

THE STATUS OF SPEECH AND HOMILETICS INSTRUCTION
IN ACCREDITED AMERICAN PROTESTANT SEMINARIES
DURING 1964

A Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
Kansas State Teachers College

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science

by
Jerry L. Winsor
August 1964

Thesis
1964
W

Approved for the Major Department

Richard A. Kilbuck

Approved for the Graduate Council

James G. Bryan

213901²

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Sincere appreciation goes out to those seminary administrators and their speech and homiletic instructors who have taken time out from their busy schedules to respond to the questionnaires, which formed the basis of this study. Particular appreciation should be expressed to Dr. William K. Clark, editor of The Digest of Research in Religious Speaking, Chairman of the Department of Speech and Theatre Arts at Hiram College, and to Dr. Carl H. Lundquist, President of Bethel College and Seminary for their guidance and constructive criticism of my study.

An unpayable debt is owed to the members of the thesis committee; namely, Dr. Richard Hildreth for his counsel and guidance, Dr. Russell Grandstaff for his helpful advice, and Dr. Darrell Wood for his worthy suggestions.

Further thanks must be expressed to Reverend Darrell Yeanev for supplying materials and suggestions which were helpful.

Last, but certainly not least, sincere gratitude is expressed to Mrs. Don Minner for her patient clerical assistance and to Mary Winsor, wife of the writer, for her help and encouragement without which this study could not have been possible.

J. L. W.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Origin of the Problem	1
Background of the Problem	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Definition of Terms	5
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	8
III. PROCEDURES	19
Questionnaire Construction	19
Questionnaire Mailing	30
Responses	33
IV. RESULTS	34
Data Received	34
General Techniques	34
Presentation and Interpretation of Data	35
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	81
Summary	81
Conclusions	85
Implications for Further Research	85
BIBLIOGRAPHY	87
APPENDIX A	90
APPENDIX B	98
APPENDIX C	100

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Number of Seminaries Offering Speech and Homiletics Courses	35
II. Number of Administrators Believing Speech Training is Essential for Effective Seminary Training	37
III. Number of Administrators Reporting a Belief Previous Speech Training of Seminary Entrants is Adequate	39
IV. A Comparison of the Responses of Six Administrators Indicating Adequacy of Speech Training on Question Four with Their Responses on Questions One and Three	40
V. Administrators Wishing to Add Speech Courses to Their Current Offerings	42
VI. Administrators Responding "Yes" to Question Five in Comparison to Their Responses to Question One	43
VII. Number Planning to Add Homiletics Courses . .	44
VIII. Administrators Who Prefer Teaching Separate Speech and Homiletics Courses	45
IX. Comparison of Negative Responses to Question Seven with Responses to Question Three . . .	46

TABLE	PAGE
X. Ranking of the Canons of Rhetoric by Responding Seminary Administrators	48
XI. Administrators' Opinions of the Future Status of Speech and Homiletics Education	50
XII. Administrators' Views of the Most Helpful Speech and Homiletics Courses for Seminary Graduates	51
XIII. Number of Sections of Speech and Homiletics Courses Offered	53
XIV. Instructors' Formal Oral Communication Qualifications	56
XV. Hours Reported Beyond the Listed Categories .	57
XVI. Instructors' Undergraduate Majors	59
XVII. Instructors' Undergraduate Minors	59
XVIII. Instructors' Master's Degree Majors	60
XIX. Instructors' Doctoral Degree Majors	61
XX. Number of Years of Preaching Instructors Have Completed	62
XXI. Number of Years of Teaching Experience Instructors Have Completed	63
XXII. Courses and Hours of Speech and Homiletics Taught by the Instructors	64
XXIII. Number of Speech and Homiletics Courses Taught by the Instructors	65

TABLE	PAGE
XXIV. Classical or Modern Scholars Relied Upon by Instructors in Teaching Speech and Homiletics Courses	66
XXV. Ranking of the Canons of Rhetoric by Responding Seminary Instructors	69
XXVI. Comparison of Administrators' and Instructors' Rankings of the Canons of Rhetoric as Areas of Potential Concentration for Speech and Homiletics Courses	70
XXVII. Instructors' Views of the Most Essential Speech and Homiletics Courses	71
XXVIII. Speech and Homiletics Journals Relied Upon as Background Materials	72
XXIX. Speech and Homiletics Journals Available to Students	73
XXX. Provisions Made for Speech Defects	74
XXXI. Use of a Speech Proficiency Examination	75
XXXII. Off-Campus Speaking Opportunities Provided by Seminaries	76
XXXIII. Use of Mechanical Equipment as Teaching Aids in Seminary Speech and Homiletics Instruction	78
XXXIV. Instructors' Views of Future Status of Speech and Homiletics Education	80

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Origin of the Problem

The origin of this study can be traced to the speech given by Dr. Carl H. Lundquist, President of Bethel College and Seminary, before the Speech for Religious Workers Interest Group of the Speech Association of America during the St. Louis Convention of 1960. A reprint of this speech came to the writer's attention in May of 1963.

Further impetus came from hearing and reading remarks from various persons concerning ministers' inability to communicate. Statements such as: "the church has a lot to say, but doesn't know how to say it," "formal speech training at the seminary level is not necessary," and "if the church had a live microphone to the whole world it would be unable to communicate" motivated the writer to prepare this study.

Background of the Problem

Theologians through the ages have made significant contributions to the theory and practice of oral communication. This would seem to suggest concern in the ministry for development of effective oral communication. Currently, however, it seems that most scholarly writing concerning the theory and practice of oral communication is being done by

the speech professional while the theologian is concerning himself with theological matters. William Pierson Merrill, author of The Freedom of the Preacher, says:

There are too many men in the pulpit who know a good deal, and think well enough, but have never gained the mastery of effectiveness and simple language, through deliberative and painstaking cultivation of a homely, forceful use of words.¹

He goes on to say, "A preacher without skill in words is like a knight with no knowledge of sword play."²

Since Merrill wrote in 1922, the competition for audience time among the communicative media has greatly increased. With the addition of television to the growing list of media the modern listener can be more selective as to what he listens and/or watches. James S. Stewart, in his homiletics text, Heralds of God, cited a passage from the Spectator, which spoke to this fact as early as 1946.

If people listen to competent speaking on all kinds of subjects during the week, they will ask for equal competence from the pulpit on Sunday. Slovenly work, careless technique, faulty construction and inarticulate delivery have had their day; they will pass muster no longer.³

Within this quotation is the suggestion that there is now a

¹William Pierson Merrill, The Freedom of the Preacher (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1922), p. 34.

²Ibid.

³James S. Stewart, Heralds of God (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1946), p. 103.

more demanding and selective audience for oral communication. Certainly, since this view was expressed, the need has expanded proportionally to the size and number of modern mass communication media and a generally more highly educated and demanding populace. R. D. Mahaffey of Linfield College speaks to this point in a recent Newsletter of the Speech for Religious Workers Interest Group. He tells us:

I believe that in this day of improved opportunity for various types of communication, with the increasing level of education for parishioners, their ministers must be trained to be effective in the spoken word.⁴

Stewart and Mahaffey have pictured an ever-expanding need for good oral communication training as a basic necessity for the modern minister.

^{copy}
Statement of the Problem

The problem is to study the status of speech and homiletics instruction in accredited American protestant seminaries during 1964. This problem will be accomplished by securing answers to the following questions:

1. What do seminary administrators consider to be the most important areas of concentration in course content in speech and homiletics courses?
2. What are the beliefs of speech and homiletics instructors concerning needed areas of concentration in content of speech and homiletics courses?

⁴R. D. Mahaffey, Newsletter of the Speech for Religious Workers Interest Group, S.A.A., April 15, 1964, p. 1.

3. What equipment and facilities are available for teaching speech and homiletics courses?
4. What are the academic qualifications of speech and homiletic instructors?

Question One will be answered from information secured from the Administrator's Questionnaire. The importance placed upon speech and homiletics training and specifically the administrator's view of what canons of rhetoric should be stressed will form the basis for answering this question.

Question Two will be answered from information secured from the Instructor's Questionnaire. Information secured from questions designed to discover what canons of rhetoric are concentrated upon and what materials and authorities are used in teaching speech and homiletics courses will form the basis for answering this question.

Question Three will be answered by Question Sixteen of the Instructor's Questionnaire which seeks all the teaching aids used by speech and homiletics instructors.

Question Four of the problem will be answered by the information secured from the first five questions of the Instructor's Questionnaire. Specific hours of formal academic training in speech and homiletics as well as undergraduate and graduate areas of degree concentration and preaching and teaching experience will be studied.

Definition of Terms

Total Course Offerings. The phrase "total course offerings" means those courses of speech and homiletics offered by the surveyed institution.

Speech Courses. The term "speech courses" will mean those courses of oral communication in which emphasis is not directed toward theological presentation; i.e., they are offered as training for speaking situations in general and are not necessarily limited to pulpit or related religious speech needs. This includes oral interpretation and other speech-related non-homiletic courses.

Courses in Homiletics. An acceptable definition of homiletics is that of Jacob Fry in his book Elementary Homiletics:

Homiletics is that branch of theology which teaches the principles and rules according to which sermons are prepared and delivered. It covers the whole subject science, and act of preaching or public address before the congregation.⁵

Mr. Fry goes on to point out:

Students come to theological schools not to become theologians, but chiefly to become preachers. Homiletics is therefore the chief aim and end of all theological study; the completion and crown of the whole course.⁶

In checking the seminary catalogs for a description

⁵Jacob Fry, Elementary Homiletics (Philadelphia: Board of Publication and General Council, 1904), p. 11.

⁶Ibid.

of homiletics courses such as Homiletics I, Principles of Preaching, or Introduction to Pastoral Preaching, the reader would normally find: "a study of the process of sermon construction including Biblical amplification plus construction of a sermon brief--listening to and reading of successful expository preachers' sermons will be included."

Qualifications of Instructors. By "qualifications of the instructor" the writer will mean the academic preparation, in terms of the numbers of hours of college credit in the area taught by the instructor.

Preaching. The term "preaching" will be defined as Albert J. Lyman, author of Preaching in the New Age, defines it when he says: "Preaching is art in the practical sense in that it is the skillful use of resources of public speech to attain the end of practical action."⁷ Preaching then is taken to mean the art of skillful religious speaking.

With an understanding of the background and nature of the problem plus a definition of the major terms, ^{let us now} an examination ^{of the problem of the sermon} of what has been written concerning this problem area is in order.

^{omit} The following chapters of this study are based upon the problem and background expressed in this chapter. Chapter II analyzes the literature dealing with the problem.

⁷Albert J. Lyman, Preaching in the New Age (New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1902), p. 36.

Chapter III presents the procedures used to collect the data presented in Chapter IV. Conclusions drawn from the data and suggestions for further research appear in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

William K. Clark reports that there is a slackening of emphasis placed upon oral communication in American protestant seminaries.^{8/10} Reverend Sylvester MacNutt of the Aquinas Institute summarizes a paper entitled "Speech Education in Protestant Theological Seminaries" presented by Clark at the 1964 Speech Association of America convention in Denver. Clark declared that there is a crisis in Protestant seminary speech education. MacNutt summarizes Clark by saying:

There appears to be a trend "toward less insistence upon undergraduate speech work by pre-ministerial students." Only two schools increased admission requirements in speech, while seven decreased them.^{9/11}

MacNutt further summarizes:

. . . 18 seminaries decreased speech requirements since 1958, while only 9 seminaries increased requirements. Dr. Clark's conclusion is that there is a "definite trend toward requiring Fewer and Fewer Speech Courses for graduation from the seminaries . . ."^{10/12}

* This decrease in the number of courses, in itself, is not
* crucial if the remaining courses are adequately training

⁸Sylvester MacNutt, Newsletter of the Speech for Religious Workers Interest Group, S.A.A., December 1, 1963, pp. 2-4.

⁹Ibid., p. 2.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 3.

* seminary graduates in oral communication.

William H. Bos expressed concern that speech training, broad in scope, is necessary for the demands of the modern minister. He says:

As I understand it, homiletics is the study of the preparation and delivery of sermons. This suggests a very limited approach to the problems of oral communication and persuasion; and it would seem to me obvious that a minister or preacher would profit much in the preparation and delivery of sermons from a broader and more extensive training than homiletics alone could provide and how would homiletics aid him in the oral reading of Scripture?¹¹

Bos indicates that more training beyond homiletics is necessary for the demands of the modern ministry. He goes on to establish a significant need for speech training as he says:

Furthermore, while he usually delivers not more than two sermons per week, he is called upon to deliver a great many speeches of various kinds; and here homiletics would be of considerably less help than a course in forms of public address. Again, with all of the committee meetings, small groups and congregational meetings that a minister is called upon to conduct, it would seem to me almost imperative that he have training in group discussion and parliamentary procedure.¹²

Finally, Bos states:

All of which, it seems to me; suggests that extensive training in speech, for the minister, is not an optional extra but an imperative necessity for the effective

¹¹William H. Bos, Newsletter of the Speech for Religious Workers Interest Group, S.A.A., April 15, 1964, pp. 1-2.

¹²Ibid., p. 2.

discharge of his various public responsibilities and activities.¹³

It seems clear then, if the remaining speech courses are not adequately complementing homiletics and theological education, a re-evaluation of speech and homiletics education should be made by seminary administrations.

Recent studies have shown those teaching these needed courses are not always well prepared academically. Carl H. Lundquist, President of Bethel College and Seminary, while analyzing what he called tensions between speech and homiletics, pointed to the lack of speech background among homiletics teachers as one cause. Speaking at the National Convention of the Speech for Religious Workers in December of 1960, he announced:

I talked with 87 people involved in full-time teaching in the 33 schools, 60 of them teaching primarily in homiletics. I discovered that of those 60, only 3.3% had Ph.D.'s in speech. Also, to my amazement, I discovered that only 6.7% had Ph.D.'s in homiletics. Fifty Per Cent of the Homiletics teachers had their graduate degrees in fields Other Than speech or homiletics--and Forty Per Cent Had No Graduate Degrees at all.¹⁴

From the evidence gathered through visits to the thirty-three protestant theological seminaries, Lundquist

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴Carl Lundquist, "Tensions Between Speech and Homiletics," Digest of Research in Religious Speaking, I:I (May, 1963), p. 3.

was able to add:

This means that these men, to whom are entrusted the basic responsibility of teaching homiletics to would-be ministers, had little more exposure to the discipline of speech than incidental courses they had taken or were taking.¹⁵

Evidence from recent studies indicates many instructors have not received adequate instruction in rhetoric. The content of speech and homiletics courses, at the seminary level, seems to necessitate knowledgeable instructors; i.e., speech and homiletics instructors do need to have academic preparation in rhetorical theory. MacNutt summarizes Clark's findings concerning this point by saying, "About half the seminary teachers of speech hold no graduate degrees in speech. . . ."¹⁶

There is some concern about the status of oral communication education in American protestant seminaries. There is considerable evidence that the number of speech and homiletic courses required and offered are on the decrease in accredited American protestant seminaries. Further evidence suggests that many instructors of these courses have less than a desirable background in the courses they are teaching.

Clark and Lundquist have made the most closely related studies. Lundquist's study is now somewhat dated, and

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶MacNutt, op. cit., p. 2.

is slanted toward the Baptist affiliation. Clark's study, "An Analysis of Contemporary Speech and Education in American Protestant Seminaries," is a Ph.D. thesis from Purdue University. Clark surveyed the curricular offerings in the catalogs of a total of 80 seminaries. Questionnaires were devised by Clark to gather opinions on the need for speech training and the place of speech offerings in the seminary. Further, Clark examined textbooks of homiletics for rhetorical elements. Clark states the purpose of his study was:

. . . to investigate the extent to which certain accepted "postulates" of contemporary speech education govern the philosophy underlying the teaching of speech and homiletics today in American protestant seminaries.¹⁷

His findings indicate that despite overwhelming verbal "lip service" to the value of speech training for ministerial students many seminaries did not practice what they preached. He tells us:

. . . 35% of the seminaries (28 of 80) did not require speech for graduation, and 19% (15 of 80) did not even list courses in speech.¹⁸

Speech training would not appear to be considered essential for seminary graduates in light of this study.

¹⁷William K. Clark, "An Analysis of Contemporary Speech Education in American Protestant Seminaries," (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana, August, 1960), p. vi.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 337.

Donald Rex Donica completed the most recent study in this area in 1962. His study, entitled "A Survey and an Evaluation of the Traditional and Contemporary Methodologies in the Teaching of Homiletics," was completed at Boston University School of Theology. Donica's hypothesis reads:

. . . that the teaching of homiletics is benefited by using certain appropriate contemporary pedagogical and technological innovations.¹⁹

This, he concludes, is born out by the study he conducted. Some of his conclusions and recommendations are of interest. He recommends a homiletics laboratory; i.e., classrooms, offices, practice cubicles, study rooms, projector room, and a chapel, located together in one area.²⁰ His reports show a tape recorder to be highly useful as a teaching aid.²¹ Finally he says:

Analysis of the results of this study show that practice preaching and workshop groups are reported to be the most effective teaching methods for homiletics.²²

Robert E. Pebley wrote a master's thesis entitled

¹⁹Donald Rex Donica, "A Survey and an Evaluation of the Traditional and Contemporary Methodologies in the Teaching of Homiletics," (unpublished Th.D. Thesis, Boston University School of Theology, 1962), p. 150.

²⁰Ibid., p. 159.

²¹Ibid., p. 166.

²²Ibid.

Oral Communication - A Curriculum Proposal for a Theological Seminary. This was found to be only indirectly related to the problem as it was a study to set a basis for a new first course in homiletics training for Butler University.

A thesis by Joseph Jones entitled Preparation for Pastoral Preaching proved to be a statement of the general preparation needed for preaching, including such things as attitude and scripture study. It does not concern directly this area of study.

^{STAFF} Edward Stasheff and Kenneth E. Anderson, sponsored by a grant from the Lilly Endowment, Inc., conducted a study for the Methodist Church which provides some related material. ^{is already indicated} The study was conducted to gather material for the preparation of a course of study for post-graduate training in preaching. The scope of this study was, however, limited to eleven of twelve American Methodist seminaries as well as several seminaries and one post-ordination institution in the United Kingdom. In this study curricular offerings in preaching ten years ago were contrasted with those of today by analysis of the seminary catalogs of 1950-52 and those of 1961-62.²³ The conclusions include:

²³Edward Stasheff and Kenneth E. Anderson, "A Study of Current Developments in the Teaching of Preaching in America and the United Kingdom," Indianapolis: Methodist Church, 1963, p. 4.

Courses in the history or theory of preaching have been added to the curriculum more rapidly than combined theory and delivery courses or straight speech courses. . . .

Very few seminaries had radio or television facilities, which naturally resulted in the offering of few or no courses in broadcasting. . . . Only half of these, however, have public address systems available for student use.²⁴

Other findings of interest to this study include:

A trend toward courses combining theory and practice was found; . . .

Only seven of the surveyed seminaries offered courses in speech per se. . . .

The staff of the Department of Preaching has either remained constant or has increased in absolute numbers, although this increase is at best in proportion to total enrollment gains. Thus, in fact, preaching faculties are not growing in proportion to the increase in course offerings of most seminaries. . . .

Only one seminary visited reported an entrance requirement in speech, and this requirement was instituted after 1950. . . . Two schools eliminated the taking of regular speech courses in the seminary if the entrant had taken three hours of speech as an undergraduate.²⁵

Recommendations arising from this study concerned a new system of post-graduate workshops, which may be termed a stop-gap measure. This measure seems hardly directed at elimination of the problem, but rather concerns post-graduate training of those who recognize their deficiency and are

²⁴Ibid., pp. 104-105.

²⁵Ibid., pp. 107-109.

willing to return for further education.

In an article, "The Teaching of Homiletics--The Present Situation in American Seminaries," H. Grady Davis reported on a series of eight inter-denominational regional conferences of teachers of preaching which were held during the winter and spring of 1960. His conclusions indicate that the place of preaching varies from essential to incidental in the theological curriculums.²⁶ The following trends in ^(curriculum) instruction were cited:

1. Preaching is increasingly taught in connection with its practice by hearing and studying actual sermons and by preparing and delivering them. . . .
2. Responsibility for instruction in preaching, especially in evaluating the students' preaching, is increasingly shared by other members of the theological faculty besides the professor of homiletics.
3. There is a tendency to emphasize the differences between preaching before a seminary class or community and preaching in a parish or other non-academic situation.²⁷

Davis indicated that teachers of homiletics often gain their position by displaying competence in some other field or success in preaching without actual primary stress upon academic training and general abilities as preaching instructors.²⁸

²⁶H. Grady Davis, "The Teaching of Homiletics--The Present Situation in American Seminaries," Encounter, Vol. XXII, No. 2 (Spring, 1961), p. 201.

²⁷Ibid., pp. 200-203.

²⁸Ibid., pp. 205-206.

Noah E. Fehl, writing in the appendix in William H. Nes's book, The Excellency of the Word, suggests that an achievement examination might well be used by seminaries to establish a minimum standard of proficiency. He suggests an increased emphasis on the arts of persuasion and discussion and a fuller incorporation of speech and homiletics with Biblical and theological teaching.²⁹ This survey included divinity schools and some pre-theological specializing colleges.

The Quarterly Journal of Speech has several articles indirectly related to the area of concern. Examples include an article by E. L. Hunt entitled: "The Teaching of Public Speaking in Schools of Theology" and a later article by F. W. Lambertson entitled: "Audience Analysis in Early American Teaching of Pulpit Oratory." The problem of these two studies is typical--the first article is dated 1924 and the second is dated 1932.

William D. Thompson's bibliography, submitted recently to Speech Monographs, entitled "Teaching Speech to the Clergy: A Bibliography," listed studies completed in this area. This bibliography revealed no studies directly related to the problem of this thesis beyond those reviewed.

²⁹Noah E. Fehl, "A Survey of Homiletics Education," as appears in the Appendix in The Excellency of the Word, by William H. Nes, New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1956, pp. 155-158.

After the survey of existing literature had been made and the problem clarified in light of current research the questionnaires were constructed. Construction of the questionnaires is considered in Chapter III.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

To answer the four questions posed in the Statement of Problem questionnaires were constructed. This process is discussed in the following section, Questionnaire Construction. After the questionnaires were constructed copies were mailed to all accredited American protestant seminaries contained in the December 1963 listing of the American Association of Theological Schools. (See Appendix C) The reason for limiting the sample group to these seminaries will be discussed in the section on Questionnaire Mailing.

Questionnaire Construction

The Administrator's Questionnaire contained twelve questions requiring eighteen responses and was designed to gather the administrator's view of speech and homiletics instruction.

In the Instructions, distinction was made between speech and homiletics by defining the former as those courses designed to improve oral communication ability in general as opposed to homiletics courses which are those courses concentrating on religious oral communication. This distinction was drawn because of a desire to make clear to the respondent that some questions pertain specifically to

values a combination approach; i.e., was it his belief both speech and homiletics should be offered to seminary students. It was the hypothesis that the combination approach would be considered more valuable by administrators.

8. Please rank the following areas of potential concentration in the order you feel they should be stressed in seminary speech or homiletic education. Please rank 1st, 2nd, 3rd, etc. in terms of areas from which you feel a seminary graduate would most benefit.

- A. Concentration should be upon construction and selection of subject materials. _____
- B. Concentration should be upon the orderly arrangement of subject materials. _____
- C. Concentration should be upon the choice of words and means to express the subject material. _____
- D. Concentration should be upon the best method of keeping the major ideas in mind which are to be expressed. _____
- E. Concentration should be upon the most effective delivery of the subject material. _____

Question Eight was constructed to discover how the administrator would rank the 'canons' of rhetoric. It was realized 'areas of potential concentration' might or might not be recognized as canons. In A, "construction and selection of subject materials" is synonymous with the canon of invention. In B, "orderly arrangement of subject materials," is synonymous with the canon of organization. In C, "choice of words and means to express the subject material" is

synonymous with the canon of style. In D, "the best method of keeping the major ideas in mind" is synonymous with the canon of memory. In E, "most effective delivery of the subject material" is synonymous with the canon of delivery.

9. Do you feel the status of speech and homiletics education, in terms of number and quality of courses offered, will be increased in protestant seminary education in the next ten years? Yes No _____

It has been cited, by various studies, that speech and homiletics education are slowly becoming extinct in contemporary seminary curriculums. This question sought to stimulate the administrator to look toward the future and give his opinion as to the future status of speech and homiletic training.

10. What speech or homiletics course or courses do you believe to be the most important to a seminary graduate? (Please List) _____

Question Ten was designed to seek administrators' views of courses which are the best training devices and the most needed by a seminary graduate. It was anticipated the course title could be found in the listing of course offerings in the seminary catalog and some indication of what content this seminarian was advocating could be gained.

11. If you are planning to add homiletics courses, or simply would like to, please indicate in order the area of concentration you would prefer. (Please indicate 1st, 2nd, and 3rd)

- A. Theoretical - sermon composition without actual delivery. _____
- B. Practical - sermon delivery _____
- C. Combined - integration of the elements of theory and delivery. _____

Question Eleven was constructed to discover the direction of emphasis the administrator would like to place in future additions to speech and homiletics courses. It was believed courses which represent a combined approach would receive higher rankings.

12. How many sections of speech and homiletics training do you offer? _____

Catalogs list the number of courses, but do not list the number of sections offered. The number of course sections an institution offers, as well as the content of the courses, was needed to evaluate the emphasis institutions place upon speech and homiletics courses.

The Instructor's Questionnaire had instructions and definitions as on the Administrator's Questionnaire. Again homiletics and speech were identified separately. Seventeen questions were asked.

1. How many semester hours of higher education do you have in the following oral communication areas?

- A. Fundamentals of Speech _____
- B. Voice and Diction _____
- C. Speech Composition _____
- D. Public Address _____
- E. Classical Rhetorical Theory _____
- F. Modern Rhetorical Theory _____
- G. Argumentation and Debate _____
- H. Discussion, Leadership, and Conferences _____
- I. Persuasion _____
- J. Oratory _____
- K. Introduction to Radio and/or Television _____
- L. Radio Speech _____
- M. Radio Production _____
- N. Television Techniques _____
- O. Oral Interpretation of Literature _____
- P. Oral Interpretation of the Bible _____
- Q. Theatre Production _____
- R. Stage Acting _____
- S. Play Directing _____
- T. Technical Theatre _____
- U. Remedial Speech _____
- V. Other oral communication areas (Please
List) _____
- W. _____
- X. _____

Many studies have indicated instructors teaching speech and homiletics have limited academic training in oral communication. This question was designed to discover the nature of the academic training achieved by the instructors. Some studies have indicated those teaching speech and homiletics at the seminary level had their majors and minors in other fields. Thus, this question also sought to find how many academic credits the instructor has in the area of speech and homiletics regardless of his major or minor.

2. What was your undergraduate major? _____
minor? _____

3. What was your graduate area of concentration?

Master's? _____
 Doctorate? _____

Both Lundquist and Clark have noted the lack of graduate degrees in the field taught. This question was designed to gather further evidence concerning the validity of this conclusion. It was recognized in Question One that despite the fact the major amount of academic training may be in another field, a considerable amount of academic training in some specific areas of rhetoric may have been achieved.

4. How many years of preaching experience do you have? _____

This question sought to find an indication of the degree of experience in homiletic communication the instructor had completed.

5. How many years of teaching have you completed? _____

Question Five arose from the realization Question Four alone might not show all the experience a seminary instructor had completed. Teaching experience was considered helpful in terms of qualification.

6. What courses do you teach in the area of speech and homiletics and how much credit is given for each?

- | | |
|----------|-----------|
| 1. _____ | 2. _____ |
| 3. _____ | 4. _____ |
| 5. _____ | 6. _____ |
| 7. _____ | 8. _____ |
| 9. _____ | 10. _____ |

Question Six was included to determine how extensively each teacher was involved in teaching speech and homiletics.

7. Which of the above courses are speech?

(Use above numbers)

Homiletics? (Use above numbers)

Question Seven was designed to determine in which of the two areas the instructor concentrated.

8. Which, if any in particular, Classical or Modern scholars do you concentrate upon in teaching the above courses?

1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____ 4. _____
 5. _____ 6. _____ 7. _____ 8. _____
 9. _____ 10. _____

Question Eight was constructed to discover what scholars were influential in current course content. Also, the question was constructed to find out if classical or modern scholars were most often used.

9. Please rank the following areas of potential concentration in order as you feel they should be emphasized in teaching speech and homiletics. Please rank 1st, 2nd, 3rd, etc., in terms of areas from which you feel a seminary graduate would most benefit.

A. Concentration should be upon construction and selection of subject materials. _____

B. Concentration should be upon orderly arrangement of subject materials. _____

C. Concentration should be upon choice of words and means to best express the subject material. _____

D. Concentration should be upon the best method of keeping the major ideas to be expressed in mind. _____

- E. Concentration should be upon the most effective delivery of the subject matter. _____

Question Nine sought the same information as Question Eight of the Administrator's Questionnaire from the viewpoint of the instructor.

10. What speech and homiletics courses do you feel are the most essential to a seminary graduate?
-

This question was designed to do two things. One, to discover what oral communication courses are valued, by the instructors, as most essential to the seminary students, and two, to discover if speech or homiletics courses are considered the more essential.

11. What professional journals of speech and homiletics or other material do you rely upon?
-

Current professional material was considered necessary to keep up on academic subjects. This question sought the most commonly used material and also to see if the instructors depend more on speech or homiletics professional material than upon the other material.

12. What professional speech and homiletics journals and other periodical materials related to oral communication are available for student and faculty use in the library?
-

Question Twelve seeks, in terms of the student, similar

information as was sought in Question Eleven.

13. What provisions for speech defects are made by your institution? (Please check one.)

A. Handled by the school _____

B. Referred to a local clinic or other center _____

C. No provisions made _____

This question was designed to discover just what is the common practice in handling speech defects.

14. Is a speech proficiency examination given? Yes No

Question Fourteen sought to discover if any speaking examination is given to either incoming students or to graduating seminary students.

15. Are off-campus speaking opportunities provided? Yes No

The classroom situation often is not the most helpful for a student to best learn the demands of modern church communication. Consequently, it was believed many seminaries provide off-campus speaking opportunities.

16. Do you have and use mechanical equipment?

A. Master tapes or records of voice and speech progress Yes No

B. Filming or video-tape equipment _____

C. Soundproof booths and listening equipment _____

D. Public address systems _____

This sampling was considered representative of graduate training in American protestant seminaries. It would be logical to assume the speech and homiletics training offered at the seminaries fully accredited by A.A.T.S. would equal or surpass instruction given in associate and affiliated members. The A.A.T.S. states that accrediting of institutions is:

. . . based upon academic criteria without reference to doctrinal position or ecclesiastical affiliation, and upon evidence that the institution has the necessary facilities and standards to prepare students for the ministry.³⁰

Further, the standards of admission maintained, as set forth in The Handbook of the A.A.T.S., are those of a graduate institution.

An accredited theological school should require of all North American applicants for admission to the school the degree of A.B. from a college which is accredited by one of the regional accrediting associations or its counterpart in Canada, or the equivalent of such a degree.³¹

Further qualifications necessary for accreditation include the necessity for no fewer than five days of academic work per week and a term comparable in length to that prevailing in accredited colleges in that region. An accredited

³⁰American Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, The Handbook (Dayton, Ohio; The Association, December, 1963), p. 22.

³¹Ibid.

seminary should maintain a curriculum broadly built around arts and sciences and should include adequate instruction properly distributed among: Biblical, Historical, Theological and Practical instruction.³² Speech instruction is subsumed under practical instruction; homiletics is generally considered practical instruction, but encompassing content from the other branches of instruction.

Associate membership in the A.A.T.S. requires only four full-time professors and at least twenty-five students. Associate members are often connected with undergraduate institutions; they must, however, have a "sufficient degree of separateness and independence" from this institution.³³

Affiliated members are institutions recommended by responsible persons or agencies and are outside the United States and Canada. Because of distance and different systems the A.A.T.S. does not complete the accrediting process.

The associate and affiliated members meet less rigid requirements; consequently the limitation of this study was to accredited American protestant seminaries which hopefully should represent the best of speech and homiletics instruction.

Eight questionnaires were mailed in a packet complete

³²Ibid., p. 23.

³³Ibid., p. 18.

with two cover letters (see Appendix A) to Deans of Instruction at each of the institutions. A self-addressed stamped envelope was included for return mailing. One copy of the Administrator's Questionnaire and seven copies of the Instructor's Questionnaires were included.

Responses

Forty responses were received before May 1. On May 1 a follow-up letter was sent. (see Appendix B) An additional eleven responses were forthcoming after the follow-up letter.

As the questionnaires were returned each question's response was recorded separately on a columned pad. These data are presented and interpreted in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Data Received

Fifty-one (62.2 per cent) of the administrators and instructors contacted responded. A list of the institutions sent questionnaires and those responding may be found by consulting Appendix C. Not all individual questions were answered on all responses. Thus, responses to each question did not always equal the total completed questionnaires.

General Techniques

The procedure for presenting and interpreting the data of this study is as follows: (1) Presentation of data collected from the Administrators' Questionnaires and interpretation of these data; (2) Presentation of data collected from the Instructors' Questionnaires and interpretation of these data.

Mathematical averages (Means) are used to present data collected on some items of each questionnaire. Interpretation of the data is based in part on observations of the Means.

Presentation and Interpretation of Data

The order of presentation and interpretation of data is the same as that which was used on the questionnaires.

Administrator's Questionnaire:

1. Are courses in speech offered at your institution?
2. Are courses in homiletics offered at your institution?

Clark indicated that the status of speech education is weak and tending to become weaker. It is inferred from Clark's study that speech instruction, as distinct from homiletics instruction, is going out of existence. Responses to Question One (Table I) indicate that a majority of the surveyed institutions do offer speech courses separate from and in addition to courses in homiletics.

TABLE I
NUMBER OF SEMINARIES OFFERING SPEECH
AND HOMILETICS COURSES

Area	Number Responding	Number Not Responding	Responses and Percentage			
			Do Offer		Don't Offer	
			Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Speech	43	8	31	72.9	12	27.1
Homiletics	43	8	43	100	0	0.0

Keeping in mind that the number responding represents a simple majority of the eighty-two accredited American

protestant seminaries, it can be seen that courses in speech are offered at a majority of the responding seminaries.

Questions One and Two served to call attention to the distinction drawn between speech and homiletics education as separate concerns of this study.

The instructions following Questions One and Two indicate that if two 'no' answers are made upon the first two questions the administrator need not respond to the remaining questions. None of the responding administrators indicated no homiletics courses were offered.

Two or three of the returned administrators' questionnaires had the comment that most, if not all, of the essentials of speech education were covered in homiletics courses. However, a study of the catalog statements concerning the homiletics courses revealed that homiletics is consistently a course with a single specific end in view. This end is to train the student to communicate the Bible or other sacred material to a select audience.

It is evident that some of the homiletics training does cover speech techniques; however, the emphasis is toward a specific type of speech--religious.

Catalogs were examined for those institutions whose administrators believe the necessary speech preparation can be gained in homiletics courses. This study indicates their

beliefs are mistaken for homiletics courses do not include the basic elements of speech.

3. Do you personally feel that training in speech at the seminary level is essential for effective seminary training?

Responses to Question One indicated that a majority of the surveyed institutions offered courses in speech. However, comparing the results from Question One with Table II it is apparent more administrators believe speech training is essential than the number who actually offer speech at their respective institutions.

TABLE II

NUMBER OF ADMINISTRATORS BELIEVING SPEECH TRAINING IS ESSENTIAL FOR EFFECTIVE SEMINARY TRAINING

Number Responding	Number Not Responding	Responses and Percentage			
		Do Believe		Do Not Believe	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
41	10	33	80.5	8	19.5

At least two additional administrators feel that training in speech at the seminary level is essential for effective seminary training than report that speech courses are offered at their respective institutions. (See Table I) These two additional responses may be the result of administrators who have recently attained their positions and

have not been able to establish a speech program.

It is interesting to note that a majority of the administrators responding view speech training as essential for effective seminary training.

These findings indicate evidence contrary to Clark's statements that theologians are not in favor of speech education.³⁴ It is possible administrators view homiletics as necessary and consider homiletics to cover the basic elements of speech. However, the clear distinction set out by Questions One and Two plus the clear separations of the two oral communications areas in the instructions would seemingly preclude this assumption and indicate the conclusion most seminary administrators believe speech training is necessary.

Question Four seeks to discover whether the seminary administrators believe students entering seminaries have adequate backgrounds in speech.

4. Is it your belief that students entering seminary usually have adequate backgrounds in speech and need theological and limited homiletics training?

Realizing the majority of students entering seminaries are secular college graduates, the responses to this question indicate the administrators' belief the seminary entrant needs speech training as well as homiletic and theological

³⁴Sylvester MacNutt, Newsletter of the Speech for Religious Workers Interest Group, S.A.A., December 1, 1963, p.3.

instruction. Table III shows a majority (89.7%) of the respondents checked 'no' as their considered response.

TABLE III

NUMBER OF ADMINISTRATORS REPORTING A BELIEF PREVIOUS
SPEECH TRAINING OF SEMINARY ENTRANTS IS ADEQUATE

Number Responding	Responses and Percentage			
	Is Adequate		Is Not Adequate	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
39	6	10.3	33	89.7

It would seem the responding administrators do not believe entering seminary students have an adequate background in speech training. Being college graduates does not seem to insure that entering students need no further speech training.

It is noteworthy that only six administrators believed adequate preparation in speech was the rule, while twelve administrators reported no speech courses were offered at their respective institutions. Table IV presents a comparison of the six administrators' responses to Questions One, Three, and Four.

TABLE IV

A COMPARISON OF THE RESPONSES OF SIX ADMINISTRATORS
INDICATING ADEQUACY OF SPEECH TRAINING ON
QUESTION FOUR WITH THEIR RESPONSES
ON QUESTIONS ONE AND THREE

Anonymous Numbers	Previous Responses			
	Question One		Question Three	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Administrator 1	X			X
Administrator 2		X		X
Administrator 3		X		X
Administrator 4	X		X	
Administrator 5		X		X
Administrator 6		X		X

Those administrators answering Question Three 'no' and Question Four 'yes' seem to present a consistent front. To say speech training is not essential to effective seminary preparation and to say most entering students are adequately trained is consistent, even if speech courses are offered at the institution, as they are elective courses in these five seminaries. However, to say speech training is necessary at the seminary level and then to say adequate speech training has been received prior to enrollment does not appear consistent.

From the majority of the responses to Questions Three and Four it is indicated a majority of the responding administrators believe speech education must be given at the seminary level for an effective ministry, and many entering students, though college graduates, do not have an adequate speech background.

5. Do you plan to add any speech courses beyond those currently listed in your catalog?

Clark postulates that speech course offerings are on the decrease and unless a definite reversal is forthcoming there will be no speech education at the seminary level. Responses to Question Five (Table V) indicate a majority of the administrators do not plan to add any speech courses.

TABLE V

ADMINISTRATORS WISHING TO ADD SPEECH COURSES
TO THEIR CURRENT OFFERINGS

Number Responding	Responses and Percentage			
	Plan to Add		Do Not Plan to Add	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
45	12	26.7	33	73.3

Table V, indicating twenty-six per cent of the administrators responding were contemplating adding speech courses, suggests the possibility the trend toward a decrease in the number of speech courses reported by Clark may be leveling off or reversing itself. It should be kept in mind that a 'no' response to this question should not be interpreted as indicating speech courses will be reduced in number or importance. However, Clark pointed out in his paper that much lip-service is paid to speech and speech needs, but little is being done to increase its position.³⁵

Further analysis of Question Five appears in Table VI. Nine of the twelve administrators who indicated they planned speech course additions represent institutions already offering speech courses. Three administrators who indicated plans to add speech courses to their curriculum

³⁵Ibid., pp. 2-3.

represent institutions not currently offering speech courses.

TABLE VI

ADMINISTRATORS RESPONDING "YES" TO QUESTION FIVE IN COMPARISON TO THEIR RESPONSES TO QUESTION ONE

Number of Yes Respondents to Question Five	Question One	
	Yes	No
9	X	
3		X

Question Five sought evidence concerning the future status of speech education in accredited American protestant seminaries. The data indicate speech education is not in as perilous a state as it was in 1960.

6. Do you plan to add any homiletics courses beyond those currently listed in your catalog?

Question Six parallels Question Five except it is designed to ascertain if any homiletics courses will be added by the responding seminaries. The results of this question are tabulated in Table VII.

TABLE VII
 NUMBER PLANNING TO ADD HOMILETICS COURSES

Number Responding	Number Not Responding	Responses and Percentage			
		Plan to Add Number	Plan to Add Percent	Don't Plan to Add Number	Don't Plan to Add Percent
38	13	16	42.1	22	57.9

As was true with 'no' responses to Question Five, 'no' responses to Question Six should not be taken to indicate homiletics courses will be dropped from the curriculum.

It is interesting to compare the number of responding administrators adding speech courses, as reported in Question Five, and those responding affirmatively to Question Six. Twelve wish to add speech courses and sixteen plan to add homiletics courses. More homiletics courses are already being offered and more homiletics than speech courses are to be added. This finding is of particular interest in view of the expressed administrator belief that speech training is essential at the seminary level. It should be kept in mind that all responding seminaries currently offer homiletics courses, while twelve do not offer speech courses. Responses do indicate that both speech and homiletics courses are in the planning stages for addition to curricula.

7. Do you feel that speech courses should be taught as well as homiletics courses?

The responses to this question present evidence administrators value a bilateral approach; i.e., teaching separate speech and homiletics courses. The results of this question are presented in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII

ADMINISTRATORS WHO PREFER TEACHING SEPARATE
SPEECH AND HOMILETICS COURSES

Number Responding	Responses and Percentage			
	Yes		No	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
39	33	84.6	6	15.4

Thirty-three of thirty-nine administrators value the combination approach. More administrators accept this approach than have been able to put it into practice.

Comparison of administrators responding 'no' to Question Seven with their responses to Question Three indicate a consistent position. Table IX presents this comparison.

TABLE IX
 COMPARISON OF NEGATIVE RESPONSES TO QUESTION SEVEN
 WITH RESPONSES TO QUESTION THREE

Number of 'No' Answers to Question Seven	Responses to Question Three	
	Yes	No
5		5
1	1	

Five of the six not accepting a bilateral approach also did not believe speech training was essential at the seminary level. This would seem consistent. However, one administrator denies the combination approach, yet responds favorably to Question Three. He represents an institution offering both speech and homiletics courses. This was the only inconsistent position among the six and may reflect the administrator's inability to secure the complete adoption of his program.

Question Eight was divided into five separate parts.

8. Please rank the following areas of potential concentration in the order you feel they should be stressed in seminary speech or homiletic education. Please rank 1st, 2nd, 3rd, etc. in terms of areas from which you feel a seminary graduate would most benefit.
- A. Concentration should be upon construction and selection of subject materials. _____
- B. Concentration should be upon the orderly arrangement of subject materials. _____
- C. Concentration should be upon the choice of words and means to express the subject material. _____

- D. Concentration should be upon the best method of keeping the major ideas in mind which are to be expressed. _____
- E. Concentration should be upon the most effective delivery of the subject material. _____

Table X presents a tabulation of the thirty-two usable responses. Eleven respondents either omitted the question or partially completed it. Three administrators indicated it was not possible to rank the 'canons' because they were inseparable.

TABLE X

RANKING OF THE CANONS OF RHETORIC BY
RESPONDING SEMINARY ADMINISTRATORS

Administrator Number	Rankings				
	A	B	C	D	E
1	1	4	3	5	2
2	1	2	4	5	3
3	2	3	1	5	4
4	2	3	5	4	1
5	1	2	3	5	4
6	1	2	3	4	5
7	2	4	1	5	3
8	2	4	5	1	3
9	5	2	1	3	3
10	3	1	5	4	2
11	1	3	4	5	2
12	2	3	5	4	1
13	1	2	4	5	3
14	2	3	4	1	5
15	1	2	4	5	3
16	1	2	5	3	4
17	1	4	3	2	5
18	1	2	4	5	3
19	4	1	2	5	3
20	1	5	2	4	3
21	1	2	3	5	4
22	1	3	4	2	5
23	1	3	2	5	4
24	1	4	2	3	5
25	1	5	2	4	3
26	5	1	4	2	3
27	1	3	4	5	2
28	1	3	4	2	5
29	1	4	5	2	3
30	1	2	4	5	3
31	1	5	4	2	3
32	1	2	5	4	3
Totals	51	91	111	122	105
Ranking	1	2	4	5	3

The canon of 'invention', construction, and selection of subject materials, is considered by the administrators to be the most beneficial for seminary graduates. Second in importance to the graduate in the administrators' opinions is disposition, orderly arrangement of subject materials. Delivery, training in the most effective presentation of subject materials, was ranked third. Fourth in potential benefit was style, the best method of choosing and joining words. Memory, the best method of keeping the major ideas in mind, was ranked last.

It would seem administrators believe it is important to have clear thoughts to express and less important how the material is kept in mind and presented. Organization is regarded as more important than style.

9. Do you feel the status of speech and homiletic education, in terms of number and quality of courses offered, will be increased in protestant seminary education in the next ten years?

Clark's paper indicated speech courses would decrease unless some immediate steps are taken.³⁶ Other writers have commented that not enough attention is being given to homiletic training and ministers are coming out of seminary ill-prepared to meet the oral communication demands of modern

³⁶Ibid., p. 3.

society. Responses to Question Nine indicate administrators are divided in their opinion concerning the future status of speech and homiletics education. Table XI presents the results to this question.

TABLE XI

ADMINISTRATORS' OPINIONS OF THE FUTURE STATUS
OF SPEECH AND HOMILETICS EDUCATION

Number Responding	Responses and Percentage			
	Yes		No	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
34	20	58.8	14	41.2

A majority of the respondents feel speech and homiletics education will increase in status. At least three respondents, not included in the table, indicated the number of courses would not increase, but the quality of the existing courses would be improved.

10. What speech or homiletics course or courses do you believe to be the most important to a seminary graduate?
(Please list)

The most consistent response to this question was Practice Preaching. Table XII presents responses to Question Ten.

TABLE XII

ADMINISTRATORS' VIEWS OF THE MOST HELPFUL SPEECH AND
HOMILETICS COURSES FOR SEMINARY GRADUATES

Name of Course	Number of Responses	Percentage
Practice Preaching	18	69.2
Homiletics	5	19.2
Sermon Construction	2	07.8
Speech	1	3.8
TOTAL RESPONSES	26	

Practice Preaching is normally a performance course or a course in sermon delivery. Sermon Construction is usually a course emphasizing theory as opposed to delivery or performance. The single speech course mentioned was a fundamentals of speech approach integrating the elements of theory and delivery.

It would seem homiletics courses are viewed as the most valuable to the seminary graduate by administrators, despite their feeling that speech training was essential. Practice Preaching, a homiletics course emphasizing performance, is chosen as the most important. This selection is opposed to the position of Bos. Bos pointed out the minister probably delivers not more than two sermons per week and is called on various occasions for public speeches in a variety of non-pulpit situations. Bos's conclusion is

that extensive training in speech is necessary.³⁷

11. If you are planning to add homiletics courses or simply would like to, please indicate in order the area of concentration you would prefer. (Please indicate 1st, 2nd, and 3rd)

- A. Theoretical - sermon composition without actual delivery _____
- B. Practical - sermon delivery _____
- C. Combined - integration of the elements of theory and delivery _____

The twenty administrators responding to this question indicate courses stressing the integration of the elements of theory and delivery would be their choice for additions. Courses stressing sermon composition without actual delivery form their second choice. The courses which would stress sermon delivery were their third choice.

Perhaps, due to the fact a majority of the seminaries now offer practical courses such as practice preaching, administrators may feel new courses should come from the currently more neglected areas of the combined and theoretical.

12. How many sections of speech and homiletics training do you offer?

Table XIII presents the responses recorded for Question Twelve.

³⁷William H. Bos, Newsletter of the Speech for Religious Workers Interest Group, S.A.A., April 15, 1964, p. 2.

indicated a range
TABLE XIII
 for each
**NUMBER OF SECTIONS OF SPEECH AND HOMILETICS
 COURSES OFFERED**

Administrators	Number of Sections	
1	30	
2	5	
3	8	
4	1	
5	4	
6	6	
7	12	
8	9	
9	9	
10	8	
11	1	
12	8	
13	10	
14	3	
15	2	
16	9	
17	2	
18	22	
19	7	
20	8	
21	8	
22	4	
23	11	
24	3	
25	27	
26	15	
27	6	
28	4	
29	4	
30	5	
Total Responses	Average Number of Sections	Total Sections
30	8.4	251

Table XIII indicates a range of 1-30 sections of speech and homiletics courses offered.

Instructor's Questionnaire:

The Instructor's Questionnaire contained a total of seventeen questions. Some of the questions involved several parts. A total of fifty-one responses were received from seminary speech and homiletics instructors.

Comparisons are made to responses on Administrators' Questionnaires wherever helpful to gain a clear picture of the status of speech and homiletics instruction.

The Instructor's Questionnaire began with a clear distinction being drawn between the questionnaire meaning for the terms speech and homiletics. The instructions were similar in both the Administrators' and the Instructors' Questionnaires.

1. How many semester hours of higher education do you have in the following oral communication areas?

- | | |
|--|-------|
| A. Fundamentals of Speech | _____ |
| B. Voice and Diction | _____ |
| C. Speech Composition | _____ |
| D. Public Address | _____ |
| E. Classical Rhetorical Theory | _____ |
| F. Modern Rhetorical Theory | _____ |
| G. Argumentation and Debate | _____ |
| H. Discussion, Leadership, and Conferences | _____ |
| I. Persuasion | _____ |
| J. Oratory | _____ |
| K. Introduction to Radio and/or Television | _____ |
| L. Radio Speech | _____ |
| M. Radio Production | _____ |
| N. Television Techniques | _____ |

TABLE XIV

ORAL ORAL COMMUNICATION

55

Average	
O. Oral Interpretation of Literature	_____
P. Oral Interpretation of the Bible	_____
Q. Theatre Production	_____
R. Stage Acting	_____
S. Play Directing	_____
T. Technical Theatre	_____
U. Remedial Speech	_____
V. Other oral communication areas (Please List)	_____
W. _____	_____
X. _____	_____

Responses to Question One show conflicting evidence. Studies conducted by Lundquist and Clark indicate many of those teaching speech and homiletics have only limited, if any, training in general oral communication theory and practice. Both Clark and Lundquist were concerned with the lack of advanced degrees in oral communication among those who are teaching speech and homiletics at the seminary level. The responses to Question One indicate some who are teaching speech and homiletics have received training in the field of oral communication even though they do not have advanced degrees in the field of oral communication. However, this is not a consistent condition. The results can be studied by examining Table XIV.

TABLE XIV

INSTRUCTORS' FORMAL ORAL COMMUNICATION QUALIFICATIONS

Course	Average Hours Credit Achieved
Fundamentals of Speech	6
Voice and Diction	5
Speech Composition	5
Public Address	3
Classical Rhetorical Theory	7
Modern Rhetorical Theory	4
Argumentation and Debate	6
Discussion, Leadership, and Conferences	4
Persuasion	4
Oratory	6
Introduction to Radio and/or Television	4
Radio Speech	4
Radio Production	5
Television Techniques	2
Oral Interpretation of Literature	6
Oral Interpretation of the Bible	3
Theatre Production	5
Stage Acting	6
Play Directing	3
Technical Theatre	4
Remedial Speech	11
Other Oral Communication Areas	X
Others	X

Several instructors do not report any speech and homiletics training. This is true for ten of the fifty respondents. Eight other respondents report fewer than six academic hours of oral communication education.

Contrarily, several instructors have strong backgrounds in oral communication training. Sixteen instructors report over twenty hours training.

Table XV analyzes the courses listed under other oral communication areas in response to Question One of the Instructor's Questionnaire. (See Appendix A)

TABLE XV
HOURS REPORTED BEYOND THE LISTED CATEGORIES

Area	Number Reporting	Hours Reported	Average Hours Per Reporter
Homiletics	5	56	11
Communication Theory	4	43	10
Speech Education	4	41	10

Only five respondents indicated they had taken academic hours in homiletics. Homiletics was not listed as such upon the questionnaire. This may account for the limited responses to training in this area.

It can be concluded few instructors have broad experience in speech and homiletics in terms of graduate

hours. Several respondents have only a few general hours of oral communication education.

With significant exceptions, it would seem the evidence collected indicates most of the responding instructors are less qualified academically, in the areas of speech and homiletics which they teach, than would be desirable. Perhaps, as other studies have indicated, instructor selection is made more on a basis of preaching success than upon academic achievement.

2. What was your undergraduate major?
minor? _____

Responses to Question Two indicate a minority of the responding instructors have an undergraduate major or minor in speech. Tables XVI and XVII indicate the responses received.

TABLE XVI
INSTRUCTORS' UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS

Number Responding	Responses Undergraduate Majors
8	Language
12	Speech
10	English
8	Social Science
2	Religion and Philosophy
1	Education
2	Music
1	Math and Science
44 TOTAL RESPONSES	7 NOT REPORTING ANY MAJOR

TABLE XVII
INSTRUCTORS' UNDERGRADUATE MINORS

Number Responding	Responses Undergraduate Minors
5	Language
3	Speech
9	English
7	Social Science
4	Religion and Philosophy
1	Education
1	Music
1	Math and Science
31 TOTAL RESPONSES	20 NOT REPORTING ANY MINOR

The responses to Questions Two and Three tend to support the findings of Clark and Lundquist. Language and English are more popular undergraduate majors than speech. A great variety of undergraduate majors was indicated. Perhaps this variety indicates there is no standard undergraduate preparation for speech and homiletics instruction.

3. What was your graduate area of concentration?

Master's? _____
 Doctorate? _____

Tables XVIII and XIX indicate the responses received to Question Three.

TABLE XVIII

INSTRUCTORS' MASTER'S DEGREE MAJORS

Number Responding	Responses Master's Degree Areas
15	Speech
2	English
10	Religion and Philosophy
1	Education
28	TOTAL RESPONSES
32	REPORTING NO MASTER'S WORK

TABLE XIX
INSTRUCTORS' DOCTORAL DEGREE MAJORS

Number Responding	Responses Doctoral Degree Areas
13	Speech
1	English
3	Social Science
6	Religion and Philosophy
23	TOTAL RESPONSES
28	REPORTING NO DOCTORAL WORK

Ten instructors indicated that they had both undergraduate and graduate majors in the field of speech. Over one-half of those persons responding to Question Three indicated they did their graduate work in the field of speech. This would seem to be a large number; however, it must be kept in mind only twenty-three instructors reported doctoral work and only five additional reported any speech training beyond the bachelor's degree level.

Evidence gathered by Questions One and Two tends to support the statements made by Lundquist and Clark that many seminary instructors do not have extensive training in speech.

4. How many years of preaching experience do you have?

It has been cited that many seminary speech and

homiletics instructors gain their positions via completion of several years of successful preaching. The responses to Question Four indicate many of the speech and homiletics instructors have completed several years of preaching. Table XX presents these results.

TABLE XX
NUMBER OF YEARS OF PREACHING INSTRUCTORS HAVE COMPLETED

Number Responding	Number Not Responding	Responses	
		Total Years Completed	Average Years Completed
46	5	862	18.7

Responses to Question Four indicate a majority of the responding instructors have completed several years of preaching prior to their becoming seminary instructors. This would tend to support the conclusion the instructors were selected in view of their past preaching experience. Only six of the forty-six respondents listed no years of experience in preaching. Of these six, four had completed graduate work in the field of speech. Only four other respondents reported fewer than ten years of preaching experience. The number of years of preaching experience plus the lack of academic speech training would seem to support the theory that many of the speech and homiletics instructors are

selected for their preaching ability rather than their academic backgrounds.

The years of preaching also indicate that speech and homiletics instruction is being given by older individuals.

5. How many years of teaching have you completed? _____

Responses to Questions Four and Five indicate many of the speech and homiletics instructors have teaching experience. Responses to Question Five indicate most instructors have considerably more preaching experience than teaching experience. Table XXI indicates the results of Question Five.

TABLE XXI

NUMBER OF YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE
INSTRUCTORS HAVE COMPLETED

Number Responding	Number Not Responding	Responses	
		Total Years Completed	Average Years Completed
46	5	533	11.6

The average of 11.6 years of teaching experience is considerably below the 18.7 years of average preaching experience respondents indicated in Question Four. Further, fifteen respondents list experience in teaching of less than five years, with one respondent listing no prior

experience.

6. What courses do you teach in the area of speech and homiletics and how much credit is given for each?

Table XXII lists the responses to Question Six.

TABLE XXII

COURSES AND HOURS OF SPEECH AND HOMILETICS TAUGHT
BY THE INSTRUCTORS

Number Responding	Number Not Responding	Responses	
		Average Number of Courses Taught	Average Number of Hours
44	7	4+	8+

The average teaching load of instructors was four courses per semester. Since these four courses averaged only eight hours, it appears that their instructional efforts must have been extended to include other teaching fields.

Responses to Question Six indicate that few of the responding instructors teach full time in speech and homiletics. Almost without exception these instructors are listed in the catalogs as full-time instructors, indicating that these persons divide their time between speech and homiletics and other areas of teaching.

7. Which of the above courses are speech?

(Use above numbers)

Homiletics? (Use above numbers)

Responses to Question Seven indicate that homiletics offerings outnumber the speech course offerings. Responses to this question can be seen in Table XXIII.

TABLE XXIII

NUMBER OF SPEECH AND HOMILETICS COURSES
TAUGHT BY THE INSTRUCTORS

Number Responding	Responses and Averages			
	Number of Speech Courses	Average	Number of Homiletics Courses	Average
47	46	.93	131	2.8

Responses to Question Seven indicate a majority of the respondents teach homiletics courses but few teach speech. Twenty-one of the responding instructors reported they did not teach speech. Thus, few speech courses are offered in comparison to the number of homiletics courses.

Question Eight sought what scholars were relied upon in teaching the courses which the respondents listed.

8. Which, if any in particular, Classical or Modern scholars do you concentrate upon in teaching the above courses?

Responses to Question Eight are presented in Table XXIV.

TABLE XXIV

CLASSICAL OR MODERN SCHOLARS RELIED UPON BY INSTRUCTORS
IN TEACHING SPEECH AND HOMILETICS COURSES

Number Responding	Responses	
	Classical	Modern
6	Aristotle	
2	Plato	
2	Quintillian	
2	Augustine	
1	Cicero	
8		Davis
3		Blackwood
3		Lucecock
3		Stewart
8	Rely Upon None	
38	TOTAL RESPONSES	

More instructors rely upon Modern than upon Classical scholars. It was noted most of those instructors who rely upon the classical group have had graduate work in Speech. Only two instructors indicated that they relied on both classical and modern scholars. The modern scholars listed are noted for their work in homiletics rather than speech. Had a blank for "Rely Upon None" been provided on the questionnaire, many of the twenty-three who did not respond might have joined the eight who indicated they relied on no scholars.

Question Nine on the Instructor's Questionnaire is identical with Question Eight on the Administrator's Questionnaire.

9. Please rank the following areas of potential concentration in order as you feel they should be emphasized in teaching speech and homiletics. Please rank 1st, 2nd, 3rd, etc., in terms of areas from which you feel a seminary graduate would most benefit.

- A. Concentration should be upon construction and selection of subject materials. _____
- B. Concentration should be upon orderly arrangement of subject materials. _____
- C. Concentration should be upon choice of words and means to best express the subject material. _____
- D. Concentration should be upon the best method of keeping the major ideas to be expressed in mind. _____
- E. Concentration should be upon the most effective delivery of the subject matter. _____

Thirty complete responses were received to Question Nine. Partial rankings of 1st, 2nd, and 3rd were received, but were not included in the findings. Table XXV indicates the responses received.

TABLE XXV

RANKING OF THE CANONS OF RHETORIC BY
RESPONDING SEMINARY INSTRUCTORS

Number	Rankings				
	A	B	C	D	E
1	1	2	3	5	4
2	1	2	4	3	5
3	1	4	3	5	2
4	1	2	3	4	5
5	1	2	4	3	5
6	1	2	3	5	4
7	2	1	3	5	4
8	1	2	3	5	4
9	3	2	4	1	2
10	1	2	4	5	3
11	1	2	4	5	3
12	1	2	4	5	3
13	1	3	4	5	2
14	2	1	3	5	4
15	1	2	4	3	5
16	5	3	4	2	1
17	3	2	5	4	1
18	1	2	4	3	5
19	1	2	4	5	3
20	1	2	3	5	4
21	1	2	3	5	4
22	1	2	5	4	3
23	1	3	5	2	4
24	1	3	4	5	2
25	2	1	3	4	5
26	1	4	3	5	2
27	4	2	5	1	3
28	2	1	3	5	4
29	1	2	3	4	5
30	3	1	4	5	2
Totals	48	65	111	123	103
Ranking	1	2	4	5	3

The instructors list "construction and selection of subject materials" as the most important area to be emphasized in teaching speech and homiletics at the seminary level. Respondents indicated they felt second in importance to seminary graduates would be "concentration upon orderly arrangement of subject materials." Third preference was given to "delivery of the subject materials." Style of presentation was ranked fourth in importance. Ranked fifth was the area of "keeping the major ideas in mind which are to be expressed."

It is of interest to compare the administrators' and instructors' responses to this question. Table XXVI illustrates the similarity between the responses received from seminary administrators and instructors of speech and homiletics.

TABLE XXVI

COMPARISON OF ADMINISTRATORS' AND INSTRUCTORS' RANKINGS OF THE CANONS OF RHETORIC AS AREAS OF POTENTIAL CONCENTRATION FOR SPEECH AND HOMILETICS COURSES

Number Responding	Standpoint of Respondent	Responses				
		Invention	Organization	Style	Memory	Delivery
32	Administrators	1	2	4	5	3
30	Instructors	1	2	4	5	3

Comparison of the results of the two questions indicates essential agreement on all of the areas of potential concentration.

10. What speech and homiletics courses do you feel are the most essential to a seminary graduate?

Table XXVII indicates the most common responses to Question Ten.

TABLE XXVII
INSTRUCTORS' VIEWS OF THE MOST ESSENTIAL SPEECH
AND HOMILETICS COURSES

Number Responding	Responses Course Felt Most Valuable
13	Practice Preaching
11	Speech
7	Homiletics I
31	TOTAL RESPONSES

Since Practice Preaching is a homiletics course, a majority of seminary instructors believe homiletics is more essential than speech.

Question Eleven sought information concerning the current periodical materials used as a background in instructing speech and homiletics.

11. What professional journals of speech and homiletics or other material do you rely upon?

Responses to this question indicate a variety of sources are used, as shown in Table XXVIII.

TABLE XXVIII
SPEECH AND HOMILETICS JOURNALS RELIED UPON
AS BACKGROUND MATERIALS

Number Responding	Responses Journals and Other Materials
10	Quarterly Journal of Speech
6	Speech Teacher
6	Speech Monographs
1	Vital Speeches
10	The Pulpit
5	Pulpit Digest
2	Christian Century
1	Today's Speech
1	Pastoral Psychology
1	The Exposition
1	Journal of Communication
1	Western Speech Journal
45	TOTAL RESPONSES

Twenty-six of the forty-five responses indicate that general speech periodicals are used. The most popularly used speech journal is the Quarterly Journal of Speech. The Pulpit is the most widely used homiletics periodical.

Responses to Question Twelve indicate similar information.

12. What professional speech and homiletics journals and other periodical materials related to oral communication are available for student and faculty use in the library?

Table XXIX presents the responses.

TABLE XXIX

SPEECH AND HOMILETICS JOURNALS AVAILABLE TO STUDENTS

Number Responding	Responses Journals and Other Materials
9	Quarterly Journal of Speech
4	Speech Teacher
6	Speech Monographs
2	Vital Speeches
12	The Pulpit
5	Pulpit Digest
2	Pastoral Psychology
1	The Exposition
1	Journal of Communication
1	Western Speech Journal
1	Homiletics Review
44	TOTAL RESPONSES

Students have access to more speech journals than to homiletics materials; however, a variety of both are available for student use.

Question Thirteen seeks to discover what is the standard practice in handling speech defects.

13. What provisions for speech defects are made by your institution? (Please check one)

- A. Handled by the school _____
- B. Referred to a local clinic or other center _____
- C. No provisions are made _____

A majority of the respondents indicate that speech defects are handled by the institutions themselves. The responses to Question Thirteen are listed in Table XXX.

TABLE XXX

PROVISIONS MADE FOR SPEECH DEFECTS

Number Responding	Responses		
	A	B	C
20	X		
13		X	
3			X
36	TOTAL RESPONSES		

Comments written on the questionnaire indicate that when speech defects aren't very serious they are handled by the school; however, if they are serious they are usually referred to clinics or other centers. At three institutions no provisions were made for treating speech defects.

A speech proficiency examination is normally a

speaking performance test given either for placement in courses or as an evaluating device for graduates. Question Fourteen seeks to discover how extensively it is used by seminaries.

14. Is a speech proficiency examination given?

Table XXXI presents the responses to Question Fourteen.

TABLE XXXI
USE OF A SPEECH PROFICIENCY EXAMINATION

Number Responding	Responses			
	Do Use	Percentage	Do Not Use	Percentage
41	18	43.9	23	56.1

Some type of speech proficiency examination could be helpful in diagnosing a student's needs and particularly in placing the student in the courses which would benefit him the most. However, a majority (56.1%) of the instructors indicate their institutions do not use a speech proficiency examination.

15. Are off-campus speaking opportunities provided?

A majority of the respondents indicate off-campus speaking opportunities are provided for their students. Frequently, this type of experience is required for

graduation. Table XXXII presents the responses to this question.

TABLE XXXII
OFF-CAMPUS SPEAKING OPPORTUNITIES PROVIDED
BY SEMINARIES

Number Responding	Responses and Percentage			
	Are Provided		Are Not Provided	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
45	37	82.3	8	17.7

The classroom speaking situation is considerably different from the normal audience/speaker situation which a minister faces in his daily work. Practice Preaching is often designed with this in mind, and actual speaking before a congregation is frequently a part of this course. Many seminaries make provision for their seniors and underclassmen to serve small churches in the area in order to receive as many off-campus speaking opportunities as possible. Eight institutions do not offer off-campus opportunities.

16. Do you have and use mechanical equipment?

A. Master tapes or records of voice and
speech progress _____

B. Filming or video-tape equipment _____

C. Soundproof booths and listening equipment	_____	_____
D. Public address systems	_____	_____
E. Tape recording equipment	_____	_____
F. Television practice studios	_____	_____
G. Others (Please List) _____	_____	_____
H. _____		

Responses to Question Sixteen are indicated in
Table XXXIII.

TABLE XXXIII

USE OF MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT AS TEACHING AIDS IN SEMINARY
SPEECH AND HOMILETICS INSTRUCTION

Number Responding	Type of Equipment	Used	Not Used
47	A. Master Tapes or Records of voice and speech progress	40	7
47	B. Filming or video-tape equipment	9	38
47	C. Soundproof booths and Listening equipment	22	25
47	D. Public address systems	33	14
47	E. Tape recording equipment	43	4
47	F. T V Practice Studios	6	41
41	G. Other (Recorded Sermons)	4	37
0	H. Other		

A majority of the responding instructors indicated their institutions provided master tapes or records of voice and speech progress of students. A minority of the respondents indicated soundproof booths and listening equipment were available for students to hear examples of preaching and speaking.

Public address systems and tape recording equipment were available in a majority of the institutions. Most ministers speak over public address systems in modern churches and practice with these mechanical aids could be helpful. Donica indicated tape recorders were valuable devices to aid oral delivery. Four instructors indicated no tape recorders were used.

Increasingly, the minister of today finds himself using the new media of TV. Six instructors indicated that TV practice studios were used for training students in TV techniques.

Under "other" the only listing was "recorded sermons." Four instructors indicated they were used.

The tape recorder and master tapes appear to be the major mechanical equipment aids used by speech and homiletics instructors.

Question Seventeen was identical to Question Nine on the Administrator's Questionnaire.

17. Do you believe the status of speech and homiletics education in American protestant seminaries will increase, in terms of number and quality of courses, in the next ten years?

Table XXXIV presents the responses to that question.

TABLE XXXIV

INSTRUCTORS' VIEWS OF FUTURE STATUS OF SPEECH
AND HOMILETICS EDUCATION

Number Responding	Number Not Responding	Responses			
		Yes	Percentage	No	Percentage
41	10	34	82.9	7	17.1

Comparison of the views of instructors and administrators regarding future status of speech and homiletics education indicates that the former group is more optimistic. Of the responding instructors, 82.9 per cent believe its status will improve, whereas only 58.8 per cent of the administrators hold this view.

A majority of the instructors of speech and homiletics and seminary administrators do look for an increase in the number and quality of speech and homiletics courses in the next ten years.

Chapter:

press:

CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS
FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Summary

In the first chapter of this study the writer discussed the origin and background of the study, stated the problem, and defined the major terms used.

The purpose of the study was to examine the status of speech and homiletics instruction in accredited American protestant seminaries during 1964. Answers to the following questions were sought through the use of questionnaires sent to the seminary administrators and speech and homiletics instructors.

1. What do seminary administrators consider to be the most important areas of concentration in course content of speech and homiletics courses?
2. What are the beliefs of speech and homiletics instructors concerning needed areas of concentration in course content of speech and homiletics courses?
3. What equipment and facilities are available for teaching speech and homiletics courses?
4. What are the speech and homiletics instructors' academic qualifications?

In Chapter II literature relevant to the study was reviewed.

Chapter III analyzed the construction of questionnaires, presented the limitations of the study, and discussed

the questionnaire mailing procedure.

In Chapter III procedures were presented for conducting the study. These included limitations, analysis of construction of the questionnaires, and statement of details of mailing them.

In Chapter IV responses to the questionnaires were presented and interpreted.

A total of fifty-one responses to the Administrator's and Instructor's Questionnaires were received. Where similar information was sought comparisons were made between administrators' and instructors' responses.

The findings of this study were derived from responses to the two questionnaires. Questions were designed to provide data by means of which the four questions set forth in the statement of the problem could be answered. The results are valid only within the context of the study and for the year of nineteen-hundred and sixty-four.

1. All institutions studied offer homiletics courses and a majority offer speech courses.
2. A majority of the seminary administrators feel speech training is essential for effective seminary training.
3. A majority of seminary administrators believe entering students do not have adequate backgrounds in speech.
4. A majority of administrators do not plan to add any speech or homiletics courses beyond those currently offered.

5. A majority of the seminary administrators believe speech courses should be taught as well as homiletics courses.
6. A majority of the administrators and instructors believe the status of speech and homiletics education will be increased in the next ten years.
7. Practice Preaching is considered the most valuable oral communication course for the seminary graduate.
8. When adding homiletics courses to present offerings, administrators will probably add courses which stress integration of the elements of theory and delivery.
9. An average of 8.4 sections of speech and homiletics courses is currently offered.
10. The majority of instructors having doctor's degrees have done their work in speech; however, only a small percentage of the instructors have completed doctorates.
11. Instructors have completed an average of 18.7 years of preaching. Eight years of teaching experience is the average. It is probable instructors are chosen for their preaching experience rather than their academic backgrounds.
12. A number of the instructors teach courses in addition to speech and homiletics.
13. The number of homiletics courses offered far outnumber speech courses at the seminaries.
14. More instructors rely upon classical than modern scholars. The modern scholars relied upon are authorities in homiletics rather than speech.
15. A majority of the instructors and students have speech and homiletics journals to use as background and reference materials.
16. A majority of the seminaries do not use a speech proficiency examination.
17. A majority of the institutions provide off-campus speaking opportunities.
18. Most speech defects are handled by the seminaries with referrals made on serious cases.

In answer to Questions One and Two of the problem of this study, it was found that seminary administrators and instructors believe speech and homiletics courses should concentrate first upon construction and selection of subject materials; second, upon orderly arrangement of subject material; third, upon the most effective delivery of the subject material; fourth, upon the best choice of words and means to express the subject material; fifth, upon the best method of keeping in mind the major ideas which are to be expressed.

The findings drawn from Question Three show a majority of the institutions have and use tape recording equipment, master tapes to check voice and speech progress, and public address systems, but a minority of the seminaries have filming or video-tape equipment, sound-proof booths and listening equipment, or TV practice studios, despite the increasing need the modern minister has for training with such equipment.

In answer to Question Four it was found a majority of the speech and homiletics instructors do not have extensive backgrounds in speech or homiletics. A majority of speech and homiletics instructors majored in areas other than oral communication as undergraduates. Only about half of the master's degrees acquired by instructors are in the area of oral communication. A majority of instructors with doctor's

degrees have done their work in speech; however, only a small percentage of the instructors have completed doctorates.

Conclusions

The findings of this study lead to the conclusions that much inconsistency exists between the stated beliefs of seminary administrators and the programs of speech and homiletics instruction currently in force.

Improvement of the status of speech and homiletics education awaits this re-evaluation of goals plus the establishment of minimal standards for instructors' qualifications and course offerings.

Currently, speech and homiletics instruction has no uniform position in seminary curricula. In a few institutions this instruction is considered of equal importance with theology, history, and Bible. However, in a majority of the seminaries much less emphasis is placed upon speech and homiletics.

Implications for Further Research

The writer believes that the best method of encouraging instructors and administrators to increase the standards of speech and homiletics instruction is through further research into the ministers' needs for effective oral communication. It is because of this belief that the following questions are suggested as bases for further research:

1. What relationship exists between extensive speech training and success in the ministry in terms of congregation size, growth, and the minister's salary?
2. What relationship exists between what congregations rate as good pulpit preaching and what the ministers consider good pulpit preaching?
3. How extensively does the modern minister need training in the use of mass communication media?
4. How helpful would establishment of minimal speech training requirements for seminary entrants be toward improvement of the standards of the seminary graduates?
5. What post-graduate course would be most helpful to train graduate ministers to express themselves in conferences and discussions on and off the mass communication media?
6. What is a valid device or method for sermon evaluation?
7. What will be the effect of the present, expressed concern that speech education is dying a tragic death at the seminary level?

On the basis of these findings it is suggested that through research into the minister's need for seminary speech and homiletics instruction and courses which can best satisfy this need, the seminaries will have a guide with which to improve the status of speech and homiletics education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Boyd, Malcolm. Crisis in Communication. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1957.
- Fry, Jacob. Elementary Homiletics. Philadelphia: Board of Publication and General Council, 1904.
- History of Speech Education in America. Edited by Karl R. Wallace. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954.
- Lyman, Albert J. Preaching in the New Age. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1902.
- Merrill, William Pierson. The Freedom of the Preacher. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1922.
- Stasheff, Edward and Kenneth E. Anderson. A Study of Current Developments in the Teaching of Preaching in America and the United Kingdom. Indianapolis: Methodist Church, 1963.
- Stewart, James S. Heralds of God. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1946.

B. PERIODICALS

- "The American Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada," The Handbook, Dayton: The Ass'n.
- Davis, Grady H. "The Teaching of Homiletics--The Present Situation in American Seminaries," Encounter, Vol. XXD, No. 2, (Spring 1961).
- Fehl, Noah E. "A Survey of Homiletics Education," Appendix in The Excellency of the Word by William H. Nes, New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1956.
- Lundquist, Carl H. "The Digest of Research in Religious Speaking," Hiram College, Hiram, Ohio, Vol. I, No. 1, May, 1963.

"Newsletter," Speech for Religious Workers Interest Group, S.A.A., Rev. Sylvester MacNutt, Secretary, Dubuque, Iowa: December 1, 1963.

"Newsletter," Speech for Religious Workers Interest Group, S.A.A., Rev. Sylvester MacNutt, Secretary, Dubuque, Iowa: April 15, 1964.

C. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Clark, William K. "An Analysis of Contemporary Speech Education in American Protestant Seminaries." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Purdue University, August, 1960.

Donica, Donald Rex. "A Survey and an Evaluation of the Traditional and Contemporary Methodologies in the Teaching of Homiletics." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Boston University School of Theology, 1962.

State Teacher
Emporia, Kan

April 27, 1917

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTERS AND QUESTIONNAIRES SENT TO AMERICAN
PROTESTANT THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES

Kansas State Teachers College
Emporia, Kansas

April 18, 1964

Dear Seminary Administrator,

The questionnaire enclosed in this envelope is a part of a graduate study being done by Mr. Jerry L. Winsor, Graduate Assistant in Forensic and Speech at the Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia. If successfully completed, the preliminary work shows this study to be of value in understanding the status, scope, and current emphasis of seminary speech and homiletic training. It should be of particular interest to seminary administrators and their oral communication instructors. Its findings should also be of value to this institution and particularly to this department in our preliminary training of young men interested in the ministry.

The success of the study depends, in large part, on the questionnaire responses. On behalf of the Speech Department of Kansas State Teachers College we join with Mr. Winsor in respectfully urging you and your oral communication instructors to complete and return the enclosed questionnaires.

Thank you in advance for taking time from your busy schedule to cooperate in this study.

Sincerely,

Karl C. Bruder
Chairman, Department of Speech

Richard A. Hildreth
Associate Professor of Speech
Chairman, Thesis Committee

ADMINISTRATOR'S QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: Most questions are to be answered by checking either yes or no. Check the left half for yes and the right half for no. Other questions require a ranking of 1st, 2nd, 3rd, etc. Question number 10 asks for course names, which you may simply list in order of your preference. Oral communication has been divided into two areas; those courses concentrating on religious oral communication (homiletics) and those courses designed to improve oral communication ability in general (speech).

- | | Yes | No |
|---|-------|-------|
| 1. Are courses in speech offered at your institution? | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Are courses in homiletics offered at your institution? | _____ | _____ |

If answers to questions one and two are no please mail all forms back in the self-addressed stamped envelope. If either answer is yes, please complete this questionnaire and give a copy of the Instructor Questionnaires to each person on your staff who teaches either speech or homiletics.

- | | | |
|--|-------|-------|
| 3. Do you personally feel that training in speech at the seminary level is essential for effective seminary training? | _____ | _____ |
| 4. Is it your belief that students entering seminary usually have adequate backgrounds in speech and need theological and limited homiletic training? | _____ | _____ |
| 5. Do you plan to add any speech courses beyond those currently listed in your catalog? | _____ | _____ |
| 6. Do you plan to add any homiletics courses beyond those currently listed in your catalog? | _____ | _____ |
| 7. Do you feel that speech courses should be taught as well as homiletics courses? | _____ | _____ |
| 8. Please rank the following areas of potential concentration in the order you feel they should be stressed in seminary speech or homiletic education. Please rank 1st, 2nd, 3rd, etc. in terms of areas from which you feel a seminary graduate would most benefit. | | |

- A. Concentration should be upon construction and selection of subject materials. _____
- B. Concentration should be upon the orderly arrangement of subject materials. _____
- C. Concentration should be upon the choice of words and means to express the subject material. _____
- D. Concentration should be upon the best method of keeping the major ideas in mind which are to be expressed. _____
- E. Concentration should be upon the most effective delivery of the subject material. _____
9. Do you feel the status of speech and homiletic education, in terms of number and quality of courses offered, will be increased in protestant seminary education in the next ten years? Yes _____ No _____
10. What speech or homiletic course or courses do you believe to be the most important to a seminary graduate? (Please List) _____

-
11. If you are planning to add homiletics courses or simply would like to, please indicate in order the area of concentration you would prefer. (Please indicate 1st, 2nd, and 3rd)
- A. Theoretical - sermon composition without actual delivery. _____
- B. Practical - sermon delivery _____
- C. Combined - integration of the elements of theory and delivery. _____
12. How many sections of speech and homiletic training do you offer? _____

 Name of Institution

 Signature

INSTRUCTOR'S QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: Some questions are to be answered by checking either yes or no. Check the left half for yes and the right half for no. Other questions require a ranking of 1st, 2nd, 3rd, etc. Question number 10 asks for course names, which you may simply list in order of your preference. Oral communication has been divided into two areas: those courses concentrating on religious oral communication (homiletics) and those courses designed to improve oral communication ability in general (speech).

1. How many semester hours of higher education do you have in the following oral communication areas?

- Fundamentals of Speech _____
- Voice and Diction _____
- Speech Composition _____
- Public Address _____
- Classical Rhetorical Theory _____
- Modern Rhetorical Theory _____
- Argumentation and Debate _____
- Discussion, Leadership, and Conferences _____
- Persuasion _____
- Oratory _____
- Introduction to Radio and/or Television _____
- Radio Speech _____
- Radio Production _____
- Television Techniques _____
- Oral Interpretation of Literature _____
- Oral Interpretation of the Bible _____
- Theatre Production _____
- Stage Acting _____
- Play Directing _____
- Technical Theatre _____
- Remedial Speech _____
- Other oral communication areas (Please List) _____

- 2. What was your undergraduate major? _____
minor? _____
- 3. What was your graduate area of _____
concentration? Master's? _____
Doctorate? _____
- 4. How many years of preaching experience _____
do you have? _____

5. How many years of teaching have you completed? _____
6. What courses do you teach in the area of speech and homiletics and how much credit is given for each?
- | | | |
|-----------|----------|----------|
| 1. _____ | 2. _____ | 3. _____ |
| 4. _____ | 5. _____ | 6. _____ |
| 7. _____ | 8. _____ | 9. _____ |
| 10. _____ | | |
7. Which of the above courses are speech?
(Use above numbers) _____
Homiletics? (Use above numbers) _____
8. Which, if any in particular, Classical or Modern scholars do you concentrate upon in teaching the above courses?
- | | | | |
|----------|-----------|----------|----------|
| 1. _____ | 2. _____ | 3. _____ | 4. _____ |
| 5. _____ | 6. _____ | 7. _____ | 8. _____ |
| 9. _____ | 10. _____ | | |
9. Please rank the following areas of potential concentration in order as you feel they should be emphasized in teaching speech and homiletics. Please rank 1st, 2nd, 3rd, etc., in terms of areas from which you feel a seminary graduate would most benefit.
- A. Concentration should be upon construction and selection of subject materials. _____
- B. Concentration should be upon orderly arrangement of subject materials. _____
- C. Concentration should be upon choice of words and means to best express the subject material. _____
- D. Concentration should be upon the best method of keeping the major ideas to be expressed in mind. _____
- E. Concentration should be upon the most effective delivery of the subject matter. _____
10. What speech and homiletics courses do you feel are the most essential to a seminary graduate?

11. What professional journals of speech and homiletics or other material do you rely upon? _____

12. What professional speech and homiletics journals and other periodical materials related to oral communication are available for student and faculty use in the library? _____

13. What provisions for speech defects are made by your institution? (Please check one)

- A. Handled by the school _____
- B. Referred to a local clinic or other center _____
- C. No provisions are made _____

14. Is a speech proficiency examination given? Yes No

15. Are off-campus speaking opportunities provided? _____

16. Do you have and use mechanical equipment?

- A. Master tapes or records of voice and speech progress _____
- B. Filming or video-tape equipment _____
- C. Soundproof booths and listening equipment _____
- D. Public address systems _____
- E. Tape recording equipment _____
- F. T V practice studios _____
- G. Others (Please List) _____
- H. _____

17. Do you believe the status of speech and homiletic education in American protestant seminaries will increase, in terms of number and quality of courses, in the next ten years? _____

Name of Institution

Instructor's Signature

APPENDIX B
FOLLOW-UP LETTER SENT TO
AMERICAN PROTESTANT THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES

100
body

111
1000

Kansas State Teachers College
Emporia, Kansas

May 1, 1964

Dear Administrator,

Recently I mailed you some questionnaires concerning speech and homiletic instruction offered at your institution. Many fine responses to the questionnaires have been received. If you, and other administrators who have not yet returned the questionnaires will do so, the scope of study will be much more complete. Many responses have requested a copy of the results. I will send an abstract of this study to all who take part.

I know that this is a busy time of the year for all of us. If you have intended to complete the questionnaires and have been delayed by other obligations, please forgive me for rushing you. If, for some reason, you do not wish to complete the questionnaires, please use the enclosed stamped envelope to simply let me know not to expect a reply from you. I will not begin to examine the responses until I can be relatively sure all responses that will be in are in.

If you have already mailed the questionnaires, please disregard this letter. Thank you very much for your cooperation. I sincerely hope to hear from you.

Very truly yours,

Jerry L. Winsor

JLW/jw

P. S. Individual returns will be kept confidential.

APPENDIX C

INSTITUTIONS SENT AND RESPONDING TO QUESTIONNAIRES

The eighty-two accredited American protestant seminaries sent questionnaires are as follows. Those seminaries preceded by a star (asterisk) responded to the survey.

- *Asbury Theological Seminary, Wilmore, Kentucky
- *Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Ill.
- *Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Austin, Texas
- Berkeley Baptist Divinity School, Berkeley 4, California
- Berkeley Divinity School, New Haven 11, Connecticut
- Bethany Biblical Seminary, Chicago, Illinois
- Bexley Hall, Gambier, Ohio
- Biblical Seminary in New York, New York 17, N. Y.
- *Boston University School of Theology, Boston, Massachusetts
- *Brite College of the Bible of Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Texas
- *California Baptist Theological Seminary, Covina, California
- Calvin Theological Seminary, Grand Rapids 6, Michigan
- *Candler School of Theology of Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia
- *Central Baptist Theological Seminary, Kansas City 2, Kansas
- Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary, Maywood, Illinois
- *Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago 37, Illinois
- *Christian Theological Seminary, Indianapolis 8, Indiana
- *Church Divinity School of the Pacific, Berkeley 9, California
- *Colgate Rochester Divinity School, Rochester 20, New York
- College of the Bible, Lexington, Kentucky
- Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, Georgia
- *Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri
- *Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pennsylvania
- Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
- Drake University Divinity School, Des Moines 11, Iowa
- Drew University Theological School, Madison, New Jersey
- *Duke University Divinity School, Durham, North Carolina

- *Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
- *Eden Theological Seminary, Webster Groves, Missouri
- *Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- *Episcopal Theological Seminary of the Southwest, Austin, Texas
- Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary, Columbus, Ohio
- *Evangelical Theological Seminary, Naperville, Illinois
- Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, California
- Garrett Theological Seminary, Evanston, Illinois
- *General Theological Seminary, New York 11, N. Y.
- *(Gettysburg) Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania
- *Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary, Mill Valley, California
- Goshen College Biblical Seminary, Goshen, Indiana
- *Hanna Divinity School of Wittenberg University, Springfield, Ohio
- *Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford 15, Connecticut
- Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- *Howard University School of Religion, Washington 1, D. C.
- *Iliff School of Theology, Denver, Colorado
- Interdenominational Theological Center, Atlanta 14, Georgia
- *Lancaster Theological Seminary, Lancaster, Pennsylvania
- *Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky
- *Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota
- *Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary, Columbia, South Carolina
- McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago 14, Illinois
- Meadville Theological School, Chicago 37, Illinois
- *Moravian Theological Seminary, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania
- *Nashotah House, Nashotah, Wisconsin
- New Brunswick Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, New Jersey
- New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, School of Theology, New Orleans 26, Louisiana
- North Park Theological Seminary, Chicago 15, Illinois
- *Northwestern Lutheran Theological Seminary, Minneapolis, Minnesota
- *Oberlin College Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, Ohio

Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley 9, California
Perkins School of Theology of Southern Methodist
University, Dallas 22, Texas
*(Philadelphia) Lutheran Theological Seminary at
Philadelphia, Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania
*Phillips University Graduate Seminary, Enid, Okla-
homa
*Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Penn-
sylvania
*Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, New
Jersey
San Francisco Theological Seminary, San Anselmo,
California
*Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, Evanston,
Illinois
*Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake
Forest, North Carolina
*Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville,
Kentucky
Southern California School of Theology, Claremont,
California
*Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, School of
Theology, Fort Worth 15, Texas
*Union Theological Seminary, New York 27, N. Y.
*Union Theological Seminary in Virginia, Richmond 17,
Virginia
*United Theological Seminary, Dayton, Ohio
*University of Chicago Divinity School, Chicago,
Illinois
*University of Dubuque Theological Seminary, Dubuque,
Iowa
University of the South School of Theology, Sewanee,
Tennessee
Vanderbilt University Divinity School, Nashville 5,
Tennessee
(Virginia) Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary
in Virginia, Alexandria, Virginia
*Wartburg Theological Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa
Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington 16, D. C.
*Western Theological Seminary, Holland, Michigan
*Yale University Divinity School, New Haven, Connecti-
cut