DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 500 RC 003 449

The Role of Rural Social Science in Theological Education (With Particular Application to the Town and Country Ministry of the Methodist Church).

Garrett Theological Seminary, Evanston, Ill.
Pub Date 69
Note-86p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.40
Descriptors-*Church Responsibility, Religious Differences, *Religious Factors, *Rural Areas, Rural Education, Rural Urban Differences, *Social Sciences, *Theological Education, Values

The relationship of rural social science to theological education was a primary focus of this study, with particular emphasis given to the thesis that an ability to think in social science terms on the part of a pastor working in a town or country community is positively related to a productive ministry. Members of the Rural Sociological Society were initially sent a questionnaire specifically developed to elicit the judgment of the members of the Society as to the importance of key sociological concepts for the work of the pastor in a rural community. The 10 most important concepts identified in this manner included: (1) norms and values; (2) community, (3) power structure, (4) community decision-making; (5) communication; (6) role; (7) socialization, (8) culture, (9) interaction; and (10) status. On the basis of the concepts listed as of major importance by the rural sociologists, a questionnaire was developed to test the sociological sophistication of rural pastors. Sociological sophistication was in turn compared with 7 measures of pastoral performance. Findings of these comparisons supported the assertion that the relationship is positive between scores on the test of sociological sophistication and high pastoral performance. A final chapter of the study discusses the responsibility the theological seminary bears in training the ministry of the town and country church. (EV)

The Role of Rural Social Science In Theological Education

The Role of Rural Social Science In Theological Education

With particular application to the town and country ministry of The Methodist Church

ROCKWELL C. SMITH
Research Director

CLIFFORD M. BLACK STEPHEN G. COBB S. BURKETT MILNER
Research Assistants

JUDITH L. BETLER
Secretarial Assistant

Published by
The Bureau of Social and Religious Research

GARRETT THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
2121 Sheridan Road, Evanston, Illinois 60201

Printed by Mumm Print Shop, Inc.
Evanston, Illinois 60204

This report is dedicated to the memory of:

HORACE G. SMITH, 1881-1968
Prophetic Pioneer in Theological Education

and

AARON H. RAPKING, 1886-1968
Prophetic Pioneer in Town and Country Leadership

CONTENTS

PREFACE

Does knowledge of rural social science contribute to the effectiveness of a change agent's leadership in the rural community? That question haunts every teacher whose faith is that his academic program makes the practioner's efforts to improve rural community life at once more efficient and effective. Is that faith justified by fruits? Specifically does a rural pastor who possesses social science knowledge do measureably better work in his church and community than one who has no formal knowledge? This question motivates the research herein reported.

Such a study cannot be carried on without many helpers. Garrett Theological Seminary provided the sabbatical leave during which the field work was done. President Orville H. McKay assisted in soliciting funds for the project. The actual funds were provided by generous gifts from Dr. Horace Mallinson, Otisville, Michigan; The Committee on Rural Economic and Social Trends of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.; The Department of Research and Survey and The Department of Town and Country of the Board of Missions of The Methodist Church; The Interagency Committee on Research of The Methodist Church; and Ideas Unlimited. In addition the punching of the data on cards was done by the Department of Research, Records and Statistics of the Council on World Service and Finance of The Methodist Church through the courtesy of its Director, Dr. Alan K. Waltz. The facilities of the Vogelback Computing Center at Northwestern University were used to process the data.

Early consultation with Dr. Joseph Ackerman of The Farm Foundation and subsequent use of the Farm Foundation library helped to give the research focus. On two occasions the Technical Consultants of the Board of Missions of The Methodist Church criticized the research design and instruments and evaluated results. Mrs. Janet Black, Mrs. Barbara Cobb and Mrs. Beverly Milner, wives of the junior authors volunteered much time to such routine but essential chores as packing and stamping the mailings.

Throughout the report reference is made to the hundreds of informants who by letter or in person gave their time and expertise to the research. Among those who were unusually helpful were:

THE REVEREND HARRY SUMMERS
New Mexico Council of Churches, Albuquerque, New Mexico

THE REVEREND DOUGLAS WOFFORD
Wesley Foundation, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico

DR. C. R. MCBRIDE
Central Theological Seminary, Kansas City, Kansas

DR. HAROLD KAUFMAN
Mississippi State University, State College, Mississippi

DR. RALPH WILLIAMSON
Interdenominational Theological Center, Atlanta, Georgia

DR. WILSON NESBITT
Duke Divinity School, Durham, North Carolina
THE REVEREND ROBERT FRERICHS
Rural Church Center, Green Lake, Wisconsin
MRS. MELERSON GUY DUNHAM
Alcorn A & M College, Lorman, Mississippi
DR. HOWARD M. SAUER
South Dakota State University, Brookings, South Dakota
DR. ROBERT SKRABANEK
Texas A & M University, College Station, Texas
DR. MARVIN T. JUDY
Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas
THE REVEREND HAROLD M. BAILEY
Board of Home Missions, United Church of Canada, Toronto, Ontario, Canada
DR. DORRIS W. RIVERS
United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

All five members of the research team participated in all aspects of the study. The development of the questionnaires, drawing the sample of pastors, and oversight of mailing and coding was managed by Mr. Black. The historical materials in general and in Chapter II particularly were developed by Mr. Cobb. Mr. Milner supervised all computer operations, adapting standard programs and developing special programs as necessary. Miss Betler assisted with editing and coding in addition to being responsible for the typing of the report and tables.

The senior author is responsible for the project design, the field work, and writing the final report. Without the assistance of the colleagues mentioned above his work could not have been completed. He expresses his deep appreciation to them severally and to his wife Dr. Frances Smith, who participated in the early field work and then maintained the home enterprise while her husband completed the visitations. It is to be hoped that with so much time and effort invested the conclusions will lead to measureably better churches and communities in town and country.
January 1, 1969

ROCKWELL C. SMITH

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

This study explores the relationship of rural social science to theological education. Its thesis is that ability to think in social science terms on the part of a pastor working in a town and country community is positively related to a productive ministry in terms of both the local church and the town-country community in which that church functions. The theological seminary is an important, though not the exclusive, means of sharing the insights and methods of social science with the pastor during his days of professional preparation.

Some indication of the relative importance of the town and country church is due the general reader who may have been impressed by the current popular emphasis on urbanization. The term "rural" is not to be understood as a synonym for "farm". Much misunderstanding has arisen from the identification of these terms. A radical decline in the farm population has occurred since the end of World War II and the conclusion is erroneously drawn that the rural population has declined.

TABLE I. UNITED STATES POPULATION

	1950		1960	
	Number	%	Number	%
Total U. S. Population	150,697,361	100.0	179,325,671	100.0
Total Urban Population	96,467,686	64.0	125,283,783	69.9
Urban (2500-9999)	11,850,522	7.9	13,247,424	7.4
Other Urban	84,617,164	56.1	112,036,359	62.5
Total Rural Population	54,229,675	36.0	54,041,888	30.1
Rural Farm	23,048,350	15.3	13,444,898	7.5
Rural Nonfarm	31,181,323	20.7	40,596,990	22.6
Town and Country Population	66,080,197	43.9	67,289,312	37.5

1950—Table 34, U.S. Census of Population, Vol II, Charts of Population, Part I, U.S. Summary.
1960—Table 65, U.S. Census of Population, Vol. I, Charts of Population, Part I, U.S. Summary.

The relevant data are given in Table I. The rural farm population declined from twenty-three million to thirteen millior between 1950 and 1960 or 41.7%. But the rural nonfarm population increased from thirty-one million to forty and a half million or 30.2%, a larger rate of increase than either the total population (19.0%) or the urban population (29.9%). Thus the rural nonfarm population was the most rapidly growing section of our total population between 1950 and 1960 and there is no reason to believe that the situation has changed in the post-censal years. The total rural population, in spite of the dramatic farm losses, lost only .4% between 1950 and 1960. The town and country population, to use the church figure of persons living in communities of less than ten thousand, actually increased by 1.8% between 1950 and 1960. If we are talking about the rural population in the narrow Census definition we are discussing a base of fifty-four million people; if we use the

TABLE II.

MEMBERS OF METHODIST CHURCH 1965 BY SIZE OF CHURCH AND SIZE OF COMMUNITY

Community Size / Church Size	0-2499 Churches	0-2499 Members	2500-9999 Churches	2500-9999 Members	10,000 & Over Churches	10,000 & Over Members	Total
0-99	14,128	732,933	418	19,635	602	34,865	15,148 787,428
100-199	7,505	1,073,219	436	65,004	964	144,700	8,905 1,282,923
200-299	2,674	646,893	424	105,064	862	215,071	3,960 967,028
300-499	1,733	646,347	887	350,257	1,479	577,458	4,099 1,574,062
500-999	447	275,464	1,259	866,216	1,833	1,261,960	3,539 2,403,640
1000-1999	14	19,264	280	345,051	1,179	1,600,089	1,473 1,964,404
2000+	1	2,055	4	10,414	341	958,236	346 970,705
Total	26,502	3,396,175	3,708	1,761,641	7,260	4,792,374	37,470 9,950,190
Percentage	70.7%	34.1%	9.9%	17.7%	19.4%	48.2%	100.0% 100.0%
Average Size	128.2		475.1		660.1		

2106 churches with 241,281 members in Central Jurisdiction not included which have an average size of 114.6
Data compiled by the Department of Research, Records and Statistics, Council on World Service and Finance, The Methodist Church.

town and country base, we are talking about sixty-seven million people. Such a body of population is not to be regarded as insignificant or undeserving of our most critical attention.

How are Methodist churches located with respect to town and country population? Table II supplies the answer. The data for 1965, the latest available, indicate that 70.7% of our churches and 34.1% of our members are located in rural areas; an additional 9.9% of our churches and 17.7% of the members are in towns between 2500 and 9999 inhabitants. Thus eighty percent of our churches and fifty-one percent of our members are in town and country areas. The Methodist Church is a town and country church. The union of Methodists with the Evangelical United Brethren in the United Methodist Church increases the town and country percentages. Ministers who are to serve in the Methodist itineracy must be prepared to spend a substantial part of their occupational careers in town and country appointments.

TABLE III.

FIRST APPOINTMENT OF GARRETT B.D. GRADUATES IN CLASSES OF 1965, 1966, 1967

	Number	Percentage
Graduates 1965, 1966, 1967	215	100.00
Entered Pastorate (Size of community)	179	83.3
Less than 2500	95	44.2
2500-9999	22	10.2
10,000+	62	28.9
Did not enter Pastorate	36	16.7

Table III gives the data on the first appointment of the B.D. graduates of the last three years (1965, 1966, 1967) at Garrett. Eighty-three percent of them enter the pastorate while the remainder go on for further graduate work, enter the chaplaincy, become foreign missionaries, or enter a non-ministerial career. 54.4% go to town and country appointments while 28.9% receive urban appointments. The majority of current Garrett graduates begin their pastoral labors in town and country.

Thus far we have pointed out the importance of town and country people as a segment of the nation, their importance in the membership of the United Methodist Church and their importance as providing the setting in which a majority of Garrett graduates begin their ministry. These three facts make imperative a study of the role of rural social science in theological education. Two additional considerations add their weight to our purpose: the call for relevance on the part of the church and the fact that numerous young ministers are leaving the ministry.

It is fashionable to say that the church is simply not relevant to the life of contemporary man. A certain splendid irrelevance is the mark of an effective church, of course. If religion is to serve any ultimate purpose we judge our lives and cultures by the standards of the faith not the faith by the

standards of the culture. But to say that the church is irrelevant may simply mean that it is failing to be heard by, or to communicate with the average citizen of our day; or it may mean that what the church does in fact communicate to the average man is neither helpful to him at the point of his need nor representative of what is the essential and central message of faith. Irrelevance in either of the latter two senses is indeed tragic both for man and for the church.

To help the pastor communicate with his people the seminary can seek to make the pastor aware of the situations in which modern men are Christian. Rural social science analyzes that situation for town and country people. The pastor who has studied the town and country community in a rural sociological perspective will be aware of trends, structures and processes at work and the means of controlling and directing them. His understanding of this decision-making process will not be narrowly psychological or moral but will involve comprehension of the attitudes and behavior of persons in the context of social expectations and meanings. He will sense that his church members react to a particular program suggestion in terms of a whole complex of factors, practical and symbolic, beyond the single church activity.

With this realistic appraisal of the decision-making process the pastor will be able to frame his suggestions and develop his program in terms that will enlist the support of his people. They will be able to see what he is trying to do in terms which make sense to them and to accept or reject particular programs on realistic assessment. Slowly but certainly they will sense the ultimate relevance of religion because they will feel it taking hold of the life they are currently living. Social science understanding and method make this possible.

Our second consideration is the fact that many young ministers give up the ministry after a short pastoral experience. In one denomination recently in a western state in a single year nineteen young men left the pastorate, most of them leaving the ministry as well. National journals have published a number of apologia on the general theme, "Why I Left the Ministry." Most such apologia indicate the sense of aloneness on the part of the young minister, his feeling that the people whom he had been called to lead actually reject him and his leadership. The majority of young men begin their ministry in town and country areas; lack of preparation to understand the social pattern and interaction of the people whom they serve there may produce such frustration and sense of impotence that the pastor leaves the ministry—a loss to the total church, urban as well as town and country.

If such reasoning is correct and if the majority of pastors begin their ministry in town and country, it is clear that whatever helps a young man to be effective in his ministry there will safeguard his entire ministry. In a real sense the future of a great majority of ministers lies in the hands of town and country people. Special preparation to understand town and country settings and to serve country people in the context of their own expectations

is the best preparation for a young man to serve anywhere in the church. Many young men if they do not get such help will not serve anywhere in the church very long.

Enough has been said to point out the importance of our concern. Does the teaching of rural social science in the seminary do in fact what we may argue a priori it will do? Do rural pastors with social science knowledge lead effectively in their churches and relate those churches significantly to the communities of which they are a part?

CHAPTER II

FROM TEAM HAUL TO NON-METROPOLITAN COMMUNITY

On August 10, 1908, President Theodore Roosevelt appointed a Commission on Country Life. In the introduction to the Commission's report published in 1911, President Roosevelt said:

> The work and the life of the farm are closely bound together, and the institutions of the country react on that life and on one another more intimately than they do in the city. This gives the rural church a postion of peculiar difficulty and one of unequalled opportunity. The time has arrived when the church must take a larger leadership, both as an institution and through its pastors, in the social reorganization of rural life.[1]

The suggestion of interaction between rural society and the church is President Roosevelt's reflection on three hundred years of history. Changes in rural life in America were constantly being met by adjustments and developments in the churches of rural communities. In the pre-revolutionary colonial period American society was almost entirely agricultural with a heavy emphasis on subsistence agriculture even in the plantation south; most colonies had an established church reflecting the European piety from which the settlers had come; there was an educated ministry whose theological training was classical in the European sense. The early national period prior to the Civil War saw the expansion of the frontier to the west; society was still dominantly based on subsistence agriculture, but commercialization was beginning; the established churches were in no position to serve the frontier, sectarian churches prospered and a new ministry evolved: among the Baptists it was a farmer-ministry, among the Methodists a traveling ministry, but in both cases a ministry largely untrained in any academic sense. In the post-Civil War period the agricultural frontier was pushed rapidly westward into lands which were not suited to subsistence agriculture, but to extreme specialization; industrialization and urbanization provided a ready market for agricultural products thus encouraging commercialization along with specialization; in commercialized agriculture there went a measure of mechanization, but the

farmer still depended almost entirely on organic power, chiefly horses, for his motor power; denominational forces consolidated their holdings, built churches and established ministries largely in terms of the team haul; the several denominations began to establish theological seminaries for formal ministerial training and a theologically trained ministry gradually developed; this was also the period in which agriculturalists became self-conscious with the rise of the Grange, the Farmers Alliance, the Society of Equity and the Farmers' Union.

Thus to summarize three hundred years of history is manifestly to do less than justice to the richness and diversity of American rural life prior to 1908. But it does remind us that President Roosevelt and the Country Life Commission spoke out of prior history. We begin a more detailed consideration with 1908 only because rural social science scarely existed prior to that date. The meaning of much that transpired since 1908 however lies in what began long before that date. To mention only one example: how can we possibly understand the dispersed farm homestead type of settlement so characteristic of American rural life as contrasted with Europe or Asia unless we recognize the formative influence of the frontier, free land, the Pre-emption Acts and the Homestead Act?

The Country Life Commission listed several problems of the rural church: lack of resident pastors; relation of pastors of different denominations; very few services; little personal visitation; part time Sunday Schools; few young people's groups; limited social activity; restricted social influence; plurality of churches of different denominations; low salaries; etc. Moreover emphasis was placed upon the rural pastor as a community leader, one who knew the rural problems, had sympathy with rural ideals and aspirations and loved the country. The rural pastor needed special training for this work. "Ministerial colleges and theological seminaries should unite with agricultural colleges in the preparation of the country clergyman."[2]

In a real sense the investigations and report of the Country Life Commission were rural social science. The report, published in 1911, led, as Brunner points out, to the choice of "Rural Life" as the topic for the American Sociological Society's annual meeting in 1912.[3] There a group of interested members began an informal conversation which grew into the rural sociological section of the Society and eventually (1938) into the autonomous Rural Sociological Society. At least three of the twelve who constituted that first group were ministers, one of them was a theological school teacher, Professor Edwin Earp of Drew Seminary.

An attempt to bring whatever rural social science insights were currently available to pastors in town and country areas was already being made by two institutional complexes: the colleges of agriculture through their extension programs and the agencies of interdenominational cooperation. Activity among colleges of agriculture for the training of rural ministers is evidenced as early as 1910 in schools such as The Agricultural College at East Lansing,

Michigan; the State Agricultural College at Orono, Maine; the Massachusetts College of Agriculture at Amherst; and Cornell University at Ithaca, New York.

In 1910, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America called Dr. George Frederick Wells to its staff to maintain a "bureau and clearing house of research, information, and promotion, touching the various church and country life interests."[4] The Home Missions Council of North America, formed in 1908, entered the rural field in 1912 by organizing a Committee on Rural Fields, with Warren H. Wilson as chairman. This committee suggested studies of communities and the selection of proving grounds, and recommended "courses to farmers including moral and religious conditions of the country."[5] In 1914 the Y.M.C.A. conducted three schools for rural leadership.

The early movements for ministerial education in rural social science were either nondenominational or interdenominational. A very important development was the tentative program for the better training of rural ministers created by the Massachusetts Federation of Churches in 1915. They set forth principles of preparation and a suggested course of study. For example: (1) the seminary curriculum should include: biblical literature-history and interpretation; the history of Christianity, especially in the modern period in America; research work, and reports on rural movements, and reports on biography; theology-biblical, historical and systematic; homiletics and pastoral methods; general sociology and the specific problems of the rural church; psychology and pedogogy, and special study of the rural Sunday school; (2) potential rural ministers should, in schools other than seminaries, make a study of agriculture, including farm practice and management and the application of science to farm problems; agricultural economics, including cooperation and market distribution; farm business methods; and advanced rural sociology including rural education, art and literature, recreation, sanitation, and social organization. Such studies were to be pursued in summer schools, correspondence courses, or one or two years in an agricultural college.[6]

The committee also suggested that men already in the ministry should have an opportunity to supplement their previous training, and to receive occasional stimulus through: (1) summer schools, in session of two weeks or more; (2) addresses and conferences at church associations and conventions; (3) Rural Institutes, where speakers from seminaries, Y.M.C.A.'s, agricultural colleges, and other rural agencies may discuss their common interests and lay plans for cooperation; (4) correspondence courses maintained by seminaries and agricultural colleges, helping the student keep in touch with the most recent investigations and conclusions; and (5) local groups, such as reading clubs, improvement societies, and other agencies of local betterment, to help unite progressive forces of the community.[7]

The Report of the Committee on the Training of the Rural Ministry by the Commission on Church and Country Life under the authority of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America in December, 1915

substantially agreed with the Committee of the Massachusetts Federation of Churches. Theological education must provide for thorough training of rural ministers in cultivating the powers of observation, reflection, concentration, and persistent intellectual toil. "In no case should he (the rural pastor) be thought to be inferior in social attainments or intellectual gifts and still be thought to be suited to a country parish because of this inferiority. Our country ministers and our country churches must be made to feel a self-respect that is not possible so long as they are regarded as not quite the equals of their city contempories."[8]

The committee suggested, that to its general courses, seminaries might add elective courses in the country church as a community center, rural sociology, rural social organization, and rural social engineering, all with a view to informing the student in the social problems he would face in the parish, and the position he would have to take as a leader. Such a position would require training for leadership. This did not mean, said the committee, that the rural pastor ought to receive agricultural training in seminary, for it was unreasonable to expect seminaries to maintain an agricultural faculty. However, the seminaries should help the pastors to become sympathetic and interested in the work of the farm.

The committee also suggested that seminaries help provide continuing education for alumni. Alumni should read continuously in rural matters, and seminaries ought to provide correspondence courses and summer school short courses with a fair division between fundamental subjects (i.e. biblical courses, church history) and specialized subjects such as rural economics or rural sociology.[9]

The denominational boards followed the agricultural colleges and inter-denominational agencies into the field. The Presbyterian church was the first to provide national leadership in the rural church movement, with the Presbyterian Department of Church and Country Life in 1910. During a seven year period, the department made surveys in 12 states, issued 18 reports of their work, and pointed out such facts as: the type of pastors who succeeded and failed, and the kind of parish program which was successful or unsuccessful. Dr. Warren H. Wilson, superintendent of the department, by 1920 was supervising demonstration parishes in 15 states.[10]

Departments of Rural Church Work began to spring up in other denominations. For example: Methodist Episcopal—1917; Congregational-Christian—1919; American Baptist—1919; Evangelical and Reformed—1922; Roman Catholic—1923; Protestant Episcopal—1924; Presbyterian Church in the U.S.—1925; United Lutheran—1926; Church of the Brethren —1927; Disciples of Christ—1943; Southern Baptist—1944; National Lutheran Council—1945; Evangelical United Brethren—1947; Cumberland Presbyterian—1950; United Presbyterian—1950; National Baptist—1953; and Church of God—1956.[11]

Typical of these programs is that of the Methodists worked out by Dr. Paul L. Vogt, a lay executive concerned for the training of community-minded Methodist ministers. He found that theological seminaries were training men away from the country, instead of equipping them to become rural pastors. Thus, he began a series of in-service training schools, Ralph Felton being responsible for organizing and directing the summer schools. The purpose was to train a new generation of rural pastors. Among the early Methodist rural teachers were Edwin L. Earp, Mark A. Dawber, C. M. McConnell, and Aaron Rapking. As with the other denominational rural church departments the Methodist rural church department was to publish monthly bulletins dealing with church methods for rural pastors; to conduct in-service training schools; to conduct parish surveys; to prepare literature; and to represent the rural church in all of the denomination's plans.[12]

The successful rural pastors, employed by Vogt, taught in a series of three week summer schools usually held at Methodist colleges and seminaries. The first of the schools was held at Drew Theological Seminary. The pastor-teachers extended their outreach by teaching rural church courses in forty or fifty Epworth League Summer Institutes, and in Camp Meeting Associations.[13]

Thus far we have dealt with social science training for the ministry with only marginal attention to the theological seminary, the institution specifically charged with such training. We have noted that counsel was addressed to the seminaries by interdenominational boards and aid was given them by denominational executives in providing special social science training for rural pastors. But we might have expected more from them of leadership in this significant movement.

The truth is that such an expectation would have been both unfair and unrealistic. The evangelical denominations such as the Baptists and Methodists were by no means clear that they wished to have an educated ministry in the early nineteen hundreds. Their seminaries were fighting not to provide specialized training for specialized ministries but some training for the general ministry. For example, only five of the twelve Methodist seminaries now active were in operation in 1908. Two others, Gammon Theological Seminary now a part of the Interdenominational Theological Center and Westminster Theological Seminary now Wesley Seminary, were in operation. All had significantly lower enrollments than is now the case and the annual conferences at that time did not require seminary training for conference membership.

Following 1908 others were founded as follows:

Candler School of Theology,
Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia—1914

Perkins School of Theology,
Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas—1915

The Divinity School,
Duke University, Durham, North Carolina—1926

Saint Paul School of Theology Methodist,
Kansas City, Missouri—1958
Methodist Theological School,
Delaware, Ohio—1960

Nonetheless the seminaries were aware of what was happening and gave place to rural social science presentations in one way or another in their offerings. We have already noted that Dr. Earp of Drew was among the group which founded the rural sociological section in the American Sociological Society. Brunner tells us that by 1925 two-fifths of American seminaries had at least a lectureship in the field of rural church.[14]

The developments we have been sketching all took place within the second decade of the twentieth century. It is paradoxical that increased attention was focused on problems and difficulties of the rural community and rural church at a time when agriculture was in its economically most prosperous period since the Civil War. The years 1909-1914 because of the high level of agricultural prices have been used as the base years for determining parity prices until "new parity" concepts were developed in the fifties. And subsequent to 1914 the World War I years extended and amplified the prosperity already achieved. During these years the four fold foundation of rural social science for the ministry was established: the agricultural college, the interdenominational agency, the denominational department, and the theological seminary.

It was fortunate indeed that this foundation had been established for the third and fourth decades of the century were to prove difficult ones for rural people. In 1920 an agricultural depression began which became general and worldwide after 1929. Falling prices for agricultural commodities made it impossible for the farmer to support the debt load he had assumed in the expansion of the war years. When the farmer defaulted upon his interest payments, the bank forclosed his mortgage. When he failed to pay his taxes, the county took over his property as tax delinquent. But banks could not run farms nor could the county government for that matter and so began that round of deflation that eventually swept whole communities into economic collapse. In the end only a bank moratorium and radical intervention by the national government succeeded in halting the total social collapse.

In the midst of that collapse stood the town and country church. Its properties decayed; it ministers were required to serve on salaries that became more and more meager as the depression deepened; its lay leadership was anxious and confused. As the cities became involved in the economic collapse, thousands of people returned to the farms and the small towns where housing and a subsistence at least were available to them, their need further burdening already over-taxed rural institutions. And rural population was further increased by the damming up of the flow of youth which characteristically had moved from the farms to the cities. Thus underpaid and unpaid pastors working in poorly maintained and inadequately equipped properties were asked

to minister to confused and displaced persons for whom there seemed little meaning in life or hope for living.

The four agencies of ministerial education we have mentioned reacted in way characterized by variety and ingenuity. Typical of the college of agriculture approach was the program at Wisconsin. In 1921 the Town and Country Church Leaders Conferences in Wisconsin were begun when a group of clergy and laymen interested in the rural churches in Wisconsin called upon representatives of the College of Agriculture asking for assistance in training conferences for rural pastors. The earliest conferences gave attention to rural sociology, agricultural economics, and the rural community, but in addition gave attention to auto mechanics, poultry raising, gardening, and stock judging, as well as various forms of recreation leadership. Instruction was offered in such fields as country church administration, Sunday School methods, religious drama, and the rural church.[15] Such programs continued through the two decades.

Dr. Hugh A. Moran was instrumental in setting up the Rural Institute for Religious Leaders, later named the Rural Church Institute, on the Cornell University Campus at Ithaca, New York, in 1935. It was to train leaders for the rural churches, at home and abroad, and to provide a field service, paralleling for the rural church the extension service of the State College of Agriculture in New York. The program was expanded to provide a summer project for training theological students of several eastern seminaries.[16]

Interdenominational agencies continued their interest and activity as well. The Agricultural Missions Foundation was organized in 1930 helping to carry on independent work in the field of agricultural or rural missions and also cooperating with existing, especially foreign, missionary organizations. The Home Missions Council and the Federal Council in 1935 held a national convocation on the theme, "What Are the Elements of a Satisfactory National Plan for the Improvement of the Rural Church". Speaking to that group Malcolm Dana said:

> Are curricula authoritative and trustworthy, so often devised by cloistered faculties, far removed from field contact, decades away from actual pastoral experience, and, worst of all, with no contact with, or knowledge of, or sympathy for, the rural church—a church which is the majority church of America?[17]
>
> Seminaries, executives, and rural ministers themselves are grossly guilty of 'using' rural churches as 'stepping stones' . . . We start our young ministers in the country. If they fail there, they remain in such churches. If they succeed, they are lifted out, and sent to the city. If they fail in city churches, they are sent back to rural pastorates.[18]

Regional developments such as the formation of the New England Town and Country Church Commission (NETAC) in Ocean Park, Maine, 1931, supplemented national interdenominational agencies.

> NETAC sought to improve living conditions, increase ministers' salaries, provide an improved program for the rural church and to

find new recruits for the rural ministry. It encouraged the formation of larger parishes, provided vacation school leadership for needy areas, aided in the federation of churches with grants of money and with leadership, and encouraged various pioneering ventures among rural churches.[19]

National denominational boards also did their part in attempting to offer to ministers the counsel social science could bring to their tasks. During the latter 1930's and throughout the 1940's special institutes and agencies for the training of rural pastors began to increase. Dr. Arthur E. Holt, of the Chicago Theological Seminary was instrumental in the establishment of Merom Rural Life Institute in 1936 at Merom, Indiana. It was an attempt to supply an institution which would help vitalize and socialize the religious culture of rural life. Among the functions of the Merom Rural Life Institute were educational activities on the campus as well as extension services; research in rural life; demonstration community organization; training rural leadership; and the furthering of interdenominational cooperation.[20] Merom was the oldest and best known of the Congregational Rural Regional Centers, but others were also established at Roanoke, Alabama; Deering, New Hampshire; Lisle, New York; and in southeastern Missouri at Delmo.[21] As early as 1938 Merom became the meeting place of an annual gathering of the Interseminary Rural Life Conference, which was a rather informal organization of faculty and students of seminaries in the Middle West who were interested in rural work, regardless of denomination.[22]

The reference to Dr. Holt above indicates that the seminaries were also at work in these troubled decades. Though struggling with the financial limitations that dogged their constituencies they maintained an interest in the rural church and a concern for teaching rural social science. Dr. Ralph Felton at Drew interested himself particularly in the rural church on the foreign mission field and among Negroes in the rural South. One of his most distinguished doctoral students, Harry Richardson, moved to leadership at Tuskeegee, then Gammon Methodist Seminary at Atlanta and finally the Presidency of the Interdenominational Theological Union at Atlanta.

At Boston, Mark Dawber carried on imaginatively until called to an executive position with the Home Missions Council. He was succeeded by C. M. "Pat" McConnell, motivator of and pastor to generations of theological students who became rural pastors. Dawber looking back on his experiences in his book, *Rebuilding Rural America* (1937) pointed out that in 1937 at Bangor Theological Seminary in Maine all student pastors were serving rural churches in communities of under 2500 (100%); at Iliff Theological School, Colorado, all but 3 were serving in rural or small town charges (94%); at Garrett Biblical Institute, Illinois, 82% were serving the rural field; and at Drew Theological Seminary, New Jersey, 82% were doing so.[23] Among his suggestions for seminary training were: 1. Seminaries should require that members of their faculty spend one year in seven serving a rural church. 2. Seminaries should make a policy of requiring a period of field work of their students.[24]

Also important was the formation in the 1920's of the Interseminary Commission for Training for the Rural Ministry in New England. It embraced six theological seminaries: Bangor Theological Seminary in Maine, Boston University School of Theology and Andover Newton Theological Institution in Massachusetts, Hartford Theological Seminary and Yale Divinity School in Connecticut, and Union Theological Seminary in New York. Through a grant from John D. Rockefeller, Jr., professors of rural church were placed in these theological schools, while Dr. Malcolm Dana was made Director of Research. The two main contributions of the Interseminary Conference have been its continuous emphasis upon rural church training as a necessary part of theological work, and its perfecting of a plan of supervised summer field work for seminary students.[25]

Dr. J. M. Ormond of the Divinity School of Duke University made a creative use of the funds of the Duke endowment to provide better church buildings for rural churches and to subsidize summer internships for seminary students in rural churches. The Reverend Clare Hewitt, first at Garrett and then at Bangor, added his insight and spirit of dedication to the work of theological training. To list names is to guarantee that some appropriate name will be neglected.

By 1940 the general depression was lifting and the inflation which was to characterize the World War II and immediately succeeding years raised farm prices and produced economic resources for the rehabilitation of rural churches and their programs. The period was also the beginning of the accelerating decline in farm population, the increasing mechanization and industrialization of farming, and the rise of the rural nonfarm population to numerical superiority in rural life. Rural sociologists and agricultural economists gave their attention to these phenomena and developed studies of changing ecological and demographic patterns, the socio-psychological patterns of the diffusion and adoption of new farm practices, the procedures by which social change takes place in a community, the social class structures of rural society and the role of social institutions in changing communities.

These studies were reflected in programs of the agricultural colleges. In the year 1947 the administration of the Wisconsin Town and Country Church Leaders Conferences and Schools changed greatly. J. H. Kolb persuaded the president of the University that now rather than being a responsibility of the department of Rural Sociology in the College of Agriculture these schools should become a responsibility of the total University and that urban church leaders should be included along with rural church leaders. The schools should now have a place in the total University program of off-campus education. Thus in 1947 the interdenominational meeting for town and country church leaders emphasized since about 1938 was dropped and replaced by a four day Wisconsin Pastors Conference under the co-sponsorship of the University of Wisconsin and the Wisconsin Council of Churches. In 1949 a series of annual Rural Life Institutes for Catholic Seminarians was launched. Most of the instructional staff came from the

College of Agriculture and organizations and agencies working in rural areas.[26]

A. F. Wileden, Professor Emeritus of the Rural Sociology Department of the University of Wisconsin, quotes the official published purpose of the Wisconsin Church Leaders Conferences:

> The purpose . . . to make available . . . the resources of the University, and to give . . . available information regarding the great social and economic forces which (are) influencing rural life. It has never been the policy to suggest how rural churches or other social institutions should be administered, nor have there been attempts to enter those fields of instruction which belong peculiarly to the church.[27]

A conference concerned with "Planning In-Service Training For Rural Clergy by Land-Grant Colleges" held at the University of Wisconsin in 1960 set these tasks for the colleges: (1) to continue the education of the ministry beyond seminary in the context of his special ministry; (2) to supplement the education of the ministry by offering courses which the college and seminary can not or do not provide; (3) to initiate the education of the ministry in new and changing problems, situations, and circumstances; (4) to reconstruct faulty or outmoded motivation, stereotypes, concepts, and patterns.[28]

The conference insisted that the denomination also had a related role: (1) to keep itself aware of the changing requirement for its ministry; (2) to understand the characteristics of the churches in reference to their neighborhoods or communities; (3) to provide opportunities for its clergy to have in-service training for continuing education available to them; (4) to cooperate with available institutions which can more expertly and adequately supply local, area, and regional needs.[29]

The stress on a new cooperative approach to the training of rural pastors was not new. In the late thirties Dr. Murray Leiffer of Garrett Biblical Institute and Dr. David Lindstrom of the Department of Rural Sociology, University of Illinois, became interested in closer collaboration between theological seminaries and agricultural colleges in the training of ministers for town and country. In 1939 a Conference on Cooperation between Theological Seminaries and Agricultural Colleges was held which continued to meet each year until 1943. In 1943 the organization was regionalized. The delegates, representatives of theological seminaries, colleges of agriculture, and the national departments of town and country church, made progress in such areas as recognizing otherwise qualified students from colleges of agriculture as equivalent to students with traditional B.A. degrees and in encouraging some of the theological schools to make arrangements whereby a student could get some of his theological training at an agricultural college.[30]

The interdenominational bodies still felt and expressed their concern. The Home Missions Council established the biennial National Convocation on the Church in Town and Country in 1943. In that same year the Federal Council of Churches later to join with the Home Missions Council and a number of other cooperative bodies to become the National Council of Churches (1950) began publishing *The Town and Country Church.* It

circulated to rural pastors and contained articles, book reviews, poems, cartoons—all the material of a magazine. Its stated purposes were: "(1) to encourage cooperation among rural churches; (2) to improve the administration of the local church . . .; (3) to stimulate the development of a Christian philosophy of rural life . . ."[31] It ceased publication in 1968.

Denominations continued to employ national rural church leaders. For example: in 1941 the Evangelical and Reformed Church with the union of the Reformed Church in the United States and the Evangelical Synod of North America, re-established a committee on town and country work naming the Reverend Claude J. Snyder as secretary; in 1944 Dr. Court Redford took over rural work as assistant to the executive secretary of the Board of Home Missions of the Southern Baptist Convention; in 1945 the Division of Missions of the National Lutheran Council established a rural church program with the Reverend E. W. Mueller as secretary; in 1946 the National Baptist Convention appointed the Reverend V. A. Edwards as executive head of a town and country department; in 1947 the Evangelical United Brethren Church established a Commission on Town and Country Work with the Reverend B. H. Cain as secretary; in 1950 the Cumberland Presbyterian Church organized a Rural Church Department with the Reverend G. Calvin Baird the head in 1952 after Hubert Murrou had been a part-time head; the United Presbyterians in 1950 set up a Town and Country Department in its Board of American Missions with Dr. George Kerr as secretary; and in 1956 the Church of God established a Department of Town and Country Work within its Department of Evangelism with Louis P. Meyer as head.[32]

The Protestant Episcopal Church in 1945 established the Roanridge Rural Training Foundation with the objectives of:

> 1. Training of young seminarians through an intensive course of lectures, field work, contacts with farm life and farm work, and pastoral work with country people, for a vocation as minister to to rural communities; 2. Similar training of young women for service in religious education in rural areas; 3. Community study and research for developing sound methods for Christian service in rural areas; 4. nurturing Christian congregations among the unchurched rural people of Western Missouri; 5. demonstrating at Roanridge sound farming practice in conservation of land and resources; and 6. demonstrating and promoting homestead agriculture for the enrichment of the livelihood of the small landowners and the rural clergy.[33]

Courses included, among others, rural sociology, farm organizations, rural health, and the rural church. In the 1950's the training program at Roanridge was decentralized through four additional institute centers with the director of Roanridge being in charge of the total program. The training was similar to that instituted at Roanridge.

In 1945 the Division of Town and Country of the Protestant Episcopal Church began a unique type of service to its ten seminaries. It provided six rural training centers during the three summer months to which the seminaries could send their students for special instruction and field supervision in the

area of rural work. From 1945 to 1960 approximately 10% of the total seminary enrollment participated in this program, 490 seminary students 60 women in church work training, and 15 army chaplain trainees completing the work.[34]

The Rural Church Center at Green Lake, Wisconsin, was organized in 1945 as a national in-service training center for town and country ministers in the American Baptist Convention. Four schools of 16 days' length were held each year, three denominational and one interdenominational, the latter being planned jointly with the Wisconsin Council of Churches and the Interdenominational Department of Town and Country Church of the National Council of Churches. The purpose of the schools for ministers, ministers' wives and laymen was to acquaint students with: ". . . . the rural church movement; improved programs including rural evangelism, administration, preaching, and related subjects; church organizations; the use of the Bible in teaching and preaching in the rural community; worship materials; Christian education; a treatment of other aspects of the minister's work; and a study of vital rural economic and social movements:"[35]

In this time of flux the seminaries made their response as well. More chairs in rural sociology were established. Dr. Rockwell C. Smith took such a position at Garrett Biblical Institute in 1940; Dr. C. Morton Hanna did the same at the Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky in 1941; and Dr. Calvin Schnucker became professor of rural church at Dubuque Theological Seminary in Iowa in 1942.[36] Dr. C. R. McBride established a Department of Town and Country Work at Central Baptist Theological Seminary in Kansas City, Kansas in 1949.

The Farm Foundation, Chicago, Illinois, was founded in 1933 on the conviction that through self-help rural life might become more productive economically and more rewarding socially and culturally. Thus, it sought to supplement and coordinate the work of agencies and initiate new projects. An important function of the Farm Foundation was its underwriting of theological training for rural ministers. For example, in 1954-55 the Foundation designated a total of six thousand dollars ($6,000.00) to ten rural church services, conferences, centers or schools.[37] Working with the Farm Foundation and Dr. Henry Taylor, its director, Murray H. Leiffer of Garrett established in 1939 the Interdenominational School for Rural Leaders. Here on the part of a seminary was an explicit effort to bring the current findings of rural social science to the service of town and country pastors. The plan called for bringing a rural sociologist and an agricultural economist generally from land-grant colleges to teach their respective disciplines to pastors. Scholarships were offered covering tuition and room for the term through denominational town and country officials. Often the denominations supplemented these grants to cover meals, books, and travel. The school, still in operation, has become a two-way street: professors bringing scientific insight to the pastors, pastors calling the attention of professors to unsolved problems in their communities.

The Rural Seminary at Columbia, Missouri, was established in 1952 as a four year school with classes three days a week. The training was standard in that it taught the subjects ordinarily taught in a theological school. However, it was rural in that it had a strong department of rural church. Courses were taught in agriculture and sociology by specialists from the College of Agriculture while rural leaders made visits. The school was set up along the lines of the College of Agriculture, with three branches—resident instruction, research and extension. The student body and faculty were interdenominational. Support for the school came from denominations, foundations, business enterprises, churches and individuals.[38]

In 1943 under the leadership of the Iowa State College of Agriculture at Ames, a farm survey school running six weeks each summer was established, giving theological students of Dubuque Theological Seminary and other seminaries courses in agronomy, animal husbandry, and agricultural economics.[39]

Ralph Felton in his book, *The Pulpit and The Plow,* reported special training for rural pastors available in theological seminaries in the year 1960. More than one-half of all the accredited seminaries in the United States offered special courses dealing with the rural church. More than one-half of these schools had the full-time services of one or more rural instructors. Thus, 23 seminaries had a rural church department with one or more professors giving full-time to the rural church. Out of each 100 student pastorates approximately 90 of them were in rural churches. The supervisor of field work, the rural church instructor, and the teachers of homiletics and pastoral work used the student parishes for practical demonstrations. Student pastors were visited each year with a discussion of their sermons, program, etc. Most student pastors were required to attend counseling sessions weekly or monthly. Thus, student rural parishes became teaching laboratories.[40]

In addition to courses in rural church and student pastorates, Felton pointed to other aspects of special seminary training. Most teachers of rural courses supervised rural research projects by their students. In the beginning, students made simple parish surveys, studied population trends, and marked out parish boundaries. However, as students progressed the projects became larger and were often published and widely used. For example, Felton cited 10 seminaries he considered typical which during a four year period published 31 research studies or nearly an average of one per year for each school.[41]

Felton classified the courses offered in most rural departments into two general groups: those designed to help students understand rural life, including courses such as rural sociology, rural community organization, rural psychology, and frequently elementary agriculture; and those courses which dealt with rural church methods or administration, designed to help adapt a well-rounded church program to meet specific rural needs.

A significant new ally to enter the field of sharing rural social science with the minister in training developed in the denominational college.

Simpson College at Indianola, Iowa, developed a Town and Country Church Program jointly with the Department of Town and Country Work of the Methodist Church and the Iowa-Des Moines Annual Conference. Eugene Carter began that work in 1946 and it has been continued by Donald Koontz. Other Methodist colleges have developed similar programs and annual meetings of town and country church professors have been held. The purpose of the movement is to offer supervision to the several students on denominational campuses who serve rural churches while in college.

In 1952 an in-service training program was organized by the West Virginia Baptist State Convocation with headquarters at Alderson-Broadus College in Philippi, West Virginia. The aim of this pre-theological program was to raise the level of training and competence among rural pastors of West Virginia. Academic credit was given for courses in the fields of the Bible, English, speech, psychology, sociology, history, and physical science. There were no courses in the rural church.[42]

Perhaps where we now stand can best be illustrated by noting that the Methodists since 1947 have conducted Quadrennial Conferences on the Town and Country Church. Plans were under way for such a conference for 1967. The suggestion was somewhat casually made that other denominations might find it convenient to hold their similar convocations at the same time as the Methodists so that a few mass meetings would provide a provocative audience for national leaders. A counter proposition that all join together in a single conference which would transcend denominational lines was presented and accepted. The denominations under common ecumenical leadership and with a study book prepared by young leaders from the seminaries, colleges and boards of the churches met in early September, 1967 in Columbus, Ohio at Ohio State University, one of the great land-grant colleges. All the agencies of which we have been speaking were thus united in a single operation around the theme: "Ecumenical Designs: Imperatives For Action In Non-Metropolitan America".

This historical review has indicated that rural life in the last sixty years in the United States has developed from a society with horizons limited by the capacity of a horse's strength to a society with horizons set by radio, television and the jet. Social science has charted these changes and noted their meanings for man. Rural man has moved in two generations from the team-haul community to the non-metropolitan service complex. Four institutional complexes have shared the new insights of developing rural social science with the rural minister: the agricultural college, now become the state university; the interdenominational agency, now outstripping organizational bonds as the ecumenical movement; the denominational department of town and country work; and the theological seminary, recently given an assist by the denominational college. We have seen that again and again these four discrete agencies have made common cause because they share a common concern. We now propose to make test of the effectiveness of the training they have provided in order to suggest where they might move tomorrow.

FOOTNOTES

[1] *Report of the Commission on Country Life,* New York: Van Rees Press, 1911, p. 138.
[2] *Ibid.,* p. 144.
[3] Edmund deS. Brunner, *The Growth of A Science,* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957, p. 3.
[4] Mark Rich, *The Rural Church Movement,* Columbia, Missouri: Juniper Knoll Press, 1957, p. 66.
[5] *Ibid.,* p. 67.
[6] Paul L. Vogt (ed.), *The Church and Country Life,* New York: Missionary Education Movement of the United States and Canada, 1916, p. 141.
[7] *Ibid.,* p. 141-142.
[8] *Ibid.,* p. 144.
[9] *Ibid.,* p. 149-150.
[10] Ralph G. Felton, *The Pulpit and the Plow,* New York: Friendship Press, 1960, p. 24-25.
[11] *Ibid.,* p. 27.
[12] *Ibid.,* p. 25-26.
[13] Rich, *Op. Cit.,* p. 106.
[14] *Ibid.,* p. 108-109.
[15] A. F. Wileden, *45 Years of Church Leaders Conferences in Wisconsin,* Madison, Wisconsin: Town and Country Church Leaders Conference, 1966, p. 5-6.
[16] Rich, *Op. Cit.,* p. 135-137.
[17] *The Rural Church Today and Tomorrow,* New York: The Home Missions Council and the Council of Women for Home Missions, 1936, p. 62.
[18] *Ibid.,* p. 62-63.
[19] Rich, *Op. Cit.,* p. 129.
[20] *Ibid.,* p. 145.
[21] *Ibid.,* p. 145.
[22] *Ibid.,* p. 145.
[23] Mark A. Dawber, *Rebuilding Rural America,* New York; Friendship Press, 1937, p. 129.
[24] *Ibid.,* p. 129.
[25] Rich, *Op Cit.,* p. 130-131.
[26] Wileden, *Op. Cit.,* p. 9-11.
[27] *Ibid.,* p. 3
[28] *Ibid.,* p. 3.
[29] *Ibid.,* p. 3.
[30] Rich, *Op. Cit.,* p. 151
[31] *Ibid.,* p. 157.
[32] *Ibid.,* p. 156
[33] *Ibid.,* p. 192.
[34] Felton, *Op. Cit.,* p. 147.
[35] Rich, *Op. Cit.,* p. 193-194.
[36] *Ibid.,* p. 152.
[37] *Ibid.,* p. 131-132.
[38] *Ibid.,* p. 195
[39] *Ibid.,* p. 196.
[40] Felton, *Op. Cit.,* p. 144-145.
[41] *Ibid.,* p. 146.
[42] Rich, *Op. Cit.,* p. 196-197.

CHAPTER III

RURAL SOCIAL SCIENTISTS AND THE MINISTRY

To test the relevance of knowledge in the field of the social sciences to the day-to-day operations of a rural pastor it was necessary to limit a body of such knowledge which might conceivably be related to his tasks and over which he might be tested. Logically practitioners in the field of rural social science should be equipped to define such a field. The concern of rural sociologists for town and country churches and their efforts to educate rural pastors has been described in Chapter II. The Rural Sociological Society is the professional organization for practitioners in this field; hence a questionnaire was sent to the active and joint members of the Society working in the United States.

The questionnaire, a copy of which is included in the appendix, was developed to elicit the judgment of the members of the Society as to the importance of key concepts and methods for the work of the pastor in the rural community. 49 representative concepts were chosen from current text books supplemented by the five most recent volumes of Rural Sociology, the journal of the Society. Rural Sociologists were asked: (1) to rank each of the 49 as "of major importance", "important" or "of minor importance" for a pastor to understand if he is to work effectively in a rural community; (2) to classify eleven research methods as either ones the pastor "should be able to use", ones he "should understand" and those that were "non-essential". Opinions as to present social skills and social status of rural pastors were invited. A final question asked for five books in rural sociology which a pastor should read. The questionnaire was anonymous but certain characteristics of the respondents were asked as a basis for testing homogeneity of response.

TABLE IV.

MEMBERS OF THE RURAL SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY BY CENSUS REGIONS

Census Region	The Total Society		The Respondents	
	Number	%	Number	%
Total	343	100.0	204	100.0
No Data			7	
New England	10	2.9	6	3.0*
Middle Atlantic	47	13.7	27	13.7
East North Central	71	20.7	39	19.8
West North Central	50	14.6	34	17.2
South Atlantic	77	22.4	39	19.8
East South Central	33	9.6	21	10.7
West South Central	19	5.5	13	6.6
Mountain	18	5.3	8	4.1
Pacific	18	5.3	10	5.1

*Percentages figured on available data.

A total of 343 questionnaires were distributed by mail and 204 were returned in time to be included in the tabulations or 59.5%. The question naturally arises as to whether such a response reflects the thinking of the members of the Society as a whole. As each questionnaire came in, the postmark on the envelope was recorded as indicating the region from which the response was sent. These recordings were then tabulated and related to a tabulation of the membership of the Society by regions as given in the 1967 Directory of the Society. The data are provided in Table IV. None of the differences in Table IV are significant statistically. Therefore we conclude as far as we have evidence that the responses are representative of the Society as a whole.

The only other data for comparison with the Society's membership relate to the work setting of the members. Nineteen members of the Society (not counting the author of this report) occupy professional positions in ecclesiastical settings; the other 324 work in secular institutions. Questionnaires were color-coded to distinguish the two categories of informants. Thirteen of the ninteen ecclesiastics, or 68.4%, returned questionnaires while 191 of the 324 others, or 59.0%, responded. Thus while more of the religious workers replied proportionately their weight in the total responses is so small as to be negligible.

TABLE V.

AGE OF RESPONDENTS IN RURAL SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Age	Number	%
Total	204	100.00
No Response	6	3.0
Less than 25	0	0.0
25-29	2	1.0
30-34	22	10.8
35-39	28	13.7
40-44	27	13.2
45-49	37	18.1
50-54	29	14.2
55-59	26	12.8
60-64	16	7.8
65-69	10	4.9
70+	1	.5

Mean = 47.9 years; Median = 47.5 years

Characteristics of the respondents were sought because it seemed that these would make professional judgments more meaningful. One respondent indicating his ire wrote: "What difference does it make as far as results of supposed survey is (sic) concerned what type of person answers the questions? Or do you intend to discard the ones you don't want? Identification data if not directly related tends to irritate." In spite of his irritation he completed the questionnaire and supplied answers to all questions. Age-wise the

respondents ranged from 25 to over seventy though only two were below thirty and one over seventy. The average age was 47.9 years and the median 47.5 years. Table V gives the data.

Questionnaires were sent to 309 men and 34 women. Of the 199 who reported, 185 were men and 14 women. Thus women are slightly underrepresented in our responses. They constitute 10% of those questioned and provide 7% of the replies. Educationally the respondents were privileged Table VI provides the data. Just short of eighty per cent had earned doctoral degrees. Only two of the informants had no graduate degree.

TABLE VI.

HIGHEST DEGREE EARNED BY RURAL SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY RESPONDENTS

Highest Degree Earned	Number	%
Total	204	100.00
No Response	5	2.5
B.A. or B.S.	2	1.0
B.D. or S.T.B.	1	.5
M.A. or M.S.	33	16.2
Ed.D.	4	2.0
Ph.D.	159	77.8

Table VII gives the report of the sociologists as to their chief area of responsibility. Here for the first time appears a substantial number of "no response" entries, 14.2%: the largest such response in the identification questions. This may be due to the fact that the alternatives offered were not germane to informants in non-academic situations.

TABLE VII.

CHIEF AREA OF RESPONSIBILITY OF RURAL SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY RESPONDENTS

Chief Area of Responsibility	Number	%
Total	204	100.0
No Response	29	14.2
Administration	34	16.7
Teaching	61	29.9
Research	56	27.4
Extension	24	11.8

Table VIII lists the church membership claimed by the several persons, in each case denominations being listed as they were reported. Since the circulation of the questionnaire the Methodist Church and the Evangelical United Brethren have merged in the United Methodist Church so those figures now combine. A total of 83.4% list a denominational membership in one of three historic faiths: Christianity, Hinduism and Judaism.

TABLE VIII.

CHURCH MEMBERSHIP LISTED BY RURAL SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY RESPONDENTS

Church Membership	Number	%
Total	204	100.0
No Response	7	3.4
Methodist	43	21.0
None	27	13.2
Presbyterian	21	10.3
Baptist	18	8.8
Lutheran	15	7.3
Roman Catholic	12	5.9
Church of Christ	10	4.9
Episcopal	9	4.4
Latter Day Saints	9	4.4
Unitarian	9	4.4
Congregational	4	2.0
Community	3	1.5
Evangelical United Brethren	3	1.5
United Church of Christ	3	1.5
Friends	3	1.5
Jewish	2	1.0
Brethren	2	1.0
Christian Scientist	1	.5
Disciples of Christ	1	.5
Hindu	1	.5
Mennonite	1	.5

Respondents were also asked to check their church attendance practices under the rubrics contained in Table IX. Answers here enable us to compare those who are regular participants in church services with the more occasional participants and those whose participation is marginal. As may be seen from the table almost two-thirds attend regularly—more than once a month. We shall report comparisons at the appropriate place in our discussion.

TABLE IX.

CHURCH ATTENDANCE REPORTED BY RURAL SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY RESPONDENTS

Number of Times Attended	Number	%
Total	204	100.0
No Response	4	2.0
Never	23	11.3
Funerals and Weddings Only	17	8.3
On Religious Festivals Only	11	5.4
Once A Month	16	7.8
More Than Once A Month	133	65.2

In Table X we find the evaluations which the rural sociologists place on the various concepts listed. It is significant to note the thoroughness with which the informants worked. No concept was unrated by more than 21 persons. From the listings of "of major importance" the ten concepts having the highest ratings became the basis for our evaluation of social science knowledge on the part of pastors.

TABLE X.

RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE FOR THE RURAL PASTOR OF 49 CONCEPTS BY 204 RURAL SOCIOLOGISTS

Concept	Of Major Importance		Important		Of Minor Importance		No Response	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
adoption process	92	45.1	77	37.8	16	7.8	19	9.3
change agent	105	51.5	67	32.8	14	6.9	18	8.8
commercial farmer	25	12.2	94	46.1	64	31.4	21	10.3
communication	137	67.2	42	20.6	9	4.4	16	7.8
community	154	75.4	35	17.2	3	1.5	12	5.9
community decision making	144	70.6	39	19.1	5	2.5	16	7.8
cosmopolites	20	9.8	76	37.3	84	41.2	24	11.7
culture	130	63.7	54	26.5	7	3.4	13	6.4
deferred gratification	33	16.2	92	45.1	61	29.9	18	8.8
diminishing returns	21	10.3	76	37.3	88	43.1	19	9.3
ecology	55	26.9	92	45.1	44	21.6	13	6.4
elasticity of demand	7	3.4	69	33.8	107	52.5	21	10.3
ethnocentrism	91	44.6	73	35.8	25	12.2	15	7.4
family farm	49	24.0	93	45.6	46	22.6	16	7.8
farmer organizations	49	24.0	107	52.5	31	15.2	17	8.3
fringe population	42	20.6	93	45.6	51	25.0	18	8.8
function, manifest and latent	59	28.9	85	41.7	39	19.1	21	10.3
Gemeinschaft, Gesellschaft	45	22.1	77	37.8	62	30.3	20	9.8
institution	106	51.9	70	34.3	14	6.9	14	6.9
integration	79	38.7	97	47.6	16	7.8	12	5.9
interaction	113	55.4	67	32.8	12	5.9	12	5.9
land tenure	26	12.8	94	46.1	69	33.8	15	7.4
land use	33	16.2	89	43.6	67	32.8	15	7.4
level of living	59	28.9	116	56.9	17	8.3	12	5.9
life chances	68	33.3	81	39.7	40	19.6	15	7.4
locality group	57	27.9	104	51.0	28	13.7	15	7.4
market economy	23	11.3	89	43.6	74	36.3	18	8.8
migration	82	40.1	97	47.6	10	4.9	15	7.4
natural resource development	43	21.1	110	53.9	33	16.2	18	8.8
norms and values	159	77.9	31	15.2	3	1.5	11	5.4
parity	19	9.3	74	36.3	92	45.1	19	9.3
power structure	153	75.0	36	17.7	6	2.9	9	4.4
prestige	78	38.2	97	47.6	16	7.8	13	6.4
primary, secondary groups	108	52.9	69	33.8	12	5.9	15	7.4
role	132	64.7	52	25.5	4	2.0	16	7.8
rural development	78	38.2	90	44.2	20	9.8	16	7.8
rural-farm, rural-nonfarm	47	23.0	96	47.1	45	22.1	16	7.8
sanctions	83	40.3	84	41.2	21	10.3	16	7.8
social mobility	105	51.5	81	39.7	4	1.9	14	6.9
socialization	132	64.7	51	25.0	9	4.4	12	5.9
social solidarity	68	33.3	92	45.1	30	14.7	14	6.9
status	111	54.4	74	36.3	9	4.4	10	4.9
stereotype	61	29.9	95	46.6	32	15.3	16	7.8
stratification	107	52.4	73	35.8	9	4.4	15	7.4
subsistence economy	27	13.2	95	46.6	63	30.9	19	9.3
territoriality	22	10.8	74	36.3	90	44.1	18	8.8
trade center	44	21.6	89	43.6	52	25.5	19	9.3
urbanization	94	46.0	84	41.2	13	6.4	13	6.4
voluntary association	72	35.3	98	48.0	19	9.3	15	7.4
49 concepts total	3647		3890		1685		774	

Table XI lists the first ten concepts marked "of major importance" by the sociologists. The first column on the left gives the percentages for the total of 204 informants. The other four columns give the choices as they were made by administrators, teachers, researchers and extension personnel. Chi square tests applied to a table of choices for each concept in which the different categories of service are separately shown indicate no statistically significant difference among the separate categories of occupation. Only in the extension personnel who give 91.7% choice to "communication" as a concept "of major importance" is there a choice significantly different from the choices of the total respondents.

TABLE XI.

FIRST TEN CONCEPTS CHOSEN AS "OF MAJOR IMPORTANCE" BY FIRST OCCUPATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY OF RESPONDENTS

Concept	Per Cent of Informants Choosing				
	Total	Administration	Teaching	Research	Extension
Total Number	(204)	(34)	(61)	(56)	(24)
Norms and Values	77.9	73.5	78.7	75.0	91.7
Community	75.5	82.4	75.4	69.6	87.5
Power Structure	75.0	79.4	73.8	69.6	83.3
Community Decision Making	70.6	73.5	70.5	67.9	83.3
Communication	67.2	67.7	65.6	58.9	91.7
Role	64.7	58.8	63.9	67.9	70.8
Socialization	64.7	58.8	72.1	66.1	45.8
Culture	63.7	52.9	75.4	60.7	54.2
Interaction	55.4	44.1	57.4	51.8	70.8
Status	54.4	52.9	50.8	57.1	50.0

While there is general agreement, certain additional concepts rise to the first ten when we consider the individual occupation categories. Administrators replace "adoption process" by "interaction" with 55.9% choices. Teachers displace "status" with "primary, secondary groups" (60.7%); and place "social mobility" in a tie with "interaction" for tenth place on their list with 57.4%. Research workers displace "interaction" with a tie for tenth place between "institution" and "stratification" both of which received 55.4% of their choices. Extension workers displace "status" and "socialization" with "adoption process" (62.5%) and "primary, secondary groups" (54.2%).

The order in which members of the several occupation categories place the concepts is suggestive. "Norms and values" takes first place for teachers, research workers and extension personnel but drops to third for administrators. "Community" and "power structure" get high billing among administrators. "Communication" ties for first place with "norms and values" in the extension personnel list but comes fifth in administrators' thinking, sixth on the teachers' list, and seventh among research workers.

We report the responses of the thirteen ecclesiastically employed rural sociologists in Table XII. They put "community" (92.3%) in first place and drop first place "norms and values" to a four-way tie for fifth place

(69.2%). They add to their first ten "integration" (69.2%) and "primary, secondary groups" (61.5%) displacing "role" and "status". While the numbers are too small to prove statistically significant, they indicate a higher degree of agreement than among rural sociologists generally. We should expect to find this whenever we can isolate a group relatively homogeneous in terms of interest.

TABLE XII.

FIRST TEN CONCEPTS CHOSEN AS "OF MAJOR IMPORTANCE" BY TOTAL RESPONDENTS AND BY ECCLESIASTICALLY EMPLOYED RESPONDENTS

Concept	Total Respondents		Ecclesiastics	
	Number	%	Number	%
Total	204	100.0	13	100.00
Norms and Values	159	77.9	9	69.2
Community	154	75.5	12	92.3
Power Structure	153	75.0	10	76.9
Community Decision Making	144	70.6	11	84.6
Communication	137	67.2	9	69.2
Role	132	64.7	7	58.3
Socialization	132	64.7	8	61.5
Culture	130	63.7	10	76.9
Interaction	113	55.4	9	69.2
Status	111	54.4	6	46.2

TABLE XIII.

SOCIAL SCIENCE METHODS EVALUATED IN THEIR RELEVANCE TO WORK OF RURAL PASTORS

Methods	Pastor Should Be Able To Use		Pastor Should Understand		Non-Essential		No Response	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Community Survey	140	68.6	52	25.5	3	1.5	9	4.4
Statistics	29	14.2	139	68.1	26	12.8	10	4.9
Scale Construction	12	5.9	95	46.5	82	40.2	15	7.4
Construction Typology	9	4.4	83	40.7	95	46.6	17	8.3
Sampling	63	30.9	114	55.8	15	7.4	12	5.9
Demography	56	27.5	120	58.8	16	7.8	12	5.9
Interviewing	151	74.0	42	20.6	4	2.0	7	3.4
Participant-Observer Techniques	133	65.2	46	22.5	13	6.4	12	5.9
Comparative Studies	42	20.6	132	64.7	16	7.8	14	6.9
Operational Procedures	28	13.7	116	56.9	37	18.1	23	11.3
Projective Techniques	27	13.2	103	50.5	60	29.4	14	6.9

The informants were also asked to evaluate various research techniques in their relevance to the work of a rural pastor. Table XIII summarizes the data. Only three methods are listed by more than half the respondents as important for the pastor's use: interviewing, community survey and participant-observer techniques The data in this table clearly suggest that rural

sociologists are not bent on making a professional sociologist out of the pastor. In this connection two quotations written on the questionnaires provide appropriate interpretation.

> As rural sociologists we have oversold the rural clergy on our discipline. The social sciences can be valuable tools for ministers. But when the clergy try to become social scientists instead of ministers of the Gospel they soon lose the respect of both their parishioners and the social scientist.
>
> My responses to Part III are based on the premise that the pastor should be more concerned with social action based on sound principles rather than with conducting research. He would probably be better guided to secure help through cooperative extension or some other agency for needed research guidance. But he is the one who will need to know how to apply research knowledge and sociological principles.

The data in Tables XIV, XV, and XVI delineate responses to questions regarding the rural pastor. Table XIV shows that among our respondents sociologists who attend church regularly are more frequently consulted by rural pastors than those who attend intermittently or not at all. The overall differences in the table do not prove statistically significant but the proportion of intermittent attenders who have been consulted by no pastors during the preceding years is significantly different from that of all respondents at the five per cent level. Since rural pastors would have no way of knowing the church attendance patterns of rural sociologists, the interesting question arises as to why fewer pastors consult the intermittent attenders. Our data provide a basis for speculation but no answer.

TABLE XIV.

NUMBER OF RURAL PASTORS COUNSELED IN LAST YEAR RELATED TO CHURCH ATTENDANCE PATTERNS OF INFORMANTS

Number of Pastors Counseled	Church Attendance Pattern					
	Total		Once A Month Or Less		More Than Once A Month	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total	204	100.0	67*	100.0	133*	100.0
No Response	5	2.5	1	1.5	1	.8
None	85	41.6	37	55.2	48	36.1
1-4	66	32.3	22	32.8	43	32.3
5-9	23	11.3	2	3.0	21	15.8
10 or more	25	12.3	5	7.5	20	15.0

*4 Sociologists gave no response to attendance question, hence total only 200

TABLE XV.

RATING OF PASTORS' KNOWLEDGE AND SKILL IN COMMUNITY RELATIONS RELATED TO CHURCH ATTENDANCE PATTERNS OF INFORMANTS

Pastors' Knowledge and Skill	Church Attendance Pattern					
	Total		Once A Month Or Less		More Than Once A Month	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total	204	100.0	67*	100.0	133*	100.0
No Response	36	17.6	16	23.9	17	12.8
High Degree	19	9.3	8	11.9	11	8.3
Average Competence	116	56.9	33	49.3	83	62.4
Low Degree	33	16.2	10	14.9	22	16.5

*4 Sociologists gave no response to attendance question, hence total only 200

TABLE XVI.

ESTIMATE OF CHANGE IN RURAL PASTOR'S SOCIAL STATUS AS PROFESSIONAL RELATED TO CHURCH ATTENDANCE PATTERNS OF INFORMANTS

Pastor's Social Status	Church Attendance Pattern					
	Total		Once A Month Or Less		More Than Once A Month	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total	204	100.0	67*	100.0	133*	100.0
No Response	48	23.5	17	25.4	28	21.1
Rising	38	18.6	6	9.0	32	24.0
No Change	34	16.7	16	23.8	18	13.5
Falling	84	41.2	28	41.8	55	41.4

*4 Sociologists gave no response to attendance question, hence total only 200

Table XV records the assessment of rural pastors' skill and knowledge in community relationships. The overall estimate is one of average or below competence. Again there are differences between attendance categories among the sociologists but these are not statistically significant. When it comes to Table XVI, however, in which the current social status of the rural pastor is assessed, differences significant at the two per cent level appear. Intermittent attenders make a higher estimate in the "no change" category and a lower estimate in the "rising" category with a slightly higher proportion of failures to respond. The proportion placing the minister in the "falling" category is constant between church attendance categories.

A concluding item in the questionnaire requested the names of books which a rural pastor should read. As might be expected a great variety of references were returned, with 235 different books, bulletins and articles mentioned Seven volumes were listed by ten per cent or more of the respondents, the range being from 21 to 39 choices. The list of these books follows.

Bertrand, Alvin L. *Rural Sociology: An Analysis of Contemporary Rural Life*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1958.

Copp, James H., Editor. *Our Changing Rural Society: Perspectives and Trends.* Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1964.
Loomis, Charles P. and J. Allan Beegle. *Rural Sociology: The Strategy Of Change.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1957.
Rogers, Everett M. *Social Change in Rural Society.* New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, 1960.
Sanders, Irwin T. *Community: An Introduction To A Social System.* New York: Ronald Press, 1966.
Taylor, Lee and Arthur B. Jones, Sr. *Rural Life and Urbanized Society.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
Vidich, Arthur J. and Joseph Bensman. *Small Town In Mass Society.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1958.

Summary:

This chapter began with the question: Is there a body of knowledge sufficiently unified and agreed upon by experts in the field of rural social science, in the light of which we can test the social science understandings of town and country ministers? The analysis of this chapter answers the question in the affirmative and provides us with ten concepts which rural sociologists agree are of major importance for the work of the rural pastor in his community. These concepts are:

Norms and Values
Community
Power Structure
Community Decision Making
Communication
Role
Socialization
Culture
Interaction, and
Status.

All the evidence we have reviewed indicates that rural sociologists are a homogeneous company. No matter how we categorize into sub-strata, significant differences do not appear. In no case would more than two items in the list above be altered to represent the first ten choices of administrators, teachers, researchers, extension personnel or ecclesiastically employed sociologists. In the course of our analysis of the data by computer we ran a total of eighty-one cross tabulations. In only five cases did the Chi square computed for a table indicate a probability that the categories within it were different at the five percent level of expectation or less.

CHAPTER IV

SOCIOLOGICAL SOPHISTICATION AND THE PASTORATE

On the basis of the concepts listed as of major importance by the rural sociologists we developed a questionnaire to test the sociological sophistication of rural pastors and relate it to their performance both in the churches they have recently been serving and in the communities in which those churches are located. A copy of this questionnaire is reproduced in the appendix. Original plans had called for a more comprehensive circulation of the questionnaire but lack of funds limited the study to Methodist town and country pastors. From the pastors' list in the national offices at 1200 Davis Street, Evanston, Illinois, a sample composed of every nineteenth name was drawn. From this sample pastors serving in communities of ten thousand or more were eliminated leaving a total of 852 town and country pastors. The questionnaire with an accompanying letter and return stamped and addressed envelope was sent to each of these persons. Questionnaires were returned by 395 persons, 46.3% of those querried. Of these only 330 were filled out in sufficient completeness to analyze so that the conclusions in this chapter are based on a 38.7% return.

How representative of town and country Methodist pastors are these 330 respondents? Ministers from 77 of the ninety annual conferences of The Methodist Church are among them. All the conferences in the North Central and the Southeastern Jurisdictions are represented. Missing in other jurisdictions are the following conferences: from the Northeastern Jurisdiction, the Northern and Southern New Jersey and the Puerto Rico Provisional Conferences; from the Central Jurisdiction, the Central Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Tennessee-Kentucky, Southwest, and Upper Mississippi Conferences; from the South Central Jurisdiction, the Little Rock and Oklahoma Indian Mission Conferences; from the Western Judisdiction, the Alaska Mission, the Hawaii Mission and Oregon Conferences. These fourteen conferences contain 471,994 members or 4.6% of the membership of the Methodist Church. Every state in the continental United States is represented in our returns with the exception of New Jersey.

Table XVII compares the numbers of respondents in our sample for each jurisdiction to the ministers of the jurisdiction as proportions of the ministry of the whole church. Unfortunately we are not able to segregate the town and country ministers from the total ministry of the Methodist Church; were that possible, a more refined assessment of representativeness would be possible. The figure for ministers given here is the sum of conference members plus supply pastors. The indications are that our response does not vary significantly from the relative regional proportions in the church itself. The North Central Jurisdiction is somewhat over-represented (28.7% of our replies against 22.4% of Methodist ministers) but this is understandable in light of the fact that Garrett, from which the questionnaire went out, is located in the

North Central Jurisdiction and has educated many of the ministers therein, a fact which might motivate a higher rate of response. What is reassuring is that the appeal for information was so generally recognized and heeded.

TABLE XVII.

MINISTERS OF THE METHODIST CHURCH, 1967, AND THE RESPONDENTS TABULATED BY JURISDICTIONS

Jurisdiction	Ministers		Respondents	
	Number	%	Number	%
Total	27,241	100.0	330	100.0
Central	1,077	3.9	11	3.3
North Central	6,098	22.4	95	28.7
Northeastern	5,531	20.3	68	20.5
South Central	4,906	18.0	54	16.3
Southeastern	7,569	27.8	81	24.5
Western	2,060	7.6	21	6.7

Chi Square = 8.702
Degrees of Freedom = 5
Probability = Between .2 and .1

Our data provide materials on the personal characteristics of our informants. In sex and ministerial status our sample represents the Methodist Church. Six of our informants were women, the remaining 324 were men; women are one per cent of ministers under appointment, 1.8 per cent of our sample. Table XVIII presents data on the ministerial status of the pastors. Of those giving information 240 are conference members against 85 who serve as accepted supplies. Supplies constitute 24.4% of the Methodist ministerial pool and 25.8% of our respondents. Table XIX is a distribution of the pastors by age. The mean age is 44.7 years and the median 42.5 years. Table XX indicates the decade in which the pastors began their ministries. The decade 1950-59 provided the largest number, 106, followed closely by the years 1960 to present with 100 in that category. Table XXI gives the educational achievements of our pastors. 82 have less than a full college education as against 189 who have completed both college and seminary.

TABLE XVIII.

MINISTERIAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS

Status	Respondents	
	Number	%
Total	330	100.0
No Answer	5	1.5
Approved Supply	85	25.8
On Trial	25	7.6
Full Member	212	64.2
Retired Supply	3	.9

TABLE XIX.

AGE OF 330 RESPONDENTS

Age	Respondents	
	Number	%
Total	330	100.0
No Answer	2	.6
Less Than 25	10	3.0
25-29	25	7.6
30-34	51	15.6
35-39	49	14.8
40-44	38	11.5
45-49	33	10.0
50-54	41	12.4
55-59	33	10.0
60-64	28	8.5
65-69	15	4.5
70+	5	1.5

TABLE XX.

DECADE IN WHICH RESPONDENTS BEGAN MINISTRY

Decade	Respondents	
	Number	%
Total	330	100.0
No Answer	18	5.5
1910-1919	2	.6
1920-1929	16	4.8
1930-1939	37	11.2
1940-1949	51	15.2
1950-1959	106	32.1
1960-1967	100	30.3

TABLE XXI.

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL ACHIEVED BY RESPONDENTS

Educational Level	Respondents	
	Number	%
Total	330	100.0
No Answer	8	2.4
No College	36	10.9
Some College	46	13.9
B. A. or B. S. degree	24	7.3
M. A. or Ph. D. but no theological degree	2	.6
B. A. or B. S. plus some theological training	25	7.6
Theological degree	149	45.1
Additional work	17	5.2
B. D. and M. A.	20	6.1
B. D. and Ph. D.	3	.9

In Table XXII the pastors are located in terms of the size of the largest community in which any of the churches they serve is located. Exactly fifty per cent of the respondents are located in a village between 250 and 2499 in population. An additional 30.7% are located in towns with populations

between 2500 and 9999. Only 16.2% serve exclusively in the open country or a small hamlet. The tendency to center our pastors in trading centers or larger towns apparently is taking hold in the church in general.

TABLE XXII.

SIZE OF LARGEST COMMUNITY IN WHICH RESPONDENT CURRENTLY SERVES A CHURCH

Community Size	Respondents	
	Number	%
Total	330	100.0
No Answer	7	2.1
Open Country	15	4.6
0-249	38	11.6
250-999	86	26.1
1000-2499	79	23.9
2500-4999	49	14.9
5000-9999	56	16.8

A part of the questionnaire involved a series of multiple choice questions regarding the meaning of the ten sociological terms we dealt with in the preceding chapter. Each term was defined in four ways one of which reflected a sociological stance. The purpose of the test was to determine whether pastors in using these terms were sociological in their outlook or not. Each of the defining four statements for each of the concepts was accurate and true in itself. The differentiation involved some of the statements being theological or common sense against the specifically sociological meaning of the terms.

To be sure that the alternates which we had devised to reflect the sociological perspective did in fact reflect that perspective we submitted the questionnaire statements to ten judges, men well known in the discipline of rural sociology. All ten responded with their evaluations. The men who so graciously served are:

Dr. Alvin Bertrand	Louisiana State University
Dr. Emory Brown	Pennsylvania State University
Dr. Harold Christensen	Purdue University
Dr. A. Lee Coleman	University of Kentucky
Dr. Fritz Fliegel	University of Illinois
Dr. Harold F. Kaufman	Mississippi State University
Dr. Douglas Marshall	University of Wisconsin
Dr. Howard Sauer	South Dakota State University
Dr. Robert Skrabanek	Texas A & M University
Dr. Walter Slocum	Washington State University

The judges were asked to choose the statement under each of the concepts which in their opinion most clearly reflected the sociological perspective. On the statements under three of the concepts—power structure, socialization and culture—they were unanimous. With three additional statements there was ninety per cent agreement—values and norms, community, and community decision making. On status there was eighty per cent agreement; on communi-

cation sixty per cent. Five of the ten agreed on the usage of role the remaining five being divided between two other definitions of that term. Only on interaction was there failure to determine a majority point of view. Here there was an even split, five supporting the point of view of the research scheme and the other five supporting a simple interpersonal definition. Overall there was eighty per cent agreement among the judges. On the basis of the evaluation of these judges we felt that the instrument represented a reasonable though not a perfect instrument for determining whether or not a particular pastor saw his community in sociological terms.

A second consideration had to do with whether or not there would be any spread in the distribution of responses to the questions. Two groups were available for comparison with the performance of the pastors on the test. The first was made up of 134 sociology students completing the introductory sociology course or taking an advanced course at McKendree College in Lebanon, Illinois. A second group was a class of fifty religious leaders (pastors, religious education directors, etc.) at Michigan State University in the 1968 Town and Country Church Leadership School. The group constituted the second year required course in the three year sequence so that members of it could be expected to have a basic sociological framework already supplied for their thinking. Table XXIII compares the performance of the 330 Methodist pastors with the McKendree sociology students and the Michigan State class. The respondents had a wider spread of performance than either of the other groups ranging from zero to ten while McKendree students ranged from one to nine and Michigan State students from four to ten. The average of the respondents (mean of 6.2, median of 6) was higher than that of

TABLE XXIII.

PERFORMANCE ON QUESTIONS ON TEN SOCIOLOGICAL TERMS BY 330 RESPONDENTS, 134 MCKENDREE COLLEGE STUDENTS (1968) AND 50 STUDENTS IN MICHIGAN STATE TOWN AND COUNTRY CHURCH LEADERSHIP SCHOOL, 1968

Number of concepts sociologically defined	Respondents		McKendree Students		Michigan State Students	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total	330	100.0	134	100.0	50	100.0
0	5	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
1	4	1.2	1	.7	0	0.0
2	10	3.0	6	4.5	0	0.0
3	13	4.0	11	8.2	0	0.0
4	26	7.6	20	14.9	4	8.0
5	56	17.0	34	25.4	5	10.0
6	58	17.6	25	18.7	12	24.0
7	72	21.9	22	16.4	11	22.0
8	63	19.2	13	9.7	10	20.0
9	22	6.7	2	1.5	5	10.0
10	1	.3	0	0.0	3	6.0
Mean Score	6.2		5.4		6.9	
Median Score	6		5		7	

the McKendree students (mean of 5.4, median of 5) and lower than the Michigan State group (mean of 6.9, median of 7). This is what we should expect in comparing pastors with graduate study in many cases with undergraduates on the one hand and with pastors who have shown special concern for and have received special training in rural sociology as the Michigan State people had. We conclude then that in the questions over the concepts we have an instrument which reveals sociological sophistication and by which we can classify our respondents in terms of relative sociological perspective, those with a higher score being more sociologically sophisticated than those with a lower score.

We now turn to determine possible measures of pastoral performance with which we can compare scores on the sociological concepts. Here we depend upon the prior work of Sidney E. Sandridge who in his doctoral dissertation (N.U., 1959), A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ECCLESIASTICAL EFFECTIVENESS AND COMMUNITY OUTREACH IN TOWN AND COUNTRY METHODIST CHURCHES—1957, developed four measures of ecclesiastical effectiveness and four of community outreach (p. 32-33).

> As was stated earlier, four measures of ecclesiastical effectiveness are used in the analysis of the data on each church. The following formulae give operational facility to the four concepts:
>
> 1. Rate of accession = $\frac{\text{Total number of people received, 1956-58}}{\text{Total church membership, 1956-58}} \times 1000$
> 2. Rate of evangelism = $\frac{\text{No. recd on prof. of faith and from prep. mbrship. '56-58}}{\text{Total church membership, 1956-58}} \times 1000$
> 3. Educational efficiency = $\frac{\text{Number in average attendance at Sunday School, '56-58}}{\text{Total church membership, 1956-58}} \times 1000$
> 4. Per capita giving = $\frac{\text{Total giving for all purposes, 1956-58}}{\text{Total church membership, 1956-58}}$

Each of the rates is standardized on the basis of a percentage of the highest score registered for that rate. For each church the four standardized rates are averaged to arrive at a composite index of ecclesiastical effectiveness for that church.

We are also using four measures of community outreach. These are: (1) rate of community leadership, (2) rate of community sponsorship, (3) rate of ministerial participation, and (4) rate of financial support. They may be expressed by the formulae on the following page.

1. Rate of community leadership = $\frac{\text{No. of church mbrs in comm. ldrship positions, '57}}{\text{Total church membership, 1957}} \times 1000$
2. Rate of community sponsorship = $\frac{\text{No. of comm. projects sponsored by the church, '57}}{\text{Total church membership, 1957}} \times 1000$
3. Rate of ministerial participation = $\frac{\text{No. of comm. activities at which minister exercised a min. funct. '57}}{\text{Total church membership, 1957}} \times 1000$

4. Rate of financial support =
$$\frac{\text{No. of comm. projs given financial support by church '57}}{\text{Total church membership, 1957}} \times 1000$$

Building on his findings we have adapted these measures to our uses as follows:

Measures of Ecclesiastical Maintenance:

1. Rate of Accessions—The total number of people received into the churches served by a particular pastor in the years 1965-67 divided by the total membership of those churches for the same years and multiplied by 1000.
2. Rate of Evangelism—The total number of persons received on profession of faith in the churches served by a particular pastor in the years 1965-67 divided by the total church membership for the same years, the result multiplied by 1000.
3. Rate of Educational Efficiency—The number in average attendance at Sunday School, 1965-67, for the churches served by a particular pastor divided by the total church memberships for those same years. multiplied by 1000.
4. Per capita giving—The total giving for all purposes of churches served by a particular pastor, 1965-67, divided by the total church memberships for the same period.

Measures of community outreach are:

1. Rate of community leadership—number of community leadership positions held in 1967 by members in churches served by a particular pastor divided by the total membership of churches served by that pastor, multiplied by 1000.
2. Rate of Community Sponsorship—number of community projects sponsored in 1967 by churches served by a particular pastor divided by memberships of those churches, 1967, multiplied by 1000.
3. Rate of Ministerial Participation—Number of community activities at which the minister exercised a ministerial function, 1967, divided by the total membership of the churches he served, 1967, multiplied by 1000.
4. Rate of Financial Support—Number of community projects given financial support by the churches served by a particular pastor in 1967, divided by the total church membership of those churches in 1967, multiplied by 1000.

The measures as originally developed by Sandridge were applied to churches. Our purpose is to make of them indices of pastoral performance and it is in this connection that we have made adjustment.

Data for the ecclesiastical maintenance indices were taken from the General Minutes of the Methodist Church for 1965, 66, 67. The principal data for the measures of community outreach came from the questionnaire, the membership of the churches was read from the General Minutes of the Methodist Church for 1967.

We now propose to relate the scores on sociological sophistication made by the pastors to their pastoral performance as indicated by the rates of ecclesiastical maintenance and community outreach in the churches they have

been serving. To any thoughtful reader it will at once be clear that what has happened and happens in the churches served by these pastors cannot be regarded as even largely the work of the pastor himself. To begin with, since we have a national sample, there are wide varieties of community setting. Some of these pastors are working in counties from which population has been steadily drifting for twenty years. They serve a declining population base. Others, in fringe arcas, are being engulfed by population growth. Again the quality of lay leadership available in the churches, the economic resources present to mount a program, the physical facilities and equipment at hand to house and tool a modern church program and the readiness of local people to welcome and participate in such a program are widely varied. Under such circumstances we should expect to find little variation in church and community program items by scores of pastors on a sociological test.

A reasonable procedure is to pose and test the null hypothesis: that is, that no relationship exists between scores achieved on the sociological concepts test and the eight measures of pastoral performance. We shall classify the informants in terms of sociological scores and cross tabulate these scores with placement in the lower, lower intermediate, upper intermediate, and upper quartiles, to determine whether the differences are such as we would expect from random variation or whether they are too large to account for by chance alone. If we come to the latter conclusion we shall have some confidence in the relationship of sociological sophistication to pastoral performance. We shall use the conventional five per cent level of probability as the dividing line of significance but will present the data in tables with the Chi Square figurc so that the reader may reach his own judgment.

Seven measures of pastoral performance are available to us to be handled in this fashion; we must exclude at this point the fourth measure of community outreach—financial support of community projects since 157 of the pastors reported no financial support of this kind being offered by their churches, a fact which makes the division into quartiles impossible. We shall make a simpler analysis of the data after we have considered in detail the other measures of pastoral performance.

Tables XXIV-XXX present the data in detail along with the Chi Square values for each of the distributions and other relevant statistics. The Chi Square figures indicate that the difference in the distributions in Tables XXIV, XXVII, XXVIII, and XXIX are so large that we cannot justify the null hypothesis that no relationship exists between scores achieved on the sociological concepts test and these four measures of pastoral performance. Furthermore our data support the assertion that the relationship is positive between scores on the test and high pastoral performance ratios. In rate of accession and per capita giving on the ecclesiastical maintenance scores there is a clear and positive relationship. On rate of community leadership and rate of community sponsorship in the community outreach scores, there is a clear and positive relationship as well.

TABLE XXIV.

PASTORS SCORES ON SOCIOLOGICAL CONCEPTS AND QUARTILE OF CHURCHES SERVED IN ECCLESIASTICAL MAINTENANCE — RATE OF ACCESSIONS

Scores	Rate of accessions quartiles									
	Total		Lower		Lower Intermediate		Upper Intermediate		Upper	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total	330	100.0	82	100.0	83	100.0	80	100.0	85	100.0
0-3	32	9.7	10	12.2	11	13.3	9	11.2	2	2.4
4,5	82	24.8	12	14.6	21	25.3	25	31.3	24	28.2
6	58	17.6	18	22.0	14	16.9	15	18.8	11	12.9
7	72	21.8	19	23.2	17	20.5	15	18.8	21	24.7
8	63	19.1	19	23.2	17	20.5	6	7.5	21	24.7
9,10	23	7.0	4	4.9	3	3.6	10	12.5	6	7.1

Chi Square = 27.723
Degrees of Freedom = 15
Probability = between .05 and .02
Coefficient of Contingency = .278
Relationship Positive

TABLE XXV.

PASTORS SCORES ON SOCIOLOGICAL CONCEPTS AND ECCLESIASTICAL MAINTENANCE BY QUARTILES RATE OF EVANGELISM

Scores	Rate of evangelism quartiles									
	Total		Lower		Lower Intermediate		Upper Intermediate		Upper	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total	330	100.0	83	100.0	82	100.0	84	100.0	81	100.0
0-3	32	9.7	8	9.6	10	12.2	7	8.3	7	8.6
4,5	82	24.8	16	19.3	21	25.6	26	31.0	19	23.5
6	58	17.6	16	19.3	14	17.1	13	15.5	15	18.5
7	72	21.8	18	21.7	17	20.7	18	21.4	19	23.5
8	63	19.1	20	24.1	15	18.3	12	14.3	16	19.8
9,10	23	7.0	5	6.0	5	6.1	8	9.5	5	6.2

Chi Square = 6.919
Degrees of Freedom = 15
Probability = between .98 and .95
No Relationship

What of the other three measures reported in the tables. Table XXV reveals that there is no relationship between scores on the sociological test and evangelism. At least ninety-five per cent of the time by chance alone we would have as large differences as exist in our table. Table XXVI indicates that we cannot trust the relationship revealed here to be other than the result of chance variation since such differences as we have in the table would occur by chance alone something more than ten per cent of the time. However, the relationship revealed is negative which is suggestive. How can we possibly understand the association of low scores on the test with high educational efficiency? We shall comment on that question later in our discussion. Table

XXX indicates differences that border on our 5% level of probability. Slightly oftener than five per cent of the time but considerably less often than ten per cent, such differences would arise by chance alone. The evidence for a positive relationship between sociological test score and ministerial participation in community activities is marginal.

We summarize by saying that our hypothesis that sociologically oriented pastors show objective measures of their competence in their church work and in the community in which their churches are located is supported clearly in four of seven indices, marginally supported in a fifth, even more marginally supported but in a negative direction by a sixth, and completely unsupported by a seventh.

TABLE XXVI.

PASTORS SORES ON SOCIOLOGICAL CONCEPTS AND ECCLESIASTICAL MAINTENANCE BY QUARTILES EDUCATIONAL EFFICIENCY

Scores	Educational efficiency quartiles									
	Total		Lower		Lower Intermediate		Upper Intermediate		Upper	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total	330	100.0	85	100.0	87	100.0	80	100.0	78	100.0
0-3	32	9.7	5	5.9	7	8.0	9	11.2	11	14.1
4,5	82	24.8	18	21.2	23	26.4	16	20.0	25	32.1
6	58	17.6	16	18.8	14	16.1	10	12.5	18	23.1
7	72	21.8	22	25.9	22	25.3	20	25.0	8	10.3
8	63	19.1	15	17.6	14	16.1	21	26.2	13	16.7
9,10	23	7.0	9	10.6	7	8.0	4	5.0	3	3.8

Chi Square = 21.358
Degrees of Freedom = 15
Probability = between .20 and .10
Relationship Negative

The suggestion in Table XXVI of a negative relationship between pastors' sociological scores and the educational efficiency of their churches while not proven requires comment. The rate of educational efficiency is a proportion of average attendance at Sunday School to church membership. Empirical studies demonstrate what observation suggests that small churches in small communities tend to have proportionately larger Sunday Schools due on the one hand to the relatively high fertility of the small community and on the other to the existence of Sunday School classes for adults, particularly older adults. Table XXXI while not substantiating these observations is congruent with them as far as our data go. It indicates that there is a highly significant (statistically) negative relationship between size of community in which a church exists and the educational efficiency rate. The larger the community the lower the rate. Since smaller communities tend to be served by less well

trained men and larger communities by better trained men it is reasonable to expect a negative relationship between scores and educational efficiency. In futher support of this contention we point to a positive relationship between sociological scores and size of community though again the relationship is less than significant statistically (probability at .70 level).

TABLE XXVII.

PASTORS SCORES ON SOCIOLOGICAL CONCEPTS AND ECCLESIASTICAL MAINTENANCE BY QUARTILES PER CAPITA GIVING

Scores	Per capita giving quartiles									
	Total		Lower		Lower Intermediate		Upper Intermediate		Upper	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total	330	100.0	83	100.0	82	100.0	86	100.0	79	100.0
0-3	32	9.7	14	16.9	10	12.2	5	5.8	3	3.8
4,5	82	24.8	16	19.3	26	31.7	24	27.9	16	20.3
6	58	17.6	19	22.9	16	19.5	7	8.1	16	20.3
7	72	21.8	12	14.5	13	15.9	28	32.6	19	24.1
8	63	19.1	17	20.5	16	19.5	13	15.1	17	21.5
9,10	23	7.0	5	6.0	1	1.2	9	10.5	8	10.1

Chi Square = 34.680
Degrees of Freedom = 15
Probability = between .01 and .001
Coefficient of Contingency = .308
Relationship Positive

There remains the question as to whether scores on the sociological test are related to training in the field. Table XXXII provides data on the relationship of scores to courses taken in sociology. Those who have had some courses do substantially better than those who have had none but there is no significant difference in scores between those who have had some courses and those who have had a major or minor in the field. Table XXXIII shows that those who have read some of the books in the field recommended by the rural sociologists have better scores on the test than those who indicate no books read.

An inspection of the tables will make very clear that the relationships we indicate are not absolute: men whose churches are in the lowest quartiles on the several measures make top grades in the sociological test and some men with churches in the top quartiles make low or mediocre grades in the sociological test. This we should expect since we have already indicated our lack of control over the church and community settings of the men. Also we cannot ascertain such personal factors as the relative intelligence of our informants. What we have demonstrated in this study is that, allowing for the host of interfering factors, there nevertheless remains a real relationship between sociological sophistication and pastoral performance of a higher than chance order.

TABLE XXVIII.

PASTORS SCORES ON SOCIOLOGICAL CONCEPTS AND COMMUNITY OUTREACH BY QUARTILES RATE OF COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP

Scores	Community leadership quartiles									
	Total		Lower		Lower Intermediate		Upper Intermediate		Upper	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total	330	100.0	79	100.0	80	100.0	89	100.0	82	100.0
0-3	32	9.7	20	25.3	7	8.7	2	2.2	3	3.7
4,5	82	24.8	23	29.1	19	23.7	24	27.0	16	19.5
6	58	17.6	11	13.9	11	13.7	20	22.5	16	19.5
7	72	21.8	11	13.9	22	27.5	16	18.0	23	28.0
8	63	19.1	11	13.9	15	18.8	23	25.8	14	17.1
9,10	23	7.0	3	3.8	6	7.5	4	4.5	10	12.2

Chi Square = 46.577
Degrees of Freedom = 15
Probability = less than .001
Coefficient of Contingency = .352
Relationship Positive

TABLE XXIX.

PASTORS SCORES ON SOCIOLOGICAL CONCEPTS AND COMMUNITY OUTREACH BY QUARTILES RATE OF COMMUNITY SPONSORSHIP

Scores	Community sponsorship quartiles									
	Total		Lower		Lower Intermediate		Upper Intermediate		Upper	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total	330	100.0	79	100.0	79	100.0	82	100.0	90	100.0
0-3	32	9.7	17	21.5	4	5.1	6	7.3	5	5.6
4,5	82	24.8	19	24.1	16	20.3	28	34.1	19	21.1
6	58	17.6	16	20.3	12	15.2	13	15.9	17	18.9
7	72	21.8	10	12.7	20	25.3	19	23.2	23	25.6
8	63	19.1	14	17.7	19	24.1	12	14.6	18	20.0
9,10	23	7.0	3	3.8	8	10.1	4	4.9	8	8.9

Chi Square = 29.436
Degrees of Freedom = 15
Probability = between .02 and .01
Coefficient of Contingency = .286
Relationship Positive

TABLE XXX.

PASTORS SCORES ON SOCIOLOGICAL CONCEPTS AND COMMUNITY OUTREACH BY QUARTILES RATE OF MINISTERIAL PARTICIPATION

Scores	Ministerial participation quartiles									
	Total		Lower		Lower Intermediate		Upper Intermediate		Upper	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total	330	100.0	90	100.0	90	100.0	79	100.0	71	100.0
0-3	32	9.7	17	18.9	7	7.8	2	2.5	6	8.5
4,5	82	24.8	22	24.4	19	21.1	26	32.9	15	21.1
6	58	17.6	9	10.0	17	18.9	18	22.8	14	19.7
7	72	21.8	16	17.8	23	25.6	14	17.7	19	26.8
8	63	19.1	18	20.0	19	21.1	15	19.0	11	15.5
9,10	23	7.0	8	8.9	5	5.6	4	5.1	6	8.5

Chi Square = 24.622
Degrees of Freedom = 15
Probability = between .10 and .05
Coefficient of Contingency = .263
Relationship Positive

TABLE XXXI.

LARGEST COMMUNITY IN WHICH PASTOR CURRENTLY SERVES A CHURCH AND ECCLESIASTICAL MAINTENANCE BY QUARTILES — EDUCATIONAL EFFICIENCY

Size of Community	Educational efficiency quartiles									
	Total		Lower		Lower Intermediate		Upper Intermediate		Upper	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total	330	100.0	85	100.0	87	100.0	80	100.0	78	100.0
No Response	7	2.1	1	1.2	3	3.4	2	2.5	1	1.3
Open Country	15	4.6	1	1.2	3	3.4	3	3.8	8	10.2
0-249	38	11.5	5	5.9	10	11.5	8	10.0	15	19.2
250-999	85	25.8	17	20.0	18	20.7	22	27.5	29	37.2
1000-2499	79	23.9	28	32.9	18	20.7	20	25.0	13	16.7
2500-4999	49	14.9	15	17.6	14	16.1	15	18.8	5	6.4
5000-9999	56	17.0	18	21.2	21	24.2	10	12.5	7	9.0

Chi Square = 38.280
Degrees of Freedom = 18
Probability = between .01 and .001
Coefficient of Contingency = .322
Relationship Negative

TABLE XXXII.

PASTORS SCORES ON SOCIOLOGICAL CONCEPTS AND THEIR REPORT OF COURSES TAKEN IN SOCIOLOGY

Score	Courses Taken							
	Total		None		1-3		4 or more	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total	330	100.0	84	100.0	153	100.0	93	100.0
0-3	32	9.7	16	19.1	11	7.2	5	5.4
4,5	82	24.8	26	30.9	33	21.6	23	24.7
6	58	17.6	15	17.9	28	18.3	15	16.2
7	72	21.8	16	19.1	33	21.6	23	24.7
8	63	19.1	9	10.7	35	22.9	19	20.4
9,10	23	7.0	2	2.3	13	8.4	8	8.6
Mean Score	6.2		5.3		6.4		6.4	
Median Score	6		5.5		6		6.5	

Chi Square = 20.829
Degrees of Freedom = 10
Probability = .05

TABLE XXXIII.

PASTORS SCORES ON SOCIOLOGICAL CONCEPTS AND NUMBER OF RECOMMENDED BOOKS REPORTED READ

Scores	Books Read					
	Total		None		Some	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total	330	100.0	202	100.0	128	100.0
0-3	32	9.7	23	11.4	9	7.0
4,5	82	24.8	50	24.7	32	25.0
6	58	17.6	38	18.8	20	15.6
7	72	21.8	43	21.3	29	22.7
8	63	19.1	33	16.4	30	23.4
9,10	23	7.0	15	7.4	8	6.3
Mean Score	6.2		5.9		6.3	
Median Score	6		6		7	

Chi Square = 4.279
Degrees of Freedom = 5
Probability = .6

CHAPTER V

THE ROLE OF THE SEMINARY

We now come to an assessment of the responsibility the theological seminary bears in training the ministry of the town and country church. Our prior analysis has suggested several facets of importance to the seminary.

1. The majority of Methodist people and churches are in town and country areas so that any realistic preparation for ministry must include preparation for ministry in town and country. While our data are exclusively Methodist the conclusions will be suggestive for Protestant denominations with similar populations.
2. Professional sociologists who study town and country life do have judgments to make as to the service which their discipline can contribute to the effectiveness of a town and country pastor's ministry.
3. These judgments are borne out when we compare the sociological sophistication of town and country pastors with their records in church and community: there is a consistent relationship between sociological knowledge and measures of pastoral performance in both church and community.

Table XXXIV lists the twenty-eight institutions visited by the senior author in the course of six months. A one to five day period was spent at each of the institutions, not only interviewing personnel but on 19 occasions visiting classes, and where opportunity offered, inspecting library and research facilities and the like. Reception by busy professors, often puzzled to have a theological school professor interested in them, was generous and helpful. Only one institution which we were concerned to visit failed to confirm an appointment.

The interviews were conducted around two questions which those interviewed were encouraged to consider broadly:

1. What does rural social science have to contribute to the pastor at work in a rural community?
2. What is the role of the theological seminary in making these contributions available?

Individual interviews ran from as short a time as ten minutes to something over two hours. The interviewer made notes immediately and openly on a clipboard; he asked for interpretation if an answer was obscure to him. The interviews were often conversational though the interviewer aimed at keeping his own convictions out of the way until the other man had completely expressed himself. The interviews were all conducted on a one-to-one basis. When two persons came together one was asked to defer conversation to a later time.

TABLE XXXIV.

EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS VISITED AND NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL INTERVIEWED IN EACH

Institution	Persons Interviewed	
Universities—19		
Alcorn A & M University	1	
University of Connecticut	3	
Cornell University	7	
University of Illinois	5	
Iowa State University	2	
University of Kentucky	7	
Louisiana State University*	2	
University of Maine	3	
Michigan State University	3	
University of Minnesota	4	
Mississippi State University	10	
University of Missouri	6	
New Mexico State University	9	
Ohio State University	9	
Pennsylvania State University	9	
Purdue University	5	
South Dakota State University	4	
Texas A & M University	4	
University of Wisconsin	9	
TOTAL		102
Church-related Institutions—8		
Bangor Theological Seminary	3	
Central Baptist Seminary	1	
Duke Divinity School	6	
Interdenominational Theological Center (Atlanta)	2	
Missouri School of Religion	2	
Perkins School of Theology	4	
Simpson College, Indianola, Iowa	2	
Wesley Theological Seminary	1	
TOTAL		21
United States Department of Agriculture Washington, D.C.		3
GRAND TOTAL		126

*Visitation cancelled because of emergency but interviews carried on in other places with Louisiana State personnel.

One of the first emphases of the professors is that they emphatically do not want to make sociologists out of pastors. In a number of ways they phrase a common insistence that the minister in the community has his own proper role and that the aim of any help given him by rural sociology should not be to make him a secular social actionist but rather to enable him to do his work as a minister with greater effectiveness. A concern for the economic and social welfare of his people is an important and necessary aspect of his role; but they insist that he should not neglect his religious or priestly service to counsel people professionally on economic and social matters. One informant on our original questionnaire writes:

> My field is Economics. I take *Rural Sociology* to keep informed. Rural pastors should do likewise. I am convinced theological training requires much too little of the prospective pastor in "know-how" to organize and operate a church. Likewise in-service training could specialize more on how to get things done, on understanding the community that his church serves, and on socio-political-economic movements of the day.

Another testifies:

> Having taught "special" courses at Southern Methodist Univ. and Iliff (each only 3 weeks duration) and being engaged actively in both teaching and research, I doubt that a great deal of effort should be expended by ministers in learning research "methods". They should be able to communicate with people first and understand their problems. These are the important things.

Analysis of the interviews discloses that 72 different contributions of rural social science to the pastor were listed. Comparison of the top ten suggestions listed in these loosely structured interviews, with the top ten concepts listed as of major importance on the questionnaire to sociologists reveals similarities and contrasts. Table XXXV lists both sets of concepts.

Concepts of "values" and "power structure" appear in both lists. From Chapter III we recall that "community survey" was marked by the rural sociologists as one of the methods a rural pastor ought to be able to use and "demography" as a method he ought to understand. In general the list given in the informal interviews stresses the action aspect of rural social understanding as over against the more theoretical stance of the concepts on the questionnaire. Choices were limited to 49 items in the first case and limited only by the individual informant's imagination in the second. Accordingly there was a broader spread of choices and less concentration—in the case of the interviews, 72 different contributions listed by 126 interviewees. But the general impact of the lists is similar.

Such interviews, however, yield suggestions that may be made by only a few or perhaps by one person and yet which provide special insight. Ten persons mentioned the social science perspective as a contribution to the pastor's peace of mind and effectiveness. They pointed out that pastors tend to take a moralistic view of social situations and blame others or themselves

TABLE XXXV.

TEN CONCEPTS MOST FREQUENTLY MARKED AS "OF MAJOR IMPORTANCE" FOR THE RURAL PASTOR BY 204 RURAL SOCIOLOGISTS AND TEN CONTRIBUTIONS OF RURAL SOCIAL SCIENCE TO THE RURAL PASTOR MOST OFTEN NAMED BY 126 INTERVIEWEES

Rank	Concepts "Of Major Importance"	Times Checked	Contributions of Rural Social Science	Times Named
1	Norms and Values	159	Community Survey	51
2	Community	154	Social Change	28
3	Power Structure	153	Community Action	24
4	Community Decision-Making	144	Community Sub-group Interaction	21
5	Communication	137	Power Structure	19
6	Role	132	Values	19
7	Socialization	132	Leadership	16
8	Culture	130	Demography	16
9	Interaction	113	Stratification	14
10	Status	111	Broad General Knowledge Of Society and Culture	14

when plans do not succeed. The social scientist, however, understands any social action as the product of many forces and influences so that the individual who seems to stand in the way of a project may actually only represent the tensions in the community, many of them non-personal and situational. The pastor then will not blame others or himself for failure to get community or church support for some innovative procedure but rather will seek to understand the power balance in community or church and work through it for significant innovations.

Single individuals noted the following somewhat novel contributions which rural social science may make to the pastor: an understanding of the alienation of rural youth; help in synthesizing science, technology and ethics in serving the welfare of people; the significance of varying sizes of groups for the work to be done by the church; the sociology of death; the role of ideology in social change; knowledge of the small city (less than 10,000) in a day that stresses the metropolitan; and the exploration of community attitudes toward the church.

TABLE XXXVI.

TEN FUNCTIONS OF THE SEMINARY IN RELATION TO RURAL SOCIAL SCIENCE MOST FREQUENTLY MENTIONED BY 126 INTERVIEWEES

Rank	Function	Times Mentioned
1	Supplementing college training in social science	46
2	Applying rural social science to church problems	43
3.5	Continuing education for graduates	15
3.5	Interpreting sociology in ethical and theological categories	15
5	Broadening minister's concept of his role	14
6	Supervising field experience	13
7	Relating to an adjacent university	11
8	Understanding social change as constant	10
9	How to integrate ministry in community	8
10	Developing awareness of social resources available	7

In Table XXXVI we list the ten functions most frequently mentioned by our interviewees when questioned on the role of the seminary. The possibility of the seminary serving the church and its ministry in a liaison role occurs and recurs: the seminary is to supplement college training and to relate its work to that in a neighboring university; continuing education and supervised field experience are essential; and integrating the ministry of the town-country community and acquainting the minister with resources in the community on which he can call for help complete the liaison cycle. In one direction the seminary should reach out to sister educational institutions, in a second it should keep in focus its alumni as well as its current students, both in their field settings; in a third direction it should relate to the communities in which its graduates work with an understanding of the changes going on there, the meaning of those changes for the church and for persons, and an awareness of agencies, personnel and financial resources available to help.

Individual insights were stimulating and suggestive. Five professors pointed out the responsibility of the seminary in training men heading for a city pastorate to understand rural migrants. Four interviewees urged that the seminary prepare its students to participate in a team approach not only to the ministry but to working with other professional leaders in the community. Four more saw an obligation falling on a professor of town and country work in the seminary to alert his faculty colleagues to the objective situation in the town and country community. Several creative suggestions focussed around rural social research; the seminary should encourage such research by its own faculty and students; the professor in the field should take as a major responsibility the interpretation of current social research results to his colleagues; the professor in the field should serve as a symbol of the concern of the seminary for rural sociologists and their work and should act as a liaison with them; in this latter role he should communicate to the personnel in college of agriculture research centers researchable problems on which the methodologists there might work.

Another significant suggestion as to the role of the seminary is the reminder that the seminary is a professional school among professional schools and that the role of social science in any professional school is like that in other such schools. It behooves theological seminaries, then, to inform themselves as to what role is assigned to social science in medical, dental, law and engineering faculties. It has not been possible to give this suggestion body in this report but it is obvious that interviews with other professional educators would be extremely helpful to seminary faculties.

One professor pointed out that "the pastor is not only a man of God but a man of knowledge" in the town-country community. Through him the contributions of modern knowledge not only in theological fields but in all the fields of study move into the community. It then becomes the responsibility of the theological seminary to devise ways and means whereby new knowledge may reach the working pastor in a form in which he can evaluate and diffuse it among his constituents as well as his parishioners. The role of the seminary as a knowledge middleman is strategic. If the pastor does not get social science knowledge continually updated from his seminary he is not likely to get it anywhere.

How should the seminary faculty adjust curriculum and program in the light of this study? Our first counsel would be that faculty members should digest the materials offered here and then come to their own conclusions as to a particular institution's adjustment. We point out in the Appendix that the offerings of the several seminaries vary widely from school to school and from time to time. Some seminaries are now working very creatively to train town and country pastors; others do virtually nothing to prepare such pastors in any special way.

Certain general guidelines emerge from our study which we underline here for every seminary's consideration.

1. Social science sophistication wherever and however gained is positively related to measures of success in the rural pastorate and outreach on the part of the church in service to the town and country community.
2. A seminary faculty needs at least one member trained in social science (it need not be rural social science, according to rural sociologists, as social science is one whether applied in urban, suburban or rural communities) who will not only educate students but share the growing understanding of man-in-community with his faculty colleagues.
3. The rural pastor operates in a field of social forces of which his church is only a part; the seminary must familiarize him with the properties of that field so that his activities as a professional religious leader take those properties into account and utilize them as resources.
4. The seminary has responsibility for establishing and maintaining a dialogue both with institutions preparing other professionals for work in the rural field and with social scientists whose job is to study and observe that field.
5. The seminary should seek feedback from its alumni in town and country, from church officials serving there, and from other dwellers in town and country both to evaluate and restructure its own program as the times suggest and to pass on researchable issues and problems to research agencies in rural sociology departments.
6. Within the limits of its resources the seminary should provide Library helps and personnel to carry on continuing education in the town and country ministry; in this connection liaison and cooperation with continuing education departments and programs in the state colleges is a real possibility.

Certain questions emerging from our study call for further research.

1. Our early analysis and all our interviews were conducted around the most general concept of the church and the minister. Only in Chapter IV are we limited to a denomination, the Methodist, and that for financial reasons solely. Using the background of Chapters II and III other denominational ministries should be studied.
2. Our data at times indicate though they do not demonstrate that those who do best in a theoretical knowledge of sociology are not the highest in terms of church and community performance; and in reverse, that those who do best in church and community do well but not best on sociological knowledge. Is there a difference between an intellectual type pastor who is most at home in the world of ideas and a practical type who is less verbally fluent but more effective in non-verbal communication? Pastoral types should be investigated specifically.
3. Our data indicate real and significant differences in performance related to age and year entering the ministry. They suggest the possibility of determining a life cycle of ministry. Does the ministry present special problems and possibilities correlated with the period in which a man finds himself age and experience-wise?
4. Finally there is need for much more experiment than we now have in various alternate methods of communicating a social science perspective to seminarians. Such experiments should be predicated on the sort of data we here presented and should be evaluated systematically and critically.

APPENDICES

INDEX OF APPENDICES

2

APPENDIX I — DATA ON QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE

TABLE XXXVII.

RESPONSE OF ACTIVE AND JOINT MEMBERS OF THE RURAL SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY (1967) TO QUESTIONNAIRE ON RURAL SOCIAL SCIENCE IN THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

	#	%
Total Active and Joint Members	343	100.0
Schedules returned as undeliverable	3	.9
Schedules returned too late for inclusion	15	4.4
Total useable schedules returned	204	59.5

TABLE XXXVIII.

RESPONSE OF TOWN AND COUNTRY METHODIST PASTORS TO QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PASTOR AND HIS COMMUNITY

	#	%
Total Pastors sampled (Each 19th name in Methodist pastors' file, urban pastors subsequently removed)	852	100.0
Total pastors returning questionnaire	395	46.3
Total useable questionnaires	330	38.7

APPENDIX II — QUESTIONNAIRE I

RURAL SOCIAL SCIENCE IN THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IS BEING SENT TO ACTIVE AND JOINT MEMBERS OF THE RURAL SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY IN THE U.S.A. IT IS AN ATTEMPT TO EXPLORE THE CONCEPTS AND METHODOLOGY OF RURAL SOCIAL SCIENCE IN RELATIONSHIP TO THE TRAINING OF MINISTERS. YOU CAN ASSIST BY COMPLETING THE SCHEDULE AND RETURNING IT IN THE STAMPED ADDRESSED ENVELOPE. A REPORT WILL BE AVAILABLE ON REQUEST FOR THOSE INTERESTED. THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND THOUGHT.

Rockwell C. Smith
Professor of Rural Church
Administration and Sociology
Garrett Theological Seminary
Evanston, Illinois 60201

I. IDENTIFICATION OF OUR INFORMANTS WILL ALLOW US TO RELATE DIFFERENCES OF OPINION TO DIFFERING BACKGROUNDS. PLEASE CHECK THE FOLLOWING ITEMS AS THEY APPLY TO YOU.

(1) Age_____ (2) Sex_____ 3-5

(3) Highest Degree: B.A. or B.S._____, B.D. or S.T.B._____, M.Div._____,
M.A. or M.S._____, S.T.D._____, Ed.D._____, Ph.D._____ 6

(4) Indicate which of the following is your chief responsibility (1), and which your second (2),
administration_____ teaching_____ research_____ extension_____ 7-8

(5) Of what church are you a member? denomination_____, none_____ 9-10

(6) How often do you attend worship services?
never_____
funerals and weddings only_____
on religious festivals only_____
once a month_____
more than once a month_____ 11

II. CONCEPTS are important to a science. The following list has been derived from usage in sociological texts and in the Journal, Rural Sociology, over the last five years. Please check those you feel are important for a pastor to understand if he is to work effectively in a rural community. Add any not included under Additional Comments.

(concepts are on the next page)

	OF MAJOR IMPORTANCE	IMPORTANT	OF MINOR IMPORTANCE	
adoption process				12
change agent				13
commercial farmer				14
communication				15
community				16
community decision-making				17
cosmopolites				18
culture				19
deferred gratification				20
diminishing returns				21
ecology				22
elasticity of demand				23
ethnocentrism				24
family farm				25
farmer organizations				26
fringe population				27
function, manifest and latent				28
Gemeinschaft, Gesellschaft				29
institution				30
integration				31
interaction				32
land tenure				33
land use				34
level of living				35
life chances				36
locality group				37
market economy				38
migration				39
natural resource development				40
norms and values				41
parity				42
power structure				43
prestige				44
primary, secondary groups				45
role				46
rural development				47
rural-farm, rural-nonfarm				48
sanctions				49
social mobility				50
socialization				51
social solidarity				52
status				53
stereotype				54
stratification				55
subsistence economy				56
territoriality				57
trade center				58
urbanization				59
voluntary association				60

III. METHODS of research are a part of a science. Which of the following should a pastor understand and use?

	SHOULD BE ABLE TO USE	SHOULD UNDERSTAND	NON-ESSENTIAL	
community survey				61
statistics				62
scale construction				63
construction typology				64
sampling				65
demography				66
interviewing				67
participant techniques				68
comparative studies				69
operational procedures				70
projective techniques				71

IV. YOUR OPINIONS:

1. How many rural pastors have sought your counsel in the year past?
   none_____ 1-4_____ 5-9_____ 10 or more_____ 72

2. Do rural ministers whom you know show knowledge and skill in community relations?
   high degree_____ average_____ low degree_____ 73

3. Has the social status as a professional of the rural minister changed in recent years?
   rising_____ falling_____ no change_____ 74

V. What five books in rural sociology would you recommend for a pastor's reading?

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

VI. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

APPENDIX III — QUESTIONNAIRE II

CMB/SBM/jlb/4-15-68

THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PASTOR AND HIS COMMUNITY

NAME_____ 1
(Last Name) (First) (Middle)

ADDRESS_____ 2-3
(Street) (City) (State) (Zip Code)

AGE_____ SEX_____ YEAR ENTERED THE MINISTRY_____ 4-7

1. Indicate below your present conference status: (check one)

Approved Supply____(1) On Trial____(2). Full Member____(3) Retired Supply____(4) 8

2. Indicate below your post-high school educational achievement:

SCHOOL	DEGREE OR TERMS ATTENDED	NUMBER OF COURSES IN SOCIOLOGY	9-12
_____	_____	_____	
_____	_____	_____	
_____	_____	_____	
_____	_____	_____	

3. List your appointments for the last four years.

YEAR	CHARGE	NUMBER OF CHURCHES	DISTRICT	ANNUAL CONFERENCE	13-15
1964-65	_____	_____	_____	_____	
1965-66	_____	_____	_____	_____	
1966-67	_____	_____	_____	_____	
1967-68	_____	_____	_____	_____	

4. Check the size of the largest community in which you currently serve a church: (check one) 16

OPEN COUNTRY____(1) 0-249____(2) 250-999____(3) 1000-2499____(4)
2500-4999____(5) 5000-9999____(6)

On questions 5 through 11 if more space is needed continue the answer on the back of the sheet.

5. What community activities are regularly held at the church? (Indicate whether weekly, monthly, semi-monthly, etc.) 17

6. What other community functions were held at the church last year? 18

7. What community service projects were sponsored by the various organizations in the church last year? 19

8. What community projects were given financial support by your church last year? 20

9. What <u>officers</u> in your church also held community offices? (Including offices in government, Political Parties, institutions, labor unions, etc.). 21.

10. What other offices in civic or other community agencies are held by <u>members</u> of your church? .22

11. In what community activities (other than church activities) were you asked to exercise a ministerial function last year? Please indicate the type of participation (to speak, to pray, to have the invocation, etc.). 23

12. Which one of the alternatives below fits your thinking best? (check one) 24

____Values and norms are given in the structure of the created order and conflict between values is a conflict between truth and falsehood. (1)

____Values and norms develop out of and find their sanctions in groups (including Christian groups) so that conflict of values is a conflict between groups. (2)

____Values and norms are functions of particular cases and conflict exists only from case to case. (3)

____Values and norms are matters of individual taste and temperament and conflict between values is the result of differences in personality types. (4)

13. Which one of the following defines the Town and Country community? (check one) 25

____The area within which persons exchange visits and work. (1)

____The collectivity within which like-minded persons work to realize, maintain and commend their style of life. (2)

____The local area of government. (3)

____The geographical area within which people satisfy the majority of their needs including the need for identification. (4)

14. The phrase "power structure" when applied to a church or a community means: (check one) 26

____The Town Council or Official Board. (1)

____The representatives of the state government or the denomination. (2)

____The hierarchy of persons who are influential in group decisions. (3)

____The wealthy farmers and businessmen. (4)

15. Which one of the following fits your opinion and practice? (check one) 27

____There is an orderly pattern over time by which a church or other group learns about, evaluates and adopts a new project or procedure. (1)

____New developments in a community or church are always the result of pressures from outside the group. (2)

____If the few influential members of a church accept a new program, the program will be effective in that church. (3)

____The pastor is the principal influence in getting the church to use new methods. (4)

16. Which one of the following do you regard as most important for effective communication between persons? (check one) 28

____Empathy. (1)

____Precise common symbols. (2)

____Language skill. (3)

____Length of acquaintance. (4)

17. In which one of the following senses is the concept of role meaningful to you in working in your church and community? (check one) 29

____A role as the part a man has in an organization. (1)

____A role as the function a man has in a particular social situation. (2)

____A role as the mask a man has in social relationships. (3)

____A role as the expectations imposed by society. (4)

18. Which one of the following statements most closely suggests your understanding of the meaning of socialization? (check one) 30

____Participation in group activities. (1)

____The taking over of private industry by the government. (2)

____Enjoying the companionship of congenial people. (3)

____Learning and adjusting to social situations and expectations in the process of personality development. (4)

19. Which one among the following meanings of the term "culture" do you customarily have in mind? (check one) 31

____The social inheritance we share. (1)

____Marks of superiority in formal education. (2)

____Marks of superiority in family background and upbringing. (3)

____Special competence in judging art forms. (4)

20. Indicate which one of the statements below reflect your understanding of the term "interaction". (check one) Interaction refers specifically to: 32

____A personal interchange between two individuals. (1)

____An interchange between a speaker and his audience (Minister and his congregation). (2)

____An interchange between groups. (3)

____Mutual changes in attitude and behavior as a result of ongoing contacts between persons, and/or groups. (4)

21. Which one of the following statements most closely reflects your thinking? (check one) 33

____To say a person has status is to indicate his superiority to others in the community. (1)

____To say a person has status is to indicate superiority because of family. (2)

____To say a person has status is to indicate his relative responsibility and obligation in a particular group. (3)

____To say a person has status is to indicate his superiority as a result to his own striving. (4)

(Conclusion of questionnaire is on the following page)

22. Rural sociologists listed the following books as helpful for a rural pastor in understanding his community. Please indicate in the appropriate column your evaluation.

BOOK	HAVE READ	HAVE IN MY LIBRARY	HAVE FOUND HELPFUL	
Beal, George M., et al., Leadership and Dynamic Group Action				34
Bertrand, Alvin L., Ed., Rural Sociology: An Analysis of Contemporary Rural Life				35
Copp, James H., Ed., Our Changing Rural Society: Perspectives and Trends				36
Gallaher, Art, Jr., Plainville Fifteen Years Later				37
Loomis, Charles P., and J. Allan Beegle, Rural Sociology: The Strategy of Change				38
Loomis, Charles P., and J. Allan Beegle, Rural Social Systems: A Textbook in Rural Sociology and Anthropology				39
Rogers, Everett, M., Social Change in Rural Society				40
Sanders, Irwin T., Community: An Introduction to a Social System				41
Slocum, Walter L., Agricultural Sociology: A Study of Sociological Aspects of American Farm Life				42
Taylor, Lee, and Arthur B. Jones, Sr., Rural Life and Urbanized Society				43
Vidich, Arthur J., and Joseph Bensman, Small Town in Mass Society				44

23. Please list additional books in the field you have found helpful. 45

APPENDIX IV — SAMPLES OF PROGRAMS IN RURAL CHURCH AND COMMUNITY AFFAIRS IN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES

Through the courtesy of Dr. Earl Brewer we are able to show the development of concern for the rural church at Candler School of Theology, Emory University, from 1914 to the present.

OFFERINGS IN TOWN AND COUNTRY CHURCH AND COMMUNITY:

In Department of Religious Education

1914-1915. *Practical Sociology*. The church and social problems. Professor Harris.

1925-1929. *Rural and Small Sunday Schools. Major*. Winter quarter. Because there are so many churches of this type, special attention should be given to this class of work. This course will include within its scope programs of worship, daily vacation and week-day Bible schools. Professor Henry.

1930-1932. *Religious Education in the Rural Church and Small Sunday School. Minor*. Study of existing types of organization; evaluation of types; materials of religious education best adapted to work in the small Sunday school; means of more effectively relating the work of the Church to community life through the home, the school, and county welfare organizations. Professor Thomas.

1932-1935. *Religious Education in the Rural Church and Small Sunday School*. Outlining a program of work for the year that is unified and comprehensive; actual methods available, tested in rural situations, for making that program effective. There will be involved a study of what the new General Conference legislation means to the small church.

1935-1940. *Religious Education in the Rural Church*. Outlining a program of work for the year that is unified and comprehensive, including program of pastoral work, preaching, church school administration, etc. Discussion of actual methods, tested in rural situations, for making that program effective.

1932-1937. *Cokesbury Training School Work*. (Minor) A Cokesbury Training School is conducted in a rural or suburban church by the instructor, assisted by the members of the class. The remaining hours for classroom work will be used as a seminar in criticism of the work done, presenting new teaching outlines, evaluation of results. Professor Thomas.

1937-1940. *Leadership Training School Work*. Leadership Training Schools will be conducted in rural or small churches supervised by the instructor but actually taught by members of the class. The hours for classroom will be used as a seminar in criticism of the work done, presenting new teaching outlines, evaluation of results. Professor Thomas.

In Department of Missions

1915-1935. *Home Missions*. The conditions and methods of effective work among the negroes, the foreigners, and the submerged masses of our cities. The country problem. The mountain problem. (Half course.) (Minor) Professor Young.

In Department of Homiletics and Pastoral Theology

1915-1916. *Practical Problems of the Modern Church*. Adjustments in message and method. The problem of the city church. The problem of the country church. Required in Third Year. (Half course. First Term.) Professor Howard.

1916-1925. *Church Efficiency and the Social Applications of Christianity.* The law of organized Christianity efficiency considered with reference to A study of present-day conditions as affecting the church and its activity. modern world problems. The relation of the church to society in its various phases; the city church; the country church. Required in third year. (Half course. Full Term). Professor Howard.

1926-1932. *Present Demands of the Pastorate.* (Minor). The principles of pastoral theology in their continuous application to the needs of the church. Certain urgent needs of the present time; present requirements of the rural and of the city pastorate. Professor Howard.

IN DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

1915-1916. *Practical Sociology.* A study of rural problems. Elective. (Half course. Summer Term.) Acting Professor Harris.

1916-1919. *Practical Sociology.* A study of city and country problems. Elective. (Full course). Acting Professor Harris.

1923-1925. *Rural Sociology.* (Minor.) The principles of rural sociology. A brief study of the field and the rural problems. Acting Professor Harris.

1925-1930. *Rural Sociology.* (Major.) Fall quarter. A study of the rural community, methods of survey, the place of the rural school and church in the life of the country, and investigations of conspicuously successful rural churches and rural church methods, will be added to the usual discussion of the theory and facts of rural social life. Professor Harris.

1930-1944. (Alternate years) *A Study of Rural Society* (Major.) This course undertakes to examine rural conditions as related to social welfare with special investigations and a study of methods and means for organization and adjustment through the home, the school, the church, and the community. Professor Woodward.

1946-1949. *Rural Sociology.* 5 hrs. Study of rural people, rural community life, rural institutions, rural culture, rural social process, rural social disorganization and organization, and rural-urban accommodation. Emphasis will be on the application of these data in professional and vocational service to rural people. Classes will meet 4 times each week, with the equivalent of three hours each week in social field trips, first-hand field studies, special forums, committee work, and other social laboratory work as arranged. Professor Brewer.

1946-1948. *Seminar in Rural Sociology* 2½ hrs. An advanced study of selected problems in rural sociology. The interests of the students will guide the choice of problems from year to year. Students will engage in social research, reports, and critical discussions. Emphasis will be upon the utilization of results in practical problems in rural areas. Professor Brewer.

1949-1951. *Rural Social Organization.* 4 hrs. A study of rural social organization and disorganization, rural leadership, rural-urban relationships, rural social welfare and the social problems of agricultural and other rural occupational groups. Emphasis will be upon social planning to meet the needs and problems of people in rural society. Professor Brewer.

1951-1955. *Seminar in Rural Social Organization.* 4 hrs. An advanced study in rural problems with emphasis upon social planning to meet needs of rural people. Professor Brewer.

1955-1968. *Rural Sociology.* 3 hrs. An advanced study of rural society. Professor Brewer.

1940-1944. *The Rural Church.* A study of present conditions, possibilities and programs of rural churches; planning and administering a comprehensive program. Recommended to students planning for summer extension service, student pastors, and students anticipating rural charges. Professor E. Johnson

1944-1946. *Rural Church.* The message and the work of the rural church in the light of local and world conditions. Limited to students doing field work in rural communities. 2½ hrs. Professor E. Johnson.

1946-1952. *Rural Church.* 5 hrs. A study of the church in town and country communities with emphasis on the development of a comprehensive program to meet the needs of rural people. Students will prepare specific plans for a town and country charge. Classes will meet 4 times each week with the equivalent of 3 hours each week in field trips to nearby parishes and in practice work as arranged. Professor Brewer.

1952-1955. *Town and Country Church.* 4 hrs. A study of the problems and resources of local churches in various types of town and country communities (10,000 population and less), with emphasis upon planning and administering a comprehensive parish program. Professor Brewer.

1955-1963. *The Town and Country Church and Community.* 2 hrs. An advanced study of the church in town and country communities. Professor Brewer.

1963-1968. *Church and Rural Community.* 4 hrs. A study of present day conditions, problems and programs facing various types of small town churches and communities with emphasis upon modern methods of Christian planning and performance. Professor Brewer.

1946-1948. *Workshop: Rural Church Problems and Program.* 2½ hrs. Consideration of specific problems of the rural church or special aspects of the program. Professor Brewer.

1947-1949. *Seminar in Rural Parish Problems.* 2½ hrs. A study of selected problems growing out of the interaction of the rural church with rural community agencies. The problems will vary from year to year, depending on the needs of the students. Reading, observations, reports, and critical discussions will constitute the method of study. Professor Brewer.

1947-1948.

1949-1950. *Seminar in Rural Church Program.* 2½ hrs. A study of selected aspects of the program of town and country churches. The topics to be studied will depend on the needs of the students. Reading, observation, reports, practice work, and critical discussion will make up the methods of study. Professor Brewer.

1950-1963. *Seminar in Town and Country Church.* 4 hrs. An advanced study of selected problems and program areas of churches in town and country communities. (Changed to 2 hrs. in 1956-57). Professor Brewer.

1946-47. *Social Role of the Rural Minister.* 2½ hrs. A study of the sociology of the occupation of the rural ministry and the duties and relationships which characterize the minister's social role in the rural community. Professor Brewer.

1946-1948. *Agricultural Economics.* 2½ hrs. A study of farming methods and resources, farm markets, and their relationships to world trade. Emphasis on rural standards of living, agricultural cooperatives, and the implications for community welfare. Professor Brewer.

1946-1948. *Rural Community.* 2½ hrs. A study of the emerging rural community, its people, institutions and problems. Town and country community organization and community survey techniques will be considered. Professor Brewer.

1946-1948. *Rural-Urban Population Trends.* 2½ hrs. A study of the rural-urban and racial birth and death rate differentials and population migration. Special application to social and religious planning. Professor Brewer.

1946-1948. *Rural Leadership.* 2½ hrs. A study of community leaders and the techniques of leadership in town and country communities. Emphasis will be upon the development of professional, community, and church leadership

to meet the local needs of rural people through democratic processes. Professor Brewer.

1946-1948. *Practicum: Creative Writing for the Rural Church.* 2½ hrs. A study of methods, materials, and opportunities in the field. Practice writing will be emphasized. Profcssor Brewer.

1947-1948. *Financing the Town and Country Church.* 2½ hrs. A study of policies and methods of financing rural churches. Emphasis will be placed on working out a financial program for the church or churches involved. Professor Brewer.

1947-1948. *Rural Church and Public Relations.* 2½ hrs. A study of ways to interpret the rural church and its program to the community. Consideration will be given to methods and materials to use in worship bulletins, church paper, and newspaper writing, and in other ways to relate the church to its rural public. Professor Brewer.

1947-1948. *Workshop: Area Supervision of Town and Country Churches.* 5 hrs. Study of principles and procedures of supervision of town and country churches. Limited to persons who have supervisory responsibilities for town and country churches on a state, county, district, or other area basis. Professor Brewer.

1948-1949. *The Church in the Community.* 2 hrs. Methods and techniques of surveying the community in the interests of effective church leadership. Divided between the urban and the rural situations. Professor Brewer or Jackson.

1949-1961. *Church and Community.* 4 hrs. An analysis of the major types and sizes of modern communities as settings within which local churches function, with emphasis upon field research in selected church-community situations. Professor Brewer or Weber (1959-61)

1961-68. *Church and Community.* 2 hrs. A sociological study of the nature of church and community plus their interrelationships in various types of modern communities. The basic course assumes an introductory knowledge of sociology.

1954-1968. *Church and Community Workshop.* 4 hrs. A workshop approach to the problems and programs of rural and urban churches and communities set in the midst of the dynamics of modern society and culture. A special staff will provide competent leadership for this in-service training workshop during the summer.

Dr. E. Calvin Baird of Memphis Theological Seminary has provided the following outline of developments in a relatively new department.

1. The first courses offered by the Cumberland Presbyterian Theological seminary were offered during the academic year 1944-45. The courses were under the direction and taught by Dr. John E. Gardner whose specialty is Christian education. The courses offered were:
   The Church in the Rural Sections
   The Church and Social Problems
2. The courses listed above were subsequently (the next year and thereafter) taught by Dr. William T. Ingram who occupied the chair of missions and whose specialty was (and is) theology. Both Drs. Gardner and Ingram brought to their work considerable experience in working with town and country churches.
3. In 1953, the nomenclature for course offerings became The Church and Its Community. The offerings were within the framework of Practical Theology. The following courses were listed in the catalogue:
   Rural People and Their Social Groupings
   The Rural Community
   The Rural Church Situation

The Church and Social Problems
The Rural Church Program
The Urban Community and the Urban Church
Seminar in Rural Life
Thesis in Church and Community.

4. The Reverend E. Calvin Baird was employed part time as assistant professor to teach the courses mentioned above for the 1953-54 academic year. (See pg. 34, General Assembly Minutes).
5. In 1954, the General Assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church approved the establishment of a Rural Church Development Foundation and the employment of the Reverend E. Calvin Baird as director. In this role, Mr. Baird was to give half time to the Cumberland Presbyterian Theological Seminary to teach the courses mentioned above and to supervise field education. The remaining half of his time was to be given to parish development throughout the denomination and act as dean of In-Service Training for the Board of Missions.
6. In 1957, the offerings in the department were changed to the following:*

   The Church and Its Community Setting
   The Family in a Changing Society
   The Program of the Town and Country Church
   The Program of the Urban Church
   Seminar in Church and Community
   Thesis in Church and Community

   *Note the change from courses in rural church and community to courses emphasizing **Town and Country.** At the same time, courses in urban church and community were being offered. The key notion became community with variability in types of communities **vis-a-vis** mission strategy.
7. The Church Development Foundation ceased to exist in 1961. At this time, work formerly done by the Director was assigned to executive staff members of the Board of Missions. The change marked the beginnings of increased offering each year of the courses listed in the catalogue. Mr. Baird accepted the call to become associate professor of Church and Society and Field Work Director.
8. Previously to this time, Mr. Baird's credentials for teaching were limited to a Th.M. degree from Louisville Presbyterian seminary and his field experience. Mr. Baird asked for and received permission to begin work on a doctorate in the sociology of religion at Princeton Theological Seminary. At the time of this writing (February, 1968), he is awaiting the scheduling of his oral examination on his dissertation with expectation of receiving the Th.D. degree this June, 1968.
9. At this juncture, Church and Society became a department of the seminary on equal status with other departments. The departments are: (1) The Biblical Basis of the Christian Faith, (2) Church History, (3) The Doctrinal Expression of the Faith, (4) Christianity and Personality, (5) Church and Society, (6) Pastoral Ministry.
   The courses currently being offered in the social sciences are:

   The Church and Social Change
   Religion, Society, and the Individual
   The Family in a Changing Society
   Sociological Analysis and the Planning Process
   Seminar in Church and Community
   Seminar in the Sociology of Religion
   Thesis in Church and Society
10. Perhaps it is significant to note that the above courses are now offered at the theoretical level of social science with emphasis on analyses.

We quote from the catalogue of Central Baptist Theological Seminary their program in Town-Country Church Leadership. C. R. McBride is the professor in charge.

Major in Town-Country Church Leadership

This major affords students an opportunity to become well acquainted with the town-country culture of American life in which he will work, and to be aware of its unique values, current needs, and future trends. It also enables him to become proficient in the various techniques which can match the resources of the gospel and the church to the opportunities of the town-country community.

This major will be composed of twelve semester-hours of courses selected by the student under the guidance of the professor. Within this major, a student must take a three-hour seminar course in order to satisfy graduation requirements.

Town-Country 201—*Town-Country Church In A Changing Society:* A study of the place of contemporary churches in Christian strategy in the light of the history of the town-country church movement in America. Consideration will be given to the concept of the town-country minister, the characteristics of the seven rural regions, and the basic elements with which the town-country church must work if it is to accomplish its mission. This is a basic course to additional study in the town-country field. *Three hours. Offered each year.* Professor McBride.

Town-Country 202—*The Church and the Land:* A study of the relationship between the church and natural resources with special attention given to the history of the farmers' movement, the programs of various rural organizations and cooperatives, problems arising out of current trends in rural life, and the ethical factors involved in government farm policy. *Three hours. Offered in alternate years (1967-68).* Professor McBride.

Town-Country 205—*The Christian Home In Town-Country:* A study designed to help Christian leaders bring town-country families into closer alignment with Christ and his church. *Two hours. Offered in alternate years (1968-69).* Professor McBride.

Town-Country 207—*Readings In The Town-Country Church Movement:* An intensive discussion course based upon selected readings in the literature of the town-country church movement in America. *Three hours. Offered in alternate years (1967-68).* Professor McBride.

Town-Country 210—*Church And Town-Country Culture:* An intensive study of the dynamics involved in the interaction between the church and its town-country culture. Attention will be given to the responsibility of the church to its community and to ways by which the church may permeate the culture. *Three hours. Offered in alternate years (1968-69).* Professor McBride.

Town-Country 212—*Clinical Observation and Survey:* Opportunities will be given for guided observation and surveys of town-country churches and their communities. The class will meet three periods a week and will be responsible for week-end trips and surveys. *Four hours. Offered each year.* Professor McBride.

Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary offers this interesting collaboration with rural social scientists under the guidance of Professor Hendricks.

AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION
SOUTHEASTERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
Spring Semester, 1967-68

A seminar on Agricultural Education designed for community leaders and conducted by visiting specialists.

Directed by Professor Garland A. Hendricks.

Visiting professors from North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina.

Time: 7:00 to 9:00 o'clock each Thursday evening.

Place: Room 101 Appleby Building.

Credit: Two semester hours.

Attendance: A student is expected to attend all class sessions. In order for him to receive credit, it is necessary that he attend at least eight of the ten two-hour classes.

Reading: The student is expected to read and present a brief written report on the following books:

Food and Fiber for The Future, Report of the National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber, July, 1967, U. S. Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C.

Agriculture/2000, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

The Yearbook of Agriculture, 1967, The U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

Reports: The student is expected to prepare a report on each subject discussed. The report should include: Name of the student. Date and subject, with the name of the visiting specialist. *A synopsis* of the lecture and class discussion. *A personal evaluation* of the lecture and class discussion as it relates to life in our churches today.

February 1. "The Role of A School of Agriculture and Life Sciences in Society." Dr. E. W. Glazener, Director of Instruction, The School of Agriculture and Life Sciences. Mr. F. S. Sloan, Professor of Adult Education.

February 8. "Sociology in Today's World." Dr. Selz C. Mayo, Head Department of Sociology and Anthropology.

February 15. "Economics and Economic Development in International Countries." Dr. W. D. Toussaint, Head, Department of Economics. Dr. J. G. Maddox, Professor of Economics.

February 22. "Soils." Dr. R. J. McCracken, Head, Department of Soil Sciences.

February 29. "Plant Sciences." (Crops and Horticulture). Dr. P. H. Harvey, Head, Department of Crop Sciences. Mr. John Harris, In Charge of Horticultural Science Extension.

March 7. "Animal Sciences." (Animal Science and Poultry Science). Dr. I. D. Porterfield, Head, Department of Animal Science. Dr. H. W. Garren, Head, Department of Poultry Science.

March 14. "Biological and Agricultural Engineering and Food Sciences." Dr. F. J. Hassler, Head, Department of Biological and Agricultural Engineering. Dr. W. M. Roberts, Head, Department of Food Science.

March 21. "Agricultural Information and Agricultural Education." Dr. Cayce Scarborough, Head, Department of Vocational Agricultural Education. Mr. Tom Byrd, A Journalism Major.

March 28. "Ministers and the Sciences." Dr. Charles Pugh, Extension Economist in Charge of Farm Management and Public Affairs.

April 4. "Ministers and the Sciences." Dr. Richard A. King, Professor of Economics.

APPENDIX V — REPRESENTATIVE PROGRAMS IN COLLEGES OF AGRICULTURE

PRINCIPLES FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION FOR TOWN AND COUNTRY PASTORS AT LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITIES CONTINUING EDUCATION

Conference

A significant national conference on planning continuing education for town and country pastors at land-grant colleges and universities was held at the University of Wisconsin in May 1960. Policies developed at that conference provided the guidelines for this pamphlet.

Background

Working relationships between land-grant universities and churches for the betterment of town and country communities go back more than 50 years. Continuing education programs to aid professional workers of town and country churches have made a significant contribution in developing leadership.

"Town and country" here means the agricultural community, including not only farmers but all people who reside in villages and smaller cities.

With rapid economic and social changes taking place today, there is a growing need for over-all community understanding and cooperative action. The land-grant university and its Cooperative Extension Service recognize that they have a responsibility to work with the church as a community institution. The leadership position of the church in the community can be helpful to the Extension Service in bettering the community.

Church leaders, increasingly concerned with the totality of life, are attaching new importance to the role of the land-grant universities in acquainting pastors with the socio-economic realities of our day.

Dr. A. F. Wileden, University of Wisconsin, stated the land-grant institution's interest as follows:

"Our task as public educators with a responsibility to all the people is to concern ourselves with the church as one of our social institutions, and to explore the various ways in which we as public educators can make the church . . . more efficient and more effective as a social institution, both in its own right and as an aspect of the total community life of which it is a part."

Dr. J. E. Hutchinson, Texas A & M College, says that conferences planned for the continuing education of town and country pastors should give clergymen a better understanding of social resources and trends—information distinct from church sponsored inservice denominational training. "Thus the landgrant college can make its resources available to a most important community institution—the church—and in this way discharge more effectively some of its own responsibility to the community."

Types of Programs

A conference is a short event held for fellowship, inspiration, and instruction. It is open to all. One-to three-day conferences acquaint participants with current trends and new developments.

A school is defined as a training experience of at least five days; preferably ten days; duration. The level of instruction and the purpose of the school should be widely publicized to encourage the attendance of pastors who have adequate prerequisites in education and experience.

Schools may have either state or regional appeal. At the state level they should, in the main, be programmed for parish pastors, emphasizing state resources and problems. Regional schools should be planned for administrators and persons who have been at state schools.

How To Develop A Program

Purpose — Church and university leaders should recognize what the program is, what it can do, and what it should not be expected to do. They must see its unique contribution to the total continuing education needs of pastors.

It should not be conceived as a "spiritual retreat." It is an educational experience for pastors in which the university makes its resources available.

Many land-grant universities have a tradition of service to special interest groups. This tradition serves churches and other fields according to their needs.

The continuing education program discussed here contemplates educational cooperation at a level which can be participated in by all church groups.

Involvement — The Cooperative Extension Service of the College of Agriculture of the land-grant institution will take the lead in contacts with church groups. The Extension staff will involve appropriate resources of the university in developing a program. They are the focal point for information and the channel for community institutions, such as the rural church, to the resources of the university.

Sponsorship — The program should be interfaith in scope, with all church groups in the area invited to participate.

Experience has shown the importance of a structure that will insure cooperative university-church planning.

A broadly-based group, which represents the churches of the state, and preferably appointed by church administrators, should suggest program ideas and promote attendance.

A university-wide committee, representing leaders in research, teaching, and extension, is also essential to planning. Understanding and support by administrative officials is necessary to involve the university staff.

Curriculum — The subject matter of these continuing education programs for town and country pastors at land-grant colleges will be concerned with the environment in which the church serves—the economic, social, and cultural aspects of the community. Other aspects of the total continuing education of the pastor (theological studies, spiritual growth, and churchmanship problems) will be excluded and left to denominational or interdenominational schools and conferences.

The university should develop program content and provide teachers. The program content should be tailored to the pastors' needs.

Church leaders must state these needs in relation to curriculum possibilities. They should recognize that theological studies cannot be programmed in the curriculum, although time can be allotted for denominational meetings.

The most successful programs provide:

- An understanding of the community—its economic, social, psychological, and cultural aspects; current developments and trends, their impacts on people and organizations, and their implications for organizations and agencies.
- Awareness of the services and programs of the university and resources in the community.
- Instruction in methodology and skills in education, leadership, and community organization.
- Demonstration of how to inventory and study a community.
- Discussion on applying program content to church programs.

Recruitment and Attendance — Attendance must be the responsibility of church leadership. Scholarships are helpful.

The university-church planning committee should provide program information well in advance of the time when the school will be held.

Church executives should be encouraged to schedule individuals to attend these schools. Recruitment cannot be left to chance. It is most practical and

effective for churches to plan for attendance of their pastors on a regular schedule.

Key church leadership should interpret to church executives the value of continuing education at the land-grant universities.

Pastors benefit most from a school if they understand its purposes. Knowledgeable church leaders can help orient prospective students. Church leaders can promote this understanding by participating in these schools themselves.

Curriculum for the 7th Annual Great Plains Church Leadership School to be held July 7-18, 1969 at Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colo.

1969 CURRICULUM

Sociology I — (First year participants) 10 hours
Problems Resulting from Migration
a. Analysis of the Problem
b. The Effect on Institutions
c. The Effect on Human Resources

Sociology II — (Second year participants) 10 hours
Developing Human Resources in the Great Plains Area
a. Potential—Use of Human Resources
b. Education and Training for a Modern Society.

Economics I — (First year participants) 10 hours
Economics As Related to the Great Plains Area
a. Principles of Economics
b. Economics of the Great Plains

Economics II — (Second year participants) 10 hours
Influences Affecting the Economy of the Great Plains
a. Government Farm Programs
b. Specialization in Agriculture
c. Diversification in Agriculture
d. Agri-Business

Political Science I — (First year participants) 10 hours
Government in the Great Plains Area
a. United States Government in the 60's
b. Organization and Purpose of Political Parties
c. Analysis and Structure of Local Governmental Units.
d. Responsibilities of Local Office Holders

Political Science II — (Second year participants) 10 hours
Government in the Great Plains Area.
a. Financing Local Government
b. Services Available through Local Government.
c. Federal and State Relationships to Local Government
d. Regional Governmental Structure.

ELECTIVES

Set A (First week, choose two, one from each group.)

Group 1
Social Psychology 5 hours
Instituting Change in Youth Programs 5 hours
Application of New Technology in Church Education 5 hours

Group 2
Instituting Change in the Church
The Church and the Community

Set B (Second week, choose one.)
Community Development 10 hours
From Idea to Action 10 hours

*First week electives are one hour sessions. Second week electives are two hours of instruction.

SHORT COURSES FOR PASTORS OFFERED AT WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY 1961 TO THE PRESENT

(*courtesy of B. B. Maurer*)

The program of continuing education for clergymen at West Virginia University began in 1921 and continued over an unbroken span of sixteen years until 1937, as the annual State Minister's Conference. Built around a central theme, the conferences were held at the State 4-H camp at Jackson's Mill. Time has not permitted opportunity to search out the necessary historical

records to provide anything more than a brief summary of this period. Out of the State Ministers Conference however, emerged the West Virginia Council of Churches.

No further record of continuing education programs for clergymen has been found after 1937 until 1961 when, through the initiative of the West Virginia Council of Churches, the West Virginia Pastors Conference was conducted at Jackson's Mill, April 24-27.

Following is an outline giving theme, dates, and place, of the programs conducted over the past eight years:

1961 April 24-27, Jackson's Mill State 4-H Camp
West Virginia Pastors Conference
Theme: "Diluting Myths of Religion"

1962 September 17, 18, 19 and 24, 25, 26, a series of one day institutes were conducted at six centers across the state: Moundsville, Jackson's Mill, Romney, Charleston, Logan, and Lewisburg in the Fall.
West Virginia Rural Church Institutes
Theme: "Facing Rapid Change in the Rural Community"

1963 October 21-23, Jackson's Mill
West Virginia Church Leaders Conference
Theme: The Church and Area Development

1964 November 16-18, Jackson's Mill
West Virginia Clergy and Church Leaders Conference
Theme: The Role of The Church in Combating Poverty

1965 November 8-10, Mont Chateau Lodge (near Morgantown)
Appalachian Regional Leisure-Recreation Conference
Theme: The Church and Leisure-Recreation
Program shift from state to Appalachian Regional emphasis.

1966 August 9-10, West Virginia University Campus, Morgantown
Appalachian Regional School for Church Leaders
Theme: The Pastor in The Community
Program shift from conference to two-week school

1967 May 15-26, West Virginia University Campus
Appalachian Regional School for Church Leaders
Theme: Communication and Community in Appalachia
Date shift from Fall to Spring

1968 July 8-19, West Virginia University Campus
Appalachian Regional School for Church Leaders
Theme: Leadership Development in Church and Community. Date shift from Spring to Summer. Program shift from one year (two weeks) to three year (six weeks) cycle with combination of basic (core), and a variety of elective courses. Program designed for parish pastors *and wives.*

Continuing education for clergy moved from a part time to full time, year-round, program with full time staff position. Threefold emphasis: 1. Regional school 2. Community oriented service (a. community planning and development, b. institutional change, c. Leiure-recreation) and 3. Resource to denominational and interdenominational groups:

CONSTITUTION FOR THE NEBRASKA TOWN AND COUNTRY CHURCH COMMISSION

Courtesy of Dr. Otto G. Hoiberg, The University of Nebraska, Lincoln Neb.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The Town and Country Church Commission, consisting of representatives of the University of Nebraska and denominations in Nebraska.

—Seeks to enrich and dignify rural living
—Helps Town and Country congregations understand their Christian mission today
—Builds morale for town and country congregations
—Offers fellowship on an Interdenominational basis
—Provides a means by which the University and cooperating denominations may join in furthering their common tasks

shall be educational in nature and will conduct an annual Town and Country Church Conference and carry on appropriate research.

MEMBERSHIP

Membership is open to all denominations within the state of Nebraska.

GOVERNING BODY

The governing body shall consist of a Commission which shall be created by the election of two representatives, preferably a layman and a minister, from each of the cooperating denominations and by two representatives of the University of Nebraska. Field representatives or executive secretaries of denominations with responsibilities for town and country programs are invited to attend Commission meetings without power to vote unless their denominational representation is not complete (2. The Executive Secretary of the Nebraska Council of Churches shall be a member of the Commission and the Executive Committee. The election shall be made by the town and country (or rural) organization of each denomination. In the event there is no such body, the positions may be filled by appointment by the denomination's head administrative officer in the state. Churches without representation on the Commission may provide a representative consultant to attend the meetings, but without vote.

OFFICERS OF THE COMMISSION

The officers of the commission shall consist of President, Vice-president, Secretary, and Treasurer. The Office of President shall be limited to a maximum tenure of two years and the office shall rotate among the cooperating denominations. No limitation shall be set on other officers of the Commission. In all cases, election shall be held annually, at the time of the Town and Country Church Conference.

FREQUENCY OF THE COMMISION MEETINGS

The Commission shall meet annually at the time of the Town and Country Church Conference or as soon thereafter as possible and shall meet on call by the President when it is deemed necessary, or by written request of one-fourth of the official representatives of the denominations. Written notice of meetings will be sent out by the secretary to all commission members at least two weeks prior to the called meeting.

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Executive Committee shall consist of the President, Vice-president, Secretary, and Treasurer of the Commission and the Executive Secretary of the Nebraska Council of Churches. The Commission may enpower the Executive Committee to act on business in the interim between commission meetings.

FINANCES

The Town and Country Church Commission shall be financed by asking each cooperating denomination for the payment of the amount of one mill for each communicant member within the state. Eligibility to vote on the Commission is contingent upon the denomination's payment of its share. The expenses of the Town and Country Church Conference should be covered by registration fees. If a deficit should occur, the balance will be made up by the Commission.

EXPENSES FOR ATTENDING PLANNING MEETINGS

When the full Commission meets, each denomination is requested to take the

responsibility for the expenses incurred in travel by its representatives. When the Executive Committee meets, the expenses will be borne by the Commission Treasury. Mileage shall be paid at the rate of 5¢, and the cost of meals and lodging for the Executive Committee shall be paid by the Treasurer.

COOPERATION

The T wn and Country Church Commission seeks cooperation with the University of Nebraska, the public schools, the Soil Conservation Service, the County Extension Service, Public Health, the Nebraska Council of Churches and other groups holding common interest.

AMENDMENTS

This constitution may be amended at any meeting of the Town and Country Commission by a two-thirds vote of qualified voters present and voting, providing the proposed amendment has been sent out two weeks before the stated time of the meeting. Any proposed amendment shall be filed with the executive committee four weeks prior to the stated meeting.

RATIFICATION OF THE CONSTITUTION

This Constitution was ratified at the annual Town and Country Church Commission Meeting in 1959.

APPENDIX VI

CURRENT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books most frequently listed by 204 rural sociologists in answer to the question: "What five books in rural sociology would you recommend for a pastor's reading?"

Beal, George M., et al., *Leadership and Dynamic Group Action*. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1962.

Bertrand, Alvin L., Ed., *Rural Sociology: An Analysis of Contemporary Rural Life*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1958.

Biddle, W. W., and L. J. Biddle, *Community Development Process*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1965.

Copp, James H., Ed., *Our Changing Rural Society: Perspectives and Trends*. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1964.

Gallaher, Art. Jr., *Plainville Fifteen Years Later*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1961.

Higbee, Edward C., *Farms and Farmers in an Urban Age*. New York: The Twentieth Century Fund, 1963.

Kreitlow, Burton W., et al., *Leadership for Action in Rural Communities*. Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Press, 1965.

Loomis, Charles P., and J. Allan Beegle, *Rural Social Systems: A Textbook in Rural Sociology and Anthropology*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1950.

Loomis, Charles P., and J. Allan Beegle, *Rural Sociology: The Strategy of Change*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1957.

Nelson, Lowry et al., *Community Structure and Change*. New York: Macmillan, 1960.

Nelson, Lowry, *Rural Sociology*, 2nd Ed. New York: American Book Co., 1955.

Rogers, Everett, *Diffusion of Innovations*. New York: Macmillan (Free Press), 1962.

Rogers, Everett M., *Social Change in Rural Society*. New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, 1960.

Sanders, Irwin T., *Community: An Introduction to a Social System*. New York: Ronald Press, 1966.

Slocum, Walter L., *Agricultural Sociology: A Study of Sociological Aspects of American Farm Life*. New York: Harper, 1962.

Taylor, Carl C., et al., *Rural Life in The United States*. New York: Knopf, 1949.
Taylor, Lee, and Arthur B. Jones, Sr., *Rural Life and Urbanized Society*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
Vidich, Arthur J., and Joseph Bensman, *Small Town in Mass Society*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1958.
Warren, Roland, *Community in American*. Chicago: Rand McNally Press, 1963.
West, James, *Plainville, U.S.A*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1945.
Williams, Robin M., Jr., *American Society: A Sociological Interpretation*. New York: Knopf, 1960.

Historical Works

Benedict, Murray R., *Farm Policies of the United States 1790-1950, A Study of Their Origins and Development*. New York: The Twentieth Fund, 1953.
Brunner, Edmund deS. *The Growth of a Science*. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1957.
Cain, B.. H., *The Church Ministering to Rural Life*. Dayton: The Home Mission and Church Erection Society—The Church of the United Brethren in Christ, 1941.
Christian Mission Among Rural People, Vol. 3 in Studies in the World Mission of Christianity. New York: Rural Missions Cooperating Committee of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, 1945.
Dawber, Mark A., *Rebuilding Rural America*. New York: Friendship Press, 1937.
Felton, Ralph G., *The Pulpit and the Plow*. New York: Friendship Press, 1960.
Human Relations in Agriculture and Farm Life, The Status of Rural Sociology in the Land-Grant Colleges. Report of a study made by a committee of Land-Grant College Personnel, Sponsored by The Farm Foundation, Chicago, 1950.
Judy, Marvin T., *Frontiers in Nonmetropolitan Church Strategies*. Dallas: Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University, 1968.
Kolb, John H., *Emerging Rural Communities*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1959.
McConnell, Grant, *The Decline of Agrarian Democracy*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1953.
Myers, A. J. Wm. and Edwin E. Sundt, *The Country Church As It Is*. Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1930.
National Convocation Reports, Journals for 1943, 1944, 1946, 1947. Report of the National Convocation on the Church in Town and Country. New York: Committee on Town and Country—Home Missions Council of North America, The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and the International Council of Religious Education, 1943, 1944, 1946, 1947
Randolph, Henry S., *The Golden Harvest*. Boone, Iowa: Sunstrom-Miller Press, 1960.
Rapking, Aaron H., *Stick To It Farmer Boy*. Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1967.
Report of the Commission on Country Life (President T. Roosevelt's), printed in the U.S.A., by Van Rees Press, New York: Sturgis and Walton, 1911—reprinted 1944, Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
Rich, Mark, *The Rural Church Movement*. Columbia, Missouri: Juniper Knoll Press, 1957.

Sells, James William, ed., *The Methodist Church in Town and Country,* Proceedings of the National Methodist Rural Pastors Conference. New York: Department of Town and Country Work, The Methodist Church, 1943.
Smith, Timothy L., *Revivalism and Social Reform In Mid-Nineteenth Century America.* Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1957.
Stacy, W. H., and John L. Tait, *Adult Education Programs with Church Leaders.* Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University, 1968.
Taylor, Carl C., *The Farmers' Movement 1620-1920.* New York: American Book Company, 1953.
The Challenge of Change For the Church in Town and Country. National Convocation on the Church in Town and Country, Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University, October 16-18, 1962.
The Rural Church Today and Tomorrow, Report of the National Conference on the Rural Church. New York: The Home Missions Council and the Council of Women for Home Missions, 1936.
Tremblay, Marc-Adelard and Walton J. Anderson, Editors, *Rural Canada in Transition.* Ottawa: Agricultural Economics Research Council of Canada, 1966.
Vogt, Paul L., ed., *The Church and Country Life.* New York: Missionary Education Movement of the United States and Canada, 1916.
Wileden, A. F., *45 Years of Church Leaders Conferences in Wisconsin.* Madison, Wisconsin: Town and Country Church Leaders Conference, 1966.

Specific Works on the Town and Country Church

(Here we have had to make a selection from an on-going literature. The volumes listed are all significant for understanding contemporary rural church problems.)

Brewer, Earl D. C., and Theodore H. Runyon, Jr., Barbara B. Pittard, and Harold W. McSwain, *Protestant Parish.* Atlanta: Communicative Arts Press, 1967.
Carr, James McLeod, *Our Church Meeting Human Needs.* Birmingham, Alabama: The Progressive Farmer Co., 1962.
Clark, Carl A., *Rural Churches in Transition.* Nashville: Broadman Press, 1959.
Crisis in Town and Country. New York: Board of National Missions, The Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., 1961.
Ecumenical Designs. The Steering Committee, National Consultation On The Church In Community Life, Dr. Harold Huff, Chairman, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, New York 10027, 1967.
Gore, William J. and Leroy C. Hodapp, Editors, *Change in the Small Community.* New York: Friendship Press, 1967.
Greene, Shirley E., *Ferment On The Fringe.* Philadelphia: The Christian Education Press, 1960.
Harris, Marshall and Joseph Ackerman, *Town and Country Churches and Family Farming.* New York: Land Tenure Committee, Department of Town and Country Church, Division of Home Missions, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. (No date given).
Hepple, Lawrence M., *The Church in Rural Missouri.* Columbia, Missouri: The College of Agriculture, University of Missouri, Research Bulletins 633A-633G, September, 1957-February, 1961.
Johnston, Ruby Funchess, *The Religion of Negro Protestants.* New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1956.
Judy, Marvin T., *The Cooperative Parish in Nonmetropolitan Areas.* Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1967.
Mavis, W. Curry, *Advancing The Smaller Local Church.* Winona Lake, Indiana: Light and Life Press, 1957.

McBride, C. R., *Protestant Churchmanship for Rural America*. Valley Forge: The Judson Press, 1962.
Mueller, E. W., and Giles C. Ekola, Editors, *Mission in the American Outdoors*. Saint Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1966.
Mueller, E. W., and Giles C. Ekola, Editors, *The Silent Struggle for Mid-America*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Augsburg Publishing House. 1963.
Nesius, Ernest J., *The Rural Society In Transition*. Public Affairs Series, No. 3, April 1966, Office of Research and Development, West Virginia Center for Appalachian Studies and Development, West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia 26506.
Randolph, Henry S., and Betty Jean Patton, *Orientation to the Town and Country Church*. New York: Board of National Missions, The United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., 1961.
Richardson, Harry V., *Dark Glory*. New York: Friendship Press, 1947.
Schaller, Lyle E., *The Churches' War on Poverty*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1967.
Sills, Horace S., Editor, *Grassroots Ecumenicity*. Boston: United Church Press, 1967.
Weatherford, W. D., and Earl D. C. Brewer, *Life and Religion in Southern Appalachia*. New York: Friendship Press, 1962.
Ziegler, Edward K., *Rural Preaching,* Westwood, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1954.

APPENDIX VII — TECHNICAL NOTES

Data from the questionnaires were coded and punched on IBM cards. Frequency distributions were tabulated and they may be had for given data on inquiry to the director and payment of the costs of reproduction. Special cross tabulations or correlations are available similarly. It is hoped that other students will in examining the data discover relationships unobserved by the research team.

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

A final overall test of relationship between sociological test scores and pastoral performance in church and community involved expressing all eight pastoral performance scores as per cents of the highest score of each variable. The scores for each pastor were then averaged into two indices: the first four as an index of ecclesiastical performance and the last four as an index of community outreach. Then the sociological scores were correlated with the two indices and the indices with each other.

The following correlation coefficients were obtained:

TABLE XXXIX. CORRELATION OF SOCIOLOGICAL TEST SCORES AND INDICES OF PASTORAL PERFORMANCE

	Sociological Test Scores	Index of Ecclesiastical Performance	Index of Community Outreach
Sociological Test Scores	1.0000	.0328	.1224
Index of Ecclesiastical Performance	.0328	1.0000	.1981
Index of Community Outreach	.1224	.1981	1.0000

We test to see whether these coefficients are significantly greater than zero.[1] A correlation as large as .0328 between scores and ecclesiastical effectiveness would occur 56% of the time by chance alone if there were no actual correlation. But a correlation between scores and index of community outreach as large as .1224 would occur only 2.6% of the time if there were no

[1]Margaret Jarman Hagood and Daniel O. Price, **Statistics for Sociologists,** New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1952, p. 424.

correlation; and one as large as .1981, the correlation between the indices, would occur only 3 times in ten thousand. We judge the latter two correlations genuine.

From these correlations we may reason as follows:

1. Sociological sophistication is not directly related to ecclesiastical performance in our sample.
2. Sociological sophistication is related positively to community outreach.
3. Community outreach is positively related to ecclesiastical performance.[2]
4. Therefore, sociological sophistication, if it has any relationship to ecclesiastical performance, affects it through community outreach.

A further indication of this relationship grows out of a comparison of high and low scorers on the sociological test. When the ecclesiastical performance indices of the 23 pastors who scored 9 or 10 are related to their community outreach indices, a contingency coefficient of .56 results, significant at the 5% level. A similar comparison among the 19 pastors scoring 2 or less yields no relationship at all.

TABLE XL. CORRELATION MATRIX OF SOCIOLOGICAL TEST SCORES AND INDICES OF PASTORAL PERFORMANCE FOR 95 PASTORS IN NORTH CENTRAL JURISDICTION

	Sociological Test Scores	Index of Ecclesiastical Performance	Index of Community Outreach
Sociological Test Scores	1.0000	—.14777	.1555
Index of Ecclesiastical Performance	—.1477	1.0000	.3361*
Index of Community Outreach	.1555	.3361*	1.0000

*significantly greater than zero

TABLE XLI. CORRELATION MATRIX OF SOCIOLOGICAL TEST SCORES AND INDICES OF PASTORAL PERFORMANCE FOR 74 PASTORS IN SOUTHEASTERN JURISDICTION

	Sociological Test Scores	Index of Ecclesiastical Performance	Index of Community Outreach
Sociological Test Scores	1.0000	.1439	.0937
Index of Ecclesiastical Performance	.1439	1.0000	.1542
Index of Community Outreach	.0937	.1542	1.0000

Regional breakdowns shown in Tables XL and XLI indicate suggestive differences. The sample is too small to yield correlations significantly greater than zero except in the relation between ecclesiastical performance and community outreach in the North Central Jurisdiction. The fact that the sign is negative in the correlation between sociological scores and ecclesiastical performance in the North Central Jurisdiction and positive in the Southeastern suggests possible regional differences which may make the national figure meaningless.

[2]This is in agreement with Sandridge's study in which he found correlations of .39 and .36 between ecclesiastical effectiveness and community outreach in two samples of effective town and country churches. He found no correlation in a third random sample of town and country churches. Sidney E. Sandridge, **A Study of the Relationship Between Ecclesiastical Effectiveness and Community Outreach in Town and Country Methodist Churches in the United States — 1957,** Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, 1959, p. 67-68.

INDEX OF TABLES