

Profiles of Ministry: A Thirty-Year Study

by Francis A. Lonsway



The Association of Theological Schools
The Commission on Accrediting

Profiles of Ministry: A Thirty-Year Study

by Francis A. Lonsway

Director of the ATS Profiles of Ministry Program,
1992–2005

2007
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania



The Association of Theological Schools
The Commission on Accrediting

This is an occasional paper, published by The Association of Theological Schools, to report findings of the thirtieth anniversary survey of the Profiles of Ministry program.

Additional copies of this paper are available by contacting The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 10 Summit Park Drive, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15275-1110; phone: 412-788-6505; fax: 412-788-6510.

Printed in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
2007



Francis A. Lonsway was a member of the ATS professional staff at the time of the original project, a consultant for the fifteen-year survey, and director of the ATS Profiles of Ministry program from 1992 to 2005. He directed the thirty-year study. He retired from ATS in the fall of 2005 and accepted an appointment to the graduate faculty in management and leadership of Webster University in Louisville, Kentucky.

Lonsway earned an undergraduate degree at the University of Dayton and graduate degrees (MA and PhD) from the University of Minnesota in administration, higher education, and the psychology of learning. He also holds undergraduate and graduate degrees in theology.

He served as the codirector of the merger of Bellarmine and Ursuline colleges, was awarded a U.S. Office of Education Fellowship, and served as assistant executive director of the American Association for Higher Education. Author of books and numerous journal articles, Lonsway also conducts seminars on research and evaluation throughout North America. He is vice president of education for the board of the Louisville Orchestra and a member of its executive committee.

Contents

Profiles of Ministry: History and Current Research	1
The Churches and the Preparation of Candidates for Ministry	9
Level of Education, Age, and Gender Examined in Profiles of Ministry Survey	19
What's in an Instrument? The Answer from the Profiles of Ministry Program	21
Bibliographical Resources	31

List of Tables

Table 1.1 Personal Characteristics—Positive	4
Table 1.2 Personal Characteristics—Negative	5
Table 1.3 Perceptions of Ministry I	6
Table 1.4 Perceptions of Ministry II	7
Table 2.1 Denominational Families by Research Project	10
Table 2.2 Mean Score by Characteristic	11
Table 2.3 Personal Characteristics by Denominational Family	12
Table 2.4 Perceptions of Ministry by Denominational Family	13
Table 3.1 Personal Characteristics by Gender	19
Table 3.2 Perceptions of Ministry by Gender	20
Table 4.1 Reliability Coefficients for Stage I and Stage II—Personal Characteristics	25
Table 4.2 Reliability Coefficients for Stage I and Stage II—Perceptions of Ministry	26

Foreword

The Profiles of Ministry instruments are based upon criteria for ministry identified by seminary faculty and administrators, parish clergy, denominational executives, and lay persons in a lengthy survey instrument. This survey was first administered in 1973, re-administered fifteen years later in 1988, and administered, once again, in 2003. Profiles of Ministry now reflects more than thirty years of effort of the Association to help schools assess characteristics that are crucial for valued and viable ministerial practice. Francis Lonsway has been a part of this effort, in one way or another, for more than thirty years.

Not long after researchers at the Search Institute completed the initial development of what is now the Profiles of Ministry program of The Association of Theological Schools in 1976, Francis Lonsway joined the ATS staff as its first Roman Catholic professional staff member. Part of his responsibilities included efforts to educate ATS member schools in the use of the newly developed Readiness for Ministry instruments, as the program was known at that time. Lonsway continued in this role for several years until leaving ATS for other endeavors. For the next twenty years, he continued to be involved either adjunctively with the ATS staff or on committees that oversaw the use of the Readiness for Ministry instruments. After their revision to the current Profiles of Ministry was completed in the late 1990s, ATS once again asked Lonsway to provide staff support for the program.

In 2002, Lilly Endowment made a grant to the Association that included funding to administer the criteria survey for a third time, and Lonsway provided all the professional staff work required for the administration and analysis of this survey. This occasional paper of the Association serves two purposes: first, it provides historical overview of the three decades of work, and second, it provides a comprehensive report on the most recent re-administration of survey expectations.

Lonsway is retired from the Association now, and ATS continues in his debt for the many contributions he made to the Profiles of Ministry program. Many people have worked on this project over the years, and no one has worked longer or brought more history of interest and care for its effective use than Francis Lonsway.

Daniel O. Aleshire
Executive Director
The Association of Theological Schools

Profiles of Ministry: History and Current Research

by Francis A. Lonsway

The Profiles of Ministry program (PoM) has its roots in 1973 as the American Association of Theological Schools¹ focused on the value and utility of adding a measure to the standard reporting of grade point average in the overall achievement of its seminaries' MDiv graduates. The goal was to explore whether a supplementary measure might be designed that would help member schools "verify" that graduates of their first professional degree were, indeed, ready for pastoral ministry in the denominations represented by the school. The original research effort was called the Readiness for Ministry (RfM) project; it was changed in the fifteen-year revision of the program in 1987–88 to the Profiles of Ministry (PoM) program.

The basic research for the thirty-year study of the original questionnaire, which explored the expectations and values clergy and laity held for beginning ministers, was completed in 2005.² There are four critical antecedent publications that trace the history of the project through its revision in 1987–88. The first two are publications of the Association itself, the third a major work published by Harper & Row, and the fourth a chapter in a volume on clergy assessment.

The first volume sketched the original research project and the sixty-four "core clusters" that resulted from the responses of clergy and laity to a 440-item questionnaire that had undergone several test administrations and analyses before the final set of items was selected.³ The second volume explored the issue of evaluation in theological education, the development of the original set of instruments to assess the criteria, the rationale for criterion-referenced instruments, and the common and unique values different denominational families placed on those beginning ordained ministry within their churches.⁴ The third work, a *magnum opus*, retraced the rationale and steps in the original research project and added individual chapters by denominational leaders representative of the distinctive profiles found in thirteen religious families of clergy/lay responses.⁵ The final piece, included in a volume focused on clergy and career development, recapped essential elements of the 1973–74 research project and provided details of both the research and the findings from the 1987–88 study.⁶

The Profiles of Ministry program from that date through the completion of the thirty-year study in mid-2005

owes its substantial form to that project. It is this work that led to the reshaping of the assessment instruments, the interpretive manuals, and related materials. While there have been textual changes in the instruments, programming changes in the presentation of individual and group profiles, and periodic research checking the reliability of the instruments, the present corpus of the materials was shaped in this fifteen-year study of the original project.

The four reports sketched above are, in effect, critical markers in the history and development of the Profiles of Ministry program and serve as the fundamental sources for learning about, understanding, and evaluating the overall project and its development. The PoM program also maintains a file of commentaries, articles, and doctoral theses that have used elements of the research, the characteristics it measures, and its instruments.

The next two sections, historical in nature, focus on the research methodology and research findings from 1973–74 to the present time. They are designed to capture the essence of the work through the thirty years of research, development, and use. The third section will explore the findings of the current thirty-year project.

History of the research methodology

The initial survey in 1974 represented a distillation of more than 2,000 items that had been gleaned from the literature and an evaluation of critical incidents in the practice of ministry. An initial set of 834 items was tested on a preliminary sample of more than 2,000 clergy and laity. The results were analyzed and items that were redundant, unclear, or failed to contribute to any pattern of statistical meaning were set aside. The remaining 440 items formed the basic questionnaire for the 1973–74 survey. A stratified, random, stage sampling procedure was used. It was designed to provide a representative sample from the various denominations and denominational families represented in the member schools of the Association. This sample included seminary faculty, senior seminarians, and alumni/ae. Denominational leaders were drawn separately but in the same proportion as their traditions were reflected in the membership of the alumni/ae. The total number of responses, 5,169, represented a 45.0 percent return.⁷

A major focus of the 1987–88 survey was to see whether the criteria that were identified in 1973–74 were still valued by clergy and laity, in what ways, and to what extent opinions and views might have changed in the intervening years. The questionnaire was shorter than the original survey. Two key decisions were made before launching this project. First, the revised questionnaire would include only those items that contributed to characteristics assessed in the casebooks, interview, and field observation form that were in use at the time. While there were sixty-four clusters revealed through factor analysis in the original research, the task of developing instruments with adequate strength to be used across North America reduced the total number of characteristics to be measured to a set of thirty-five. Second, a set of items that reflected “Contemporary Issues” was added to the abridged survey in order to take account of the 1987–88 research team’s judgment about changes in the “theological landscape” since the beginning of the Readiness for Ministry project. Among these were items to test elements of an individual’s personal spirituality, the broader issues of social justice, and the role of women in the church.

The questionnaire consisted of 330 items and was sent, using the same research protocols as the earlier study, to a random sample of clergy and laity that reflected the membership of ATS and the denominational bodies represented in its schools. The sample size was 5,776; the number of respondents 2,607, a percentage (45.1 percent) nearly identical to the response rate of the original survey.⁸

The relative strength of the assessment instruments, the *Casebook* and *Interview for Entering Students* (renamed *Stage I* in 1987–88), the *Casebook*, *Interview*, and *Field Observation for Graduating Students* (renamed *Stage II*), were also studied at this time. Reliability coefficients were reported for each instrument again in 1990, 1995, 2000, and 2005. A thorough study of the instruments, their development, changes over time, and their reliability will be reported in a subsequent article.

Finally, the goals of the thirty-year study in 2002–05 were the same as those of the prior two surveys. The 2002–05 study had increased interpretive potential simply because it allowed ATS to have a unique view over thirty years of the positive values, attitudes, skills, and sensitivities that clergy and laity hold as important to those beginning pastoral ministry. At the same time, it provides an opportunity to see how these may have changed as well as to identify the judgments clergy and laity made about traits that could impede effective ministry.

The survey instrument was the same as that used in the 1987–88 survey and the number of clergy and laity, 5,570, was nearly identical as well. The number of respondents was 2,433 which is 43.7 percent of the total, a percentage nearly equal to each of the two earlier surveys.⁹

Review of the research findings

Factor and cluster analyses run on the responses of clergy and laity in the 1973–74 survey yielded sixty-four “criteria” or “characteristics” drawn from statements in the survey. The research staff met with small groups of individuals across the United States and Canada to examine the characteristics, to summarize the sets of statements, and to name each criterion.¹⁰ Further analysis of the data revealed differences between clergy and lay responses across denominations and similar patterns of responses formed by seventeen denominational families.¹¹ The responses of clergy and laity were weighted evenly so that the responses from each group received equal treatment in the analysis of the data. The same was done for the denominational families in light of their unequal size. Analyses by geographic region, gender, age, level of education, and other factors yielded no statistically significant differences. Virtually all of the differences were accounted for by whether the respondent was clergy or lay.

The Readiness for Ministry project focused next on the characteristics that could be developed into reliable assessment instruments. The goal was to assess the extent to which those preparing for ordained ministry reflected the positive characteristics highlighted by the responses of clergy and laity as well as those traits that they judged might impede or derail effective ministry. The first set of instruments designed for those in their final year of graduate preparation for ministry included a casebook, a structured interview, and a field observation form. The latter was to be completed by up to five individuals who experienced the ministry of a seminarian in a supervised ministry setting. Items from thirty-six of the original set of criterion characteristics were judged strong enough for reliable feedback and were therefore measured in this initial set of instruments.

The first year’s use of the instruments was limited to thirty-five ATS member schools. Within two years it was clear that the power of the instruments was such that some characteristics and patterns that might impede effective ministry were emerging and, with that in mind, the research team moved to develop a parallel set of instruments designed for the first-year MDiv student.

Approximately 90 percent of the cases and the entire structured interview were brought together so that both strengths and weaknesses in a seminarian's profile could be interpreted early in his or her preparation. There were a few minor changes in the tense of several interview questions in order to accurately explore responses from individuals who had no experience of ministry and those in their final year of study who had supervised ministry experiences. The field observation instrument was reserved for the graduating student. Gradually, over time but intentionally in the early 1990s, the focus of the assessment became the entering student and then the pattern of growth and change in a given student over the years of his or her graduate studies. The new set of Readiness for Ministry instruments lay the ground work to capture the emerging importance given to a seminarian's formation by both seminary and denomination.

The primary goal of the fifteenth anniversary study of RfM in 1987–88 was to see how stable the items and characteristics being measured were over time. There were forty items added to this questionnaire to reflect new issues and changes in emphasis that the research team judged had occurred in the intervening years. These included the importance of personal spirituality, the role of women in the church, issues of peace and justice, and moral concerns such as abortion and homosexuality. As in the RfM project, the responses of clergy and laity were weighted in order to make their value equal in the analysis of the data.

The principal researcher reported that, "The most consistent finding about the ratings of importance was that little change was evident between the 1974 and 1987 ratings."¹² The characteristics assessed in the mid-1970s remained important characteristics or traits for those beginning ordained ministry in the late 1980s. Furthermore, the responses of clergy and laity and the denominational families were fairly close to those reported in the earlier research. Daniel Aleshire observed:

A notable difference in the 1987 data was the greater degree of agreement between clergy and laity and among denominational families. The variance in the 1987 responses suggests that North American denominations have considerable agreement about personal characteristics judged negatively, some agreement about personal characteristics judged important for

ministry, and minimal agreement about the importance of different approaches to ministry.¹³

Based on the findings of this research, the assessment instruments (casebooks, interview scripts, and field observations forms) were revised and the overall project renamed. It became Profiles of Ministry with a set of instruments for the beginning seminarian titled, *Stage I*, and a set for the graduating seminarian, *Stage II*.

As the year 2002 approached, the timetable for the thirtieth anniversary study of the original Readiness for Ministry project was set. The overall goal of the 2002–05 *Profiles of Ministry Survey*, the official name of the questionnaire sent to clergy and laity, was to see how the program had fared over the thirty years of its life. Were the personal characteristics and perceptions of ministry being measured by the instruments valued overall as they were at the study's inception and again in 1987–88? What was the relative value that clergy and laity gave to the items in the survey and in what ways was it the same and how had it changed in the intervening years? What insights could be gleaned from the pattern of clergy and lay responses by denominational family now in contrast to those reported in the 1973–74 and the 1987–88 studies? These questions provide the focus of the next section of this paper.

The thirtieth anniversary study

The findings of the current research project are developed in four sections, the first of which focuses on the responses of clergy and laity to a positive set of traits within the overall area titled "Personal Characteristics." The second section focuses on potentially negative personal traits, attitudes, and behaviors. The third and fourth sections focus on four interrelated sets of "Perceptions of Ministry." In contrast to the earlier two studies, the responses of clergy and laity in the current project were not weighted because the number of respondents from each group was nearly equal.

Separate analyses of the data revealed some statistically significant differences by gender as well as by age. An interpretation of these differences will be explored in a separate article.

"Within two years it was clear that the power of the instruments was such that some characteristics and patterns that might impede effective ministry were emerging . . ."

Personal characteristics—positive

The *Profiles of Ministry Survey* asked respondents to judge the value of the more than three hundred items, ranking them from “Highly important” (1) to “Not applicable” (7). Choices were to be made in light of the importance of each statement for “a beginning minister” in his or her denomination. The value of the items was reversed for eight of the nine sections of the instrument, the exception being Section VII, The Minister as a Person—Negative.

The printed individual and group profiles for the Profiles of Ministry program devote one page each to Personal Characteristics and Perceptions of Ministry. The division is a logical one insofar as it groups related characteristics and thus provides a helpful framework for the analysis of data that follows.

Scores from clergy and lay respondents on thirty-eight characteristics are presented in this and the following sections. Thirty-five are part of the original research in 1973–74 while three were developed in 1987–88 and continued in the current research project. The three are Christian Spirituality (treated in this section), Concern for Social Justice, and Support for Women in the Church (covered in the section devoted to Perceptions of Ministry II).

All but one of the nine characteristics in the first three sections of Table 1.1 (Responsible and Caring, Family Perspective, and Personal Faith) were highly valued by all respondents indicated by mean scores greater than 6.00 (see Table 1.1). Involvement in Caring was not considered quite as important as the others for a beginning minister and in every other instance the characteristics were ranked midway between “Quite important” and “Highly important.”

In rank order, the three highest were Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety (PIET), Acknowledgment of Limitations (LIMT), and Christian Spirituality (SPRT). All three signal the importance of various dimensions of a minister’s personal spiritual life. The score on PIET was drawn from such items as “Shows the mission of Christ

to be first in own life” and “Appears to be sustained by a sense of God’s call when the going gets rough.” LIMT, on the other hand, supports a realistic appraisal of a minister’s gifts and includes “Acknowledges own need for continued growth in faith,” and “Shows sufficient awareness of own inadequacies to know when help is needed.” Finally, SPRT, a new dimension first measured in 1987–88, includes statements such as “Own life reflects a spirituality that encompasses both contemplation and action,” “In teaching and preaching, stresses the importance of growth in prayer,” and “Own life gives witness to a personal relationship with God.”

Each of these characteristics reflect a dimension in the spiritual life of a minister or priest. It is far from complete, of course, but it suggests the importance that the respondents, whether clergy or lay, placed on the presence of these traits among their young clergy.

The other six characteristics, all highly valued, measure, for example, the extent to which a young minister is able to work cooperatively and nondefensively with people (Fidelity to Tasks and Persons), keep commitments even under pressure (Personal Responsibility), adapt well to new situations (Flexibility of Spirit), demonstrate interest in and compassion for a parishioner in stress or illness (Involvement in Caring), listen attentively and compassionately in a counseling context (Perceptive Counseling), and understand and incorporate the importance of spouse and family in his or her own life (Mutual Family Commitment).

This set of personal characteristics or traits reflected in the profiles of tens of thousands of seminary and nonseminary students who have completed the Readiness for Ministry and Profiles of Ministry assessment instruments are a mixture of both inherent attitudes and learned skills. The mix contains both of these elements and the value of the RfM and PoM approach is to have placed them in the context of attitudes and skills viewed important in the life of a minister or priest.

Table 1.1 Personal Characteristics—Positive

	Clergy Mean N=1,138	Lay Mean N=1,295
Responsible and Caring		
Fidelity to Tasks and Persons	6.32	6.31
Personal Responsibility	6.26	6.30
Acknowledgment of Limitations	6.50	6.44
Flexibility of Spirit	6.08	6.14
Involvement in Caring	5.88*	5.77
Perceptive Counseling	6.29	6.27
Family Perspective		
Mutual Family Commitment/ Ministry Precedence Over Family	6.08	6.08
Personal Faith		
Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety	6.55	6.53
Christian Spirituality	6.43	6.50*

Source: *Profiles of Ministry Survey*, 2002

*The responses of clergy and laity differed significantly from each other (p< .001).

There were only two statistically different responses given by clergy and laity in these three sections. Clergy gave greater emphasis to the importance of a compassionate, involved minister (Involvement in Caring) while lay respondents gave more weight than clergy to the importance of young ministers who understand their own spirituality and can nurture spiritual life in others (Christian Spirituality).

Potential negative characteristics

The first three scores in this section were derived from responses to Section VII of the survey instrument, The Minister as Person—Negative. (See Table 1.2.) Respondents were asked to consider the statements in this section from “Highly detrimental” (1) to “Not applicable” (7). The mean scores, in rank order, for Self-Serving Behavior, Self-Protecting Behavior, and the Pursuit of Personal Advantage indicate that both clergy and laity considered behaviors that reflect these constructs to be between “Quite detrimental” and “Highly detrimental” for a beginning minister. The fourth score, Intuitive Domination of Decision-Making (DMNA), was drawn from responses in Section VIII, The Minister as a Leader. Because the items in this section were not reversed, the response represents more of a “bridge” between a behavior or attitude that might be considered by some a minor asset while by others, a “hindrance in ministry.”

What do these scores mean? Self-Serving Behavior captures behaviors and attitudes in which the young minister considers himself or herself as someone who is separate from the congregation, above them, and because of calling, his or her “own opinion as a minister should be accepted without question.” This very same individual may use the ministering role “to maintain a sense of superiority” or be one who seeks “preferential treatment.” Self-Protecting Behavior (PRTC) is exhibited in much the same way but seems to capture a minister who “Worries excessively about what others think of him/her,” fails to let go and delegate, and has a tendency to violate confidences. The behaviors of PRTC reveal a person who is uncertain of self, one who must be in control, and is impatient or demeaning of others. The Pursuit of Personal Advantage joins items that reflect manipulative behavior including an individual who “Entertains ambitions and dreams inconsistent” with

ministry and “Seeks constant reassurance” that he or she is doing a good job.

Intuitive Domination of Decision-Making (DMNA) can be read “more compassionately” because some of the items that form this characteristics are, at times, strengths while at other times they can impede effective ministry. Items joined statistically in this characteristic include “Relies primarily on charisma and intuition in planning parish activities” and “Glosses over differences among people to give the impression of unity.” Neither is inherently negative. But DMNA also includes behaviors and attitudes that can derail church life, such as a minister who plans projects without considering

financial requirements or seeks to be viewed as the “ultimate authority” in the congregation or parish.

It is easy enough to read the scores in this section as simply negative and thereby provide reasons for the individual who possesses them to be counseled to leave seminary. Rare is the

lay or clergy person who has not seen or been affected by these traits. There is, however, a caution at the beginning of this section in the use of the words “Potential Negative Characteristics.” Anyone can see how the presence of these attitudes and behaviors would be impediments to effective ministry. The word, “Potential,” however, is both a caution and a safeguard to keep in mind for the interpretation of these scores to beginning and graduating seminarians. It is also a call to help the aspiring minister see the potential destructiveness of these traits and to take concrete steps to address them during the years of seminary. It is incumbent on the seminary, as well, to monitor the student’s progress for to simply allow an individual with these traits to move forward to a call or ordination is quite simply an injustice to the church.

Perceptions of ministry—church and congregation

The schema used in the Readiness for Ministry project to identify styles of or emphases in ministry have a long history and a useful logic about them. They have been helpful both in research and in discussions of the kinds of ministry to which individuals are called as well as to identify the ministerial styles that frame many denominational traditions. I have joined two of the four clusters in each of the following discussions. Ecclesial Ministry includes a group of measures that focus on the “priest-

Table 1.2 Personal Characteristics—Negative

	Clergy Mean N=1,138	Lay Mean N=1,295
Potential Negative Characteristics		
Self-Serving Behavior	1.90	1.89
Pursuit of Personal Advantage	2.15	2.23
Self-Protecting Behavior	1.91	1.93
Intuitive Domination of Decision-Making	3.64	3.78

Source: Profiles of Ministry Survey, 2002

ly” or sacramental role of the minister while Community and Congregational Ministry suggests ministerial or priestly outreach. Both the Conversionist Ministry and Social Justice Ministry, on the other hand, highlight particular overarching goals for those who minister. It is within these four areas that the responses of clergy and laity showed the greatest difference. Such differences were evident in all but two of the twenty-four characteristics measured in these four sections. Scores from clergy included fourteen of them while there were eight in the responses of laity.

What are some of the highlights of the research for an ecclesial and a community and congregational ministry? Evidence for the importance of the first area is supported by high scores given by clergy and laity for a Theocentric-Biblical Ministry, Clarity of Thought and Communication, and Relating Faith to the Modern World. (See Table 1.3.) All are viewed within the range of major assets or as “essential or mandatory” for beginning ministers and priests. The items that contribute to each of these characteristics are straightforward and include such statements as “Guides people by relating the Scriptures to their human condition,” “Own statements of belief reflect careful thought and evaluation,” and “Presents the Gospel in terms understandable to the modern mind.”

Denominational Collegiality, a measure of the relationship between a young minister and his or her denomination is also highly valued but slightly less than the first three characteristics. So, too, the scores on Sacramental-Liturgical Ministry and Competent Preaching. All three likely reflect the value different denominational traditions place on each of these characteristics.

Clergy and lay scores differed significantly on five of the six measures in this section. Lay members highlighted the importance of Denominational Collegiality, Competent Preaching, and Sacramental-Liturgical Min-

istry whereas the clergy emphasized the importance of a Theocentric-Biblical Ministry and Clarity of Thought and Communication. The difference between the two groups is important. Laity, for example, showed a preference for beginning ministers who are “attached” to their denomination and who, in the exercise of their ministry, preach well and exhibit an understanding of the sacramental dimensions of ministry including attention to rite and ritual.

Table 1.3 Perceptions of Ministry I

	Clergy Mean N=1,138	Lay Mean N=1,295
Ecclesial Ministry		
Sacramental-Liturgical Ministry	4.97	5.23*
Relating Faith to Modern World	6.15	6.14
Theocentric-Biblical Ministry	6.47*	6.39
Competent Preaching/ Competent Worship Leading	5.86	5.97*
Clarity of Thought and Communication	6.30*	6.17
Denominational Collegiality	5.93	6.12*
Community and Congregational Ministry		
Pastoral Service to All	6.07*	5.98
Relating Well to Children and Youth	5.86	6.05*
Encouragement of World Missions/ Balanced Approach to World Missions	6.19*	5.94
Building Congregational Community	6.17*	6.10
Conflict Utilization	6.06*	5.99
Sharing Congregational Leadership	6.10*	5.95
Promotion of Understanding of Issues	5.65*	5.33

Source: *Profiles of Ministry Survey, 2002*

*The responses of clergy and laity differed significantly from each other (p < .001).

Community and Congregation Ministry, much of the heart of the MDiv, the first professional degree offered by the seminaries and schools of ATS, received high marks by both clergy and laity. Again, the names of the measures provide a clear sense of their meaning. Building Congregation Community (BLDG), Encouragement of World Missions together with a balanced approach to missions (MISN/MSBL), and Sharing Congregational Leadership (LDRS) shared top rankings. The other four measures were not far behind in importance.

On all seven measures in Community and Congregational Ministry, there were significant statistical differences, six of the seven for clergy respondents. They highlighted all but Relating Well to Children and Youth (YUTH). That was the emphasis for the lay respondents. Clergy clearly favored a ministerial style that engaged lay members in building the local congregation (BLDG and LDRS), encouraged the spread of the Gospel with attention to the physical needs of the unchurched at home and abroad (MISN/MSBL), moved beyond its doors (Pastoral Service to All), and worked with conflict (Conflict Utilization). To a lesser degree, they endorsed the value of efforts of young clergy to help individuals and congregations understand issues they faced in their lives (Promotion of Understanding of Issues). Laity, by contrast, judged attention to and ministering to children and youth (YUTH) as “a major asset” for a beginning minister. It is also an “assignment” that most new clergy receive.

Perceptions of ministry—conversion and social justice

It was part of common wisdom a decade or so ago that a high commitment to an aggressive evangelical proclamation of the Gospel would yield a low score on issues pertaining to social justice. The converse was held just as strongly. However, many evangelical churches today have a high commitment to issues of social justice and many churches committed to social justice have a high commitment to the active proclamation of the Gospel. One can “be” for both.

For whom then, clergy or laity, is one or the other more central to their expectations for young ministers and priests? The evidence is quite clear. For laity, in descending order of importance, were Assertive Individual Evangelism, the Precedence of Evangelistic Goals (GOAL), Law Orientation to Ethical Issues (LAW), and Concentration on Congregational Concerns (CONG). (See

Table 1.4.) Those differences represent four of the five characteristics measured in this section. Beware, however. Assertive Individual Evangelism, although valued more highly by laity than clergy, was seen only as “somewhat important” while the remaining three were seen as being within the range of “detrimental” or as a “hindrance in ministry.” It is clear that lay members of congregations and parishes view as troubling a tendency of a young minister to focus only on the Gospel (GOAL), to address moral issues simply as black and white (LAW), or treat the congregation or parish solely as a shelter from the world (CONG).

Clergy, by contrast, placed greater emphasis on issues related to social justice. In descending order, they more strongly endorsed Support for Women in the Church, the Support of Unpopular Causes, Concern for Social Justice, Active Concern for the Oppressed, Interest in New Ideas, and Aggressive Political Leadership. Only the latter was seen midway between being “Undesirable” and “Somewhat important.” The rest of the char-

acteristics were comfortably within the range of “Somewhat important” to “Quite important.”

It seems clear from these measures that clergy in general are, at least theoretically, more committed to social justice issues as being important for the beginning clergy than are laity. Laity, on the other hand, expressed more concern about the potential negative impact of young clergy with narrow views in the active proclamation of the Gospel and in their work with people.

Table 1.4 Perceptions of Ministry II

	Clergy Mean N=1,138	Lay Mean N=1,295
Conversionist Ministry		
Assertive Individual Evangelism	5.04	5.22*
Precedence of Evangelistic Goals	3.89	4.21*
Concentration on Congregational Concerns	3.65	3.80*
Law Orientation to Ethical Issues	3.60	4.17*
Theologically Oriented Counseling	6.22	6.22
Social Justice Ministry		
Aggressive Political Leadership	4.51*	4.08
Support of Unpopular Causes	5.75*	5.58
Openness to Pluralism	5.71	5.65
Active Concern for the Oppressed	5.40*	4.99
Interest in New Ideas	4.99*	4.58
Concern for Social Justice	5.72*	5.39
Support for Women in the Church	5.97*	5.74

Source: *Profiles of Ministry Survey*, 2002

*The responses of clergy and laity differed significantly from each other ($p < .001$).

Overall, the scores in these two areas were not as high as they were for either Ecclesial Ministry or for Community and Congregational Ministry, the exception being Theologically Oriented Counseling (6.22) that was viewed by both clergy and laity in the range of “major asset” to an “essential” trait for beginning clergy. The scores are likely somewhat lower, in part, because individuals, clergy and lay, have a preference for either the

cluster of scores for a Conversionist Ministry or for a Social Justice Ministry. In large surveys such as this, the high and low scores meet in the middle with the mean. The article planned on each of these and all of the other scores assessed in the study should find “illumination” in the profiles of individual denominational families.

Final thoughts

This report is the first of three reports planned for the Readiness for Ministry and the Profiles of Ministry projects. Its scope is broad enough to provide a unifying thread from the original work in 1973–74 through the revisions in 1987–88, and the current study in 2002–05. The foundation has been laid to be able to explore two other key topics, the first being the denominational shifts in the values given each of the core characteristics over the years. The final piece will be a careful tracing of the assessment instruments as they were originally developed, modified, and in each case, studied for their structural integrity from their beginning to the present.

This report is also narrow enough to have explored the patterns of similarity and difference among the clergy and laity who responded to the *Profiles of Ministry Survey*. While much more can be written about the findings, those reported here give, I trust, helpful insights

into the importance of the measures for the preparation of clergy for pastoral ministry and provide a sense of the markers that clergy and laity judged important and helpful to ministry as well as those that are likely to impede or derail it.

ENDNOTES

1. The name of the Association was changed in 1974 to The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada (ATS) to reflect more accurately the binational character of its membership.
2. The *Profiles of Ministry Survey* was prepared in 2002, the research conducted in 2003–04, and the analysis of data completed in mid-2005.
3. David Schuller, Milo Brekke, and Merton Strommen, *Readiness for Ministry: Volume I—Criteria* (Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1975).
4. David Schuller, Milo Brekke, Merton Strommen, and Daniel Aleshire, *Readiness for Ministry: Volume II—Assessment* (Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1976).
5. David Schuller, Milo Brekke, and Merton Strommen, *Ministry in America* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1980).
6. Daniel O. Aleshire, “The Profiles of Ministry Program,” in *Clergy Assessment and Career Development*, eds. R. Hunt, J. Hinkler, Jr., and H. Malony (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1990).
7. The responses of seminary faculty, senior seminarians, alumni/ae, and denominational leaders were combined to form a “clergy” group. The total of their responses was 3,089 and those of the laity was 1,806.
8. The total number of clergy responses was 1,459 and the laity, 1,038. An additional 110 responses could not be classified.
9. The total number of clergy responses was 1,138 and the laity 1,295. The current survey realized nearly equal numbers of the two groups responding to the survey instrument.
10. For example, the cluster of statements that was named Fidelity to Tasks and Persons included such items as “Generally finishes what he/she starts,” “Does not avoid tasks of ministry that he/she does not enjoy,” and “Works at further development of pastoral skills.” It was summarized by the researchers and panelists as “Showing competence and responsibility by completing tasks, relating warmly to persons, handling differences of opinion, and growing in skills.”
11. Over time, the original number of denominational families was modified. For example, the Evangelical family was divided into Evangelical A and Evangelical B to reflect more accurately the different historical origins of each group while the two Roman Catholic categories, whether from a Religious Order or Congregation or from a Diocese, were merged into a single family. Analysis and interpretation of the findings from the final set of thirteen families were reported in the 1980 volume, *Ministry in America*.
12. Aleshire, “The Profiles of Ministry Program,” 123.
13. Ibid. Among the characteristics judged negatively by clergy and laity were Self Serving Behavior and Pursuit of Personal Advantage. Agreement among the two groups about personal characteristics included Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety, Acknowledgment of Limitations, and Fidelity to Tasks and Persons. On the other hand, denominational families showed slight agreement for characteristics that clustered under headings such as Conversionist Ministry and Social Justice Ministry.

The Churches and the Preparation of Candidates for Ministry

by Francis A. Lonsway

Throughout its history, The Association of Theological Schools (ATS) has focused sharply on the accreditation of graduate theological programs in the United States and Canada. It adopted standards for judging the quality of such programs in 1936 and established its first list of accredited schools in 1938. ATS now has more than 250 schools in its membership. Furthermore, while most of its member schools have historical ties to the denominations that established and supported them, more recently a number of schools have sprung to life within a broader interdenominational tradition, many of them evangelical seminaries.

The Association accredits schools, not denominations. Consequently, it has no juridical relationship with any denomination. Nevertheless, because the member schools engage in the preparation of men and women for ordained or called service within the churches of North America, there is a clear connection between what the churches expect of their theological school graduates and the preparation of these individuals through courses, seminars, and supervised ministry experiences while in seminary. That connection seems clearest in the Association's Profiles of Ministry program (PoM).

Originally named Readiness for Ministry, the PoM program began in 1973 and sought to systematically study the expectations of its member schools for the pastoral styles of newly minted seminary graduates. ATS specifically explored the characteristics, traits, sensitivities, and approaches that would foster good pastoral ministry and those that seemed likely to impede it. Key documents in the development and history of the research project are well documented in a recent article published in the ATS journal, *Theological Education*.¹

The original study was followed by a second in 1987–88 and by a thirty-year study completed in 2005.² The primary focus of this article is to trace the similarities and differences in the responses among the denominational families over this period and specifically to explore how the expectations within each of them may have remained the same or changed in the last thirty years. There are two essential preparatory notes. First, there have been some modest and helpful changes in the listing of the denominational families over the years of the project and, second, the framework for the analysis of

data was changed with the revision of the research instruments in 1987–88.

Denominational families

The original research project in 1973–74 sought responses from denominational leaders, seminary faculty, senior seminarians, alumni/ae, and laity to a 444-item survey focused on characteristics that could be important to the success of young clergy in their congregations and parishes in North America. The 4,895 responses came from a random stratified stage sample drawn from the forty-seven denominations represented in ATS at that time.³ Assignment of a school to a denominational family was done by ATS staff in light of their knowledge and experience with the schools of the Association.⁴ This was modified slightly by a factor analysis of the responses after the questionnaires were returned. The list of denominational families was also adjusted in 1987–88 and again in 2002–05. (See Table 2.1.) The modifications in the list reflect in part the changes in the membership of the Association over the thirty years of research. Currently, for example, new seminaries have been established in the broader category of "Baptist Churches" and the number of respondents who chose "Unaffiliated/No Denomination" has grown in the intervening years.

Core clusters

In the original study, 1973–74, sixty-four clusters of characteristics emerged by a factor analysis of the questionnaire. Analysis of data by denominational family and published reports eventually focused on sixty key clusters. In the 1987–88 study, however, the clusters to be studied were limited to the thirty-five that had been incorporated either into the Stage I or Stage II assessment instruments.⁵ In the same study, four additional sets of items were developed to reflect new emphases in ministry. Both of these decisions resulted in a change in the questionnaire sent to prospective participants. When the data were analyzed, three of the four were judged sufficiently robust to be included in subsequent editions of the *Field Observation Stage II* form. They are Support for Women in the Church (Cluster 81), Christian Spirituality (Cluster 82), and Concern for Social Justice (Cluster 84). The same schema was used in the 2002–05 study.

As a result of the differences in the number of clusters in the first and subsequent studies, a complete analysis across the thirty years of the study is impossible. It is possible, however, to make summary statements of the findings by each denominational family for each study and then to trace those common clusters through all three studies to see what has remained the same and what has changed. These two tasks form the heart of this article.

Summary of findings from each study

The original research in 1973–74

There were both personal qualities and ministerial functions in which there was high agreement across the seventeen denominational families. The personal qualities included three viewed as “Highly Important” and three considered “Most Detrimental.”⁶ The name of each cluster provides a sense of the overall meaning gleaned from the items that comprise it. The first group included items associated with Fidelity to Tasks and Persons, a Positive Approach (to ministry), and Flexibility of Spirit, while the detrimental group included Alienating Activity, Professional Immaturity, and Self-Protecting Ministry. There were six ministerial functions shared by the families as well. They included Building Congregational Community, Relating Faith

to the Modern World, Competent Preaching and Worship Leading, Involvement in Caring, Co-ministry to the Alienated, and Responsible Staff Management.⁷ The authors reported that there were an additional fifteen characteristics that, with few exceptions, were viewed similarly by the denominational families.

Strommen, reflecting on this groundbreaking project, suggested that the data supported four distinct models of ministry and observed that “[D]enominational differences account for more variance in how people view ministry than all other variables considered in our analyses.”⁸ The four models included a spiritual, sacramental-liturgical, or social action emphasis while the final model was a blend of the first and third.

The Spiritual Emphasis was most notable among the Evangelical A and B families and Southern Baptists. Grouped in the Evangelical A family because of the similarity of their responses were, for example, the Conservative Baptist Association of America, the Baptist Missionary Association of America, and the Baptist General Conference. Illustrative of the Evangelical B family were the Church of God (Anderson), The Churches of God General Conference, and the Evangelical Covenant Church of America. The Spiritual Emphasis among these three families included clusters that

Table 2.1 Denominational Families by Research Project

A Priori List 1973–1974	Factor Analysis List 1973–1974	Fifteen Year Study 1987–1988	Thirty Year Study 2002–2005
Anglican-Episcopal	Anglican-Episcopal	Anglican-Episcopal	Anglican-Episcopal
Canadian & American Baptist	Canadian & American Baptist	American-Canadian Baptist	American-Canadian Baptist Baptist Churches
Christian-Disciples	Christian Churches - Disciples Christian (Not Disciples)	Christian Churches - Disciples Christian (Not Disciples)	Christian Churches (Disciples and Non-Disciples)
Evangelicals	Evangelical A Evangelical B	Evangelical A Evangelical B	Evangelical A Evangelical B
Free Churches	Free Churches	Free Church	Free Church
Jewish	Jewish-Unitarian		
Lutheran	Lutheran	Lutheran	Lutheran
Orthodox	Orthodox	Orthodox	
Presbyterian-Reformed	Presbyterian-Reformed	Presbyterian-Reformed	Presbyterian Reformed
Roman Catholic Diocesan	Roman Catholic (Diocesan)	Roman Catholic	Roman Catholic/Orthodox
Roman Catholic Order	Roman Catholic (Order)		
Southern Baptist	Southern Baptist Convention	Southern Baptist	Southern Baptist
United Church of Canada	United Church of Canada	United Church of Canada	United Church of Canada
United Church of Christ	United Church of Christ	United Church of Christ	United Church of Christ
United Methodist	United Methodist	United Methodists	United Methodists
Others (outside ATS)			Other Denominations
Others (affiliated with ATS)			Unaffiliated/No Denomination

focused on Theocentric-Biblical Ministry, Assertive Individual Evangelism, Precedence of Evangelistic Goals, Theologically Oriented Counseling, and Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety. By contrast, the Sacramental-Liturgical Emphasis and Denominational Collegiality included Roman Catholics, the Orthodox, and the Anglican-Episcopal families.

The Social Action Emphasis, less cohesive than the first two models, was mirrored in the Christian Churches (Disciples), the United Church of Canada, and the United Church of Christ, while the final emphasis, called Combined Emphases, included the Lutheran Churches, the Presbyterian-Reformed family, and the United Methodists. In effect, each of these families combined an interest in the active proclamation of the Gospel, for example, as well as an interest in social issues.

The fifteenth anniversary study

Daniel Aleshire, reporting on the 1987–88 study, wrote, “The most consistent finding about the ratings of importance was that little change was evident between the 1974 and the 1987 ratings.”⁹ His overall view was succinctly stated:

North American denominations have considerable agreement about personal characteristics that are judged negatively, some agreement about personal characteristics that are judged to be important for ministry, and minimal agreement about the importance of different approaches to ministry.¹⁰

His statement reflects the three central areas that provide the framework of the individual and group profiles for Stages I and II. For example, the negatively judged characteristics included Self Serving Behavior, the Pursuit of Personal Advantage, and Self Protecting Behavior, while the positive characteristics included such traits and behaviors as Fidelity to Tasks and Persons, the Acknowledgment of Limitations, and a Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety. The minimal agreement about the importance of different approaches to ministry focused on the broad areas of Ecclesial Ministry, Conversionist Ministry, Social Justice Ministry, and Community and Congregational Ministry and the characteristics measured within each of these sections.

The thirtieth anniversary study

It is natural enough to become intrigued by the differences evident in the responses of individuals to the items and clusters of the three studies. To set the overall tone, however, it is useful first to portray and then reflect on the mean scores by characteristic measured over the thirty years. Table 2.2 presents those data.

Table 2.2 Mean Scores by Characteristic

	Scale	1973–74	1987–88	2002–05
Responsible and Caring				
43	FIDL	6.29	6.30	6.31
42	RESP	6.43	6.49	6.28
36	LIMT	6.35	6.44	6.47
45	FLEX	6.11	6.14	6.11
25	ICAR	5.73	5.81	5.82
21	PRCO	6.26	6.35	6.28
Family Perspective				
48	FAML	5.83	5.98	6.08
Personal Faith				
37	PIET	6.20	6.42	6.54
82	SPRT		6.46	6.47
Potential Negative				
54	SELF	2.98	2.84	1.90
63	PADV	3.41	3.18	2.19
52	PRTC	3.11	2.90	1.92
60	DMNA	3.68	3.62	3.71
Ecclesial Ministry				
9	LITG	4.87	5.00	5.11
1	RELT	6.20	6.10	6.14
2	TBIB	6.24	6.35	6.43
5	PRCH	5.87	5.89	5.92
28	CLAR	6.18	6.19	6.23
49	DNOM	5.76	5.89	6.03
Conversionist Ministry				
17	EVAN	5.03	5.08	5.14
19	GOAL	4.03	3.99	4.06
20	CONG	3.58	3.67	3.73
27	LAW	4.00	3.85	3.90
24	THCO	6.17	6.25	6.22
Social Justice Ministry				
18	PLIT	4.34	4.32	4.28
50	CAUS	5.74	5.63	5.65
8	OPEN	5.57	5.61	5.68
16	OPRS	5.12	5.22	5.23
33	IDEA	4.75	4.83	4.77
84	JUST		5.58	5.54
81	WOMN		5.86	5.85
Community/Congregation				
11	SERV	5.92	5.98	6.02
3	YUTH	6.04	5.92	5.96
12	MISN	5.95	6.08	6.06
55	BLDG	6.34	6.32	6.13
56	CNFL	6.11	6.12	6.02
57	LDRS	6.07	6.13	6.02
14	UNDR	5.39	5.53	5.48

Note: The numbers to the left of the Scale column match the criterion characteristics identified in the original research in 1973–74 and those added in 1987–88. See Appendix 2A for descriptions of Scale abbreviations.

The top five characteristics—and six where the means were identical—(indicated in bold) are nearly all lodged in the Personality Characteristics section of the PoM profile. On the seven-point scale of the three instruments, each of these scores was rated between “Quite

important” and “Highly important” by both clergy and lay respondents across denominational families. Note that characteristics within the Responsible and Caring section accounted for either three or four of the top five scores in each study. Only one characteristic in the Perceptions of Ministry section surfaced as one of the top five. In 1973–74 it was Building Congregational Community (BLDG) while in the subsequent two studies it was Theocentric-Biblical Ministry (TBIB).

In the original study, Personal Responsibility (RESP) ranked highest as it did in the 1987–88 study. Items that formed this scale included “Keeps own word—fulfills promises” and “Maintains personal integrity despite pressures to compromise.” Nearly equal in importance over the years was the Acknowledgment of Limitations (LIMT). Contributing to this score are statements such as “Acknowledges own need for continued growth in faith” and “Says willingly, ‘I don’t know,’ regarding subjects beyond own knowledge or competence.”

There appears to be a slight shift to a new emphasis reflected first in the revision of the survey instrument in 1987–88 and the addition of a cluster of statements designed to measure a new construct called Christian Spirituality (SPRT). This was one of three areas in which items were added to the survey to reflect a perceived shift in emphasis among the seminaries of the Association and the churches to which their graduates are called. In 1987–88 this characteristic ranked second

and tied for second place with the Acknowledgment of Limitations in the thirty-year study. Note the thrust of the items that comprise this measure: “Own life gives witness to a personal relationship with God,” “Own life reflects a spirituality that encompasses both contemplation and action,” and “In teaching and preaching, stresses the importance of growth in prayer.”

But, is there not a clear shift in emphasis in the 2002–05 study? Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety (PIET) was ranked first while tied for second were Christian Spirituality (SPRT) and Acknowledgment of Limitations (LIMT). In third place was Theocentric-Biblical Ministry (TBIB). The top choice includes such statements as “Shows the mission of Christ to be first in own life” and “Holds that in the midst of serious problems, God is at work.” The two tied for second place have been described in an earlier paragraph while the third, Theocentric-Biblical Ministry, indicates an individual who “leads worship so it is seen as focusing on God,” and “Guides people by relating the Scriptures to their human condition.”

One can reasonably make the case that, in the thirtieth anniversary study, the focus of the respondents to the survey emphasizes the importance of a new reality. It is now “Highly important” for the minister both to have a personal sense of the primacy of the mission of Christ and a willingness to proclaim that very importance to those whom he or she serves.

Table 2.3 Personal Characteristics by Denominational Family¹²

	A-C Bapt	Angl-Epis	Christians	Evang A	Evang B	Free Church	Lutherans	Presb Ref	Roman Catholic	Southern Baptist	United Meth	UC Canada	UCChrist
Responsible and Caring													
FIDL	6.45++												
RESP		6.39+	5.97--		6.54++	6.40+		6.39++		6.04--	6.41++		6.05--
LIMT													
FLEX													
ICAR													
PRCO				6.16-									
Family Perspective													
FAML	6.38++			6.47++	6.47++	6.42++	6.28++	6.36++	4.00--	6.43++	6.25++		
Personal Faith													
PIET	6.65++	6.39--		6.62++	6.70++	6.67++				6.70++		6.19--	6.30--
SPRT	6.64++	6.31-			6.62++		6.19--			6.60++		6.22--	
Potential Negative													
SELF		1.76-						1.78-					
PADV													
PRTC													
DMNA			3.55-	3.60-									

Focus on similarities and differences by denomination

Summary statements on the general pattern of similarities and differences by denominational family for the 1973–74 and the 1987–88 studies were presented in the prior section of this article. This section will examine first the overall pattern of similarities across denominational families and then the statistically significant differences (<.01 and <.001) by church family.

Personal characteristics

The format for the tables that follow reflects the categories printed for an individual or school profile. Table 2.3 presents page one of the profile, Personal Characteristics, and Table 2.4, the second page, Perceptions of Ministry. To help visualize the differences in importance, mean scores significant at the .01 level are either higher (+) or lower (-) than the mean for the total study sample. Differences at the .001 level that are higher are indicated by “++” while those that are lower are indicated by “--.”¹¹

Responsible and caring. It is striking that there are no significant differences among denominational families on half of the characteristics measured in this section. These include Acknowledgment of Limitations (LIMT), Flexibility of Spirit (FLEX), and Involvement in Caring (ICAR). There is only one significant difference among the various denominational families on Fidelity to Tasks and Persons (FIDL) and Perceptive Counseling (PRCO). The only area in which there are clear differences among roughly half of the families is in the area of Personal Responsibility (RESP). Five families view this characteristic as significantly more important than the general population of respondents while three consider it less important. The differences are considerable, some as much as a half point higher or lower (e.g., 5.97 vs. 6.54). To a significant degree, then, respondents in the Anglican-Episcopal, Evangelical B, Free Church, Presbyterian Reformed, and United Methodist traditions judge it very important for a minister or priest to maintain “personal integrity despite pressures to compromise” as well as to keep one’s word and fulfill promises.

Table 2.4 Perceptions of Ministry by Denominational Family

	A-C Baptist	Anglican-Episcopalian	Christians	Evan A	Evan B	Free Church	Lutherans	Presbyterian Reformed	Roman Catholic	Southern Baptist	United Methodist	UCCanada	UCChrist
Ecclesial Ministry													
LITG		5.49++	4.86-	4.50--		4.59--	5.27+		5.76++	4.78--	5.26++		
RELT	6.28++			6.04--		5.99-	6.23+			6.04			
TBIB	6.55+	6.19--		6.53+	6.62++				6.32--	6.61++		6.11--	6.24--
PRCH	6.12++		5.64--	5.63--			6.02+			5.76-	6.01+	6.15++	
CLAR								6.30+					
DNOM		6.27++	5.54--		6.26++	6.22++		6.19++	6.26++	5.51--	6.26++		5.70-
Conversionist Ministry													
EVAN	5.46++	4.39--		5.53++	5.75++	5.41++	4.82--	4.93--	4.67--	6.10++		4.28--	4.48--
GOAL	4.35++	3.55--		4.49++	4.61++		3.86-	3.85--	3.61--	4.92++	3.89--	3.50--	3.50--
CONG									3.55--	3.94++			
LAW	4.27++	3.58--			4.34++		3.67--		3.66--	4.38++		3.53--	3.63-
THCO	6.33++	6.03--		6.36++	6.36+	6.35+	6.07--			6.39++		6.01--	6.03--
Social Justice Ministry													
PLIT	4.52+			3.94--					4.47++	4.12-	4.46++		
CAUS	5.93++								5.41--	5.79+			
OPEN				5.40--						5.46--	5.86++		
OPRS		5.45+		4.79--					5.54++	4.84--	5.41++	5.54+	
IDEA	4.98+	5.15++		4.21--	4.45--	4.56-		4.93+	4.94+	4.19--	5.02++	5.36++	5.13++
JUST	5.79++			5.16--				5.70+	5.85++	5.13--	5.67+		
WOMN	5.10++	6.02+		5.44--				6.00++		5.36--	6.10++	6.08+	6.07++
Community/Congregation													
SERV	6.21++			5.87-							6.12+		
YUTH	6.09+			5.68--		5.81-					6.07++	6.16++	
MISN		5.90-											
BLDG										6.02-			
CNFL		6.14+		5.93-				6.10++					
LDRS		6.17++						6.16++		5.76--	6.10+		
UNDR				5.28--						5.27--	5.60+		5.65+

Family perspective. The differences that appear in the Family Perspective section reflect the view of many Protestant traditions about the importance of the family and the historical celibate nature of Roman Catholic priesthood. The items from the questionnaire do not consider an unmarried clergy.

Personal faith. The items that measure the importance of a beginning minister's Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety (PIET) were part of the original study and the continuing importance of this characteristic is reflected in the current project as well. The measure, Christian Spirituality (SPRT), was added in 1987–88 and continued in the thirtieth anniversary study. Yoked together these two measures reflect the importance given these characteristics by Baptists, the Evangelical A and B churches, and the Free Church family. In sum, they reinforce statements that affirm the critical presence of God in a person's life as well as the burden for those in ministry to reflect that power in their personal lives.

Potential negative. The view of the denominational traditions vis-à-vis the Potential Negative characteristics is remarkably similar. The low mean scores across denominations indicate the level of their concern. Participants completing the questionnaire judged the presence of Self-Serving Behavior (SELF), the Pursuit of Personal Advantage (PADV), and Self-Protecting Behavior (PRTC) from "Quite detrimental" to "Highly detrimental" and their potential presence in a beginning minister as either a major hindrance or one that might disqualify the individual. An Intuitive Domination of Decision Making (DMNA) was seen as "Somewhat detrimental."

Whatever differences appear in this section, then, indicate only slightly less concern than the study sample in general for the potential conflicts that can spring from a self-centered ministry, from a minister who is uncertain of his or her gifts, or from one who would use the ministry to direct and control people.

Summary. This section warrants five summary statements. First, overall there are few significant differences by denominational family among the characteristics measured in the Responsible and Caring area. Second, the significantly higher scores given to Personal Responsibility by the Anglican-Episcopal, Evangelical B, Free Church, Presbyterian Reformed, and United Methodists reflect an important emphasis for these traditions. Third, the differences in Family Commitment are explained simply as the likely differences between celibate and noncelibate clergy. Fourth, the importance of a Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety and Christian Spirituality were highlighted in the Baptist, Evangelical, and Free Church traditions. Fifth, there were few differ-

ences to be noted in the view that Potential Negative characteristics could impede or even derail a successful beginning to congregational and parish ministry.

Perceptions of ministry

Table 2.4 presents the cluster of characteristics in which most of the significant differences by denominational family appeared. It underscores, in general, Aleshire's summary statement from his 1987–88 study, namely, that North American denominations have "minimal agreement about the importance of different approaches to ministry."¹³

The Perceptions of Ministry section arrays four broad areas of ministry; ecclesial, conversionist, social justice, and community and congregational. Adopted from earlier published "categories" of ministry, these four have been used to provide a framework for fruitful discussions in the practice of ministry. While it can be argued that new categories need to be imagined, they have nonetheless remained helpful for the interpretation of students' and schools' profiles in the Profiles of Ministry program.

Ecclesial ministry. At first glance, the scores of the six characteristics grouped in this area resemble a scatter plot. They appear to defy trying to detect any patterns. Some do emerge, however.

First, as might be anticipated, the Anglican-Episcopal, Lutheran, Roman Catholic, and United Methodist traditions placed a higher value on elements of a Sacramental-Liturgical Ministry (LITG) than did the Christian, Evangelical A, and Southern Baptist churches. One would reasonably anticipate that the same group would value Denominational Collegiality (DNOM) and, for the most part, they do. Joining them, however, are the Evangelical B churches, members of the Free Church and the Presbyterian Reformed traditions. Each of these, too, values such items as "works cooperatively with superiors" and giving "calm rational explanation when a request contrary to denominational regulations cannot be granted."

Relating Faith to the Modern World (RELT), a Theocentric-Biblical Ministry (TBIB), and Competent Preaching (PRCH) form a second cluster within Ecclesial Ministry, one that relates more to proclamation than to either rite or ritual. Within this group of characteristics only the first and third form a pattern. The American-Canadian Baptists and Lutherans both valued these more highly than, for example, the Evangelical A or the Southern Baptist traditions. The first two families judged it very important to help "people determine religious educational needs in the congregation" and "lay people

relate Christian teachings to current issues and human needs” as well as to both hold “the interest and attention of congregation” and conduct religious rites smoothly. If *Relating Faith to the Modern World and Competent Preaching* included only statements about proclamation, it is safe to assume that the Evangelical A and Southern Baptist traditions would have scored similarly to the other two families. However, neither measure is that narrowly focused. Both include statements about rite and ritual with the likely result of a lower rated importance for these two denominational families.

Clarity of Thought and Communication (CLAR) drew in only the Presbyterian-Reformed tradition whose respondents judged it more important than did any other family.

Conversionist ministry. Overall, Baptists, evangelicals, and members of the Free Church tradition chose to emphasize the importance of aggressively proclaiming the Gospel (EVAN) and being clear about the value of faith “in coping with personal problems.” The Anglican-Episcopal, Lutheran, Presbyterian Reformed, Roman Catholic, United Church of Canada, and the United Church of Christ, however, while considering these important were more likely to consider them a “minor asset” rather than as either “Quite important” or “Highly important.” The Precedence of Evangelistic Goals (GOAL) and a Law Orientation to Ethical Issues (LAW) divided the two groups in a similar fashion although the level of importance attributed to these two was less than for either of the first two characteristics.

Significant differences in Total Concentration on Congregational Concerns (CONG) drew in only the Roman Catholic and Southern Baptist traditions. However, the level of its importance for both families suggests that neither viewed this with any great importance. This is likely a significant difference with little meaning.

Social justice ministry. Churches have been accused of talking a better line about the importance of social justice issues than actually doing anything about them. Taking into account both level of importance (greater than 5.00) and consistency, only one of these measures struck a cord with a number of church families, namely, Support for Women in the Church (WOMN). American-Canadian Baptists, Anglican-Episcopals, Presbyterian Reformed, United Methodists, the United Church of Canada, and the United Church of Christ underscored the importance of this area and viewed it significantly higher than did any of the other church families. Among items in this characteristic are an active encouragement for “women to take leadership roles in the congrega-

tion” and an invitation for “both women and men to speak on significant occasions” in congregational and parish life. Other items in this characteristic broaden the social justice issue to include the poor, the oppressed, and the disabled.

United Methodist respondents regularly chose levels of response to six of the seven areas measured in this section that provide them, as a denominational family, the most consistent pattern of significantly higher scores than all other families in this study. They include Aggressive Political Leadership (PLIT), Openness to Pluralism (OPEN), Active Concern for the Oppressed (OPRS), Interest in New Ideas (IDEA), Concern for Social Justice (JUST), and Support for Women in the Church (WOMN). The Roman Catholic family shared four of the six areas of concern with United Methodists. By contrast, the Evangelical A tradition and Southern Baptists routinely rated these same areas as significantly less important. The contrast is both sharp and noteworthy.

The other significant differences among the denominational families, whether higher or lower than the overall mean, do not indicate a clear pattern.

Community and congregational ministry. The first professional degree of the member schools of ATS, the MDiv, is designed with an emphasis on preparing seminarians for pastoral ministry in the congregations and parishes of the churches in the United States and Canada. The seven measures in this cluster have been consistently rated as “Quite important” overall for a beginning minister through the thirty years of this research project. At some points in its history, one or the other has had a heightened emphasis. For example, in 1973–74 Building Congregational Community (BLDG) was valued more highly than it was in the thirtieth anniversary study while Sharing Congregational Leadership (LDRS) had a special emphasis in the fifteen-year study. Neither difference detracts from the overall conclusion that each of the seven measures was and remains important for those preparing for pastoral ministry. It should not be surprising then that there were only about half as many significant differences in this section of the Perceptions of Ministry as there were on average in each of the prior sections (53.8 percent).

Nonetheless there were important differences. The most striking pattern was that of the United Methodist family. In this section as in the prior one, United Methodists most clearly accented a preference for a particular style of congregational ministry. They included Pastoral Service to All (SERV), Relating Well to Children and Youth (YUTH), Sharing Congregational Leadership (LDRS), and Promotion of Understanding of Issues

(UNDR). Each involves outreach and each is relational. Pastoral Service to All is an outreach to prospective church members, Relating Well to Children and Youth is an effort to engage and support youth in the mission of the congregations, Sharing Congregational Leadership prompts ownership among congregants for the welfare and growth of the church, and Promotion of Understanding of Issues reflects an openness to different ideas and individuals with different perspectives. Also striking, but significantly lower than the mean for all denominations, was the diminished accent on most of these same characteristics for the Evangelical A family. Southern Baptists also reflected lessened concern for the importance of Promotion of Understanding of Issues and included a similar view on Building Congregational Community and Sharing Congregational Leadership.

The American-Canadian Baptist family shared a heightened concern with the United Methodists for Pastoral Service to All and Relating Well to Children and Youth. The Anglican-Episcopal and the Presbyterian Reformed families on the other hand highlighted both Conflict Utilization (CNFL) and Sharing Congregational Leadership. The first of these affirms the reality of differences and disagreements in congregational life but sees them as potentially positive if given both the structure in which to engage the differences and competence in moderating them.

Summary. It is clear that the church families differed most in the area of preferences for pastoral ministry or styles of ministerial service. The differences are intelligible. First, the area of Ecclesial Ministry had a cluster of families—Anglican-Episcopal, Lutheran, Roman Catholic, and United Methodist—that placed a high value on liturgical ministry. On the other hand, the active proclamation of the Gospel was a distinctive pattern for others. Second, Conversionist Ministry was clearly the terrain of Baptists, evangelicals, and members of the Free Church tradition. The Scriptures need to be both proclaimed and lived. Third, Support for Women in the Church was highlighted by more than half of the denominational families. The United Methodists, however, endorsed nearly all of the characteristics measured in the Social Justice Ministry section, thus providing a clear accent to the ministry of those engaged in that tradition. Fourth, Community and Congregational Ministry, held “Quite important” by all families, revealed for a second time an emphasis of the United Methodist tradition. Other denominational families endorsed a preference for some of the same areas while others, the Anglican-Episcopal and the Presbyterian Reformed traditions, held up the importance of working with and resolving conflicts.

Conclusion

The seventeen denominational families in this and the two prior studies share much in common. It seems clear, however, that there has been a gradual, intensifying expectation that young ministers and priests both be more personally spiritual and witness their commitment to Christ in the congregations and parishes they serve. To be a person of one’s word and to acknowledge limitations lay the groundwork for this transformation. Both were highly valued in each of the studies. Movement to a deeper level of self-awareness was detected in the 1987-88 study and has come into its own in the thirty-year study. Respondents from the Christian churches expect their ministers and priests to have both a personal sense of the primacy of Christ in their lives and to witness that in their ministry. The characteristics that form this judgment begin with the importance given to Personal Responsibility and the Acknowledgment of Limitations in the original study, the addition of Christian Spirituality in 1987–88, and in the 2002–05 study, the transformation was completed with Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety and a Theocentric-Biblical Ministry.

Denominational families in the thirty-year study, as in 1987–88, were also united in the power of the Potential Negative characteristics to harm, reduce, or prevent effective ministry.

Finally, the distinctive histories of the church families have shaped their vision for Christian ministerial service. As in 1980 with the publication of *Ministry in America*, the churches are encouraged to look at their own particular profile, not as part of the whole Christian tradition but in fidelity to their understanding of the call of Christ. A helpful resource for this exploration is the Association’s *Profiles of Ministry Advisor’s Manual*.¹⁴

Appendix 2A

Descriptions of Scale Abbreviations

Responsible and Caring

FIDL	Fidelity to Tasks and Persons
RESP	Personal Responsibility
LIMT	Acknowledgment of Limitations
FLEX	Flexibility of Spirit
ICAR	Involvement in Caring
PRCO	Perceptive Counseling

Family Perspective

FAML	Mutual Family Commitment
------	--------------------------

Personal Faith

PIET	Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety
SPRT	Christian Spirituality

Potential Negative

SELF	Self-Serving Behavior
PADV	Pursuit of Personal Advantage
PRTC	Self-Protecting Behavior
DMNA	Intuitive Domination of Decision Making

Ecclesial Ministry

LITG	Sacramental-Liturgical Ministry
RELT	Relating Faith to the Modern World
TBIB	Theocentric-Biblical Ministry
PRCH	Competent Preaching
CLAR	Clarity of Thought and Communication
DNOM	Denominational Collegiality

Conversionist Ministry

EVAN	Assertive Individual Evangelism
GOAL	Precedence of Evangelistic Goals
CONG	Total Concentration on Congregational Concerns
LAW	Law Orientation to Ethical Issues
THCO	Theologically Oriented Counseling

Social Justice Ministry

PLIT	Aggressive Political Leadership
CAUS	Support of Unpopular Causes
OPEN	Openness to Pluralism
OPRS	Active Concern for the Oppressed
IDEA	Interest in New Ideas
JUST	Concern for Social Justice
WOMN	Support for Women in the Church

Community/Congregation

SERV	Pastoral Service to All
YUTH	Relating Well to Children and Youth
MISN	Encouragement of World Mission
BLDG	Building Congregational Community
CNFL	Conflict Utilization
LDRS	Sharing Congregational Leadership
UNDR	Promotion of Understanding of Issues

ENDNOTES

1. Francis A. Lonsway, "Profiles of Ministry: History and Current Research," in *Theological Education* 41, no. 2 (Pittsburgh: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 2006).
2. The *Profiles of Ministry Survey* was prepared in 2002, the research conducted in 2003–04, and the analysis of data completed in mid-2005.
3. David Schuller, Milo Brekke, and Merton Strommen, *Readiness for Ministry Volume II—Assessment* (Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1975).
4. Sources include: David Schuller, Milo Brekke, and Merton Strommen, *Readiness for Ministry Volume I—Criteria* (Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1975), 113; Schuller, Brekke, and Strommen, *Readiness for Ministry Volume I—Criteria*, 112–113; Daniel O. Aleshire and David S. Schuller, *Profiles of Ministry Advisor's Manual* (Pittsburgh: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1987), 83–113; and Francis A. Lonsway, *Profiles of Ministry Advisor's Manual* (Pittsburgh: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 2005), 59–91.
5. The *Profiles of Ministry Advisor's Manual* lists forty-three measured characteristics not thirty-eight. Three in the manual are double measured. Mutual Family Commitment and Ministry Precedence over Family are different components of the same characteristic as are Competent Preaching and Competent Worship Leading, and Encouragement of World Mission and Balanced Approach to World Mission. One characteristic, Belief in a Provident God (PROV) is measured by responses to the *Casebook* and not the *Profiles of Ministry Survey* while Position on Conservative Moral Issues (MORL) is drawn solely from interview questions.
6. David Schuller, Milo Brekke, and Merton Strommen, *Ministry in America* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1980), 81.
7. *Ibid.*, 83. Four of six of the personal characteristics are part of the subsequent research projects, namely, Fidelity to Tasks and Persons, Flexibility of Spirit, Self-Serving Behavior, and Self-Protecting Behavior. Four of six ministerial functions likewise are part of the 1987–88 and 2002–05 research projects, Relating Faith to the Modern World, Competent Preaching and Worship Leading, Involvement in Caring, and Building Congregational Community.
8. *Ibid.*, 55.
9. Daniel O. Aleshire, "The Profiles of Ministry Program," in *Clergy Assessment and Career Development*, eds., Richard A. Hunt, John E. Hinkle, Jr., and H. Newton Malony (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1990), 101.
10. *Ibid.*
11. It is appropriate to use $<.001$ when exploring the possible differences between large groups within this study, for example, the differences between the responses of clergy and laity. However, when estimating the likelihood of error between a denominational family, e.g., between the Anglican-Episcopal sample (N= 121) or the Evangelical A family (N= 217), it is reasonable to use $<.01$ or one in a hundred chances that the significant finding was an error. Researchers would also feel justified at using the $<.05$ level for these subgroups. Both $<.01$ and $<.001$ have been used to increase the probability that there would be little doubt that the significant difference detected is in fact real and not an error.
12. Two families have been omitted from this and subsequent tables, the newly created Baptists and the Unaffiliated/Nondenominational. The Baptists included newly formed groups such as the Cooperative Baptist Fellowship. No significant differences were detected between the responses of these groups and those of the sample population.
13. Aleshire, "The Profiles of Ministry Program."
14. Francis A. Lonsway, *Profiles of Ministry Advisor's Manual* (Pittsburgh: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 2005).

Level of Education, Age, and Gender Examined in Profiles of Ministry Survey

by Francis A. Lonsway

Respondents of the *Profiles of Ministry Survey* were asked to indicate their position, (e.g., alumnus/a or lay member), gender, age, level of education, and religious tradition to see what differences—if any—would be found.

There were no statistically significant differences by level of education on the characteristics measured by the 308 item questionnaire. Whether a respondent had completed grade school, high school, or had graduate or professional degrees seemed to have made no difference in their answers. When the data were explored by age, the only category in which any significant differences were found was between those who were *Under forty* and those *Over forty*. The two differences, while slight in number given the thirty-eight characteristics and traits explored through the questionnaire, nevertheless reveal the importance given these areas by those over forty years old. Competent Preaching (<.001) and Support for Women in the Church (<.001) were the two issues. One can reasonably surmise that a lifetime of church attendance would bring the quality of preaching and the style of worship to the fore. So, too, the emerging presence of women in leadership positions may reflect more of a mood to “Let’s get on with it” or “Why has this taken so long?”

Personal characteristics

It is in the area of gender, however, where there was a substantial number of differences in nearly two-thirds of the areas measured in the survey (24 of 38). It is natural to ask what they were and to explore what they mean. Table 3.1 provides the first glance, exploring the similarities and differences covered on the Personal Characteristics page of the individual and group profiles for seminarians.

The differences between male and female respondents are clear and striking. While both groups hold high expectations for positive character traits and view negative characteristics as potentially damaging to ministry, women hold both higher expectations for positive characteristics among young clergy and are less tolerant of potential negative traits among these same clergy.

Christian Spirituality, Fidelity to Tasks and Persons, Perceptive Counseling, Personal Responsibility, and

Involvement in Caring were the five character traits in rank order. Their meaning, for the most part, is clear in the name of each characteristic. For example, Christian Spirituality includes a “witness to a personal relationship with God,” while Personal Responsibility conveys, in part, an individual who “keeps own word, fulfills promises.”

The Potential Negative traits, drawn from a single section of the questionnaire, indicate that Self-Serving Behavior, Self-Protecting Behavior, and the Pursuit of Personal Advantage may well be, in the words of the survey itself, “a major hindrance” to effective ministry. Self-Serving Behavior, for example, includes statements such as “Often belittles a person in front of others” and “Appears to believe own opinion as a minister should be accepted without question.” Self-Protecting Behavior, on the other hand, suggests a minister who “Tends to be cold and impersonal,” or one who “Frequently shows favoritism.”

TABLE 3.1 Personal Characteristics by Gender

Scale Description	Male Mean	Female Mean
Responsible and Caring		
43 Fidelity to Tasks and Persons	6.27	6.36*
42 Personal Responsibility	6.24	6.33*
36 Acknowledgment of Limitations	6.45	6.49
45 Flexibility of Spirit	6.06	6.17*
25 Involvement in Caring	5.83	5.80
21 Perceptive Counseling	6.23	6.35*
Family Perspective		
48 Mutual Family Commitment/ Ministry Precedence Over Family	6.08	6.08
Personal Faith		
37 Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety	6.53	6.55
82 Christian Spirituality	6.41	6.54*
Potential Negative		
54 Self-Serving Behavior	1.96*	1.82
63 Pursuit of Personal Advantage	2.25*	2.12
52 Self-Protecting Behavior	1.98*	1.85
60 Intuitive Domination of Decision-Making	3.73	3.68

Note: The numbers to the left of the Scale Description column match the criterion characteristics identified in the original research in 1973–74 and those added in 1987–88.

*The statistically significant differences are at the <.001 level.

Perceptions of ministry

Can two words sum up the significant differences between women and men in this section of the profile? Let me suggest that for women the word is *relationship* and for men it is *clarity*. (See Table 3.2.)

The seven significantly different choices made by women reflect a particular emphasis. They are Sacramental-Liturgical Ministry, Relating Faith to Modern World, Competent Preaching, Denominational Collegiality, Openness to Pluralism, Support for Women in the Church, and Relating Well to Children and Youth. Each characteristic or trait is fundamentally relational: how one conducts worship, conveys the treasury of faith, proclaims the Word, interacts within the denomination, relates to other faiths, and expresses concern for their own gender and for children and youth.

Male respondents, by contrast, highlighted the importance of Assertive Individual Evangelism, Precedence of Evangelistic Goals, Concentration on Congregational Concerns, Law Orientation to Ethical Issues, and Aggressive Political Leadership. Each of these evokes a sense of clarity. Men were more likely than women to press others on the issue of personal faith, the priority of the Gospel message, the central importance of the congregation, the eternal importance of moral choices, and active engagement in public moral and social debates.

One could be tempted to look at the two areas where most of the significant differences occurred and judge that male respondents are more interested in issues of conversion while female respondents are more in tune with elements of an ecclesial ministry. The problem with that hypothesis is two-fold. First, both groups—men and women—by and large gave all areas of ministry similar weight. Second, there are those other four differences present in Social Justice Ministry and Community and Congregational Ministry that do not fit such an argument.

Reflection

The findings of the similarities and differences by level of education, age, and gender in the Profiles of Ministry study do not so much beg for a conclusion as for discussion. In particular, the accent given by the different choices made by male and female respondents should prompt us to explore the underlying differences between both groups as they live their lives in the Christian churches of North America. Furthermore, the churches need to understand how they can engage both men and women with their similarities and differences in an active Christian witness to the Gospel.

Table 3.2 Perceptions of Ministry by Gender

	Scale Description	Male Mean	Female Mean
Ecclesial Ministry			
09	Sacramental-Liturgical Ministry	5.03	5.20*
01	Relating Faith to Modern World	6.09	6.21*
02	Theocentric-Biblical Ministry	6.42	6.44
05	Competent Preaching Competent Worship Leading	5.84	6.01*
28	Clarity of Thought and Communication	6.21	6.25
49	Denominational Collegiality	5.94	6.14*
Conversionist Ministry			
17	Assertive Individual Evangelism	5.27*	4.97
19	Precedence of Evangelistic Goals	4.20*	3.88
20	Concentration on Congregational Concerns	3.77*	3.67
27	Law Orientation to Ethical Issues	3.97*	3.82
24	Theologically Oriented Counseling	6.23	6.21
Social Justice Ministry			
18	Aggressive Political Leadership	4.33*	4.21
50	Support of Unpopular Causes	5.69	5.61
08	Openness to Pluralism	5.60	5.78*
16	Active Concern for the Oppressed	5.25	5.20
33	Interest in New Ideas	4.76	4.78
84	Concern for Social Justice	5.51	5.57
81	Support for Women in the Church	5.75	5.97*
Community and Congregational Ministry			
11	Pastoral Service to All	6.01	6.04
03	Relating Well to Children and Youth	5.87	6.06*
12	Encouragement of World Missions/ Balanced Approach to World Missions	6.07	6.03
55	Building Congregational Community	6.12	6.14
56	Conflict Utilization	6.00	6.05
57	Sharing Congregational Leadership	6.01	6.03
14	Promotion of Understanding of Issues	5.48	5.48

Note: The numbers to the left of the Scale Description column match the criterion characteristics identified in the original research in 1973–74 and those added in 1987–88.

*The statistically significant differences are at the <.001 level.

What's in an Instrument?

The Answer from the Profiles of Ministry Program

by Francis A. Lonsway

The thirtieth anniversary study of the Profiles of Ministry (PoM) program focused on the 330-item survey sent to a stratified random stage sample of ATS member school graduates, seminary faculty, senior seminarians, denominational leaders, and laity served by the graduates.¹ It was *stratified* because it sought responses from different groups of individuals, *random* because the seminaries chosen to participate were drawn from the total list of ATS schools, and a *stage* sample because the laity were chosen after the alumni/ae were identified by local seminary coordinators of the overall project.

The research methodology was identical to the original Readiness for Ministry study of 1973–74 and the fifteen-year study in 1987–88. The only changes were the size of the samples in the latter two studies and the number of items contained in the survey. The original study, for example, analyzed responses from 5,169 individuals while the fifteen-year and thirty-year studies were approximately half that size (2,607 in 1987–88 and 2,433 in 2002–05).² The smaller samples were adequate for replicating the original study. Furthermore, in 1987–88 and 2002–05, the research teams decided to use only those items from the original survey tied to the assessment instruments (*Casebook*, *Interview*, and *Field Observation*) plus the addition of items designed to explore developing areas in ministry. Among these were an individual's personal spirituality, concern for social justice, and the role of women in the church.³

The findings of the current study have been reported in the prior three articles, each focused on a different cluster of findings. The first explored the pattern of similarities and differences between clergy and lay responses; the second, a similar analysis of the responses by denominational family; and third, an analysis by level of education, age, and gender.⁴

With this final article, then, the reporting of the thirtieth anniversary survey has been completed. What remains is an equally important issue, however, and one that guided the original research, namely, once we know how important the characteristics measured by the survey were to all those sampled and to different subgroups, (e.g., clergy vs. laity and total sample by denominational family), how does one estimate the presence of the characteristics in those completing theological studies? The answer: develop sound instru-

ments to assess the relative importance of both personal characteristics as well as perceptions of ministry. That is precisely what the original research team did and that is what Daniel Aleshire tested and modified in 1987–88. Further analysis of the strength of the revised instruments was done in 1995–97 and again at the outset of the thirty-year study.

This article focuses on two large issues. The first is, what the process was in selecting instruments to develop, what the instruments looked like, and how they changed. Second, what has been the relative strength of the instruments over time and what impact this has on their use now and into the future.

The instruments then, now, and why

The full goal of the original survey was not to learn the relative importance of the items in the questionnaire but to use the findings as a basis to determine the presence of these traits, characteristics, and sensitivities in those preparing for called or ordained ministry within the churches of North America.

Measurement, then, leading to the development of instruments is a two-step process. The data from all three surveys reveal how important or essential to ministry respondents have considered a number of statements. They ranged from "Highly important," understood as essential or required for effective ministry in the church, to "Meaningless/irritating" or even "Not applicable" to a particular denominational context. The scale was a seven-point modified Likert scale.

Once the relative importance of individual items (e.g., "Helps lay people relate Christian teachings to current issues and human needs" and "Presents the Gospel in terms understandable to the modern mind") are linked to characteristics (as in this instance, to Relating Faith to Modern World), the task is to figure out a reasonable way to assess the characteristic. The only direct way to do this is to arrange the statements in an instrument and ask how important each is to a particular respondent. The problem with the direct approach is that nothing much is learned. The research had already indicated their relative importance to pastoral ministry across a broad range of denominational families. A more subtle approach would be to seek evidence of the importance

of the traits, characteristics, and sensitivities indirectly. This was the ultimate goal of the original research team. In what fashion and to what extent do those who are in their final year of professional studies leading to ministry embrace or show evidence of these characteristics? Remember there were traits judged both positively and negatively by clergy and lay participants.

It is no easy task to answer this question. One must keep in mind that the measure of any characteristic in this way is an approximation. Consequently, instruments must be developed that are both strong enough to be perceived as “on target” for measuring a given characteristic (content validity) and stable over time (reliability) so there is no question of a shift in the meaning of the trait measured. Attention to both of these measurement icons, content validity and test-retest reliability, are hallmarks of the Profiles of Ministry program from its inception as Readiness for Ministry through its fifteen-year revision and to its thirty-year study concluded in 2005.

In the beginning

There are two seminal essays focused on the development of the original instruments. The first by Milo Brekke and the second by Daniel Aleshire are both contained in *Readiness for Ministry: Volume II Assessment*.⁵ Brekke’s essay focuses on the decision of the research team to develop criterion-referenced instruments and presents details about the long and intricate issues involved in the development and testing of the *Casebook*, *Interview*, and *Field Observation*. Aleshire, on the other hand, presents samples of the actual instruments and explores the strengths of each instrument and the cautions involved in the use and interpretation of each.

The goal of the original research and hence its name, Readiness for Ministry, was to help seminaries identify the characteristics and traits that would serve the new seminary graduates well as they began pastoral ministry within their denominations. The first set of instruments then was designed for the seminary graduate, and the initial question was, how does one adequately measure the sixty-four *core criteria* found in the responses to the survey? The answer was to create criterion-referenced instruments, a task easier said than done.

The development and examples of criterion-referenced instruments was in its infancy at the outset of the Readiness for Ministry project in 1973–74. Norm-referenced instruments was the common method of interpreting test data then as it is now. The “norm” is usually a large group of individuals who have taken a particular test over the course of years. The average or mean scores of these individuals eventually become the norm, and

subsequent test subjects are either at, above, or below the norm on the basis of the percent or range of their responses in relation to the norm. Achievement, aptitude, and personality tests commonly are norm referenced.

While the project team knew the average scores of respondents across denominations, a valuable point of reference, they were specifically interested in the extent to which seminarians who completed the assessment instruments reflected the range of responses given to the survey items. They were interested in responses to questions such as, “How likely is the senior seminarian to reflect Fidelity to Tasks and Persons?” or “How much of the criterion does the prospective seminary graduate demonstrate by his or her responses?” These and similar questions call for the development of criterion-referenced instruments. Among the key benefits of such an approach is that the seminarians’ responses are not likely to be judged as prescriptive but as “likely” or “probably” to be reflected in their actual ministry. An additional benefit to this approach is the acknowledgment that denominational families with their distinctive histories had already been shown to rate the strength of evidence of different characteristics differently. Consequently, any set of instruments needed to be interpretable to the unique outlook of the specific denominations using them.

Three types of assessment instruments were eventually selected by the research team. The first was a paper and pencil test; the second, an oral interview; and the third, collected judgments from individuals served by a seminarian in a supervised setting.

Casebook

There are considerable strengths to paper and pencil tests, among them, a wealth of information gathered in a relatively short time, the opportunity to use items directly garnered from the original survey, and ease in applying standard statistical methods to evaluate the reliability of the responses. The *Casebook* was just such an instrument. With its inherent strength there is also an obvious drawback. Because the seminarian is presented with a list of choices to each case, a respondent would see and possibly select alternatives better than he or she might otherwise have considered.⁶ A strategy incorporated in the instrument designed to mitigate the “halo” effect was the requirement that each response possibility was to be weighed on a five-point scale of “Very Likely” to “Very Unlikely.” This structure provides a better indicator of the overall value given to each of the response possibilities. The most difficult part of the task facing the research team remained developing pastoral scenarios or cases that would appropriately set the stage for the selection of responses linked to the

original survey. This task consumed considerable time for the research team and a panel of writers.

Interview

The second instrument, an interview, was developed as a *structured* interview meaning that the questions posed by the reader were to be read as written and not modified or interpreted.⁷ The questions and the responses were taped for subsequent interpretation. The unique problem associated with such an instrument is the reliability of the judges of the responses. One only needs to recall oral exams to understand the “risk” involved in responding to a question before a panel of judges. Each has his or her own criterion for passing or failing the question. The research team, after having judged and categorized the response possibilities for each question, set themselves to the task of training individuals to evaluate the responses in the same way as did the team. The daunting issue that faces the reliability of the interview consistently remains the one of inter-judge reliability. The strength of the *Interview* lies in its format. Seminarians have not seen the questions prior to the interview, the items appear to be random moving from one issue to another, and, because they are open-ended, invite personal responses. The *Interview* has always been rated as engaging by those who complete it.

Field Observation

The third instrument, *Field Observation*, is a particular form of paper and pencil test. It does not rely on the responses of the seminarian but on the observations of those central to his or her supervised ministry. While two rating forms were developed at the outset, the surviving method uses a modified five-point Likert scale with judgments ranging from “Very Likely” to “Unlikely.” The goal of the researchers was to have three of five individuals who experienced the seminarian’s style of ministry evaluate that ministry in light of statements from selected criteria. An advantage shared with the *Casebook* is that core responses came directly from the survey while a unique advantage is the pooling and averaging of the responses by more than one individual. The format and choices for each “rater” is the same. As with all instruments, this one too has a weakness. It is difficult to encourage raters to be objective. Who would want to stand in the way of a seminarian achieving his or her goal of ordained service?

The decision to develop a set of criterion-referenced instruments was clear to the research team as were the strengths and potential weaknesses of each. Everything had been done to ensure their integrity and usefulness across a broad spectrum of Christian ministries within the United States and Canada. What remained then was

their introduction to a sample of seminaries. Even that was not a simple task.

It was the spring of 1976 before the first group of forty schools was selected to participate in the Readiness for Ministry program.⁸ The small number was chosen to allow unforeseen problems with the administration and interpretation of the materials to be addressed and quickly resolved. Workshops were put in place to train school personnel in interpreting student and seminary group profiles. Coders for the structured, taped interviews had to be trained at each seminary.

It was clear within the first two years of use that the assessment instruments had significant power to accurately display patterns of characteristics helpful and harmful to beginning ministers and the congregations and parishes they were likely to serve. The presence of some patterns of responses in the early results raised questions about just how ready some of the young men and women were for ministry. In light of this, David Schuller, director of the project, his staff, and the research team developed a parallel *Casebook* and included a replication of the *Interview* for entering first-year seminarians in 1979. This date signaled the beginning of the use of the instruments for ministry formation. If potential positive or negative characteristics were evident in the early stages of a seminarian’s graduate studies (Profiles of Ministry: Stage I), how much more helpful the interpretive process would be. Likewise how much richer would be the use and interpretation of what became known as Profiles of Ministry: Stage II at the conclusion of graduate studies.

In the same year, a set of instruments identical to those designed for senior seminarians was christened “Ministry: A Professional and Personal Profile.” Prepared for ministers, priests, and sisters, its earliest use was focused on helping those considering their special gifts for ministry and a possible redirection or change in ministry.

The first major revision of the instruments occurred in the fifteen-year study led by Daniel Aleshire in 1987–88. The *Casebooks* were pared with the effect of shortening the time of completing the instrument from more than four hours to three hours or less. The statistical integrity of the instrument remained fundamentally unchanged. Interview questions with low reliability were eliminated and a set of questions designed to assess an individual’s stand on contemporary moral issues was added. The *Field Observation* instrument was modified to assess three issues that had been developing in the years after the introduction of the original set of instruments. The clusters of responses were named Christian

Spirituality, Concern for Social Justice, and Support for Women in the Church.

The thirty-year study, completed in 2005, resulted in only minor changes in the instruments. As with a revision in 1999, there were textual changes to make the feel of the instruments more contemporary. There were also changes in the names of several characteristics, for example, MORL became Position on Conservative Moral Issues to more accurately describe the items that formed this criterion.

Since 1987–88, substantial work was done on the *Interview*, focusing on two areas. The first was to the “key” of the *Interview* itself. Contract coders, listening to taped interviews over the years, detected additional nuances in the responses of students.⁹ Their listening skills prompted enlarging the range of responses to some questions. The second was to the weight given each coded response. The weights were modified in light of ongoing research as well as the enlargement of the coding schema.

With the completion of the thirty-year study, the instruments are ready for their next decade of use. No one in 1973–74 could have anticipated their value for seminarians, ordained clergy, religious men and women, seminaries, and the churches. By any measure, thirty years is a long life for any set of instruments. The Profiles of Ministry instruments, however, monitored and changed throughout their history, remain fresh and ready for the challenge.

Measures of strength in assessment instruments

Two questions, whose meanings are often confused, quickly arise in any discussion of a test or questionnaire. Is it valid? Is it reliable? Many ask if an instrument is valid when they want to know if it measures what it is designed to measure. Others ask if the test or questionnaire is valid when they intend to ask about its power to predict outcomes. Herein is a maze of meanings. Let us look more closely at each, not with an exhaustive treatment but to focus on legitimate questions about the Profiles of Ministry assessment instruments.

Validity

There are various types of validity. Most discussions of validity focus on four types: content, concurrent, predictive, and construct validity.¹⁰ The two types central to the Profiles of Ministry program are content and predictive validity. Concurrent validity focuses on comparing two different tests to see if one has any relationship to the other; whereas, construct validity focuses on the relationship of an instrument constructed in light of a

theory. Two studies of concurrent validity were done, one comparing the constructs of PoM with the Theological School Inventory and a second, part of a doctoral study comparing a single PoM scale with a personality test.¹¹ Measures of construct validity are not relevant to the design of the PoM assessment instruments.

Content validity, often called *face validity*, is a measure without a number or percent attached. It asks whether the instrument as designed does indeed measure what it intends. There are a number of ways to test this kind of validity. One can assemble panels of experts to review the material and judge the likelihood that it will do what it purports to do. Another way is to ask users how the instruments seem to be working. Both have been done for PoM. The first was accomplished at its outset and again during the major revision of the instruments in 1987–88. The second is an ongoing question presented to individuals responsible for administering the program and to students who complete the instruments and review their individual profiles. The answers have been positive and the judgment of leaders and researchers of the program has been consistent, namely, that the Profiles of Ministry instruments are accomplishing the goal set for them at the outset: to assess characteristics, traits, sensitivities, and responses that can strengthen or weaken the pastoral ministry of seminary graduates.

The predictive validity of the PoM program is an unanswered question. Can a score or pattern of scores likely predict a seminary graduate’s success (or lack thereof) in ministry? We simply do not know. We have hunches and anecdotal feedback on individuals in ministry that seem to support its predictive ability. However, there has been no systematic study to date. One potentially important study is in the conceptual stage involving the seminary leadership of Huron University College Faculty of Theology. This ATS member school has been in the Readiness for Ministry and Profiles of Ministry programs since their inception. The school maintains a close relationship with its graduates, most of whom work in the Anglican diocese that supports the seminary. A director of research, a team that determines what a successful or an impaired ministry would look like, selection of a reasonable sample, and funds are what are needed to accomplish the study.

Reliability

As with validity, there are different measures of an instrument’s reliability. The most often used are test-retest, alternative form, and internal consistency reliability.¹²

Measures of internal consistency reliability have been the standard measure for the Profiles of Ministry program. At the outset of the research project in the mid-1970s, test-retest and alternative form assessments were also made. Responses to the *Interview* instrument were subjected to test-retest reliability to gauge the extent to which trained coders would assign identical values to student responses, and the earliest *Casebooks* had an alternative form designed to achieve the same goals in assessing different groups of senior seminarians.

Tests of internal consistency reliability result in a numeric coefficient. It is designed to assess the strength of the relationship among items comprising a scale. For example, the reliability coefficient for Fidelity to Tasks and Persons in 2003–04 was .75. With 1.00 the perfect score, correlations about .60 are considered high.

A closer look

Two tables portray the reliability coefficients for the Profiles of Ministry instruments. The first table matches the first printed page of an individual profile in Stage I and Stage II,¹³ while the second reflects the second page.

There are three important keys to understanding the tables. First, all *Interview* scores are shared in Stages I and II profiles; second, all *Field Observation* scores are specific to Stage II; and third, while most *Casebook* scores are shared by both Stage I and Stage II, several assess the same characteristic but through different cases. For example, Personal Responsibility (RESP) is assessed in both Stages I and II, but the cases from which the responses are drawn differ from one another.

The closer the reliability coefficient is to 1.00, the more confidence there is that the instrument assesses the whole characteristic. One way to raise the coefficient is to increase the number of items that are part of what is being measured. However, there is a significant downside to this strategy: it would be exhausting to complete the *Casebook*, *Interview*, or *Field Observation*. Consequently, over the years the PoM research teams gauged how

much time could reasonably be devoted to completing each instrument before test-takers raced, likely sloppily, to finish it.

Overall, *Field Observation* scores have the highest reliability coefficients (see Tables 4.1 and 4.2). Fourteen of the fifteen measures were stronger in 2003–04 than a decade earlier; the fifteenth matched its performance in 1994–95. These scores, more tightly behaviorally anchored than the responses to either the *Casebook* or *Interview* scores, likely contributed to this effect. The underlying fact remains, they are solid reliability coefficients.

More than 90 percent (92.8%) of the twenty-eight *Casebook* scores currently rest comfortably above .60; three-quarters of them, in fact, range between .70 and .87. These are solid measures, able to be strengthened, certainly, but “respectable.” Only Balanced Approach to World Missions (MSBL) and Personal Responsibility (RESP) as measured in the Stage II *Casebook* suggest the need for a closer look as the program goes forward.

TABLE 4.1 Reliability Coefficients for Stage I and Stage II—Personal Characteristics

Scale	Source	1987–88		1994–95		2003–04	
		Stage I	Stage II	Stage I	Stage II	Stage I	Stage II
Responsible and Caring							
FIDL	<i>Casebook</i>	.67		.69		.75	
FIDL	<i>Field Obs</i>		.71		.76		.82
RESP	<i>Casebook</i>	.68		.68		.65	
RESP	<i>Casebook</i>		.79		.79		.59
LIMIT	<i>Casebook</i>	.84	.84	.82	.82	.81	.81
FLEX	<i>Interview</i>	(.17)	(.17)	.11	.11	.15	.15
ICAR	<i>Casebook</i>	.83	.83	.86	.86	.84	.84
PRCO	<i>Casebook</i>	.80	.80	.81	.81	.77	.77
Family Perspective							
FAML	<i>Casebook</i>	.82	.82	.82	.82	.82	.82
MNFM	<i>Casebook</i>	.87	.87	.84	.84	.82	.82
Personal Faith							
PIET	<i>Interview</i>	.52	.52	.47	.47	.43	.43
PIET	<i>Field Obs</i>		.82		.79		.88
PROV	<i>Casebook</i>	.76	.76	.67	.67	.70	.70
SPRT	<i>Field Obs</i>		NA		.79		.82
Potential Negative							
SELF	<i>Casebook</i>	.79	.79	.72	.72	.74	.74
SELF	<i>Field Obs</i>		.75		.73		.86
PADV	<i>Casebook</i>	.59		.66		.65	
PRTC	<i>Interview</i>	(.33)	(.33)	.39	.39	.41	.41
PRTC	<i>Field Obs</i>		.61		.68		.82
DMNA	<i>Field Obs</i>		.76		.72		.86

Note: See Appendix 4A for descriptions of Scale abbreviations.

MSBL was calculated from scores in the 1987-88 research that indicated another facet to Encouragement of World Missions (MISN). There was a slight shift downward in the measure's strength in 2003-04. RESP, measured in both Stage I and Stage II, maintains a reasonably solid score in Stage I but a significant drop in Stage II.

The reliability coefficients from the structured interview present a different situation. While always low, measured by standard statistical measures, nine of the ten *Interview* scores have nonetheless risen in the fifteen-year period since the 1987-88 revision. It is likely that they will always be in the low to moderate range for two important reasons. First, there are considerably fewer response possibilities for an *Interview* question, generally three or four, compared with seven to ten on either the *Casebook* or the *Field Observation*. In such a situation, one does not have nearly enough data points to correct for extremely high or low scores. Second, the *Interview* does not reflect precise points on a continuum such as from "Very Likely" to "Very Unlikely" as in the *Casebook*. It estimates the amount of presence of each response in a continuum.

It is for these reasons that significant work has been done on a biennial basis over the past decade and a half with the individuals who are selected and work as contract coders. Every two years the coders meet in a coder certification conference. The conference is designed to assess the participants' skills in the intervening years, to sharpen their skills, and to approve those who successfully complete the conference. The standard for their inter-judge reliability has always exceeded .90. At the most recent conference in March 2005, the inter-judge reliability was .96.

One can have high confidence that the assigned coder thorough-

ly knows the range of potential codes, understands the student's response to the question, and will highly likely agree with a fellow coder in her or his judgment of a response. These are the direct outcomes of the biennial workshop. The number of *Interview* questions could reasonably be increased, but an eye would need to be kept on the length of the interview. The original interview had fifty-six questions. There is room between the

TABLE 4.2: Reliability Coefficients for Stage I and Stage II—Perceptions of Ministry

Scale	Source	1987-88		1994-95		2003-04	
		Stage I	Stage II	Stage I	Stage II	Stage I	Stage II
Ecclesial Ministry							
DNOM	<i>Interview</i>	(.41)	(.41)	.22	.22	.40	.40
LITG	<i>Interview</i>	(.57)	(.57)	.30	.30	.47	.47
RELT	<i>Field Obs</i>		.69		.81		.81
TBIB	<i>Field Obs</i>		.60		.76		.83
PRCH	<i>Field Obs</i>		.70		.74		.80
WRSH	<i>Field Obs</i>		.70		.68		.78
CLAR	<i>Field Obs</i>		.71		.73		.76
Conversionist Ministry							
EVAN	<i>Casebook</i>	.73	.73	.68	.68	.63	.63
EVAN	<i>Interview</i>	(.52)	(.52)	.15	.15	.44	.44
GOAL	<i>Casebook</i>	.81	.81	.81	.81	.82	.82
CONG	<i>Casebook</i>	.73	.73	.81	.81	.80	.80
LAW	<i>Casebook</i>	.91		.85		.87	
LAW	<i>Casebook</i>		.83		.79		.82
THCO	<i>Casebook</i>	.88		.86		.79	
THCO	<i>Casebook</i>		.81		.69		.72
Social Justice Ministry							
PLIT	<i>Casebook</i>	.86	.86	.87	.87	.86	.86
PLIT	<i>Interview</i>	(.44)	(.44)	.38	.38	.45	.45
CAUS	<i>Interview</i>	(.40)	(.40)	.18	.18	.21	.21
OPEN	<i>Interview</i>	(.43)	(.43)	.29	.29	.33	.33
OPRS	<i>Casebook</i>	.70	.70	.69	.69	.69	.69
MORL	<i>Interview</i>	NA	NA	.13	.13	.26	.26
IDEA	<i>Casebook</i>		.74		.78		.80
JUST	<i>Field Obs</i>		NA		.82		.84
WOMN	<i>Field Obs</i>		NA		.80		.81
Community and Congregational Ministry							
SERV	<i>Casebook</i>	.70	.70	.74	.74	.73	.73
YUTH	<i>Casebook</i>	.82	.82	.82	.82	.79	.79
MISN	<i>Casebook</i>	.69	.69	.69	.69	.71	.71
MSBL	<i>Casebook</i>	NA	NA	.61	.61	.56	.56
BLDG	<i>Casebook</i>	.80	.80	.82	.82	.78	.78
CNFL	<i>Casebook</i>	.79	.79	.75	.75	.75	.75
LDRS	<i>Casebook</i>		.75		.77		.66
LDRS	<i>Field Obs</i>		.77		.81		.84
UNDR	<i>Field Obs</i>		.74		.76		.80

Note: See Appendix 4A for descriptions of Scale abbreviations.

current number and the original to build a stronger assessment of an individual characteristic.

Summary

From the standpoint of the standard measures of assessment, the Profiles of Ministry instruments hold their own. Content validity has been attested to and the reliability coefficients are robust for the most part. Measured by the criterion of efficiency, a useful measure for all tests, PoM holds up well. It gathers a significant amount of information on characteristics judged important to ministry, in a timely fashion, and with reasonable statistical rigor. This affirmation does not mean that the instruments or the measures are perfect. They could be better. But, they are good.

Concluding observations

The original research team set two broad goals. The first was to learn what characteristics, traits, sensitivities, and behaviors were important for the beginning minister or priest in the churches of North America. This goal was achieved with considerable care and attention to the unique mix of denominational families, the interplay of clergy and lay responses, as well as to the input of seminary faculty and denominational leaders. The second goal was equally challenging, namely, to develop a set of instruments that would help seminarians assess their gifts for ministry, the traits that were likely to support effective ministry, as well as those behaviors that would impede or even derail ministry. All of this work was done with careful attention to empirical research and measurement issues. They succeeded in achieving both goals.

The fifteen-year study in 1987–88 addressed the issue of what changes and additions were necessary to strengthen the work while subsequent analysis of data and the thirty-year study revisited the original work and were able to pronounce it solid and useful for seminarians and the churches. The Profiles of Ministry program is healthy and ready for the next chapter of its development and use.

Appendix 4A

Descriptions of Scale Abbreviations

Responsible and Caring

FIDL	Fidelity to Tasks and Persons
RESP	Personal Responsibility
LIMIT	Acknowledgment of Limitations
FLEX	Flexibility of Spirit
ICAR	Involvement in Caring
PRCO	Perceptive Counseling

Family Perspective

FAML	Mutual Family Commitment
MNFM	Ministry Precedence Over Family

Personal Faith

PIET	Commitment Reflecting Religious Piety
PROV	Belief in a Providential God
SPRT	Christian Spirituality

Potential Negative

SELF	Self-Serving Behavior
PADV	Pursuit of Personal Advantage
PRTC	Self-Protecting Behavior
DMNA	Intuitive Domination of Decision Making

Ecclesial Ministry

LITG	Sacramental-Liturgical Ministry
RELT	Relating Faith to the Modern World
TBIB	Theocentric-Biblical Ministry
PRCH	Competent Preaching
CLAR	Clarity of Thought and Communication
DNOM	Denominational Collegiality
WRSH	Competent Worship Leading

Conversionist Ministry

EVAN	Assertive Individual Evangelism
GOAL	Precedence of Evangelistic Goals
CONG	Total Concentration on Congregational Concerns
LAW	Law Orientation to Ethical Issues
THCO	Theologically Oriented Counseling

Social Justice Ministry

PLIT	Aggressive Political Leadership
CAUS	Support of Unpopular Causes
MORL	Position on Conservative Moral Issues
OPEN	Openness to Pluralism
OPRS	Active Concern for the Oppressed
IDEA	Interest in New Ideas
JUST	Concern for Social Justice
WOMN	Support for Women in the Church

Community/Congregation

SERV	Pastoral Service to All
YUTH	Relating Well to Children and Youth
MISN	Encouragement of World Mission
BLDG	Building Congregational Community
CNFL	Conflict Utilization
LDRS	Sharing Congregational Leadership
MSBL	Balanced Approach to World Missions
UNDR	Promotion of Understanding of Issues

Appendix 4B

Chronology of Readiness for Ministry Instruments and Resources

Instrument	Title or Form	Content	Year
<i>Case Assessment</i>	Book 1	28 cases	1975
<i>Case Assessment</i>	Book 2	27 cases	1975
<i>Case Assessment</i>	Form AB	43 cases	1976
<i>Casebook</i>	Ministry: A Professional and Personal Profile	43 cases	1979
<i>Casebook</i>	Casebook For Entering Students	30 cases	1979
<i>Interview</i>	Entering and Graduating Students	56 questions	1977
<i>Interview</i>	Entering and Graduating Students	48 questions	1982
<i>Field Observation</i>	Prototype	"Tree" rating plus 60 items	1976
<i>Field Observation</i>	Prototype	130 items	1977
<i>Field Observation</i>	Revised	130 items	1980
<i>Advisor's Interpretive Manual</i>			1979

Chronology of Profiles of Ministry Instruments and Resources

Instrument	Title or Form	Content	Year(s)
<i>Casebook</i>	Stage I	24 cases	1985, 1998, 2003, 2005
<i>Casebook</i>	Stage II	23 cases	1985, 1999, 2003, 2005
<i>Interview</i>	Stage I and Stage II	46 questions	1985, 1997, 2005
<i>Field Observation</i>	Stage II	116 items	1988, 1999, 2005
<i>Interpretive Manual</i>	Stage I		1985, 1999, 2005
<i>Interpretive Manual</i>	Stage II		1985, 1999, 2005
<i>Advisor's Manual</i>	Stage I and Stage II		1987, 1997, 2005

ENDNOTES

1. The responses of seminary faculty, senior seminarians, alumni/ae, and denominational leaders were combined to form a "clergy" group.
2. Francis A. Lonsway, "Profiles of Ministry: History and Current Research," in *Theological Education* 41, no. 2 (2006): 112.
3. *Ibid.*, 113.
4. *Ibid.*; Francis A. Lonsway, "The Churches and the Preparation of Candidates for Ministry," in *Theological Education* 42, no. 1 (2006); Francis A. Lonsway, "Level of Education, Age, and Gender in the Profiles of Ministry Survey," in *Interpretation*, no. 19 (Fall 2006).
5. Milo L. Brekke, "The Development of Criteria Referenced Instruments for Assessing Readiness for Ministry" and Daniel O. Aleshire, "The Assessment Instruments," in *Readiness for Ministry Volume II—Assessment*, David Schuller, Milo Brekke, Merton Strommen, and Daniel Aleshire, eds. (Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1976).
6. Brekke, "The Development of Criteria Referenced Instruments," 75.
7. Aleshire, "The Assessment Instruments," 30.
8. Jesse H. Ziegler, "Foreword," in *Readiness for Ministry Volume II—Assessment*, David Schuller, Milo Brekke, Merton Strommen, and Daniel Aleshire, eds. (Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1976), vii.
9. A major shift was made in the expectation that each participating seminary would supply its own coders. This did not work well for several reasons. First, the coders typically listened to tapes only once a year with the result that the accuracy of their judgments slipped in the second and ensuing years. Second, the turnover among coders was high, and retraining was expensive for the seminaries. In the late 1980s, more and more of the coding was being centralized at ATS with Arlene Galloway, Francis Lonsway, and Pauline Jacobi. In the early 1990s, the concept of "contract coders" arose. These individuals were tested, prepared, and equipped to listen to hundreds of tapes throughout the academic year. They likewise committed themselves to a biannual coder certification conference to test and further sharpen their coding skills.
10. Tom Kubiszyn and Gary Borich, *Educational Testing and Measurement*, 4th ed. (New York: HarperCollins College Publishers, 1993), 293–296.
11. Jeff Nave, *An Analysis of Socially Desirable Responding to Required Psychological Tests by Students Entering Seminary Graduate Programs* (doctoral dissertation, New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 2002).
12. Kubiszyn and Borich, *Educational Testing and Measurement*, 307–310.
13. Stage I is designed for seminarians beginning graduate studies, while Stage II explores an individual seminarian's growth at the end of his or her master's level program.

Bibliographical Resources

A. Readiness for Ministry project

1. Core resources

- Aleshire, Daniel O. "Readiness for Ministry Instruments: A Five-Year Study." New York: Annual Meeting of the Religious Education Association, 1985.
- . "Revising the Readiness for Ministry Program for Entering Theological Students." New York: Annual Meeting of the Religious Education Association, 1985.
- Brekke, Milo L. *Identification of Criteria for Assessment of Readiness for Ministry*. New Orleans: Annual Meeting of the Religious Education Association, 1984.
- Brekke, Milo L., David S. Schuller, and Merton P. Strommen. "Readiness for Ministry: Report on the Research." In *Theological Education* 13, no.1 (1976).
- Menges, Robert J. "Assessing Readiness for Professional Practice." Occasional Paper Number 1. Evanston, IL: Center for the Teaching Professions, 1973.¹
- Schuller, David S., Milo L. Brekke, and Merton P. Strommen. "The Assessment of Readiness for the Practice of Professional Ministry: Rationale and Research Method." In *Theological Education* 10, no. 1 (1973).
- . *Ministry in America*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1980.
- . "Readiness for Ministry Project: Questionnaire on Criteria for New Ministers." Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1973.
- . *Readiness for Ministry: Volume 1—Criteria*. Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1975.
- . *Readiness for Ministry: Volume II—Assessment*. Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1976.
- Stake, Robert E. "Third Party Review of the Readiness for Ministry Study." Independent evaluation, 1982.
- Wuthnow, Robert. Independent evaluation of the Readiness for Ministry Project, 1982.
- Ziegler, Jesse H., ed. "Readiness for Ministry: Significance for Church and Seminary." In *Theological Education* 12, no. 3 (1976). Nine articles exploring different aspects of the Readiness for Ministry project.

2. Assessment instruments

Survey

Readiness for Ministry Survey: What do You Consider Most Important in a Beginning Minister? Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1974.

Casebook

- Brekke, Milo L., and David S. Schuller. *Readiness for Ministry Case Assessment Form AB*. Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1976.²
- Brekke, Milo L., David S. Schuller, and Dorothy L. Williams. *Casebook for Entering Seminarians*. Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1979.
- Readiness for Ministry Case Assessment Book 1*. Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1975.
- Readiness for Ministry Case Assessment Book 2*. Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1975.

Interview

Brekke, Milo L., and Dorothy L. Williams. *Readiness for Ministry Interview*. Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1975, 1977.³

Field Observation

Aleshire, Daniel O. *Readiness for Ministry Field Observation, Prototype*. Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1976.

———. *Readiness for Ministry Field Observation*. Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1977.

Brekke, Milo L., Daniel O. Aleshire, and Dorothy L. Williams. *Readiness for Ministry Field Observation*, revised. Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1977, 1979, 1980.

3. Interpretive materials

Aleshire, Daniel O., assisted by Dorothy L. Williams. *Readiness for Ministry Field Observation Process Manual*. Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1976.

Brekke, Milo L., Dorothy L. Williams, and Francis A. Lonsway. *Readiness for Ministry Advisor's Interpretative Manual*. Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1979.

Lonsway, Francis A., and Daniel O. Aleshire. *Coordinator's Handbook*. Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1979.

Readiness for Ministry Administrator's Manual. Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1976–77.

Readiness for Ministry Coordinator's Workbook. Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1978–79.

Readiness for Ministry Interpretative Manual. Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1976, 1977.

Readiness for Ministry: Interpretative Manual for Entering Seminarians, Lutheran Edition. Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1978.

Readiness for Ministry Interpretative Manual for Entrance Assessment. Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1977.

Readiness for Ministry Interpretative Manual Graduating Seminarians. Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1977.

Williams, Dorothy L., and Milo L. Brekke. *Key for Scoring Readiness for Ministry Interview*. Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1976.

Williams, Dorothy L., Milo L. Brekke, and Daniel O. Aleshire. *Readiness for Ministry Interpretative Manual for Entering Seminarians*. Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1976.

B. Profiles of Ministry program

1. Core resources

Aleshire, Daniel O. "The Profiles of Ministry Program." In *Clergy Assessment and Career Development*. Edited by Richard A. Hunt, John E. Hinkle, Jr., and H. Newton Malony. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1990.

Aleshire, Daniel O., and David S. Schuller. "Expectations of Ministers and Priests: Assessment of Criteria in 1973 and 1987." Unpublished paper, 1987.

Lonsway, Francis A. "Readiness for Ministry Project and Profiles of Ministry Program: Bibliographical Resources." Pittsburgh: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 2007.

Schuller, David S., and Daniel O. Aleshire. "The Profiles of Ministry Program: The 1987 Survey of Expectations of Ministers, Method and Preliminary Results." San Francisco: Thirty-sixth Biennial Meeting of The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1988.⁴

2. *Assessment instruments*

Survey

Profiles of Ministry Survey: Which Qualities do You Consider Most Important in a Minister? Pittsburgh: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1987.

Profiles of Ministry Survey: What do You Consider Most Important in Those Beginning Ordained Ministry? Pittsburgh: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 2002.

Casebook

Aleshire, Daniel O. *Profiles of Ministry Casebook Stage I*. Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1985.⁵

———. *Profiles of Ministry Casebook Stage II*. Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1988.

Interview

Aleshire, Daniel O. *Profiles of Ministry Interview, Stage I and Stage II*. Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1985.⁶

Field Observation

Aleshire, Daniel O. *Profiles of Ministry Field Observation*. Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1988.

3. *Interpretive materials*

Aleshire, Daniel O., and David S. Schuller, *Profiles of Ministry Advisor's Manual*. Vandalia, OH: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1987.⁷

Aleshire, Daniel O., Milo L. Brekke, and Dorothy L. Williams. *Profiles of Ministry Interpretative Manual Stage I*. Pittsburgh: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1988.⁸

———. *Profiles of Ministry Interpretative Manual Stage II*. Pittsburgh: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1988.

Lonsway, Francis A. *Profiles of Ministry Advisor's Manual*. Pittsburgh: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 2005.

———. *Profiles of Ministry Coder's Manual*. Pittsburgh: The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, 1997, 2005.

4. *Supplemental publications*

Lonsway, Francis A. "A Call to Growth: The Potential of the Profiles of Ministry Program." In *Theological Education* 39, no. 2 (2003).

———. "The Churches and the Preparation of Candidates for Ministry." In *Theological Education* 41, no. 1 (2006).

———. "Level of Education, Age, and Gender Examined in the Profiles of Ministry Survey." In *Interpretation* 19 (Fall 2006).

———. "Perceptions of Ministry in Stage II." *Profiles of Ministry II*, no. 2 (1996); "Interpretation: The Structured Interview." In *Interpretation* 5 (Fall 1999); "Interpretation: Suggestions for Interpreting Individual Profiles, Part 1." In *Interpretation* 9 (Fall 2001); "Suggestions for Interpreting Individual Profiles, Part 2." In *Interpretation* 10 (Spring 2002); "PoM Survey: Association Administers 30th Anniversary Study." *Interpretation* 12 (Spring 2003).

———. "Profiles of Ministry—Assessing a Student's Readiness for Ministry." (Kissimmee, FL: American Association of Bible Colleges Annual Meeting, 1995).

———. “Profiles of Ministry: History and Current Research.” *Theological Education* 41, no. 2 (2006).

———. “What’s in an Instrument? The Answer from the Profiles of Ministry Program.” In *Theological Education* 42, no. 2 (2007). *Profiles of Ministry*. Semi-annual newsletter I, no. 1 (1975) through III, no. 2 (1977).⁹

5. *Dissertations, reports, and presentations*¹⁰

- Bowlin, Adrian G. *An Analysis of Persisting and Nonpersisting Students in Eight Selected Roman Catholic Seminaries as Measured by the Readiness for Ministry Test*. Eugene, OR: The University of Oregon, 1980.
- Nave, Jeff. *An Analysis of Socially Desirable Responding to Required Psychological Tests by Students Entering Seminary Graduate Programs*. PhD diss., New Orleans: New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 2002.¹¹
- Saxon, Ruth O. *The Development and Validation of an Instrument for Measuring Readiness for Ministry in Graduating Students of Caribbean Nazarene Theological College*. PhD diss., Kansas City, MO: Nazarene Theological Seminary, 1980.
- Stango, Ann Mary. *A Program of Formation Toward Justice in Roman Catholic Seminaries*. DMin thesis, Washington, DC: Wesley Theological Seminary, 1982.
- Stephens, Valerie R. *Implementation of Profiles of Ministry at Eastern Pentecostal Bible College*. DMin project, Ashland, OH: Ashland Theological Seminary, 1996.
- Steward, J. Christopher. *Validation of a Multi-Dimensional Assessment Battery for Ministerial Candidates*. PhD diss., Pasadena, CA: Fuller Theological Seminary, 1989.
- Wesemann, Kenneth R. *Predicting Ministerial Effectiveness*. PhD diss., Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University, 1995.

ENDNOTES

1. This paper was published as: Robert J. Menges, “Assessing Readiness for Professional Practice,” *Review of Educational Research* 45, no. 2 (1975).
2. Interest in the project from Protestant and Roman Catholic clergy and religious women prompted the research time in 1979 to package the complete set of instruments (*Casebook, Interview, and Field Observation*) and the *Interpretative Manual as Ministry: A Professional and Personal Profile*.
3. Subsequent printings of substantially the same material are noted by the year of publication.
4. Reports on the Profiles of Ministry program are routinely presented in the *ATS Bulletin, Part 3*, which provides details of the Association’s biennial meetings. Reports of workshops and activities are also reported on a regular basis in the *ATS newsletter, Colloquy*.
5. The materials for the Readiness for Ministry project were substantially revised and the project renamed the Profiles of Ministry program. Daniel Aleshire and David Schuller led the revision with appropriate attribution to the members of the original research team. Subsequent editorial changes were made to the *Casebooks* for Stage I and Stage II by Francis A. Lonsway in 1997 (Stage I), 1998 (Stage II), 2003, and 2005.
6. Subsequent editorial changes were made to the interview scripts for Stage I and Stage II by Francis A. Lonsway in 1995, 1997, and 2005.
7. The *Advisor’s Manual* was revised by Francis A. Lonsway in 1997 and 2005.
8. The Stage I and Stage II manuals were revised by Francis A. Lonsway in 1999 and 2005. The use of the word “Interpretative” in the title of the manual was changed to “Interpretive” with the reprinting of the text.
9. Prepared by the director of student information services, each issue focused on the Student Information Project and the Profiles of Ministry program. For the latter, two brief articles explored the use of the program at participating seminaries and issues of interpretation. The newsletter was expanded and renamed *Interpretation* in the fall of 1997.
10. Historical materials at the office of ATS reveal a host of papers exploring the use, interpretation, and value of the assessment materials over the years. In addition there have been numerous presentations at professional association meetings made by directors of the Readiness for Ministry project, the Profiles of Ministry program, and the executive directors of the Association.
11. See Jeff Nave, “Preliminary Findings in SDR Among Seminary Students,” *Interpretation* 11 (Spring 2002) and “Socially Desirable Responding Among Seminary Students,” *Interpretation* 10 (Spring 2002).

