This article was downloaded by: [University of Birmingham]

On: 23 March 2015, At: 03:19

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>

TEACHERS FOR WEEK-DAY RELIGIOUS SCHOOLS

Walter S. Athearn M. A.^a

^a Drake University, Des Moines

Published online: 10 Jul 2006.

To cite this article: Walter S. Athearn M. A. (1916) TEACHERS FOR WEEK-DAY RELIGIOUS SCHOOLS, Religious Education: The official journal of the Religious Education Association, 11:3, 245-252, DOI: [10.1080/0034408160110306](https://doi.org/10.1080/0034408160110306)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0034408160110306>

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>

TEACHERS FOR WEEK-DAY RELIGIOUS SCHOOLS

WALTER S. ATHEARN, M. A.
Drake University, Des Moines

I. RECENT HISTORY OF TEACHER-TRAINING

The problem of preparing teachers for religious day schools is a part of the larger problem of preparing teachers of religion for all schools, including the "school of the mother's lap." The time has come for the serious consideration of an all-inclusive and thoroughly articulated system of training religious teachers which will extend from the seminary to the local church. The present chaotic condition of the teacher-training movement in this country is a sufficient reason to justify such an analysis of the situation as will lead to a reorganization of the movement on a new and better basis.

The Illinois Sunday School Association claims the honor of employing the first teacher-training secretary and producing the first series of teacher-training manuals. These manuals, however, were soon handed over to denominational control, and from that day until now the denominations have claimed and exercised the right to issue their own textbooks, to grant their own certificates and to promote their own standards. In 1903 the International Sunday School Association established a teacher-training department to promote denominational courses through state associations. In 1908 the famous Philadelphia conference agreed to standardize the various denominational courses on the basis of a First Standard Course of fifty lessons, to be followed by an Advanced Standard Course of one hundred lessons. Following this conference the country was flooded with hastily prepared drill books conforming to the fifty and one hundred-lesson specifications. Hundreds of thousands of copies of these drill books were sold, and thousands of teacher-training certificates were issued, but it soon became evident that the efficiency of the Sunday school teaching force was not being materially increased by this method. The scathing fire of criticism which was directed at these denominational courses has resulted in an agreement to withdraw the old courses and to substitute for them a new course of 120 lessons. We may now expect the country to be flooded again with a series of teacher-training manuals but slightly better than those which they are expected to displace. It is very evident that the Sunday School Council, and the present denominational agencies charged with this responsibility, are incompetent by the very nature of their organizations, to stan-

dardize and to direct the training of religious teachers for this continent.

II. COMMERCIALISM AND SECTARIANISM

The trend of the past few years has been setting strongly toward the sectarianizing and commercializing of the whole field of religious education. At the present time the teacher-training standards, as well as the courses of instruction and textbooks, are determined by denominational publishers and salaried educational secretaries more or less directly dependent upon the denominational publishing houses. Attempts to raise the standards or to improve the textbooks are often opposed by publishers having vested interests to protect.

The situation is complicated by the almost universal custom of financing denominational missionary and benevolent enterprises with the profits from Sunday school supplies. Publishers are under constant temptation to exploit childhood in the interests of denominational causes. Educational secretaries employed by denominational boards are often expected to promote the sale of denominational publications. In many cases they are but high-grade salesmen. Uneasy rests the head of a denominational secretary whose educational ideals are higher than that represented by his denominational publications.

Many denominational benevolences are supported by offerings from Sunday school children. The educational secretary who can secure liberal gifts from the children will be in high favor with the leaders of the associations which are the beneficiaries of his skill as a money raiser. Subordinate secretaries and field men are often judged by the financial returns from the schools in their territories, rather than from their educational programs. Under our present system, denominational educational secretaries are constantly tempted to devote their energies to erecting tables of comparative statistics, securing large offerings for their denominational boards, and meriting the favor of the denominational publishing houses.

There ought to be universal agreement to the proposition *that salaried educational secretaries and persons directly or indirectly connected with publishing houses should be regarded as ineligible to membership on committees or boards charged with the adopting of lesson courses, textbooks or educational standards.* An interest in the sale of any kind of bridge building material renders one ineligible to membership in the American Bridge Builders' Association. Our laws will not permit a school-book publisher, or a publisher's agent, to sit on a school board which adopts books for our

public schools, and such men, many of whom are brilliant educators, have too high a standard of ethics to seek membership on standardizing boards for the control of public-school procedure. And yet the ethical standards of denominational publishing agents will permit them to sit on boards that determine standards and adopt books for use in the schools of their denominations! The adoption of the foregoing proposition would reorganize the committees which now adopt standards and texts for teacher-training courses and it would also make necessary the reorganization of the International Lesson Committee. Because of ethical and professional reasons the training of religious teachers demands the complete divorcing of publishing and secretarial interests from the educational agencies of the church.

III. THE FUNCTION OF CHURCH COLLEGES

I wish now to submit a second proposition, viz., *The training of the religious teachers of the country is primarily the responsibility of the church colleges.* Each state supports from one to a dozen teachers' colleges for the training of public school teachers. The church must provide equal facilities for the training of religious teachers. If the present church colleges are unwilling to undertake this service it will be necessary for the various religious bodies to establish other institutions of college grade to do this work. The meager contribution of church colleges to religious education was shown in my report to the Council of the Religious Education Association last year (published in RELIGIOUS EDUCATION, October 1915). Of the 120 church colleges reporting at that time, only 34 offered any courses designed to train religious teachers. Only 66 courses totaling 208½ semester hours are offered in the 120 colleges, and only three professors are employed for full time in this field, and 32 for part time.

(a) *The Contribution of Church Colleges to the Training of Secular Teachers.* I have just completed a survey showing what these same church colleges are doing for the training of secular teachers for the state. Eighty-eight colleges report 258 courses in psychology; 125 in history of education; 229 in educational theory; 116 in practice teaching; 169 in methods of teaching public school branches; 159 other educational courses for public school teachers: a total of 1056 educational courses in addition to the courses offered in subject matter, such as science, history, mathematics, etc. These 88 church colleges employ 110 full-time professors and 421 part-time professors to train secular teachers, over against three full-

time and 32 part-time professors to train teachers for the church. Sixty-eight of these colleges report a present enrollment of 31,956 students, 8,045 of whom are preparing for public school positions. This means that a little over 25 per cent of the students in these church colleges are being trained for the secular schools. There were 1,493 graduates from educational departments last year. Sixty-nine of the eighty-eight institutions reporting fully meet the requirements of their respective state Boards of Education, so that their graduates receive state teachers' certificates upon their graduation without further examination. (In most states the requirement is 30 semester hours of psychology and education during a four-year course of 120 semester hours.)

Seven colleges of one religious body, which is typical of the others, report 12 courses in religious education and 101 courses in secular education; they employ two professors for full time and two for part time to train religious teachers, and 21 for full time and 43 for part time to train teachers for the state. Six of the seven colleges meet the requirements of the state for state certificates without examination.*

Another view of the same situation may be had by looking at the statistics of all the church colleges of a typical state. The 17 church colleges in Iowa offer 14 courses in religious education, and 213 courses in secular education. They employ two professors for full time and four for part time to train religious teachers, and 29 for full time and 58 for part time to train secular teachers. Thirteen of the 17 fully meet the state requirement of 30 hours of psychology and education. Over 2,000 public school teachers are trained each year in these 17 church colleges. If these 17 church colleges were annually training 2,000 teachers of religion, the problem of educational leadership in the local churches of Iowa would be solved. Or if these 2,000 school teachers trained in church colleges were given an insight into the theory, practice, and organization of modern religious education in the local church, in addition to their public school training, a new day would come in the church life of that state. But the church people of Iowa pay their taxes to support a great state normal college; in addition to this, they contribute liberally to their church colleges for a different service, and get back the same product from both investments. Some day the eyes of the good church people will be opened, and they will talk about misappropriation of funds, double taxation, etc., and the so-called church colleges will be called to a bitter repentance.

*See RELIGIOUS EDUCATION, Vol. X, 5., Oct. 1915, pages 412-425.

b. *The Organization of Courses in Secular Education in Church Colleges.* An examination of catalogues of church colleges shows that the courses in education are organized usually under one of two types, as follows:

1. School of Education. This type is exemplified by the University of Chicago. This School of Education includes a number of departments, but it is not separate from the rest of the university. Dr. Charles H. Judd, director of this school, says: "We give all of the degrees; that is, if a candidate in education has specialized in the classics we give him the degree of Bachelor of Arts in Education; if he has specialized in science we give him the degree of Bachelor of Science in Education; and the same is true of the degree of Bachelor of Philosophy. The phrase 'of Education' in each of these cases means that he has done all the work required of any department of the university for the baccalaureate degree, and in addition has specialized in education. The bachelor's degree as administered by us is in its entrance requirements, in the amount and quantity of the work, equivalent in all respects to any other degree given by the university, and the students get exactly the same rating in all graduate matters. The students in education may take a major sequence of nine courses with us, or a secondary sequence of six courses, exactly as in any other specialty, and they may elect beyond this point within the limits of the general university rule which prescribes that not more than fifteen units may be taken in any single department." In the undergraduate courses from one-sixth to one-fourth of the entire number of courses required for the baccalaureate degrees may be specialized and vocationalized. In the graduate courses a high degree of specialization is required and the master's thesis must be a piece of minor research, objective in character, and involving the use of three types of technique, namely experimental, statistical, or historical.

The School of Education in the University of Washington is organized on the University of Chicago plan with the exception that the work for the master's degree is designedly not over specialized. It is intended to be extensive rather than over-intensive. A rigid examination is required in the work of education, in the academic major, and in the two academic minors, but no thesis is required. It is not intended to make this year one of specialized, but rather of thorough scholarship in education, and in one academic subject supported by two academic minor subjects.

2. Departments of Education. In the University of Wisconsin the courses in education are organized as a department parallel with

physics, English, history, etc. This is typical of many state universities and independent and denominational colleges. Specialists in this field are not agreed as to the amount of work which students of education should be required to take in their undergraduate years. Some departments of education require thirty hours of professional work; others believe this number to be too great. In the Universities of Iowa and Illinois, the students may take twenty to thirty-six semester hours respectively in education, but the heads of the departments do not advise students to do so. In addition to six semester hours of psychology they advise pupils to carry from fourteen to sixteen hours of education. It is argued that in the present state of educational science it is not wise for an institution to attempt too wide a range of electives in this field. The older subjects are said to be better organized and better taught, and besides the average teacher will be asked to teach many branches and it is not wise to concentrate on the pedagogy of a single subject in addition to the courses in general educational theory.

The North Central Association requires eleven semester hours of education of those who teach in recognized high schools. Where practice teaching is provided, it is believed by many educators, that eighteen required hours in educational courses would be adequate, including five hours of practice teaching. Other leaders in the educational world believe eighteen hours to be insufficient.

I have dwelt at length on the status of secular education in church colleges (1) to show that there can be no valid reason offered by these colleges for refusing an equal service for religious education, and (2) to suggest types of organization of courses in religious education.

c. *The Relation of the Church College to the Seminary and Graduate School.* In order that the church college may do high grade work in religious education, it is necessary for seminaries and graduate schools to offer advanced courses in this field with adequate provision for research, observation and experimentation.

d. *The Relation of the Church College to Local Church Schools.* It should be the privilege of a church college to inspect and standardize the Sunday or day schools maintained by the churches in its territory exactly as they now inspect and accredit the high schools in their territory. Why should not a church college publish a list of accredited church schools, just as it publishes a list of accredited public schools? And why should not a college maintain an extension department for the training of teachers in the local church, issuing its own teacher-training certificate and granting

appropriate academic credit for the work? The colleges in a given state might simplify inspection and unify requirements through a joint board representing all the colleges in the state. I am firmly convinced that we shall never standardize teacher-training in the local church until the work is taken away from the publishing houses and attached to the church colleges where professional and academic ideals will supplant commercialism and sectarianism.

IV. COMMUNITY TRAINING SCHOOLS FOR RELIGIOUS TEACHERS

In addition to the colleges, a second source of trained teachers for religious day schools is the community training school for religious teachers. All of the teachers of religion required by a local community cannot be expected to be college trained. There are problems of teacher training which can only be solved by community coöperation. The leadership for these community schools will be trained in the departments of religious education maintained by church colleges. These schools should be standardized and accredited by the church colleges.

V. TEACHER-TRAINING CLASSES IN LOCAL CHURCHES

A third source of trained religious teachers is the teacher-training class maintained by the local church. This class should be in charge of a trained educator. It should pursue a course of instruction which could meet the approval of the department of religious education in the church college. The leadership for the local teacher training class must come from the church college.

VI. THE QUALIFICATIONS FOR RELIGIOUS TEACHERS

Religious teachers must be the best educated people in the community. Their professional training should be equal to that of teachers in kindred grades of the public schools. I believe each church and community should employ a few trained educators who will give their entire time to religious education in the community. If the church colleges offer adequate opportunities for Bible study and for training in religious education as a regular part of their college courses, there will be found in every community college graduates who will willingly give a portion of their time to the teaching service of the church under the general direction of a few salaried leaders.

The thesis of this paper is that we shall never be able to furnish an adequate supply of trained religious teachers for this country until we abandon our present methods and reorganize the whole

movement around our church colleges. This plan would not abolish denominational educational boards, but it would attach them to educational institutions instead of publishing houses and church benevolences. The training of religious teachers has been commercialized: it must be professionalized. To this end it is not too much to demand that our church colleges shall do as much towards the training of teachers for the church as they are now doing towards the training of teachers for the state.*

COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

UPON WHAT CONDITIONS CAN CHURCHES OF DIFFERENT DENOMINATIONS COMBINE FOR WEEK-DAY INSTRUCTION

MYRON C. SETTLE

Director of Religious Education, Disciples Church, Gary, Ind.

It is a pleasing sign of the times that there is a growing tendency on the part of churches of different denominations to combine for the good of the community and the Kingdom of God. There are few things more encouraging than the fact that there is an increasing number of people in many churches that put the interests of the Kingdom first and the interests of their own particular denomination next, and are willing to stand with anybody that fears God and desires the betterment of the race. Resolutions were recently adopted by The Metropolitan Federation of the Methodist Episcopal Church in New York City, which say:

"We favor the utilization by churches, either singly or in federated groups, of any free periods in the school day, for the purpose of religious instruction."

Dr. E. S. Lewis, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in a very recent address before the Evangelical Sunday School Council at Richmond, Va., said:

"I am in favor of coöperation between religious denominations for impressing the truths of our holy faith upon children and youth."

In May, 1915, a conference made up of representatives of the Sunday School Boards of the Methodist Episcopal, Presbyterian,

*The writer has discussed other phases of this subject at previous sessions of the Religious Education Association, and the International Sunday School Convention, as follows: Religion as a Liberal Culture Subject, published in RELIGIOUS EDUCATION, April, 1912, Religion in the Curriculum, Dec., 1913, Teacher Training Standards, Dec., 1914, Religious Education in Colleges, Oct., 1915.