This article was downloaded by: [Universitaetsbibliothek Giessen]

On: 18 January 2015, At: 05:47

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK

Religious Education: The official journal of the Religious Education Association

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/urea20>

CO-ORDINATING TRAINING SCHOOLS

J. E. McCulloch ^a

^a Secretary The Inter-Church College , Nashville, Term.

Published online: 10 Jul 2006.

To cite this article: J. E. McCulloch (1912) CO-ORDINATING TRAINING SCHOOLS, Religious Education: The official journal of the Religious Education Association, 7:5, 544-550, DOI: [10.1080/0034408120070515](https://doi.org/10.1080/0034408120070515)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0034408120070515>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

CO-ORDINATING TRAINING SCHOOLS.

THE PRINCIPLES OF CORRELATION AND CO-OPERATION APPLIED TO TRAINING SCHOOLS FOR RELIGIOUS AND SOCIAL WORKERS.

J. E. McCULLOCH,

Secretary The Inter-Church College, Nashville, Tenn.

The great lesson that the business world has been teaching our generation for a quarter of a century is this: "Combine in order to reduce expenses and increase the efficiency of the working forces." The chief objection to combination in business is that the extra profits for the producer are too great in proportion to the extra profits for the consumer. If there were a business combination in which *all* the profits went to the consumer, there could be no valid objection whatever to the principle or its practice. This is precisely the case in educational business. Here the entire expense of competition is borne by the public and all the profits of combination and co-operation go to the public.

We would, therefore, expect to find in educational business the most enthusiastic advocates of co-operation. Here, however, there seems to be less progress towards the elimination of competition than in business generally. Nevertheless, there is a strong and growing conviction among educational leaders that the time has come for a general readjustment of our educational machinery by the thorough application of the principles of correlation and co-operation. Two primary causes of this tendency are: first, the inadequacy of the present educational force demands some immediate re-enforcements in order that the almost unlimited educational work in this country may be thoroughly and efficiently done. Since the correlation of two institutions usually renders both two-fold more efficient without increasing the expense of either, we are discovering vast resources that have been valueless because of the detachment of our institutions, but that may easily become serviceable by the simple process of correlation. The second primary cause of the accelerated tendency towards correlation is that philanthropists have learned the lessons of combination in business and are impatient with the useless waste of institutional rivalry and duplication and consequently are increasingly disposed to insist that their investments shall be made in

institutions that recognize and profit by the application of the principles of correlation and co-operation.

The institutions in America that have profited least by correlation and co-operation seem to be the Training Schools for Religious and Social Workers. Those schools have profited least not because these principles are of less value to them than the other institutions, but because the training schools have given less attention to the question of correlation and co-operation than probably any other class of institutions. This is due doubtless to the fact that the training schools for lay workers are new. They have been looked upon more or less as experiments and in some quarters regarded with disfavor. Again the theological seminaries with which they should have the most vital relations have to a great extent looked upon the development of the training schools as a somewhat dangerous educational heresy. There has been no pronounced opposition on the part of the seminaries to the training school movement because it was considered too insignificant as an educational factor to demand much attention from any really scientific institution. But now the training school movement has developed to the point where it demands recognition.

At present a new profession is being created—the profession of social service. This new profession is making the professional training schools for social workers a necessity and tremendously enhancing the value of their work. The social awakening, however, has only begun. If during its first few years so great an impetus has been given to the training school movement, what will take place when the profession of social service is fully developed? Will not the very force of this rising tide of interest in social service and missions lift the professional training schools into a position of influence and opportunity scarcely less important than that of the theological seminaries themselves?

Of forty-five training schools, including all the most important ones, there are thirty-three that have no connection whatever with any other educational institution. Nine of these thirty-three schools are co-educational, two are for men only and twenty-two are exclusively for women. Seven training schools are affiliated with theological seminaries, one being only nominally related to a seminary while the other six are very closely affiliated. Four of these schools affiliated with seminaries are co-educational and three are for women only.

Five training schools are affiliated with universities and all five are co-educational. In other words, only twelve of the forty-five most important training schools in this country are affiliated with other institutions. Nine of the twelve are co-educational, and three are for women only. Of the twelve training schools that are affiliated with universities or seminaries, all but three have been organized within the last seven years. Of the thirty-three unaffiliated training schools only five were organized within the last seven years; twenty-one were organized more than fifteen years ago. This seems to indicate at least that the tendency is for new schools to affiliate with universities or seminaries while the older schools are more disposed to remain independent.

The two latest developments in the training school movement are the School of Missions which is organized in affiliation with the Hartford Theological Seminary and with the Hartford School of Religious Pedagogy, and the American Inter-church College for Religious and Social Workers, which is to be affiliated with Vanderbilt University and with the George Peabody College for Teachers. As both schools are being developed on the basis of correlation and co-operation with other institutions of high grade, we may readily see the advantages of the application of these principles by a consideration of their plans.

The organizers of the Inter-church College assumed that under ordinary circumstances at least a half dozen training schools for religious and social workers would be developed in the South during the next few years. Seven years ago there was no school of this kind south of the Ohio River and east of the Mississippi. Now there are two. Five other training school enterprises are being considered with increasing conviction on the part of their promoters that enlarged facilities for training workers are demanded in the South. The question naturally arises: Is it better for these new educational enterprises to be organized and developed independent of each other, or could a plan of correlation be adopted that would benefit each and enable all together to render a larger service to the country? Believing that the latter was possible, the organizers of the Inter-church College have adopted the following plan: First to have a self-perpetuating board of directors as the central factor in the organization. This board is to provide a large campus, in the central portion of which will be located

an administration building thoroughly equipped for class room work, an auditorium, a sociological and missionary museum, a gymnasium, a great library and other facilities that may be used in common. The College Board will also provide teachers for such subjects as biblical literature and interpretation, religious education, sociology, psychology, missions, comparative religion, languages, music, manual arts, household economics and in other subjects that have no denominational coloring. Around this central college plant will be established denominational church houses or training schools on or adjacent to the college campus. The training schools will supervise the home life of their respective students and give such courses in denominational doctrine, polity and methods as each may deem needful. The denominational boards or schools will have absolute ownership of their property and control of their students. Any affiliated school is at liberty to decide for itself just how far it will go from time to time in affiliating with the college. It may use one or all of the college buildings; it may elect one or all of the courses in the college curriculum. If it prefers it may reduce its expenses to a minimum by using all the college facilities and by electing all the college courses, or it may increase its expenses to a maximum by using none of the college facilities and by providing a full faculty of its own. Accordingly there would be no loss of freedom on the part of the denominational school, for every course in the college would be offered solely on its merits. Besides, every affiliated school has charter rights to three representatives on the College Board of Directors, so that they also share in the administration of the college proper.

The material advantages of this plan of correlation and co-operation are very great. The Inter-church College Board estimates that at least half a million dollars will be needed for its buildings and equipment. Yet all the buildings and equipment of the college will be practically as serviceable to the affiliated schools as if they actually owned them. Consequently any affiliated school would be getting the benefits of a half million dollars' worth of buildings and equipment without a dollar's outlay.

Again, at least two-thirds of the average training-school curriculum has no denominational coloring whatever. There is no such thing as Baptist sociology or Presbyterian music, or Methodist pedagogy. It requires at least six hundred thousand

dollars properly to endow a training school for religious and social workers. Two-thirds of that amount provides courses that are just as suitable for one denomination as another. By this plan of correlation each affiliated school would simply be gaining the benefits of four hundred thousand dollars of endowment.

A training school for religious and social workers is extremely expensive, for it is a school of specialists. This is probably the reason why there is not and never has been, a first-class school of this kind in America. If any institution in all the country should be thoroughly scientific and efficient, it is the training schools whose function is to supply the nation and the world with trained men and women for moral, social and religious leadership. Yet everybody who is familiar with the facts knows that most of the training schools in America are so limited financially that it is absolutely impossible for them to provide adequate facilities for training Christian workers. These schools are too often forced to employ cheap teachers, which means, as a rule, teachers lacking in training and natural ability. Consequently a cheap school means an inefficient school. When the hundreds of young men and women go up to the training schools each year offering all that they have—their lives—for the service of humanity they are entitled to the very best training, yet they are often confronted with teachers who are so lacking in ability as to be utterly unable to prepare them properly for the best service. They master the curriculum, too much of which is often devoted to non-essentials, and then go out into the world forever handicapped by having been trained not for the best leadership, but in such a manner as leads them, often unknowingly, to antagonize and retard the work of the real leaders in the building of the kingdom. Herein is an educational crime.

The organizers of the Inter-church College are endeavoring to prevent this mistake, as far as possible, in the South. With its plan worked out, the Inter-church College can say to every denomination in the South: If you will co-operate with us by building your training school adjacent to the college, by supervising the home life of your students and by giving them instruction in denominational doctrine, polity and methods, we will, by uniting our forces, enable every student to secure the advantages of a million dollar school of specialists." It is unity for efficiency. This plan of co-operation means one-tenth

of the denominational expense with ten-fold gain in efficiency; whereas failure to co-operate would mean ten-fold denominational expense or one-tenth of the efficiency.

It is the purpose of the Inter-church College Board to maintain the same standards of work and administration that prevail in the best universities. It will aim constantly to secure the best teachers available and to provide first-class equipment for educational work. Since the affiliated schools are relieved of a large part of the expense for faculty and equipment, they can afford to maintain a much higher standard for the strictly denominational courses and equipment. Thus the students will be given the benefit of a strictly high-grade institution in every respect.

There are also many social advantages gained by this plan of correlation and co-operation. The enthusiasm of the larger numbers is a real gain. This is not secured, however, at the expense of intensive work of smaller groups; because the smaller group is maintained in the denominational home life and work.

Again, in an inter-church school the tendency will necessarily be to emphasize essentials of Christian teaching and work and minimise the non-essentials. It will also promote Christian fraternity by having teachers and students of different denominations associated together in work and training.

The larger faculty would bring a greater professional knowledge and richer experience to bear on the complex problems of training school work. The larger faculty composed of thoroughly trained teachers would also insure a wiser administration and prevent the breaking of the continuity of constructive work by any temporary denominational changes.

Another important aspect of this question is brought out in a letter from Dr. Josiah Strong. He says in speaking of the Inter-church College plan:

I believe that the reunion of Christendom is to come primarily through the social work of the churches. For many years to come it will, I think, be impossible to compose doctrinal and ecclesiastical differences between the various denominations, but along social lines, where nothing can be done without co-operation, they have no differences whatever. Here, where a united front is most needed, it is most practicable.

But there are still other benefits accruing from this application of the principle of correlation, owing to the fact that

this group of schools, this collegium, this Inter-church College itself is to be affiliated with two other powerful institutions—Vanderbilt University and the George Peabody College for Teachers. Here again is opened up an immense field of service and opportunity. The entire educational resources of all three institutions are within reach of all the students. The value to students of the extensive elective system thus made practicable is beyond calculation. Educationally, the strength of each school becomes the combined strength of all three institutions. Furthermore, when the faculty and the student body of the Inter-church College is brought into contact with the life of a great university and a professional school for teachers, it has opened to it a door of opportunity for service that is of the utmost importance. Hundreds of choice young men and women would be brought annually to the very door of the Inter-church College. By focusing their strength on this institution, the denominations could spread a moral and religious contagion through this entire educational community and thereby render a service to the future leadership of the entire South that would be utterly impossible in any other way. If the Inter-church College and the southern denominations that may work through it have any social message for the nation and the world, what more effective method could they desire than to breathe their spirit into the life of these two great institutions, every student of which may in turn become an evangel of the truth that they seek to proclaim.

THE GROWTH AND RESOURCES OF TRAINING SCHOOLS.

J. SHELLY MEYER,

Superintendent Chicago Training School, Chicago.

It is noticeable that the era of the religious training school began only a little later than the wide-spread revival of interest in the work of women which struck the world fifty years ago—a revival which manifested itself in the organization of the Woman's Missionary Societies, the Y. W. C. A., the W. C. T. U., and especially the Woman's Club movement which has penetrated to even the smallest villages of our land. The pres-