter two types, which are more widely approved and positively evaluated among administrators and faculty regardless of denomination, because they are confident that they can recruit the numbers of students these program types require. It seems also to be the case that, perhaps because the total group of evangelical institutions is much smaller, evangelical seminaries -- at least as they have established their D.Min. programs -- are better attuned to what each other is doing. There are stronger resemblances among the programs in evangelical institutions than among those in mainline seminaries. Thus a few strong prototype programs may have steered development in most evangelical seminaries in the direction of extended M.Div. and unique content or method program types.

Differences Among Denominational Types: Relationship to Program Format Types

Schools of different denominational types have also formed distinct patterns in their choice of program formats, as shown in Table III.

TABLE III Denominational Types by Program Format Types

	Mainline		Evangelical	
		N =		N =
Local/regional	43%	(23)	13%	(3)
Campus-based intensive	21	(11)	78	(18)
Extension/colleague group	11	(6)	--	(0)
Two or more formats	25	(13)	9	(2)
	100%	(53)	100%	(23)

The plurality of mainline programs is local/regional in type. The majority of evangelical programs is campus-based intensive. Many mainline programs are offered in more than one format. In part, of course, these choices of format are associated with choices of program philosophy type. The local/regional format is the natural one for the independent/specialized programs, the great majority of which are offered by mainline schools. The two types of programs most common in evangelical institutions are best supported by the campus-based intensive format. It may also be the case that mainline institutions are more likely to have moved to multiple formats because many of them have been offering D.Min. degrees considerably longer than have evangelical institutions. As earlier noted, it is also usually the case that mainline institutions are smaller and have smaller constituencies. The move to additional formats may be a natural tendency in the attempt to recruit program groups of viable size.

Differences Among Denominational Types: Size

Mainline and evangelical programs are, as Table IV makes clear, quite evenly matched by size.

TABLE IV Denominational Types by Program Size

Program Size	Mainline		Evangelical	
10 - 25	25%	(13)	26%	(6)
26 - 46	23	(12)	35	(8)
47 - 86	31	(16)	22	(5)
87 - 177	15	(8)	13	(3)
178 - 721	6	(3)	4	(1)
	100%	(52)	100%	(23)

The lack of important differences in the distribution of programs by size is surprising. Evangelical institutions are considerably larger than mainline institutions in total enrollment and faculty size. One would therefore expect that their D.Min. programs might, proportionally, be concentrated in the larger size categories, but this is not the case. It may be the late starting dates of many evangelical programs that accounts for this parity in size between larger evangelical and smaller mainline institutions. Or it may have to do with the fact that larger institutions with larger M.Div. student bodies and, usually, somewhat less favorable faculty-to-student ratios, feel that they are already heavily committed and cannot support extensive D.Min. programs. Whatever the determinative reasons, we do, as we explore below, expect that the size of programs in evangelical institutions will grow in the next period.

Differences Among Denominational Types: Other Issues

One of the most interesting sets of differences to emerge between D.Min. programs in mainline institutions and those in evangelical seminaries were differences associated with program content, teaching methods and educational structures. Students and faculty associated with programs in evangelical institutions are more likely than those who study or teach in mainline schools to report that their programs emphasize Biblical studies, spiritual formation, organization development, and ministerial arts. Students and faculty members in mainline institutions, are more likely to report an emphasis on psychological theory, and the use of a battery of structures and methods -- colleague groups, peer learning, learning contract, involvement of laity and off-campus courses -- that are commonly characterized as pertaining to a non-traditional, "adult education" model. In striking contrast, those who teach in evangelical institutions are more likely to report

that the D.Min. courses they teach require more hours (than the hours reported by mainline faculty members), more preparation before the course begins, a greater number of pages of reading and a greater number of pages of writing. Such faculty members are also considerably more likely to report that students always complete assigned reading for courses, and that they -- the faculty members -- require written reports on these assigned readings. The sum of these differences suggests that there may be different academic cultures at mainline and evangelical institutions, stemming from differing assumptions about and views of ministry. The differences in D.Min. programs thus may be a sign of more profound contrasts. We plan to return to this data in the future for further analysis and study.

Other data describing differences between the two types of programs are more difficult to interpret. A mixture of D.Min. and non-D.Min. students in courses D.Min students take is more common in mainline institutions. This finding is associated with the prevalence of independent/specialized programs in mainline institutions. Students in mainline institutions are also markedly more likely to report smaller class sizes than students in evangelical institutions. This finding is, however, probably the result of the fact that students in a few evangelical programs of considerable size that have fairly large courses dominate the whole group of our evangelical student respondents.

One interesting difference uncovered by the mainline/evangelical typology is the resources for continuing education available to students in each group. Students in mainline seminaries are markedly more likely to report that their denomination requires them to complete a certain amount of continuing education each year, that denominations should require clergy to engage in continuing education, that they have funds provided to pay continuing education expenses and that they used all these funds in 1984. These correlations seem to suggest that the conditions that promote continuing education may be stronger in the denominations and environments in which mainline clergy work than in those where evangelical clergy are employed.

As suggested above, there are a number of indications that programs in evangelical institutions can anticipate considerable future growth. Directors of evangelical programs are twice as likely as those of mainline programs to say that they believe the pool of potential recruits for their program is increasing. Faculty, a critical group in the decision about future size of program, are more than twice as likely, if they teach in evangelical seminaries, to predict that their institution's program will be larger in five years, and markedly more likely to say that they and the majority of their colleagues would like to see the program grow. It also seems to be the case that evangelical seminaries are better positioned for growth. Most programs in these institutions are the campus-based intensive type, the program format that can draw most broadly. And there are strong indications that evangelical students are willing to travel considerable distances to enroll in a program that has the character they are seeking. They are

far more likely than students in mainline seminaries to emphasize the reputation of particular faculty and somewhat more likely to emphasize the reputation of the program among their motives for choosing a program. Students in mainline institutions, by contrast, are more likely than evangelical students to emphasize the availability of financial aid, geographical proximity of the seminary, and the possibility of enrolling in an extension program's field group in their area.

In one important area there are virtually no differences between programs in mainline and evangelical institutions: The attitudes of faculty. The groups tend to be fairly evenly matched in their views about the D.Min. and evaluation of its various features and components. Faculty in evangelical seminaries are slightly less likely than those in mainline seminaries to be markedly more positive if their institution's program is large, or, rather, evangelical faculty are very slightly more likely to be more positive on some measures regardless of program size. Differences are not, however, consistent or dramatic enough to provide the basis in the extended speculation about the role of the D.Min., in the faculty perspective, in evangelical versus mainline institutions.

II. B. 1. Program Types

e. Program Size

Findings

The size of D.Min. programs of various types has already been mentioned frequently in this exploration of types. For the purposes of analysis, we have grouped programs in the size categories in which they cluster as follows:

TABLE I Size of D.Min. Programs

Number of Students	N=	Percentage
10 - 25	19	25%
26 - 46	20	27
47 - 86	21	28
87 - 177	11	15
178 - 721	4	5
	75	100

As the Table suggests, the range in program sizes is great: From ten students in the smallest program to 721 in the largest (in 1984). Most notable in the distribution is the fact that one quarter of all programs are small, even minute in size, enrolling 25 students or fewer. Equally interesting is the relatively small number of programs in the two largest size categories: Fifteen programs or 20% of the total. Yet, as Table II shows, an entirely different picture emerges when one displays the number of students rather than the number of programs in particular size categories.

TABLE II Numbers of Students Enrolled in Program Size Categories*

Size	Total Students Enrolled	Percentage of Students Enrolled
10 - 25	329	6%
26 - 46	692	12
47 - 86	1341	23
87 - 177	1467	25
178 - 721	2004	34
	5833	100%

*Figures for 1983-84

Though programs are concentrated in the smallest size categories (over half of all programs have fewer than 47 students), students are concentrated in larger programs: Over half of all students are enrolled in programs in the two largest size categories, and over one-third of all students are enrolled in the four programs (5% of the total number of programs) that form the largest category. Thus, the majority of schools have experience running small programs, but the majority of students have been enrolled in a moderately or very large program.

Differences in Size: Relationships with Other Program Types

In the foregoing sections, we showed the distribution of various types among size categories. Table III shows the mean sizes of various types, both for all programs and for all programs excluding the largest four.

TABLE III Mean Size of D.Min Programs of Various Types

	All Programs		Excluding Four Largest Programs	
Program Philosophy Types	N=	Mean Size	N=	Mean Size
Independent Specialized	(38)	47.2	(38)	47.2
Unique Content	(9)	165.0	(7)	54.0
Extended M.Div.	(29)	89.1	(27)	62.5
Program Format Types				
Local/Regional	(26)	43.0	(26)	43.0
Campus-based Intensive	(29)	76.9	(28)	53.9
Extension Colleague Group	(6)	237.2	(3)	46.7
Two or more options	(15)	73.9	(15)	73.9
Denominational Type				
Mainline	(54)	77.9	(51)	57.4
Evangelical	(23)	81.8	(22)	52.8

As earlier suggested, independent/specialized programs and local/regional programs, categories between which there is substantial overlap, are the smallest categories in their typologies, whether or not figures for the largest four programs are removed. Interestingly, in both the philosophy and format typologies, the second largest category for all programs (extended M.Div. and campus-based intensive) becomes the largest category if the four largest programs are excluded. Unique content or method programs are not, in other words, generally large: Only the presence of one very large program gives them a mean size twice as large as the next largest category. The same is true for

extension/colleague programs: If three programs are omitted from this category which are among the four largest programs overall, the mean size of the remaining programs is shown to be quite small. Removing the four largest programs also has an effect on the relative sizes of mainline and evangelical programs. Though the differences are not great in either case, when the four programs are included the evangelical mean is higher; when they are excluded, the mainline mean is higher. Perhaps the most notable factor in this negotiation is that, to accomplish this change, only one program is removed from the evangelical total, while three are removed from the mainline total.

As we noted earlier when we examined the total number of students enrolled in programs in different size categories, the percentage of programs of a particular type can differ a great deal. Table IV shows the percentages of students enrolled in programs of different philosophy and format types. The figures in the table are approximate, because of the difficulty of separating the figures for the general or parish ministry programs we are studying from those for specialized program tracks we are not dealing with here.

TABLE IV Approximate Percentages of Students Enrolled in Programs of Different Formats and Philosophy Types

	Percentage of Students	Percentage of Programs
Philosophy Types		
Independent/Specialized	31%	50%
Unique Content/Method	25	12
Extended M.Div.	44	38
	100	100
Format Types		
Local/Regional	19%	34%
Campus-based Intensive	38	38
Extension/Colleague group	24	8
Two or more formats	19	20
	100	100

Because independent/specialized programs are small, they enroll a smaller percentage of students, in relation to the number of such programs, than do extended M.Div. type programs and, especially, unique content or method programs, which represent only 12% of the total number of programs but enroll 25% of the students. Local/regional programs, like the independent/specialized programs with which they overlap, constitute one-third of all programs but enroll less than 20% of all students; and a small number of extension programs (six programs, or 8%) enroll 20% of all students. Again, the types of programs with which the majority of schools have experience is different from the types in which the majority of students and graduates have been enrolled.

Table V breaks out mean enrollment figures by both format type and denominational type.

TABLE V Average (Mean) Enrollment by Program Format Type by Denominational Type

	D.Min. Enrollment for All Programs (mean)		D.Min. Enrollment Excluding Largest Four Programs (mean)	
Format Type	Mainline	Evangelical	Mainline	Evangelical
Local/regional	44.3	32.7	44.3	32.7
Campus based intensive	44.9	96.4	44.9	59.6
Extension/ Colleague Group	237.2	----	46.7	----
Two or more	80.3	24.5	80.3	24.5

As the Table shows, whether the four largest programs are included or not, mainline programs of the local/regional type are larger than evangelical programs of that type; and evangelical programs of the campus-based intensive type are larger than mainline programs of that type. The Table also shows that the average size of the mainline local/regional and campus-based intensive programs is nearly identical, whereas, whether or not the largest four programs are included, there is a marked difference in size between the two types in evangelical institutions. The Table suggests that evangelical institutions may have, heretofore, avoided adopting the extension format because they have succeeded in recruiting somewhat larger student bodies for their campus-based intensive programs. (The willingness of evangelical students to travel to evangelical programs, described in the section above, is probably also a factor.) Interestingly, the decision to offer a program in two or more formats seems to have provided better results in enrollment for mainline than for the few evangelical schools that have attempted it.

Relationship of M.Div. and D.Min. Program Size

In one sense, the range of program sizes among D.Min. programs is not surprising. A similar range exists among M.Div. programs. In both cases, the most programs are small, but the majority of students is

enrolled in the larger programs. There is, however, a notable difference in the two patterns: In general, larger M.Div. student bodies are found in institutions that are larger overall, particularly with respect to total budget and faculty size. Though faculty-to-student ratios are very often more favorable in small institutions than large ones, nonetheless, in the case of M.Div student body size, the size of the faculty tends to increase as the size of the student body increases. This generalization is true for D.Min. programs only up to a point. Table VI compares M.Div. and D.Min. enrollments.

TABLE VI Relationship of Sizes of M.Div. and D.Min. Enrollment*

	Total D.Min. Enrollment				
Total M.Div. Enrollment	10 - 25	26 - 46	47 - 86	87 - 177	178-721
Under 51	(1) 5%	(1) 5%	(0) 0	0	0
51-150	(12)63	(8)42	(0)42%	(3)27%	0
151-300	(3) 16	(6)32	(8)42	(3)27	(3)75%
301-500	(3) 16	(2)10.5	(2)11	(3)27	0
Over 500	(0) 0	(2)10.5	(1) 5	(2)18	(11)25
	(19)	(19)	(19)	(11)	(4)

*The number in parentheses indicate the number of programs in each cell.

The rectangles on the Table encompass the category or categories that contain 60% or more of all programs in each D.Min. size category. As the progression of rectangles indicates, larger D.Min. programs tend to be located in institutions with larger M.Div. student bodies -- that is, in institutions that also, in general, have larger faculties and total budgets. The pattern breaks down, however, for the largest category of D.Min. programs. The majority of these (three of four) is located in institutions with "middle sized" M.Div. enrollments. When this Table is combined with Table II, which shows how many students are enrolled in these largest programs, the break in the pattern becomes even more striking. Over one-third of all students in D.Min. programs are enrolled in four programs: Three of these programs are in institutions that are, apart from their D.Min. programs, relatively modest in size: Only one is located in a very large institution.

Program Size: Other Issues

The effects of program size are hard to discern. In many cases, the correlations we discovered between program size and students' and graduates' responses are explainable in other ways than as direct effects of size. For instance, since mainline programs dominate the group of largest programs, it is not surprising that such pedagogical features as analysis of the ministry setting and use of colleague groups, common in mainline programs, are likely to be reported as emphasized by students in large programs. Nor is it surprising that adjunct faculty, off-campus courses and similar features are more often reported to be emphasized in larger programs, since extension/colleague group programs form a large part of the large program group. The corresponding list of features of small programs are more easily explained as related to denominational type, program format or program philosophy than to size itself. One notable pattern does, however, seem to be directly related to size. Faculty attitudes toward larger D.Min. programs, and especially toward programs in the largest category are distinctly more positive than faculty attitudes toward smaller programs. Faculty members declare themselves to be more positive if they teach in an institution with a large program (the denominational type of seminary they teach in makes no significant difference in this pattern); the larger the D. Min. program, the less likely the faculty member to think that the D.Min. consumes significant amounts of time that should have been used for research and writing. Faculty in large programs are more likely than those in small ones to say that most students are capable of carrying out the project without undue difficulty, that most students are very able, that the overall quality of the thesis is good to excellent, and that the program has advanced students to a distinctly higher level of professional competence. They are slightly more likely to observe positive effects among students and graduates and to believe that D.Min. teaching enriches teaching in the M.Div. programs, and significantly more likely to judge that the D.Min. program has had positive effects on the institution. In many cases, though the rate of positive approval tends to rise as the size of program increases, views of faculty associated with the category of largest programs, those with 178-721 students, are markedly more positive than all others. A similar effect was earlier observed among faculty associated with extension programs, a category that partially overlaps with the large program category. Statistical analysis shows that the association between program formats and attitudes (especially extension programs and positive attitudes) are somewhat stronger and more consistent than relationships with size, though size and attitudes are still, on many measures, strongly and significantly related.

Discussion

The size of a handful of large D.Min. programs is a major issue in theological education. It appears to be one of two major sources of mistrust, among theological educators, of the quality of the D.Min. degree. (The other source is the extension format, with which, as just

noted large program size is usually but not always associated.) In our view, size is not an automatic obstacle to quality. As we shall explore extensively in the sections that follow, the safeguards required to keep program quality high can be built into large programs, and these safeguards can also quite easily be absent in small programs. Our case studies and our surveys suggest that examples can be found in every size category of responsible programs and of those poorly or carelessly run.

Even though some of the negative judgments of large programs may be misplaced, however, attention must be paid to the fact that large programs are so widely distrusted. The integrity of a degree depends in significant measure on public perception, and public perception is formed in part by the views of peer institutions granting the degree. Thus, though we do not think that those conducting very large programs are necessarily irresponsible, we believe that it is critical that the community of theological schools either: (1)set standards strict and specific enough so that the community of schools is satisfied that all institutions granting the D.Min. degree meet these standards, rendering the issue of program size moot for institutions that meet the standards; or (2)establish per-D.Min.-student resource standards that eliminate the possibility of any institution offering a disproportionately large D.Min. program.

Obviously, we would favor the first course of action. The movement in revisions of ATS Standards in recent years has been away from resource requirements. Arbitrary limitations on size would, as we have indicated, be unfair, since large programs can be -- and, in our view, are being, in some cases -- conducted responsibly. The first option we suggest, tightening and strengthening the Standards in the several ways suggested in this report, would probably have the effect of reducing the size of some programs, since some of the steps we suggest, especially the much closer tracking of students as they move through D.Min. programs and the use of consequential mid-point qualifying exams, would require substantially more administrative investment than is currently made in some programs. Whichever route is chosen, however, the issue of the public perception of program integrity must be faced. A new program venture such as the Doctor of Ministry degree will not succeed if a majority of administrators and faculty members in institutions that grant the degree believe that a group of programs that enroll a substantial proportion of students is of poor quality.

II. B. 1. Program Types

f. Program Age

Findings

The foregoing section on the history and growth of the D.Min. degree traced its development by numbers of programs and total enrollment. In this section we examine the relationship of program starting date to other features of D.Min. programs.

Table I groups programs by starting year. As was evident in the earlier section, more than half of all programs existing today were established by the end of 1974. (Numbers and percentages in this section are based on number of programs still in existence during our study. Numbers cited earlier, in the section on history and growth of the D.Min., included where possible all D.Min. programs, including those that no longer exist or that have been merged with other programs.)

TABLE I Mean Starting Year of Seventy-Six Programs Existing in 1984

Started In:	Number	Percentage
1971-72	11	14.5%
1973-74	32	42
1975-79	22	29
1980-84	11	14.5
	76	100

Mean age of all programs 1975.24

Table II shows the average starting years for programs of different philosophy types.

TABLE II Mean Year D.Min Program Started by Program Philosophy Type

	Mean Starting Year
Independent/Specialized	1975.00
Unique content or method	1977.11
Extended M.Div.	1975.06

Mean Starting year, all programs 1975.27

Program Age

The difference the Table suggests between independent/specialized and extended M.Div. type programs, on the one hand, and the apparently "younger" unique content or method type programs on the other, is explained by the fact that the majority of programs in the unique content or method category are replications of programs begun early in the history of the D.Min. program. (The programs we judge to be "prototypes" for the unique content or method category have starting years of 1973 or 1974.) Thus, it appears to us that all three basic conceptions of the D.Min. were present at the beginning of its development. None can really be judged as precursor or successor to the others.

Table III shows the age differences among program formats.

TABLE III Mean Year D.Min Program Started by Program Format Types

Format	Year
Local/regional	1975.07
Campus-based intensive	1976.34
Extension/colleague group	1975.00
Two or more options	1973.66
Mean Starting Year, All Programs	1975.27

The campus-based intensive form is, on average, 1/3 years younger than the other major forms. This is not surprising, since few if any other seminary programs are offered in this form, and thus it had to be "invented" to accommodate the D. Min. when other forms proved unsatisfactory. (A handful of institutions did have summer advanced degree programs for clergy before the D.Min. degree was approved. With these few exceptions, however, the campus-based intensive form is new for seminaries.) What is surprising is the age of extension/colleague group programs. This, too, is a new form for seminaries. Yet the majority of programs were developed quite early. The early average starting age is also a sign, however, that this category has not grown substantially since the early days. Thus institutions that have extension programs are likely to have had them for a fairly long time, but institutions that do not have them are unlikely to have started them. As its early average starting date suggests, the category for programs offered in two or more format types contain some of the oldest programs. The figures suggest that the move to one or more additional formats is more likely to occur as a program becomes more mature, and possibly as the original format becomes less productive of student enrollment.

Table IV shows program starting year by denominational type.

TABLE IV Mean Year D.Min. Program Started by Denominational Type

Type	Year
Mainline	1974.54
Evangelical	1976.95

Mean starting year, all programs 1975.24

Mainline programs are a little older than the average for all programs, and evangelical programs are substantially younger -- almost two full years. Evidently, the possibility of giving a degree such as the D.Min. appealed initially to mainline institutions. Since evangelical institutions have begun to establish such programs they have, however, done so at a much faster rate, the conclusion we reached by observing both their later starting dates and the fairly high percentage of evangelical institutions that have established D.Min. programs. Some evangelical institutions are relatively late entrants into ATS, a possible secondary explanation for their late start in establishing D.Min. programs.

The relationship between program size and starting year is striking.

TABLE V Mean Starting Year By Program Size

Size	Year
10-25	1977.36
26-46	1974.85
47-86	1974.90
87-721	1973.53

Mean starting year, all programs 1975.24

As Table V shows, the larger a program is, the older it is likely to be. The largest programs are by far the oldest (though in some cases their growth to substantial size is relatively recent). The smallest programs are quite strikingly young. Though there are signs that enrollment is leveling, this Table suggests that there had not, at the time these data were gathered (1983-84), been any tendency of programs to shrink substantially in size as they become more mature.

Is program age a predictor of future program size? Reports from program directors and various possible indicators of future growth or decline are mixed with respect to program age. As Table VI shows,

directors who report that, in recent years, the numbers admitted to their programs have stayed about the same tend to be directors of

younger programs; those who note increases or decreases in admissions are in older programs.

TABLE VI A. Mean Year D.Min. Program Started by Changes in Number Admitted

Changes in Admissions	Year
Increasing	1974.5
Staying the same	1975.9
Decreasing	1974.1
Varies considerably	1975.2

B. Mean Year D.Min. Program Started by Increase in Pool of Potential Recruits

Change in Pool of Recruits	Year
Getting larger	1976.4
Staying the same	1973.9
Getting smaller	1974.6
Cannot assess	1974.6

Directors who say that their pool of potential recruits seems to be staying about the same in size and those who say the pool is getting smaller are more likely to be directors of older programs than those who say that the pool is getting larger. Thus, it appears that recent trends in actual growth and decline are unrelated to program age. Directors' perception of the immediate future pool on which programs have to draw seems, however, to suggest that younger programs may have somewhat larger pools.