


Div.Sch.
BX
8381
.N9
M4
1953

DUKE UNIVERSITY
DIVINITY SCHOOL
LIBRARY



GIFT OF

A.J. Walton



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
Institute of Museum and Library Services under the provisions of the Library Services and Technology Act administered by the State Library of North Carolina. Grant issued to Duke University for the Religion in North Carolina project.

STUDIES

in

**Western North Carolina
Methodism**

**Commission on Town and Country Work
Western North Carolina Conference**

of

THE METHODIST CHURCH

STUDIES
in
WESTERN NORTH CAROLINA
METHODISM

Commission on Town and Country Work
Western North Carolina Conference
of
THE METHODIST CHURCH

PIEDMONT PRESS
Greensboro, N. C.

1953

Contents

Part	Page
I Membership and Population	5
II Ministerial Support	16
III Records of Performance 1952	30
IV Conclusions and Suggestions	41
Appendix A	43

W. J. Waller
11-6-53

Div. S.
287, 8752
A1 592, 3

Introduction

The Western North Carolina Conference in 1952 authorized a study "of . . . matters pertaining to the Minimum Salary Fund." This was done as a recognition of the need for more information on ministerial support and upon a recommendation made by the Commission on World Service and Finance. The report of the Commission on Town and Country Work that year contained a similar recommendation. The conference asked that the study be conducted by the Cabinet, the Board of Missions and the Commission on Town and Country Work.

On January 2, 1953, a joint study committee was convened at First Methodist Church, Morganton, N. C., to inaugurate the study. This committee was composed of the steering committee of the Commission on Town and Country Work (which includes a representative from each of the following agencies and groups: The Cabinet, the Board of Missions, the Board of Education, the Conference Woman's Society of Christian Service, the Board of Lay Activities, the Board of Evangelism, one rural layman and one rural pastor, and the Methodist Rural Fellowship), the Conference Missionary Secretary, the Conference Lay Leader, an urban pastor and one rural pastor from each district. Thus, the personnel of the study committee was: Rev. G. B. Culbreth, Rev. J. W. Hoyle, Jr., Rev. Ralph Jacks, Rev. Wilson Nesbitt, Rev. E. C. Few, Rev. Neal V. McGlammery, Leslie Starnes, Rev. Carl H. King, Mrs. Rupert Crowell, G. L. Goodson, Rev. J. C. Madison, Rev. Horace McSwain, Rev. C. O. Kennerly, Rev. E. H. Blackard, Rev. Harlan Creech, Rev. Charles D. White, Paul R. Ervin, Rev. R. W. Walters, Rev. G. W. Rudisill, Rev. J. R. Petree, Rev. J. C. Vernon, Rev. W. A. Kerr, Rev. F. R. Barber and Rev. G. R. Stafford.

Dr. E. D. C. Brewer, Professor of Sociology in Candler School of Theology, Emory University, Georgia, was present to give guidance in setting up the study.

The study committee assigned to Rev. Wilson Nesbitt, Executive Secretary of Town and Country Work, the duty of directing the study. The steering committee of the Commission on Town and Country Work agreed that the Commission would underwrite the cost of the study and issue the report. Dr. Brewer was selected as the technical director of the study.

An immense amount of work by many people has gone into the study so far. No one has received any remuneration. Gratitude is hereby expressed to all who have co-operated so generously in making this much progress on the study possible, including the large number who answered questionnaires. Special services have been rendered by several persons: Rev. Wilson Nesbitt was general director of the study; Dr. E. D. C. Brewer has been technical adviser and interpreter of the information secured, large sections of this report being his writing; Rev. Neal V. McGlammery did the major research work; Dr. Douglas Jackson, of the Sociology Department, Candler School of Theology, gave much helpful advice in presenting the findings; Rev. Clegg Avett, Rev. J. R. Petree, Rev. Ralph Jacks, Rev. W. T. Ratchford, Rev. O. N. Hutchinson, Jr, Rev. G. B. Culbreth and Rev. G. N. Dulin, who attended the 1953 Town and Country School at Emory University, gave many hours of work in tabulating the data.

In the conduct of the studies the purpose has been to present factual data descriptive of selected conditions and situations. These areas of study were chosen with the hope that the results would be useful to various agencies and personnel

with policy-making and administrative functions. The need for continued research work is obvious.

These studies are largely introductory and descriptive with a limited amount of interpretation and analysis. Refinements of data and more complete analysis would doubtless enhance their validity and utility. Time and resources did not permit this or the technical art work needed to present the results more graphically and interestingly. Too much stress cannot be put upon the fact that serious students of these data will want to move beyond the interpretations and types of presentation included here.

Several related studies were outlined but could not be completed. One of these had to do with the characteristics of the many new charges formed during the past ten years and another with charges receiving supplementation on salary from conference sources for the past ten or more years. It is hoped that these and other studies may be carried on in the future. Suggestions for other areas of research are included in the final summary section.

Understandably, one liability of tabulation work performed by several persons over many months and in widely separated places is the increased possibility of hidden errors and misunderstanding of the meaning of categories. Every effort has been made to insure against such possibilities.

A preliminary presentation of some of the study findings was made and discussed at a meeting of the Commission on Town and Country Work at Camp Tekoa, Hendersonville, N. C., on August 17 and 18, 1953, at which almost all members of the study committee were present.

Garland R. Stafford, Chairman,
Commission on Town and Country Work
Western North Carolina Conference

High Point, N. C.
25 September, 1953

Part I

Membership and Population

The growth of Methodism in the population of the United States during the past 150 years is as dramatic a story, though perhaps not seasoned with as much human interest, as contained in the diaries and records of the circuit riders who made it possible. The Methodist record is one of consistent gains over the population to move from a church of 57,858 members with 1.2 percent of the people of the United States in 1800 to a denomination claiming 8,935,647 members and 5.9 percent of the population in 1950. From 1800 to 1850 Methodist membership increased 1719.4 percent to become 5.1 percent of the population; from 1850 to 1900 the increase was 256.4 percent to become 5.6 percent of the population; and from 1900 to 1950 Methodist membership slightly more than doubled by increasing 111.4 percent and becoming 5.9 percent of the population. The declining rate of this increase is evident and can be most vividly expressed by indicating that if the rate of growth in membership during early circuit rider days (1800-1850) had been maintained from 1850 to 1950, Methodist membership today would be 19,439,960 or 12.9 percent of the 1950 population. This is more than twice the actual membership in 1950.

With these data as background evidence of the significance of this type of study, the relationship between Methodist membership changes and white population changes in Western North Carolina will be explored briefly. These data are largely descriptive with a minimum of interpretation. However, they are sufficient to provide a broad picture of the performance of Methodism in membership gains by counties and to suggest additional membership and population characteristics in need of further study.

In 1950, North Carolina ranked tenth among the states in size of population. The total population was 4,061,929, an increase of 13.7 percent over the 1940 population. North Carolina was the third most rapidly growing state in the Southeast, and its rate of growth was only slightly less than that of the United States as a whole. Nearly three-fourths of the population was white. The white population in 1950 totaled 2,983,121, which was an increase over the previous decade of 16.2 percent. Thus, the white population increased at a more rapid rate than the population as a whole and more than twice as rapidly as the non-white population.

The Western North Carolina Conference covers 44 of the 100 counties in the state. These counties comprise less than half of the land area but more than half of the population of the state. The white population of the 44 counties in the Western North Carolina Conference was 1,695,693 in 1950. This was an increase during the decade of 13.5 percent. The 56 counties of the North Carolina Conference contained 1,287,428 white people in 1950 and increased 19.9 percent over the 1940 white population, or at a rate 6.5 percent higher than that of the Western North Carolina Conference.

Table 1 contains the white population for each of the 44 counties in the Western North Carolina Conference for 1940 and 1950 with the percentage change and the ranking by size of population in 1950. Thirteen of the 44 counties lost white population ranging from Jackson, with a loss of 0.9 percent, to Swain, with

a decline of 21.2 percent. The fastest growing county was Mecklenburg with an increase of 35.5 percent during the decade.

There were six standard metropolitan areas in North Carolina in 1950. These are counties with a city of 50,000 inhabitants or more and a certain density of population with urbanized characteristics in the county around the city. Of the six in the state, four are located in the Western North Carolina Conference.

TABLE I
White Population for North Carolina, Forty-four Counties of the Western
North Carolina Conference with Ranking by Size for 1950.
By Counties and Percentage Change, 1940-1950

County	Rank by Size 1950	White Population 1950	White Population 1940	Pct. Change 1940-1950
All counties in North Carolina		2,983,121	2,567,635	16.2
44 counties in W.N.C. conf. . .		1,695,693	1,494,129	13.5
Alexander	37	13,521	12,516	8.0
Alleghany	42	7,887	8,032	- 1.8
Anson	36	13,773	14,516	- 5.1
Ashe	25	21,599	22,189	- 2.6
Avery	39	13,148	13,302	- 1.1
Buncombe	3	109,126	92,598	17.8
Burke	16	42,116	35,444	18.8
Cabarrus	9	54,024	49,592	8.9
Caldwell	18	40,354	33,117	21.8
Catawba	7	56,196	46,488	20.9
Cherokee	30	17,978	18,602	- 3.4
Clay	44	5,939	6,326	- 6.1
Cleveland	11	50,284	45,208	11.2
Davidson	8	55,849	47,481	17.6
Davie	38	13,267	12,730	4.2
Forsyth	4	104,693	85,310	22.7
Gaston	5	95,950	74,941	28.0
Graham	43	6,665	6,244	6.7
Guilford	2	153,738	121,751	26.3
Haywood	19	36,801	33,910	8.5
Henderson	22	28,851	23,916	20.6
Iredell	13	46,305	40,849	14.2
Jackson	31	17,796	17,963	- 0.9
Lincoln	24	23,978	20,890	14.8
McDowell	23	24,279	21,166	14.7
Macon	33	15,813	15,414	2.6
Madison	27	20,329	22,300	- 8.8
Mecklenburg	1	147,079	108,507	35.5
Mitchell	34	15,094	15,912	- 5.1
Polk	40	10,118	10,231	- 1.1
Randolph	12	46,498	40,226	15.6
Rockingham	10	51,805	45,843	13.0
Rowan	6	62,538	56,238	11.2
Rutherford	17	40,675	39,445	3.1
Stanly	20	32,897	28,916	13.8
Stokes	28	19,588	20,364	- 3.8
Surry	14	42,985	39,252	9.5
Swain	41	8,370	10,627	- 21.2
Transylvania	35	14,442	11,400	26.7
Union	21	32,554	29,920	8.8
Watauga	29	18,114	17,750	2.0
Wilkes	15	42,521	40,177	5.8
Yadkin	26	21,035	19,482	8.0
Yancey	32	16,121	17,044	- 5.4

Source: *United States Census of Population: 1950*, Vol. II, Characteristics of the Population, Pt. 33 North Carolina, Chap. B, Table 41; *United States Census of Population: 1940*, Vol. II, Characteristics of the Population, Pt. 5, North Carolina, Table 22.

These are Mecklenburg, Guilford, Buncombe, and Forsyth counties. Gaston County ranks fifth in white population and each of these five largest counties increased at a more rapid rate than the state. The five most rapidly growing counties were Mecklenburg, Gaston, Transylvania, Guilford, and Forsyth, four of them being among the five largest counties in the Conference.

TABLE 2

Methodist (White) Membership for North Carolina, Western North Carolina Conference with Ranking by Size for 1950. By Counties and Percentage Change, 1940-1950

County	Rank by Size 1950	Methodist Membership 1950	Methodist Membership 1940	Pct. Change 1940-1950
All counties in North Carolina		401,959	341,883	17.6
44 counties in W.N.C. conf. . . .		233,330*	198,451*	17.6
Alexander	31	1,820	1,518	19.9
Alleghany	42	429	445	— 3.6
Anson	22	3,920	3,568	9.9
Ashe	25	2,798	2,808	— 0.4
Avery	39	653	494	32.2
Buncombe	5	11,502	10,564	8.9
Burke	17	5,166	4,309	19.9
Cabarrus	11	8,408	7,642	10.0
Caldwell	23	3,746	3,185	17.6
Catawba	12	8,029	7,288	10.2
Cherokee	34	1,172	1,005	16.6
Clay	38	777	771	0.7
Cleveland	10	8,411	7,403	13.6
Davidson	4	13,204	11,181	18.1
Davie	21	4,226	3,556	18.8
Forsyth	3	16,526	13,381	23.5
Gaston	6	10,350	8,483	22.0
Graham	44	97	45	115.5
Guilford	1	25,047	19,979	25.3
Haywood	15	5,532	4,392	26.0
Henderson	27	2,544	2,089	21.8
Iredell	7	10,130	8,667	16.9
Jackson	32	1,594	1,286	23.9
Lincoln	18	4,804	3,605	33.3
McDowell	24	2,812	2,605	7.9
Macon	30	1,881	1,688	11.4
Madison	41	526	649	— 18.9
Mecklenburg	2	20,218	14,342	41.0
Mitchell	36	823	909	— 9.5
Polk	40	599	610	— 1.8
Randolph	8	9,659	8,522	13.3
Rockingham	14	6,205	6,094	1.8
Rowan	9	8,897	7,264	22.5
Rutherford	19	4,639	4,175	11.1
Stanly	13	6,212	5,672	9.5
Stokes	28	2,202	1,970	11.8
Surry	20	4,547	4,182	8.7
Swain	43	217	218	— 0.5
Transylvania	37	821	591	38.9
Union	16	5,286	4,754	11.2
Watauga	33	1,410	1,362	3.5
Wilkes	29	1,916	1,669	14.8
Yadkin	26	2,478	2,367	4.7
Yancey	35	1,061	1,146	— 7.4

*These totals differ from those in the Annual Conference Journals due to adjustments in charge boundaries and totals from 1940 to 1950 and the division of charges by counties.

Source: *Journal of the North Carolina Conference (Southeastern Jurisdiction) of The Methodist Church, 1950, Table 1A; Journal of the North Carolina Annual Conference of The Methodist Church, 1940, Table 1; Journal of the Second Session of the Western North Carolina Annual Conference of The Methodist Church, 1940, Table 1; Journal of the Twelfth Session of the Western North Carolina Annual Conference of The Methodist Church, 1950, Table 1.*

The five smallest counties in white inhabitants were Clay, Graham, Alleghany, Swain, and Polk. All of these lost white population except Graham County,, which gained 6.7 percent. In fact, all the counties under 20,000 population either lost or gained at a much slower rate than the state, Transylvania County being the only exception.

All counties losing white population, except Anson, are located in the mountain area of the state. Those showing medium rates of growth stretch from Buncombe to Randolph counties down to the middle of the state. The most rapidly growing counties are scattered from Transylvania in the mountains through Gaston and Mecklenburg to Guilford in the eastern edge of the Conference.

The white Methodist membership by counties is shown in Table 2. In order to present these data it was necessary, with the aid of the district superintendents, to locate charges and churches by counties for 1950 and 1940. Because of changes in charges during the ten year period and the problems of location of the majority of membership of charges near the borders of counties, the total memberships in Table 12 do not equal those in the Conference Journals, but the difference, greater for 1940 than 1950, is not sufficient to distort the general picture.

In 1950, there were 401,959 white Methodists in North Carolina, an increase of 17.6 percent during the decade. The Western North Carolina Conference membership was 233,330, and it had increased at the same rate as the North Carolina Conference. Both conferences in the state increased at a slower rate than the Southeast (20.7 percent) or the church as a whole (21.4 percent).

The size of membership for counties ranged from Guilford with 25,047 to Graham with 97 members in 1950. The five counties with the largest memberships, in addition to Guilford, were Mecklenburg, Forsyth, Davidson, and Buncombe. The five smallest memberships were found in Graham, Swain, Alleghany, Madison, and Polk counties. Seven counties lost Methodist membership ranging from Ashe with -0.4 percent to Madison with -18.9 percent. This compares with 13 counties losing white population.

The five fastest growing counties in Methodist membership were Graham, Mecklenburg, Transylvania, Lincoln, and Avery, while the five losing the most rapidly were Madison, Mitchell, Yancey, Alleghany and Polk.

Most of the counties losing Methodist membership are in the mountain while the rapidly growing counties are scattered over every part of the state.

The total population of the United States increased 14.5 percent from 1940 to 1950, while The Methodist Church grew 21.4 percent, or 6.9 percent faster than the population. In the Western North Carolina Conference the white population increased 13.5 percent and Methodist membership 17.6 percent, or 4.1 percent more than the population. Thus, the Conference increased over the population by a 2.8 percent lower rate than the church as a whole. Taking into account the racial difference in the population base, it is likely that Western North Carolina Methodism did not equal the performance of American Methodism in terms of percentage growth.

Table 3 shows the relationship between the change in white population and the change in Methodist membership by counties from 1940 to 1950. This and Table 4 are work sheets containing information from which may be drawn a composite picture of the performance of Methodism in any county in terms of membership change in relationship to population change. Columns 1 and 3 are taken from Tables 1 and 2 where the percentage changes in the white population

and in Methodist membership were discussed separately. These data are brought together here in column 5. Is the church growing as rapidly as the population? This question can be answered for the Conference and for each county by a study of Table 3.

One measure of the efficiency of Methodist churches would be the extent to which they grow in membership in relationship to population change. Counties with minus percentages in column 5 are those which did not grow as rapidly in Methodist membership as in population from 1940 to 1950. The ranking in column

TABLE 3

Percentage Change in White Population and Methodist (White) Membership and Difference in Percentage Changes with Ranking by Counties for Western North Carolina Conference, 1940-1950

County	White Population		Methodist Membership		Difference	
	Pct. Change 1940-1950 (1)	Rank (2)	Pct. Change 1940-1950 (3)	Rank (4)	(Col. 1 Minus Col 3) (5)	Rank (6)
All counties ..	13.5		17.6		4.1	
Alexander	8.0	24.5	19.9	13.5	11.9	12
Alleghany	-1.8	35	-3.6	41	-1.8	32
Anson	-5.1	39.5	9.9	29	15.0	9
Ashe	-2.6	36	-0.4	38	2.2	22
Avery	-1.1	33.5	32.2	5	33.3	2
Buncombe	17.8	10	8.9	31	-8.9	41
Burke	18.8	9	19.9	13.5	1.1	25.5
Cabarrus	8.9	21	10.0	28	1.1	25.5
Caldwell	21.8	6	17.6	17	-4.2	36
Catawba	20.9	7	10.2	27	-10.7	43
Cherokee	-3.4	37	16.6	19	20.0	5
Clay	-6.1	42	0.7	36	6.8	17
Cleveland	11.2	18.5	13.6	21	2.4	20.5
Davidson	17.6	11	18.1	16	0.5	28
Davie	4.2	28	18.8	15	14.6	10
Forsyth	22.7	5	23.5	9	0.8	27
Gaston	28.0	2	22.0	11	-6.0	39
Graham	6.7	26	115.5	1	108.8	1
Guilford	26.3	4	25.3	7	-1.0	31
Haywood	8.5	23	26.0	6	17.5	7
Henderson	20.6	8	21.8	12	1.2	24
Hredell	14.2	15	16.9	18	2.7	19
Jackson	-0.9	32	23.9	8	24.8	3
Lincoln	14.8	13	33.3	4	18.5	6
McDowell	14.7	14	7.9	33	-6.8	40
Macon	2.6	30	11.4	24	8.8	15
Madison	-8.8	43	-18.9	44	-10.1	42
Mecklenburg ..	35.5	1	41.0	2	5.5	18
Mitchell	-5.1	39.5	-9.5	43	-4.4	38
Polk	-1.1	33.5	-1.8	40	-0.7	29
Randolph	15.6	12	13.3	22	-2.3	34
Rockingham	13.0	17	1.8	35	-11.2	44
Rowan	11.2	18.5	22.5	10	11.3	13
Rutherford	3.1	29	11.1	26	7.0	16
Stanly	13.8	16	9.5	30	-4.3	37
Stokes	-3.8	38	11.8	23	15.6	8
Surry	9.5	20	8.7	32	-0.8	30
Twain	-21.2	44	-0.5	39	20.7	4
Transylvania ..	26.7	3	38.9	3	12.2	11
Union	8.8	22	11.2	25	2.4	20.5
Vatauga	2.0	31	3.5	37	1.5	23
Wilkes	5.8	27	14.8	20	9.0	14
Yadkin	8.0	24.5	4.7	34	-3.3	35
Yancey	-5.4	41	-7.4	42	-2.0	33

Source: Tables 1 and 2.

6 gives the order from highest to lowest in which Methodism increased over the population by counties.

The increase of Methodist membership over population increase for all counties was 4.1 percent, with Graham County ranking first with 108.8 percent and Rockingham County ranking last with a loss of 11.2 percent. The median rate of increase of membership over population was 2.3 percent, which means that one-half of all the counties increased at less than this rate.

The 10 counties in which Methodist churches increased membership at the highest rates over the increase in population were Graham, Avery, Jackson Swain, Cherokee, Lincoln, Haywood, Stokes, Anson, and Davie. By checking these counties with the 10 fastest growing counties in Methodist membership, it will be found that five are in both lists. These are Graham, Lincoln, Avery, Haywood, and Jackson. However, not any of the 10 counties showing the best record in membership growth over population growth are among the 19 fastest growing counties by population.

The Methodist churches in 16 counties increased at a less rapid rate than the population. These losses over population growth began with Polk County which lost 0.7 percent and continued to Rockingham County which lost 11.2 percent.

The 10 counties in which Methodist membership fell behind population at the highest rates, in addition to Rockingham, were Catawba, Madison, Buncombe, McDowell, Gaston, Mitchell, Stanly, Caldwell and Yadkin. Of these Gaston, Caldwell, Catawba, and Buncombe were among the 10 fastest growing counties, and Madison and Mitchell were among the 10 fastest declining counties in white population.

It would be instructive to study the relative ranking of the five largest and the five smallest counties by size of white population in 1950. This can be done in columns 2, 4, and 6 of Table 3.

As already noted, the largest counties were Mecklenburg, Guilford, Buncombe, Forsyth and Gaston. Mecklenburg County ranked first in white population growth, second in Methodist membership growth, and eighteenth in the increase of the membership growth over population change. Guilford County ranked fourth in population growth, seventh in membership growth, and thirty-first in the difference between the two. In fact, Guilford County Methodism failed to grow at as rapid a rate as the population by -1.0 percent. Buncombe County ranked tenth in population increase, thirty-first in membership increase, and forty-first in the difference between the two. Buncombe County Methodism failed to increase at as rapid a rate as the population by -8.9 percent. Forsyth County ranked fifth in population growth, ninth in membership growth and twenty-seventh in the relationship between the two. Gaston County ranked second in population growth, eleventh in membership growth, and thirty-ninth in the difference between the two. This county failed to grow in membership as rapidly as in population by -6.0 percent.

The five smallest counties in white population were Clay, Graham, Alleghany, Swain and Polk. Clay County ranked forty-second in population change, thirty-sixth in Methodist membership change, and seventeenth in the difference between the two. Graham County was twenty-sixth in population change and first in membership change, to rank first in the increase of membership over population. Alleghany County ranked thirty-fifth in population change, forty-first in membership change, and thirty-second in the relationship between them. It lost

in population by 1.8 percent, in membership by 3.6 percent, and in membership over population by 1.8 percent. Swain County lost population at the highest rate in the Conference (-21.2 percent) and ranked forty-fourth, while it lost Methodist membership by 0.6 percent and ranked thirty-ninth, but it ranked fourth in the difference between the two. This is an example of a situation where, even though the churches lost membership, the county lost population at a much heavier rate so that at the end of the decade the churches in Swain County were 20.7 percent better off in relationship to the white population than they were in 1940. This indicates vividly that the ranking in column 6 is a measure of membership change in relationship to population change, rather than simply a measure of the rate of membership change itself. Polk County ranked 33.5 in population change, fortieth in membership change, and twenty-ninth in the relationship between them. It lost population by 1.1 percent, Methodist membership by 1.8 percent, and failed to increase in membership as rapidly as in population by 0.7 percent.

This analysis of the five largest and the five smallest counties is simply an indication of the way in which leaders in the various counties may use these data for purposes of analyzing the performance of churches in their own counties as a basis for planning the future.

Table 4 is a comparison work sheet to Table 3. It shows the percentage of the white population in Methodist membership. On the average, 13.8 percent of the white population in 1950 belonged to the churches of the Conference and this was an increase of 0.5 percent during the decade. A larger percentage of the population in Western North Carolina claimed Methodist membership than in the Southeastern Jurisdiction. The Methodist Church claimed 5.9 percent of the population of the United States in 1950, which was less than half the percentage in this Conference.

In 1950, Davie County ranked first, as in 1940, with 31.8 percent of the population in Methodist membership. Graham County ranked forty-fourth with only 1.5 percent of its population in the Methodist Church. The five counties containing the highest percentage of Methodists in the population were Davie, Anson, Davidson, Iredell, and Randolph. None of these counties were among the five largest or the five most rapidly growing in population. The five counties in which Methodism was weakest as a proportion of the population were Graham, Madison, Swain, Wilkes, and Avery. All of these are mountain counties.

It should be noted that column 5 of Table 4 is similar to column 5 of Table 3. However, it is not identical, as shown by the ranks of column 6, and it presents, in addition to the relationship between the rates of change, the relationship between the size of Methodist membership and county population. Using this measure of performance, Anson and Davie Counties tied for first place with an increase of 3.9 percent in the percentage of the population claiming Methodist membership. The highest rate of loss in this regard was found in Catawba County, -1.4 percent. Here, again, in 16 counties Methodism failed to show a gain in the percentage of the population in membership.

By comparing columns 2, 6 and 5 it is possible to analyze the relative performance of counties by ranks and percent increase in the percentage of the population in Methodist membership.

The five counties growing most rapidly in white population, as already noted, were Mecklenburg, Gaston, Transylvania, Guilford and Forsyth. The ranks of Mecklenburg County were 16 and 17.5 with a gain of 0.5 percent; for Gaston

TABLE 4

Percentage of White Population in Methodist Membership and Changes in Percentages with Ranking by Counties for Western North Carolina Conference, 1940-1950

County	Percentage of White Population in Methodist Membership					
	1950	Rank	1940	Rank	Change (Col. 3 Minus Col. 1)	Rank
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
All counties . . .	13.8		13.3		0.5	
Alexander	13.5	17	12.1	22.5	1.4	7
Alleghany	5.4	38.5	5.5	37	- 0.1	31
Anson	28.5	2	24.6	2	3.9	1.5
Ashe	13.0	19	12.6	18	0.4	19.5
Avery	5.0	40	3.7	41	1.3	8.5
Buncombe	10.5	29	11.4	24	- 0.9	43
Burke	12.3	20	12.2	20.5	0.1	26
Cabarrus	15.6	12	15.4	13	0.2	23
Caldwell	9.3	30	9.6	30	- 0.3	35.5
Catawba	14.3	14	15.7	11.5	- 1.4	44
Cherokee	6.5	35	5.4	38	1.1	10
Clay	13.1	18	12.2	20.5	0.9	12
Cleveland	16.7	8	16.4	8.5	0.3	21.5
Davidson	23.6	3	23.5	3	0.1	26
Davie	31.8	1	27.9	1	3.9	1.5
Forsyth	15.8	11	15.7	11.5	0.1	26
Gaston	10.8	27	11.3	25	- 0.5	39.5
Graham	1.5	44	0.7	44	0.8	13.5
Guilford	16.3	9	16.4	8.5	- 0.1	31
Haywood	15.0	13	12.9	16.5	2.1	4
Henderson	8.8	32	8.7	31	0.1	26
Iredell	21.9	4	21.2	4.5	0.7	15
Jackson	9.0	31	7.2	33	1.8	5
Lincoln	20.0	6	17.3	7	2.7	3
McDowell	11.6	24	12.3	19	- 0.7	41.5
Macon	11.9	22	10.9	26	1.0	11
Madison	2.6	42.5	2.9	42	- 0.3	35.5
Mecklenburg . . .	13.7	16	13.2	15	0.5	17.5
Mitchell	5.4	38.5	5.7	36	- 0.3	35.5
Polk	5.9	36	6.0	35	- 0.1	31
Randolph	20.8	5	21.2	4.5	- 0.4	38
Rockingham	12.0	21	13.3	14	- 0.7	41.5
Rowan	14.2	15	12.9	16.5	1.3	8.5
Rutherford	11.4	25	10.6	27.5	0.8	13.5
Stanly	18.9	7	19.6	6	- 0.5	39.5
Stokes	11.2	26	9.7	29	1.5	6
Surry	10.6	28	10.7	27.5	- 0.1	31
Swain	2.6	42.5	2.0	43	0.6	16
Transylvania . . .	5.7	37	5.2	39	0.5	17.5
Union	16.2	10	15.9	10	0.3	21.5
Watauga	7.8	33	7.7	32	0.1	26
Wilkes	4.5	41	4.1	40	0.4	19.5
Yadkin	11.8	23	12.1	22.5	- 0.3	35.5
Yancey	6.6	34	6.7	34	- 0.1	31

Source: Computed from Tables 1 and 2.

County 27 and 39.5 with a loss of 0.5 percent; for Transylvania County 37 and 17.5 with a gain of 0.5 percent; for Guilford County 9 and 31 with a loss of 0.1 percent; and for Forsyth 11 and 26 with a gain of 0.1 percent.

The five counties declining most rapidly in white population, as already noted, were Swain, Madison, Clay, Yancey, and Anson. The ranks for Swain County were 42.5 and 16 with a gain of 0.5 percent; for Madison County 42.5 and 35.5 with a loss of 0.3 percent; for Clay County 18 and 12 with a gain of

0.9 percent; for Yancey County 34 and 31 with a loss of 0.1 percent; and for Anson County 2 and 1.5 with a gain of 3.9 percent.

The percentage of the population in Methodist membership is highest in five piedmont counties, four of which border each other. Most of the counties with lowest percentages are to be found in the mountains.

In Table 5 the ranks of column 6 in Tables 3 and 4 are arranged into a composite measure of performance and related to the percentage of total population that was urban according to the 1950 definition of "urban." This composite measure of performance includes the rate of membership change over population change as well as the change in the percentage of the population in Methodist membership. It ranks the performance of the churches in the counties in terms of membership change in relationship to population change, as well as size of membership as a percentage of the size of population.

Using this measure, the five counties whose churches rated the highest level of performance during the decade were Jackson, Lincoln, Anson, Avery, and Haywood. These do not include any of the five largest or fastest growing counties. The ranks in terms of size and percentage change of white population are for Jackson, 31 and 32; Lincoln, 24 and 13; Anson, 36 and 39.9; Avery 39 and 33.5; and Haywood 19 and 23.

The five counties ranking lowest in Table 5 are Catawba, Buncombe, McDowell, Gaston and Madison. Here are found two of the five largest counties (Buncombe and Gaston) and one of the five fastest growing counties (Gaston). The corresponding ranks in terms of size and percentage change of white population are for Catawba 7 and 7; Buncombe 3 and 10; McDowell 23 and 14; Gaston 5 and 2; and Madison 27 and 43.

Seven of the ten highest ranking counties contained no urban population by

TABLE 5

Composite Ranking and Percentage Urban Population, 1950 Definition
For Counties of Western North Carolina Conference

County	Composite Rank*	Percentage Urban	County	Composite Rank*	Percentage Urban
Jackson	4.0	0.0	Rockingham	22.8	38.5
Lincoln	4.5	19.7	Cabarrus	24.2	66.0
Anson	5.2	12.7	Watauga	24.5	16.2
Avery	5.2	0.0	Henderson	25.0	19.7
Haywood	5.5	27.1	Burke	25.8	24.3
Davie	5.8	0.0	Forsyth	26.5	65.8
Stokes	7.0	0.0	Davidson	27.0	39.7
Graham	7.2	0.0	Polk	30.0	0.0
Cherokee	7.5	0.0	Surry	30.5	28.4
Alexander	9.5	0.0	Guilford	31.0	66.0
Swain	10.0	0.0	Alleghany	31.5	0.0
Rowan	10.8	41.1	Yancey	32.5	0.0
Macon	13.0	0.0	Yadkin	35.2	0.0
Transylvania	14.2	25.7	Caldwell	35.7	18.2
Clay	14.5	0.0	Randolph	36.0	15.2
Rutherford	14.8	33.4	Mitchell	36.8	0.0
Wilkes	16.8	9.7	Stanly	38.2	31.8
Iredell	17.0	42.7	Madison	38.8	0.0
Mecklenburg	17.8	71.5	Gaston	39.2	55.2
Ashe	20.7	0.0	McDowell	40.7	21.9
Cleveland	21.0	35.3	Buncombe	42.0	47.0
UUnion	21.0	24.1	Catawba	43.5	37.7

* Average of ranks in Table 3, column 6 and Table 4, column 6.

Source: Computed from Tables 3 and 4.

the 1950 definition. Only two of the lowest ten counties were entirely rural. The median or middle rank in Table 5 is 21.0. Mecklenburg is the only standard metropolitan area above the median, while Forsyth, Guilford, and Buncombe fall below it. Only six of the 17 counties with no urban population fall below the median, while 11 of them are in the top half of the array. By observing the last column of Table 5, it is evident that counties with high percentages of urban population cluster around the middle and in the bottom half of the composite rankings.

From these data it seems possible to conclude that Methodist churches are performing best in terms of this composite measure in counties which have a high percentage of rural population and which are growing in population at a relatively low rate, if at all.

The fertility ratio refers to the number of children under five years of age per 1,000 women of child bearing age. A study of the fertility ratio by counties indicates that the highest fertility is in the mountains and the lowest in the piedmont area of the Conference. Since these mountain counties are declining in population while maintaining high fertility, there must be high out-migration of population. It is in this area that the lowest percentage of the population is found in The Methodist Church. Methodist evangelism, with outstanding exceptions, is apparently lowest where human fertility is highest.

According to Table 6, seventeen of the 44 counties of the Conference were completely rural. The majority of these had lower than the average percentage of their population in The Methodist Church. The one exception was Davie County which had no urban population in 1950 but which had the highest percentage of white population in the Methodist membership. Generally, the larger the percentage of urban population, the higher the percentage of the population which claims Methodist affiliation. No county over 30 percent urban has less than 10 percent of the population Methodist. Three counties with from 60.1 to 70.0 percent urban were 15.1 to 20.0 Methodist.

TABLE 6
Percentage of White Population in Methodist Membership by Urban
Percentage of Total Population in Counties, Western
North Carolina Conference, 1950

Percentage Urban	Total	Percentage of White Population in Methodist Membership						
		0.1-5.0	5.1-10.0	10.1-15.0	15.1-20.0	20.1-25.0	25.1-30.0	30.1-35.0
All counties	44	5	10	17	7	3	1	1
0	17	4	6	6	—	—	—	1
0.1-10.0	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
11.1-20.0	6	—	3	—	1	1	1	—
20.1-30.0	6	—	1	4	1	—	—	—
30.1-40.0	6	—	—	3	2	1	—	—
40.1-50.0	3	—	—	2	—	1	—	—
50.1-60.0	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—
60.1-70.0	3	—	—	—	3	—	—	—
70.1-80.0	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—

Source: Computed from Table 3 and *United States Census of Population: 1950, Vol. II, Characteristics of Population, Pt. 33, North Carolina, Chapter B, Table 12.*

Summary and Conclusion

The white population of Western North Carolina was more Methodist than the Southeast and greater than that of the nation during the past decade. This is lation growth, it was growing in Methodist percentage at a rate equal to that of

the Southeast and greater than that of the nation during the past decade. This is obviously an excellent record and one worthy of analysis to determine points at which it can be improved.

The white population in the 44 counties of the Western North Carolina Conference is growing more rapidly than the total population but less rapidly than the white population of the North Carolina Conference. Methodist membership grew at the same rate for the two conferences from 1940 to 1950.

The larger counties are growing most rapidly in white population, and the smaller ones are declining or growing only slightly.

With few exceptions, the percentage of the population that is Methodist is lowest in counties with no urban population and, generally, increases as the urban percentage increases. Methodism tends to have larger percentages of the population in piedmont counties and smaller percentages in mountain counties.

In terms of a composite measure of performance based on the increase of membership over population changes and the growth in the percentage of the population in Methodist membership, the highest ranking counties were primarily rural and growing at a slow rate or declining in white population. The four standard metropolitan areas, excepting Mecklenburg, made relatively low scores.

The fertility ratio is highest in the mountain counties where Methodism has the lowest percentage of the population and where the white population is declining most rapidly. This means heavy out-migration and high rurality for these counties on the whole.

Methodism shows high performance on the composite measure used in this study in rural counties growing slowly or declining. Several factors should be kept in mind in interpreting this picture. Such counties have heavy out-migration of the population and there is a strong tendency for Methodists to leave their membership in the home church. Rapidly growing counties show a high percentage of their population under 10 years of age. Since those under 10 years of age are not generally candidates for church membership a county with a rapid increase in this age-group would normally show a low rate of growth in relationship to it. With the high rate of migration to rapidly growing cities coupled with an unusually high birth rate since 1945, the surprising thing is that churches in such counties show as good record as they do. Refined studies taking into account birth rates, migration rates and the changing age structure of the counties would be necessary to construct a more adequate composite measure of performance.

These data indicate the necessity of detailed analysis, careful planning, and aggressive action in all types of counties and communities to keep the march of Methodism abreast the shifting and rapidly changing population. With the Presbyterian Church, U. S. increasing at a 10.8 percent higher rate, and the Southern Baptist Convention at a 14.2 percent higher rate than the Methodists of North Carolina and under identical white population characteristics during the past decade, it is obvious that the spirit and strategy of Methodism need deepening and sharpening for the tasks ahead.

Part II

Ministerial Support

As a part of the total program of research and survey a questionnaire was sent to all ministers serving pastoral charges and to the district superintendents. Of the 514 questionnaires sent out, 392 were returned in time to be tabulated.

Three general areas of information and opinion were sought through the questionnaire: (1) *Background Information* asking for the minister's conference relationship, the number and size of churches being served, number of years in the pastorate, and number of dependents; (2) *Ministerial Support*, asking for minister's salary, the various types of supplement to his salary, help provided by the pastoral charge, and miles driven in serving the pastoral charge; (3) Factors involved in the *Minimum Salary Program*.

It is the purpose of this study to present and analyze data indicative of facts and trends in problems of ministerial support which can furnish guidance to policy makers and administrators in these areas. The full information available from tabulations of the questionnaires is not displayed here, but only those parts of it most directly related to the purposes at hand.

The Minimum Salary Program

Of the 392 questionnaires returned, 142 contained some type of reply to the question concerning the Minimum Salary Program. Answers varied in length from one brief statement to several typewritten pages. This opportunity was used by many to express deep feelings and convictions concerning not only the Minimum Salary Program but, also, the entire program of the Western North Carolina Conference.

Excerpts from these replies are included as a fair sample of the thinking of the respondents. They do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the Committee on Research and Survey. Pastors were encouraged to write appraisals of the Minimum Salary Program under three general questions.

A. RAISING AND ADMINISTERING MINIMUM SALARY FUND

What changes, if any, would you make in the present method of raising or administering minimum salary fund?

1. "I think our plan for lifting the minimum support in our conference is basically a good one. I don't feel that the assessments placed upon the services for this item proves to be a burden. In fact, I have the opinion that laymen generally would be responsive to most anything we would suggest in supplying funds for the support of minimum salary."
2. "The Board of Lay Activities needs to be presented with the facts, and I feel sure that their support will be given."
3. "I think this Minimum Salary program has been the salvation of our smaller and weaker churches. But I also believe we have about reached the halting point—the leveling-off place. I think the next step in our program would be a vast, sweeping program of stewardship, taught in every church. Also, this other criticism which is coming from our laymen: This Minimum Salary Program is too much of a preacher-promoted affair, that the individual church has very little say-so in it. So, to eliminate some of this dissatisfaction, each church

should be allowed to say what it is to give to this cause, just like it does in paying its own pastor—a little more democracy is needed at this point—they say. After all, maybe too much is being handed down to the local church.”

4. “I am proposing that if there is any increase in this Minimum Salary Fund, and I think there should be, that this whole matter be referred back to the local churches, and let them decide. (This same method should apply also to Conference Claimants Fund, D. S.’s, as well as the Bishops’.) The local pastor has been penalized long enough. Too long, he has been responsible, to a large degree, of seeing that the “other fellow” got his pay, and at the same time, he isn’t supposed to mention his own salary.”
5. “I would favor a plan for each minister who receives more than the average salary within our conference making a contribution according to amount received above the conference average on a graduated scale.”
6. “I think this fund should be administered either by the Commission on Town and Country Work or a separate commission organized for the purpose of studying the needs and possibilities of each charge making application for Minimum Salary support.”
7. “I think it would be better to have a Commission to administer that fund.”
8. “Our constantly raising it has begun to create a burden and distaste on the smaller churches who seek to be fully self-supporting. The pushing is too much the work of ministers instead of laymen. We are not challenging churches to meet standards, but are simply supplementing and letting the lazy churches all too often feed on the ‘fat of the land.’”
9. “Somehow, a Charge ought to be able to raise its ministerial support so that the minister may benefit by its effort. As it is, the more raised on the Charge simply reduces the amount from MSF: the minister may applaud, but the Charge morale feels no up-swing in its effort to show appreciation to its pastor in this way.”
10. “The Executive Committee of the Board of Missions is doing an excellent job in handling the funds, but under present method of distributing the funds this group has no authority in fixing the amount of assistance a charge receives. It has no method by which to help the district superintendent in getting local pastoral charges to increase their giving.
“Either this committee or a Minimum Salary Commission, established by the conference, should be given the specific task of studying the schedule to be paid and to make recommendations to the annual conference; to review before the meeting of the annual conference the charges receiving help from the fund, especially prospective new charges expecting to receive help, to determine if the charge is doing as much as it should; and to work with the district superintendents to raise the level of ministerial support on subminimum charges.”

B. REQUIREMENTS FOR LOCAL PASTORAL CHARGE

What requirements, if any, should be made of a local pastoral charge before it can qualify for minimum salary support?

1. “Of course the main objective this question has is: How to get the charges that are able to support themselves to quit riding the Board, and how to give the most wholesome encouragement to those charges not capable of self-support in their efforts to keep the church going in those weak places.”
2. “As to the requirements for a charge to qualify for minimum salary support: The Discipline Par. 826 says ‘Each Annual Conference . . . shall adopt a schedule of minimum support for its pastors . . .’ That doesn’t leave much room for a “Charge’s qualifications”, when the discipline directs that the pastor **shall have** minimum support on such a schedule as the Conference may determine. The only way I see for us to do is to keep on doing the way we are, considering the present regulation in the Discipline—”

3. "As to the requirements of a local pastoral charge becoming a Minimum Salary Charge, this should be left up to the District Superintendent and a District Committee elected by the Annual Conference on nomination of the Cabinet."
4. "Let the D. S. discuss practically, and sympathetically the matter with all charges receiving Minimum Salary, with study of approximate income level of church members and for the service expected of a minister."
5. "Analyze their status, and perhaps find if the charge is doing more per capita than the average charge in the Conference. If analysis shows it to be "riding the Board of Missions—LET IT SHOW!!"
6. "The charge's resources should be investigated thoroughly by the administrative agency to find out whether or not it is carrying its share of the load. If it is not, it should be required to face this fact and make as much remedy at once as possible. The appointment of a pastor should take into account the willingness of a charge to do what it can."
7. "A committee of the District Superintendent, the District Lay Leader, and the district leader of the W. S. C. S. ought to review each charge receiving the Minimum Salary Fund, they meeting immediately after Annual Conference."
8. "I think that a time limit should be set beyond which the MSF does not support—then the charge might easily be termed special, and cared for by other mission funds."
9. "I would suggest that for a church to qualify for minimum salary it should be required to put forth every effort to reach the minimum in a reasonable time if its resources are sufficient."
10. "... that the District Superintendent make every effort to see that every church applying for Minimum Salary Fund do its part; that no new charge be created and put on the Minimum Salary Fund without stipulations of becoming self-sustaining within a given period of time, say, of several years . . ."
11. "I think that before a Charge should ask for ministerial support aid, it ought to conduct an Every Member Canvass."
12. "Methodists seem not to be convinced that loyalty to the church and its program involve their eternal destiny. This must be remedied before the solution of our salary problem in the church will fall naturally in the way of solution. Emphasis upon stewardship has been too impersonal and legalistic—divorced from Christian character and destiny on both ends, collection and distribution."
13. "I think that any charge which receives or applies for Minimum Salary support should pay the Conference average (or above) per member before it qualifies for Minimum Salary support. I definitely think it unfair to assess a congregation which pays \$15.00 per member on salary to help another congregation which pays only \$5.00 per member on salary."
14. "It is bad psychology for any group of people to get to where they feel it other's duty to support them, that the general church owes it to them."
15. "A charge could well be required to file a financial plan and carry it out. Much inadequate support is not because of poverty but poor financing. This takes all sorts of bizarre forms as, refusal to receive revival offerings, hoarding money in Sunday School treasuries while the church budget lags, maintaining no annual or more frequent contact with non-resident members and absentee members."
16. "A training class in stewardship and church finance could be required."
17. "Many salaries are lower than they would be for the simple reason that the District Superintendent has no time to make the contacts and cultivation necessary prior to the 4h QC. The program should begin with providing Superintendents with clerical help and possibly an administrative assistant. Then he could work on some matters like these which a modest pastor is in no position

to do. The people are not always stingy. They do not know what is needed for the minister to live. Friendly counsel from the D. S. could do the trick."

18. "That each church receiving such support should be required to raise its pastors salary, or what it pays toward it at least every two years, based on its membership increase and on the general scale of increases in Conference if such could be determined."
19. "No established church should be "set up" as a station with less than 300 members. If we continue to divide charges, and take the strong church off the circuit, we will always have a large number of minimum salary charges, and a shortage of ministers."
20. "There is one thing that might be given consideration, the multiplying of small charges. It seems evident that the Minimum Salary Fund is largely supporting a great number of charges which hold little promise of growth. There are scores of new places where we should have churches. Many of them would require aid only in the beginning years."

Conference legislation might be quoted on this point. ". . . provided that the Minimum Salary Fund *shall not pay more than 25%* of the minimum schedule for the ensuing year for any charge, except by vote of the Executive Committee of the Board of Missions and Church Extension after recommendation by the District Superintendent of the claimant; and . . . expense allowance(s) or other monetary compensation shall be counted among the resources making up the total minimum." (The 1950 Journal of the Western North Carolina Conference of The Methodist Church, p. 146.)

However, practically all sub-minimum charges receive the full help from the Minimum Salary Fund, even though they do not pay 75% of the total salary.

C. AMOUNTS PAID MINISTERS AND FACTORS DETERMINING THE AMOUNTS

What amounts do you think should be paid to ministers serving pastoral charges and what factors (conference relationship, length of service, competence, marital status, etc.), if any, should be considered in determining these amounts?

1. "I am proud of the accomplishments of the Minimum Salary Fund. I feel that it has met a definite need in the life of our church. I definitely feel that the present salary scale is about as high as it should go. Certainly I feel that it should not go beyond \$3,000.00."
2. "A plan similar to that used by the military service would seem practical. Under this plan a man receives an automatic 5% pay increase every three years, on his base pay, regardless of whether he receives a promotion or not. I feel that every minister ought to be able to expect at least a 5% pay increase every three or four years, over and above the established minimum salary."
3. "I believe the minimum salary for Conference members should be the minimum for approved supplies who are giving their full time to the work of the Lord."
4. "The Methodist itineracy is always underpaid and many of our ministers never rise to adequate salaries. Why should not members on trial know that they are in a slightly different category than men who have passed trial and may have been serving at the minimum many years."
5. "Perhaps we should start at the bottom and say what is the minimum on which a full-time supply can devote himself entirely to the work and build up from there to those in full connection."
6. "I believe the Methodist Church also should encourage large families and set the example allowance of perhaps graduated amounts should be made for children up to a 'growing population'."

7. "Besides conference relationship, seniority, and similiar "political" factors, certainly **competence, marital status, and his growing family and family responsibilities** ought to enter the bases picture of MSF assistance."
8. "A minimum schedule does not begin to meet the needs of our situation.
 - a. "There should be an additional increase for each child—perhaps \$150 per child.
 - b. "There should be an additional increase periodically for years of service, perhaps \$200 every four years for ten or twelve years, at which time this increase might discontinue.
 - c. There should be a special bonus (or special increase) given when a son or daughter enters college. This would be conditioned upon the son or daughter actually going to college. Perhaps this might be a yearly stipend of \$200 to \$300.

"Surely, number of children, age of children, and length of ministry would have universal relevance."
9. "Too many of our ministers have not gone to seminary because they had no way to support their family and go to school. I feel student pastors should have a minimum salary probably based on number of dependents."
10. "Surely competence should enter the calculations, but that introduces the difficult problem of how to accurately determine competence."
11. "I feel that a young man entering the ministry should be placed in a different bracket from one who has served in the active pastorate for four years or more."
12. "I would say that when it comes to amounts that should be paid ministers we are dealing with a difficult subject. This is particularly true in times of inflation. The amounts should vary with the purchasing power of money, and these might be determined by considering the government cost of living index."
13. "I am happy that our church has a real concern for older men and I feel that a man who has passed the peak of his effectiveness should continue to receive an adequate wage."
14. "I think it goes without saying that our wide differential in salary is the basis for a good deal of jealousy among the men. As we move slowly toward decreasing that wide differential, I think we will at the same time move closer together in fellowship and true brotherhood."
15. "As to factors that should be considered: Possibly Conference Relationship; length of service up to say 20 years; competence, certainly if there was any possible way of getting around the barrier that we are all superior in ability **IN OUR OWN EYES**; Marital status????; possibly the number of children up to three. We'd have to set some limit there or some Samuel Wesley might join Conference and break the treasury."
16. "This problem will probably not be settled to the satisfaction of the majority until there is de-emphasis upon salary as a criterion of picking a minister, or of supplying a charge."
17. "The Conference should know the financial status of a man just out of Divinity School."
18. "I believe the mission board has worked out the only Christian way in this matter—pay a minister (any man we accept to fill a pulpit) according to his need, depending upon demands made upon him for travel, etc., number and age of children, etc. Every man has a right to a salary large enough to meet his needs. No man has a right to ask for more when other ministers have less."
19. "In every other line of work, or profession, experience counts for many things."
20. "When all members of our Conference put **SERVICE** above **SALARY**, we will see a better and stronger group of churches throughout our conference."

21. "In all I venture to say that over half of my salary goes back into my car which is service for my people."
22. "I feel that ministers are held at such low financial state that they have very little community influence."

These statements are difficult to summarize, but they definitely point to the fact that the majority of the ministers have given thought to the matter of minimum salary support and that there is a widespread understanding of the issues and willingness to continue and to expand this phase of the work of the Conference.

Factors in Minimum Salary Schedule

What factors should be considered in setting the minimum salary schedule? This question has been frequently discussed by officials and members of the Conference. In Table 7, one hundred and seventy-five respondents exposed their opinions and there was a wide variety of items mentioned. Only two persons bothered to agree with the present basis of establishing the schedule. Dependents, marital status and years of service accounted for 95 of the 166 "Yes" replies and 4 out of the 9 "No" answers. Conference relationship, which is partially the basis in the present schedule, ranked next with 21 "Yes" and 2 "No" replies. Competence of minister, with no suggestions as to how to measure this term, and the number of miles traveled in serving charge were given 16 and 13 "Yes" answers respectively. Other items received a few "Yes" replies with number of churches served and costs of living the highest among them.

If these replies approximate a sample of the opinions of ministers in the Conference, a rather serious revision of the basis of the schedule should be considered. Not any of the major items mentioned enter into the present schedule.

TABLE 7
Number of Respondents Checking "Yes" and "No" in Items to Consider
In Setting Up Minimum Salary Schedule.

<i>Items</i>	<i>Number of Replies</i>	
	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
All Items	166	9
Dependents	35	
Marital status	30	1
Years of Service	30	1
Conference relationship	21	2
Competence of Minister	16	5
Miles traveled in serving charge	13	
Number of churches served	7	
Cost of living	6	
Children in college	3	
Same as present	2	
Educational qualifications	1	
Health of minister	1	
Number of members served	1	

Source: Questionnaire tabulations.

Since a large number of those responding expressed the opinion that the number of dependents should be one of the factors in setting the minimum salary schedule Table 8 provides data on this point. Of 392 respondents, 382 reported 1,282 dependents ranging from 1 to 9 each. The average number of dependents was 3.4 per parsonage. Pastors reporting \$3,000 salary or less average 3.1 dependents while those receiving over \$3,000 average 3.6 dependents. Those getting

lowest salaries tended to have fewer dependents while the reverse was the case for those with higher salaries. Individual exceptions occur as, for example, the only pastor with 8 dependents had a salary of \$2,000 or less. Assuming no supplements, this was a little more than \$200 per person in the family per year.

TABLE 8
Number of Dependents by Size of Salary.

Salary	Total	Number of Dependents								Total	Av.
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
All Salaries	382	17	94	101	101	49	16	3	1	1282	3.4
\$2000 and under	78	7	23	20	16	8	3	—	1	243	3.1
2001-3000	114	5	32	39	29	6	3	—	—	350	3.1
3001-4000	117	2	27	25	36	22	3	2	—	417	3.6
4001-5000	43	1	10	10	10	9	2	1	—	155	3.6
Over 5000	30	2	2	7	10	4	5	—	—	117	3.6

Source: Questionnaire tabulations.

Minimum Salary Schedule

It is obvious from Table 9 that the majority of the 48 respondents wanted a \$3,000 schedule for Conference members. Six replies were below \$3,000 while 10 persons wanted a schedule of from \$3,200 to \$4,000. For approved supplies the largest number wanted \$2,600 and for supplies \$2,400. However, the range for approved supplies was from \$2,400 to \$3,250 and for supplies from \$2,200 to \$3,000.

TABLE 9
Number of Respondents Suggesting Specified Amounts for Minimum Salary Schedule for Conference Members and Supply Pastors

Amount	Number Suggesting Amount for		
	Conference Members	Approved Supplies	Supplies
All Amounts	48	20	20
\$2200	—	—	3
2300	—	—	1
2400	—	3	8
2500	—	1	2
2600	1	7	—
2700	—	1	1
2750	—	1	1
2800	—	—	1
2850	5	2	—
2900	—	—	—
3000	32	2	3
3100	—	1	—
3200	2	1	—
3250	3	1	—
3300	1	—	—
3400	—	—	—
3500	2	—	—
3600	1	—	—
4000	1	—	—

Source: Questionnaire tabulations.

Salary Schedules of Other Conferences

The W. N. C. Conference compares favorably with other conferences in the Southeastern Jurisdiction as to scale of payments. Only two conferences have a higher scale, North Carolina and Virginia.

The North Carolina Conference Schedule for 1952-53

\$2,600.00—Single Men

2,800.00—Married Men—no dependent children

3,000.00—Married Men with one or more dependent children

The Virginia Conference Schedule for 1953-54

\$3,000.00—Full time married men who are members of the conference, on trial, or approved supplies.

2,750.00—Full time single men.

How Much Is Needed?

Dr. Ralph Felton, professor emeritus of Drew University, made a study for The Presbyterian Church in North Carolina in 1952. In this study his findings concerning ministerial support were as follows:

“Here is what a pastor must spend a year to meet the ‘necessary minimum requirements’ according to the ‘technical advisory committee’ of the Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics:

“Food	\$1,183.00
Utilities and household supplies	252.00
Clothing	487.00
Medical care and hospitalization	177.00
Transportation for church work and personal needs	679.00
Reading and Recreation	130.00
Personal	68.00
School	11.00
Gifts and Contributions	338.00
Other outlays	344.00
Miscellaneous	42.00
TOTAL	\$3,751.00

“The Bureau of Labor Statistics calculated these items according to a family of four, one son and one daughter. If the family consists of five instead of four, it would be 115% of the above amount. A family of three would be 84%. The amount for ‘rent’ from the Bureau of Labor Statistics budget was omitted from the above budget for a minister, because a manse is usually provided.

“The amount for gifts and contributions which was \$169.00 in the Labor Statistics budget was doubled for the minister and changed to \$338.00.

“The transportation item in the Labor Statistics budget of \$237.00 was increased by \$442.00, that is, to \$679.00 for the minister, to include the cost of travel on church business. This item of \$442 was based on a study, made by the writer, of the travel expenses of 119 ministers in 35 states, based on an accurate record of the miles they traveled on church business calculated at 5.3 cents per mile, the Labor Bureau rate.”

(Special Studies of the Home Mission Program in the Synod of North Carolina Presbyterian Church in the United States, section 6, p. 1.)

How Much Additional Salary Is Needed?

Table 10 tends to confirm the generalization that the more one has the more he wants. Forty-one percent of the respondents to the questionnaire expressed the need for additional salary to meet the needs of the family and to do effective work. Most of these replies came from pastors receiving less than \$4,000 salary. Indeed, only 15 of the 162 respondents receive as much as the minimum amount needed by a family of four, \$3,751.00, according to Dr. Felton’s estimate. The majority of pastors needed from \$300 to \$700 more. There is some tendency for

those with smaller salaries to request smaller additional amounts while those with larger salaries need larger amounts. This is seen especially in the fact that 8 of the 9 men receiving \$4,000 and over needed \$700 or more in addition.

TABLE 10

Number of Respondents Needing Specified Additional Income by Present Salary.

Present Salary	Total	Additional Income Needed				
		\$100-299	300-499	500-699	700-899	900 and over
All Replies	162	24	50	48	28	12
\$2000-2499	48	10	12	17	8	1
2500-2999	29	10	9	4	6	—
3000-3499	52	2	19	19	7	5
3500-3999	24	2	10	7	2	3
4000 & over	9	—	—	1	5	3

Source: Questionnaire tabulations.

This is more clearly seen in Table 11. To the present salary is added the average extra amount needed to give the estimated salary required. The average extra amount needed is \$522 with a range from \$343 needed by those getting \$3,500 to \$933 needed by those with a salary of \$4,000. The average salary according to need is \$3,509 with a range from \$2,726 to \$5,750. In all cases these estimated amounts are larger than the present minimum salary schedule. Persons receiving less than \$3,000 wanted \$438 more; those getting less than \$4,000 wanted \$534 more and pastors with salaries of over \$4,000 desired \$861 more. It should be noted that the average salary wanted by these 162 respondents was \$3,509, just under the estimated minimum amount for a family of four.

It is evident that most pastors with salaries under \$4,000 desire and probably need additional amounts to provide for families and professional competence. Some of this need could become the motivation to better work. That these possibilities are limited may be seen in the fact that more than half of the charges in the Conference paid less than \$3,000 salary in 1952.

TABLE 11

Average Extra Amount Needed and Average Total Needed by Present Salary.

Present Salary	Average Extra Amount Needed	Average Total Amount Needed
All Salaries	522	3509
2200	526	2726
2400	452	2852
2800	411	3211
2900	367	3267
3000	543	3543
3100	500	3600
3200	620	3820
3300	525	3825
3400	400	3800
3500	343	3843
3600	490	4090
3800	875	4675
3900	500	4400
4000	933	4933
4200	800	5000
4900	850	5750

Source: Questionnaire tabulations.

Sources of Salary Supplements

The need for supplementation of salaries paid by charges is clearly indicated. This is actually achieved in a variety of ways. Table 12 shows the number of pastors receiving church-related supplements to their salary. One hundred and seventy-seven pastors received no supplement and although the majority of these had salaries over \$3,000, there were 61 pastors with salaries under \$3,000 without supplements from church sources. The remaining 215 pastors received supplements from 237 sources. Travel allowances, a local charge source, accounted for the largest number of supplements, with the majority of them paid to pastors in the \$2,000 to \$4,000 salary class. Of the 84 supplements to pastors with salaries under \$2,000 only 12 were travel allowances. The second largest source of supplements is derived from appropriations made by the annual conference in the form of Minimum Salary Fund, Board of Missions Funds, and Duke Endowment.

TABLE 12
Number of Respondents Receiving Salary Supplements from Church-Related Sources by Size of Salary.

Source of Supplement	Total	Size of Salary				
		Under \$2000	2001-3000	3001-4000	4001-5000	Over 5000
Total	414	90	138	117	39	30
No supplement	177	6	45	71	29	26
All supplements	237	84	93	46	10	4
Travel allowance	99	12	37	37	9	4
Duke Endowment, Minimum Salary Fund, Missions	89	57	30	2	—	—
Local firms and endowments	15	3	9	3	—	—
Other	34	12	17	4	1	—

Source: Questionnaire tabulations.

More than half of these supplements go to churches under \$2,000 salary. Furthermore, these sources furnish the majority of supplements for this group of charges. Local firms and other sources account for the remainder of the supplementation of salary. Here pastors in the \$2,000 to \$3,000 class receive most supplements.

Pastors, like other people, fall back upon personal and family sources of supplementation of income, as seen in Table 13. The majority of respondents did not depend on this type of extra income but 171 persons received supplements from 211 sources. Additional income from the employment of wife and/or children was

TABLE 13
Number of Respondents Receiving Salary Supplements from Personal Sources by Size of Salary.

Source of Supplement	Total	Size of Salary				
		Under \$2000	2001-3000	3001-4000	4001-5000	Over 5000
Total	432	71	151	134	45	31
No supplement	221	35	62	72	27	25
All supplements	211	36	89	62	18	6
Employment of wife and/or children	91	16	35	33	7	—
Property and Investments	51	8	25	11	4	3
Additional employment of Pastor	43	3	19	14	5	2
Other	26	9	10	4	2	1

Source: Questionnaire tabulations.

reported the largest number of times. Ninety-one of the 211 sources were of this type with most of them falling in the \$2,000 to \$4,000 range. Most of those whose wife worked maintained that her income was essential to meet current family expenses and to serve the pastoral charge. Next in importance was income from property and investment. This form of supplement was spread through the salary classes with nearly half of them, curiously, in the \$2,000 to \$3,000 group. The next source of extra income was additional employment of the pastor. Forty-three of the 171 pastors received such income. Most of these were in the \$2,000-\$4,000 salary group.

Mileage

According to Table 14, three hundred and sixty-four respondents reported the miles driven by car in serving their charges. Many of them indicated that the mileage was estimated. However, the estimated mileage compared favorably with mileage reported from records. It is likely that the estimates were conservative. Table 14 relates the mileage reported to the number of churches served. According to this table the 364 pastors traveled approximately 4,107,750 miles last year, at an average rate of 11,254 miles per charge. The majority of the pastors drove their cars around 1,000 miles per month or less during the year. The largest group, 134 pastors, drove between 10,000 and 15,000 miles. The pastors of one-point charges averaged a little less than this, but the pastors on circuits averaged from 12,500 to 16,750 miles with a clear tendency for the larger number of churches to result in a higher number of miles driven. For example, six-point charges had the highest average of 16,750 miles driven. There are individual exceptions, of course, with one pastor serving 3 churches reporting over 35,000 miles. The maintenance and operation of the car as a necessary piece of equipment in serving as pastor is expensive, especially in relationship to the size of the salary. Using the low replacement and operational cost of 7c per mile the 364 pastors had a car expense of \$287,542 last year or \$788 each on the average. Since circuits generally pay smaller salaries, provide travel allowances less frequently and require more travel mileage it is obvious that car cost is a major financial consideration, especially on large circuits.

In view of these data, the number of churches served could well serve as a factor in setting the minimum salary schedule on travel allowance.

Incidentally, another cost of car travel is the amount of time consumed at the wheel. At a moderate average rate of speed (35 miles per hour) pastors spent an

TABLE 14
Number of Miles Driven per Year Serving Charge by Number of Churches Served.

Miles	Total	Number of Churches Served					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
All replies	364	217	43	36	38	25	5
5000 and under	34	17	5	5	5	2	—
5001-10,000	113	84	10	7	6	5	1
10,001-15,000	134	74	17	16	18	8	1
15,001-20,000	63	33	8	5	7	8	2
20,001-25,000	11	5	3	1	1	1	—
Over 25,000	9	4	—	2	1	1	1
Total miles	4,107,750	2,278,500	537,500	450,000	403,000	355,000	83,750
Average miles	11,254	10,500	12,500	12,500	13,000	14,200	16,750

Source: Questionnaire tabulations.

average of 8 forty-hour weeks last year driving the car. The length of time advanced by the number of churches served. Pastors serving 1-church charges averaged 7.5 weeks; 2- and 3-church charges, 8.9 weeks; 4-church charges 9.0 weeks; 5-church charges, 10.6 weeks and 6-church charges, 11.9 weeks in the automobile. John Wesley and his circuit riders spent more time than this in the saddle but they could read as they rode.

Add to this official use of the car the normal amount of family driving and it becomes apparent that the automobile, primarily in the past generation, has risen to a challenging position in the pastor's budget—both of money and time.

Years of Service

There was serious concern with "Years of service" as an item in the minimum salary schedule on the part of respondents. Table 15 shows that this is an important differentiating factor in terms of salary received. The 385 pastors received \$3,204 on the average last year. Those serving 5 years and less had an average salary of \$2,714. This increased steadily to a high of \$3,875 after 16 to 20 years of service. After a slight decline for those in 21 to 25 year class the same peak was reached again for those serving 26 to 30 years. Following this there was an irregular decline to \$1,593 on the average for those serving over 40 years. Thus, the average pastor may expect to begin at a \$2,174 salary and reach two peaks of \$3,875 during his 18th and 28th year and fall to a low of \$1,593 if he serves more than 40 years. It may be noted that these two peak salaries by years of service are only slightly higher than the minimum amount estimated to meet the needs of a family of four under the present cost of living.

Although the number of dependents was not tabulated by years of service, it is likely that pastors reach their peak dependency load before their top salary. This would support persons interested in considering years of service, up to a given number, as a factor, along with number of dependents, in setting the minimum salary schedule.

Twenty-eight percent of the 385 respondents had served 5 years and less. Nearly half of this number received less than \$2,000 and only one-fifth had achieved the \$3,000 and over class. Sixty persons had served from 6 to 10 and the same number from 11 to 15 years. Forty-five persons had served more than 30 years and eleven of these for over 40 years.

The age of the pastors was not related to the length of service, but since 92 supplies have been added since 1940 it is likely that a large percentage of the 168 persons serving 10 years and under fall in this category.

TABLE 15
Size of Salary by Years of Service.

Salary	Total	Years of Service								
		5 and Under	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	Over 40
All Salaries	385	108	60	60	36	43	33	21	13	11
Under \$2000	74	47	11	1	1	2	—	3	2	7
2000-2999	89	38	15	11	5	5	7	4	1	3
3000-3999	134	22	28	26	15	17	11	7	7	1
4000-4999	54	1	6	17	6	12	8	4	—	—
5000 and over	34	—	—	5	9	7	7	3	3	—
Average	3204	2174	3132	3486	3875	3791	3875	3286	3625	1593

Source: Questionnaire tabulations.

Summary and Conclusions

An unusually large percentage of pastors and other officials returned the questionnaire dealing with ministerial support and the minimum salary schedule. The large number of opinions and comments about the present plan of minimum salary support with suggestions for changes gave evidence of widespread interest in and understanding of the problems involved. These opinions dealt chiefly with factors to be included in setting the minimum salary schedule, safeguards against pastoral charges "riding" the Fund and the need to provide a decent wage to ministers in these days of high living costs. These comments represent amplification of some of the statistical material tabulated from the questionnaires.

Some twelve items were mentioned for consideration in setting the minimum salary schedule. Number of dependents, marital status, years of service, conference relationship, competence of minister and miles traveled serving the charge are factors receiving most replies. None of these, except Conference relationship to some extent, is now included in the schedule.

There is a difference in the number of dependents by size of salary. Generally, respondents in lower salary groups have fewer dependents, and those in higher salary groups have relatively more dependents, although the differential is only 0.5 dependents on the average. The largest group of pastors replying expressed a preference for \$3,000 minimum salary for Conference members, \$2,600 for approved supplies and \$2,400 for supplies, although in only the first case did the group represent a majority of respondents.

The present minimum salary scale is surpassed by only two annual conferences in the Southeastern Jurisdiction. Both the North Carolina and the Virginia Conferences have \$3,000 as the top level of the scale.

Studies based on cost of living estimates of the Bureau of Labor Statistics and adjusted for pastors set \$3,751 as the amount of the money needed to meet "necessary minimum requirements" for a family of four.

According to 385 pastors, their average salary this year was \$3,204, or over \$500 short of this necessary amount. By length of service, this minimum amount is not reached until pastors have served 18 years on the average and is maintained for only 10 years, after which the average salary again falls below \$3,751. Since the average salary peak is reached after from 16 to 20 years of service, it is likely that the peak load of dependent children has passed.

One hundred and sixty-two pastors reported a need for additional salary. Their average salary was \$2,981 and they expressed a desire for \$522 more for a total average salary of \$3,509. This amount is about \$250 below the cost of living estimated minimum income. There was a definite tendency for pastors getting larger salaries (\$4,000 to \$4,900) to state a need for higher additional amounts (\$800 to \$933) than those in lower salaries (\$2,200 to \$3,000) with needs for lower extra amounts (\$367 to \$543).

The salary paid by the pastoral charge is supplemented from a variety of church-related sources. Travel allowances are the most numerous supplement with Conference funds (minimum salary, Duke Endowment, missions) running a close second.

Nearly as many supplements to salary come from personal and family resources as from church-related sources. The working wife and/or children provide the largest number of supplements with property and investment income and extra jobs by the pastor following in order.

The average number of miles driven last year by 364 respondents in performing ministerial functions was 11,252 with an increase in miles by the number of churches on circuits. This was a cost for operation and maintenance of \$788 on the average. Pastors of larger circuits received less salary, paid more for travel, and were granted travel allowances less frequently. Furthermore, about two months of the working year are spent driving the car, on the average, with 6-point circuit pastors spending nearly one-fourth of the year behind the wheels of cars on official business.

These data, then, may become the basis of further thinking and planning in this area of providing a competent ministry with a minimum wage, taking account of the various differentiating factors. Also, it may undergird practical efforts to secure more local support in terms of more effective work in the parish with emphasis upon service and stewardship.

Part III

Records of Performance, 1952

Part III of these studies deals with selected characteristics of the Western North Carolina Conference in 1952. Three measures of performance have been computed for each pastoral charge. These are evangelistic ratio, percentage of the Sunday School enrollment in average attendance and per capita contributions to the current budget. Appendix A contains these data for each pastoral charge in the Conference. These measures are related to the size of membership of pastoral charges.

According to Table 16 the 504 pastoral charges range in size of membership from 10 charges with less than 100 members to seven charges with over 2,000 members. The average for all charges of the Conference was 473. The largest group of charges, 124, contained from 300 to 399 members while 24 charges had memberships of 1,000 to 1,999. The districts fluctuated in the number of charges in each membership class with Marion having the lowest and Gastonia the largest average sized charges.

TABLE 16
Size of Membership of Pastoral Charges by Districts,
Western North Carolina Conference, 1952

Districts	Total	Pastoral Charges by Size of Membership											
		0-99	100-199	200-299	300-399	400-499	500-599	600-699	700-799	800-899	900-999	1000-1999	Over 2000
All districts . . .	504	10	48	90	124	79	48	32	18	15	9	24	7
Asheville	46	3	11	8	14	3	2	1	1	—	—	2	1
Charlotte	59	1	7	9	17	7	6	3	1	2	1	2	3
Gastonia	48	1	4	9	7	4	6	7	2	2	3	3	—
Greensboro	64	2	5	14	12	6	6	6	4	4	—	3	2
Marion	45	1	3	9	19	7	2	3	—	—	—	1	—
Salisbury	48	—	3	6	9	15	4	2	5	1	1	2	—
Statesville	53	—	2	7	15	14	5	2	—	3	2	3	—
Thomasville	55	1	3	6	15	11	5	4	2	2	—	6	—
Waynesville	33	1	5	9	7	6	3	—	—	1	1	—	—
Winston-Salem	53	—	5	13	9	6	9	4	3	—	1	2	1

Source: Computed from *The Journal of the 1952 Session of the Western North Carolina Annual Conference of The Methodist Church*, Table 1A.

The average membership is larger than the median since a few charges with very large memberships pull the average up. For this reason the median is a better comparative measure. This is the "middle" sized charge with one-half of the charges being larger and the other half smaller than the median. The difference in the mean or average and median charges by size of membership for the Conference and districts is shown in Table 17. The average membership for the charges of the Conference is 473 while the median is 394. This means that one-half of the pastors of the Conference serve fewer than 394 members. In the Asheville District one-half of the pastors minister to fewer than 302 members while one-half of those in the Thomasville District serve fewer than 464 members with the other districts ranging between these extremes. Table 17 shows the comparative ranks for the mean and median size of charge for the other districts.

It is obvious that more than one-half of the charges in the Conference (those clustering around and all those below the median) would have to make a per capita contribution to salary alone of more than \$10.00 on the average to approximate the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimate, modified by Dr. Felton as reported in Part I, of the minimum amount necessary for a family of four. This is compared to the per capita giving to pastor's salary by all charges in 1952 of \$6.23. At the per capita rate of last year a charge would need 482 members to pay the pastor

TABLE 17

Mean and Median Size of Charge by Membership for Western North Carolina Conference with Ranking by Districts, 1952

District	Mean Membership	Rank	Median Membership	Rank
All districts	473	—	394	—
Asheville	376	9	302	10
Charlotte	532	2	373	7
Gastonia	534	1	461	2
Greensboro	518	3	389	6
Marion	373	10	359	8
Salisbury	498	5.5	439	3
Statesville	484	7	412	5
Thomasville	515	4	464	1
Waynesville	389	8	323	9
Winston-Salem	498	5.5	418	4

Source: Computed from *The Journal of the 1952 Session of the Western North Carolina Annual Conference of The Methodist Church*, Table 1A.

3,000. With half the charges containing less than 394 members and, doubtless, at least one-half of all charges paying less than \$6.23 to pastoral support the implications of the size of charge, as well as the level of per capita giving, for the salaries of pastors become clear.

One measure of the effectiveness of a church or charge is the number of persons received on profession of faith in comparison to the size of membership. This evangelistic ratio is computed by dividing the number coming into the church by profession of faith into the total full membership. The Conference evangelistic ratio was 35. This means that for every 35 Methodist members one person was added on profession of faith. The Conference fell below the whole church in 1952 which had an evangelistic ratio of 29. In fact, one-half of all charges in the Conference required 39 or more members to win one by profession of faith. It could be noted that by this measure the smaller the ratio the greater the evangelistic activity. The Gastonia District was the most evangelistic and next door Charlotte District, the least evangelistic, with other districts falling in between follows:

Gastonia	29.8
Greensboro	30.2
Waynesville	33.7
Asheville	34.3
Salisbury	34.8
Thomasville	37.1
Statesville	37.7
Winston-Salem	37.9
Marion	40.7
Charlotte	44.7

Twenty-two charges reported no additions on profession of faith. In computing the evangelistic ratio it was assumed that these charges had each received one person so that the ratio would equal the membership of the charge.

Table 18 relates the evangelistic ratio to the size of membership. The best evangelistic work was done by charges under 100 and between 800 and 899 members while the poorest, on the average, was registered by churches over 900 and between 600 and 699 members. Twelve of the thirteen churches with the best evangelistic record had fewer than 400 members. Sixty-one charges took 100 members or more to bring in one person by profession of faith in 1952. The majority of these had between 200 and 499 members.

A second measure of performance has to do with the percentage of the Sunday school members in average attendance on activities of the Sunday school. In the Methodist church 55.5 percent of those enrolled attended activities on the average. The Western North Carolina Conference showed a better record in 1952 since 58.7 percent were in average attendance. Thomasville District had the best record with 63.1 percent average attendance while nearby Greensboro District showed the lowest attendance with 55.1 percent. The ranking of all districts by this measure of performance is as follows:

Thomasville	63.1
Winston-Salem	61.4
Waynesville	61.0
Asheville	59.8
Marion	59.8
Statesville	59.2
Charlotte	58.0
Salisbury	58.0
Gastonia	56.3
Greensboro	55.1

TABLE 18

Evangelistic Ratio by Membership of Pastoral Charge,
Western North Carolina Conference, 1952

Membership of Charge	Total	Evangelistic Ratio										
		Under 10	10- 19	20- 29	30- 39	40- 49	50- 59	60- 69	70- 79	80- 89	90- 99	100 & over
All charges	504	13	67	99	78	60	53	34	14	11	14	61
0-99	10	2	3	1	1	—	1	—	1	—	1	—
100-199	48	5	8	7	7	1	4	2	2	1	1	10
200-299	90	2	14	24	11	8	8	5	2	1	4	11
300-399	124	3	23	22	23	14	10	6	3	1	2	17
400-499	79	1	4	16	10	13	10	7	3	1	3	11
500-599	48	—	9	10	7	8	1	5	2	—	1	5
600-699	32	—	3	7	4	2	5	3	1	3	—	4
700-799	18	—	1	7	3	1	3	2	—	—	1	—
800-899	15	—	2	5	3	3	1	—	—	1	—	—
900-999	9	—	—	—	3	1	1	1	—	1	1	1
1000-1999	24	—	—	—	4	6	8	2	—	2	—	2
2000 and over	7	—	—	—	2	3	1	1	—	—	—	—

Source: Appendix A and computed from *The Journal of the 1952 Session of the Western North Carolina Annual Conference of The Methodist Church*, Tables 1A.

Educational activity is related to size of charge in Table 19. Five charge reported under 40 percent attendance and seven had 90 percent or more of th

Sunday school scholars present on the average in 1952. The majority of the charges cluster around 50 to 70 percent attendance with the average and median just under 60 percent. Four of the five charges showing the poorest record and all the seven with the best record had under 600 members. Four of the seven charges with over 2,000 members averaged under 50 percent Sunday school attendance.

It is evident that the educational activity of the conference, by this measure, is superior to that of the whole church and this rate of performance is well divided among all charges by size of membership.

A measure of stewardship and financial activity constitutes the third performance area to be studied. Because of the seasonal nature of amounts contributed to buildings and indebtedness these items were deducted from the

TABLE 19
Percentage of Sunday School Enrollment in Average Attendance by Size of Membership of Pastoral Charge, Western North Carolina Conference, 1952.

Size of charge	Total	Percentage Attendance						
		Under 39.9	40.0-49.9	50.0-59.9	60.0-69.9	70.0-79.9	80.0-89.9	90.0 and over
All Charges	503*	5	71	191	155	60	14	7
0-99	10	—	3	2	3	1	1	—
100-199	47	1	8	16	14	5	2	1
200-299	90	1	8	27	39	9	3	3
300-399	124	—	9	55	37	18	4	1
400-499	79	1	12	21	23	19	2	1
500-599	48	1	6	24	12	3	1	1
600-699	32	—	7	14	10	1	—	—
700-799	18	—	2	11	3	2	—	—
800-899	15	—	1	7	6	1	—	—
900-999	9	—	2	2	4	1	—	—
1000-1999	24	1	9	10	3	—	1	—
2000 and over	7	—	4	2	1	—	—	—

*One charge did not report.

Source: Appendix A and computed from *The Journal of the 1952 Session of the Western North Carolina Annual Conference of The Methodist Church*, Tables 1A.

total giving to provide a per capita rate for contributions to the total current budget. The per capita giving to the current budget in the whole church in 1952 was \$18.65 while in the Western North Carolina Conference it was \$20.77. The districts ranged from Charlotte with the best record of \$28.17, to Thomasville with a low of \$16.21. The districts are ranked by per capita contributions to the current budget as follows:

Charlotte	\$ 28.17
Greensboro	23.21
Salisbury	22.15
Winston-Salem	21.12
Asheville	20.47
Gastonia	20.00
Statesville	17.29
Marion	17.21
Waynesville	16.43
Thomasville	16.21

Table 29 relates stewardship activity to size of charge. It is obvious that the charges under 100 members and the seven with more than 2,000 members

display higher per capita giving to the current budget than any other size of charge. Eighty-six charges paid under \$10.00 per capita and they are well distributed by size, except none of them are among the largest or smallest charges, with a clustering around charges from 200 to 499 members. Nine of the 16 charges paying \$40.00 and more had under 200 members and three of them were larger than 1,000 members each. There is a definite tendency for the middle sized charges to fall at or below the conference average of \$20.77. Since the median per capita contribution was \$18.65, one-half of all the charges fall below this amount.

These data show that the Conference is performing in the field of stewardship, using this measure, better than the church as a whole and that the charges with median to average size memberships fall below the smallest and the largest charges in per capita contributions.

TABLE 20

Per Capita Contribution to Current Budget by Size of Membership of Pastoral Charge, Western North Carolina Conference, 1952

Size of Charge	Total	Per Capita Contribution							
		Under 10.00	10.00-14.99	15.00-19.99	20.00-24.99	25.00-29.99	30.00-34.99	35.00-39.99	40.00 over
All Charges	504	86	100	91	100	62	26	23	16
0-99	10	—	—	—	1	1	2	2	4
100-199	48	6	5	5	12	7	2	6	5
200-299	90	14	14	19	15	16	10	1	1
300-399	124	17	28	26	27	18	6	2	—
400-499	79	20	20	18	13	5	1	2	—
500-599	48	8	12	12	11	3	1	1	1
600-699	32	9	8	4	6	1	1	1	1
700-799	18	5	5	3	3	1	—	—	1
800-899	15	3	6	2	2	2	—	—	—
900-999	9	1	1	2	2	1	—	2	—
1000-1999	24	3	1	—	8	5	2	4	1
2000-over	7	—	—	—	—	2	1	2	2

Source: Appendix A and computed from *The Journal of the 1952 Session of the Western North Carolina Annual Conference of The Methodist Church*, Tables 1A.

By reference to Appendix A it is possible to measure the performance records of any pastoral charge against that of other charges of the district and of the Conference as a whole. It is impossible here to deal with the best, middle, and poorest records of charges by districts. Yet some insights may be gained from a study of the three groups of 10 charges each for the entire Conference falling at the top, middle, and bottom of the three performance records under consideration. This is done in the following pages. It should be said that the 10 median or middle charges are those which cluster most closely around the median performance. For example, the median size charge in membership was 394 and 10 charges with memberships closest to 394 were chosen. In some cases several churches had some performance record either identical with the median or just above or below it. Since only 10 charges were desired, when this situation occurred the charges were chosen in alphabetical order until the tenth charge was reached. Thus, the 10 median charges should be interpreted as the 10 charges clustering most closely around the median arithmetically and/or alphabetically.

Do charges perform differently by size of membership? Table 21 shows the 10 largest, median, and smallest charges by membership together with their

performance records. The 10 largest charges ranged from Centenary with 3,126, to First Church, Hickory, with 1,584 members for an average of 2,332. The ten median charges ranged from Ansonville with 398 to Randleman Circuit with 389 members for an average of 393. The ten smallest churches were all under 100 members, ranging from 94 to 16 for an average of 68 members.

TABLE 21

Evangelistic Ratio, Percentage of Sunday School Enrollment in Average Attendance and Amount of Per Capita Contributions to the Current Budget for Ten Largest, Ten Median, and Ten Smallest Pastoral Charges by Size of Membership, Western North Carolina Conference, 1952

<i>Pastoral Charge</i>	<i>Membership</i>	<i>Evangelistic Ratio</i>	<i>Percentage Attendance</i>	<i>Per capita Contribution</i>
Ten largest charges	2,332	46	49.8	\$34.45
Centenary	3,126	34	58.6	38.06
West Market Street	3,057	57	45.7	34.24
Charlotte, First	3,048	42	40.2	41.79
Hawthorne Lane	2,446	34	42.3	27.26
Asheville, Central	2,337	37	45.0	27.15
Wesley Memorial	2,122	47	55.8	37.12
Dilworth	2,049	60	66.9	42.70
Gastonia, Main Street	1,796	53	50.3	35.24
Salisbury, First	1,760	48	46.2	38.19
Hickory, First	1,584	50	47.2	22.72
Ten median charges	393	53	63.9	14.14
Ansonville	398	196	65.2	9.91
Henrietta	396	33	71.2	17.40
Pisgah	395	49	88.4	10.55
Drexel	394	56	55.9	14.05
Troutman	393	44	59.3	14.55
Ward Street	393	16	53.6	33.26
Cole Memorial	392	57	51.1	4.78
Mount Mitchell	392	49	63.9	13.92
Asheboro Circuit	392	26	61.5	12.98
Randleman Circuit	389	12	69.0	10.10
Ten smallest charges	68	33	60.8	38.96
Marshall	94	94*	58.8	25.09
Groometown	90	11	60.5	31.46
Benton Heights, Monroe	84	28	89.1	39.80
Sherwood, High Point	83	3	43.5	37.11
Cherokee	80	11	44.7	31.45
Skyland	78	78*	53.3	21.51
Saluda	68	11	75.5	42.10
Martin St., Shelby	57	57*	69.9	56.56
Kona	30	30*	65.8	53.47
West Side, Asheboro	16	2	47.2	41.06

* None reported on Profession of Faith. This is membership figure.
Source: Appendix A and computed from *The Journal of the 1952 Session of the Western North Carolina Annual Conference of The Methodist Church*, Tables 1A.

The best evangelistic record (33) was made by the 10 smallest charges although there was a wide range from 2 to 94. The second best record (46) was made by the 10 largest, with a range from 34 to 69, and the poorest record (53) by the 10 median charges with a range from 12 to 196. The 10 median charges made the best record in educational activity with the 10 largest charges second and the 10 smallest charges showing the poorest record. The 10 smallest charges made the largest per capita contributions to the current budget with the 10 largest charges second and the 10 median charges falling far below the other two groups.

Looking at it another way, the 10 largest charges placed second in evangelistic and stewardship activities and third in educational attendance. The 10 median charges placed first in educational activity and third in evangelism and stewardship. The 10 smallest charges placed first in evangelism and stewardship and second in education, according to the measures used in this study.

What are the characteristics of charges with high, medium, and low evangelistic activity? It should be kept in mind that the lower the evangelistic ratio the more effective the evangelistic work. Table 22 shows that the best performing charges in the field of evangelism have an evangelistic ratio of 6 with a range from 2 to 9.. This is nearly six times as good an average as the Conference as a whole. These 10 charges were lowest in membership and in educational activity and were highest in per capita giving to the current budget.

The 10 median charges in evangelistic activity had an average ratio nearly

TABLE 22

Membership, Percentage of Sunday School Enrollment in Average Attendance, and Per Capita Contributions to the Current Budget of the Ten Charges with the Highest Evangelistic Ratio, the Ten Median Charges, and the Ten with the Lowest Evangelistic Ratio, Western North Carolina Conference, 1952.

<i>Pastoral Charge</i>	<i>Evangelistic Ratio</i>	<i>Membership</i>	<i>Percentage Attendance</i>	<i>Per capita Contribution</i>
Ten charges with highest evangelistic ratio	432	432	62.3	\$13.96
Woodleaf Circuit	620	620	58.4	11.40
Franklin Circuit	565	565	79.3	8.51
Gold Hill Circuit	472	472	71.9	16.80
Bostic Circuit	464	464	57.0	9.41
Linville Falls Circuit	452	452	51.9	6.94
Forsyth-Stokes Circuit	418	418	70.8	9.37
Wilkesboro Circuit	356	356	54.0	22.98
Balfour Circuit	342	342	64.2	16.90
Roberta	316	316	53.8	19.85
Franklin Heights, Mt. Airy	316	316	61.8	17.44
Ten median charges	39	614	65.9	18.62
Bald Creek Circuit	40	356	73.2	6.73
Belmont Park, Charlotte	40	883	54.5	15.57
Ardmore, Winston-Salem	39	1412	52.6	23.22
Belwood Circuit	39	932	73.7	8.74
Cullowhee	39	194	67.9	27.93
First, Wadesboro	39	982	46.7	23.81
Murphy	39	386	59.2	32.61
Prospect Circuit	39	501	93.0	9.10
West End, Thomasville	39	270	68.5	15.30
Bethel (Waynesville District)	38	229	70.0	23.16
Ten charges with lowest evangelistic ratio	6	192	55.5	25.44
Westside, Asheboro	2	16	47.2	41.06
Sherwood, High Point	3	83	43.5	37.11
Betha, Bessemer City	5	130	47.0	22.96
South China Grove Circuit	5	256	63.7	8.88
Reeves-Brown View Circuit	7	147	54.4	19.21
Calvary, Asheboro	7	137	59.3	39.64
Oak View, High Point	8	366	52.9	24.97
Bethel, Charlotte	8	180	59.8	9.37
Bethesda-Tabernacle Circuit	8	274	68.3	25.18
Hudson Circuit	9	329	59.4	25.98

Source: Appendix A and computed from *The Journal of the 1952 Session of the Western North Carolina Annual Conference of The Methodist Church*, Tables 1A.

equal to that of the Conference with little range. These charges were largest in membership, first in educational work and medium in stewardship.

The 10 poorest charges in evangelistic activity had a ratio of 432. These charges had either one accession on profession of faith or none and the size of the evangelistic ratio is equal to the size of the membership. They ranked second in membership and in educational work and third in stewardship.

What are the characteristics of charges doing excellent, medium, and poor educational work measured by the percentage of the Sunday school enrollment in average attendance? Table 23 shows that the 10 highest charges showed 96.9 percent in attendance, with two charges reporting over 100 percent. These were the smallest charges with the worst record in evangelism and stewardship. The 10 median charges in educational work had the middle size of membership and the median record in evangelism and stewardship. The 10 weakest churches in educational work were those largest in membership and showed the best record in evangelism and stewardship.

TABLE 23

Membership, Evangelistic Ratio, Per Capita Contributions to the Current Budget for the Ten Charges with the Highest Percentage of Sunday School Enrollment in Attendance, the Ten Median Charges, and the Ten Charges with the lowest Percentage of Sunday School Enrollment in Attendance, Western North Carolina Conference, 1952.

Pastoral Charge	Percentage Attendance	Membership	Evangelistic Ratio	Per capita Contribution
Ten charges with highest percentage attendance	96.9	398	57	\$13.84
Leicester	115.2	323	162	7.41
Shooting Creek	107.4	287	96	6.17
Nathan's Creek	100.0	210	52	5.64
Ruffin	97.9	241	20	24.24
Boone Circuit	96.4	194	24	5.87
Prospect Circuit	93.0	501	39	9.10
First, Winston-Salem	91.4	488	41	14.13
Pigeon Valley Circuit	89.6	268	18	5.67
Elkin Circuit	89.3	458	92	11.29
Benton Heights, Monroe	89.1	84	28	39.80
Ten median charges	59.2	471	55	19.02
Calvary, Asheboro	59.3	137	7	39.64
First, Thomasville	59.3	370	31	20.65
Mitchell's Grove	59.3	231	33	25.19
Troutman Circuit	59.3	393	44	14.55
East Bend Circuit	59.2	517	258	7.26
Murphy	59.2	386	39	32.61
Park Avenue, Salisbury	59.2	774	24	13.89
Sandy Ridge Circuit	59.2	376	24	12.75
St. Paul's Circuit	59.2	736	26	5.76
Coburn Memorial, Salisbury	59.0	792	36	17.86
Ten charges with lowest percentage attendance	38.7	968	45	27.99
Lowell Circuit	17.2	548	55	15.28
Purcell	39.7	177	22	47.33
First, Charlotte	40.2	3048	42	41.79
Newlin Street, Greensboro	40.3	290	97	32.67
Spindale Circuit	41.4	348	70	28.77
Trinity, Lexington	41.4	446	28	12.47
West End, Gastonia	41.6	627	12	17.63
Glenwood, Greensboro	41.7	729	27	24.60
Grace, Greensboro	41.7	1032	64	32.06
Hawthorne Lane, Charlotte	42.3	2446	34	27.26

Source: Appendix A and computed from *The Journal of the 1952 Session of the Western North Carolina Annual Conference of The Methodist Church*, Tables 1A.

By the third measure of performance, shown in Table 24, the 10 best charges had a per capita contribution of \$56.18 with a range of \$42.10 to \$100.32. These charges were highest in membership and in evangelistic activity and medium in educational activity. It should be noted that there is a broad range in size of membership from 30 to 2,049. The 10 median charges in per capita contribution were lowest in size of membership, evangelism, and educational work. Finally, the poorest charges in stewardship were highest in education and median in size of membership and in evangelism.

The size of the salary paid the pastor by the charges is, of course, a function of the per capita giving and the size of membership. On the basis of a pre-

TABLE 24

Membership, Evangelistic Ratio, Percentage of Sunday School Enrollment in Average Attendance by the Ten Charges with the Highest Per Capita Giving to the Current Budget, the Ten Median Charges, and the Ten Charges with the Lowest Per Capita Giving to the Current Budget in the Western North Carolina Conference for 1952.

Pastoral Charge	Per capita Contribution	Evangelistic Ratio	Membership	Percentage Attendance
Ten charges with highest per capita giving	\$56.98	59.5	658	36
Myers Park	100.32	47.8	1554	49
Hot Springs Circuit	72.98	67.3	173	58
Martin Street, Shelby	56.56	69.9	57	57
Kona	53.47	65.8	30	30
Central, Concord	52.07	57.9	750	40
Trinity, Winston-Salem	47.46	49.2	131	12
Purcell	47.33	39.7	177	22
Central, Mt. Airy	46.86	55.2	689	22
Dilworth, Charlotte	42.70	66.9	2049	60
Saluda	42.10	75.5	68	11
Ten median charges	18.81	54.7	407	78
Claremont-Shiloh Circuit	19.19	57.7	522	35
Burnsville	19.18	48.0	333	56
Glen Alpine	19.06	56.1	380	34
Broad Street, Mooresville	19.03	73.1	470	118
North Morganton, Morganton	18.88	53.8	353	353
Kerr Street, Concord	18.73	35.7	445	37
Lewisville Circuit	18.67	54.7	500	21
Pleasant Grove (Marion District)	18.48	55.6	382	38
West Bend, Asheboro	18.48	56.7	269	54
Bethel (Salisbury District)	18.43	65.9	415	38
Ten charges with lowest per capita giving	5.39	73.4	433	61
Green Valley Circuit	3.50	51.3	370	11
Cole Memorial	4.78	51.1	398	57
Monroe Circuit	5.51	77.2	301	301
Hebron Circuit	5.55	74.8	344	19
Nathan Creek Circuit	5.64	100.0	210	52
Pigeon Valley Circuit	5.67	89.6	268	18
Saint Paul's Circuit	5.76	59.2	736	26
Sunshine Circuit	5.79	66.4	441	49
Thomasville Circuit	5.85	68.5	1067	53
Boone Circuit	5.87	96.4	194	24

Source: Appendix A and computed from *The Journal of the 1952 Session of the Western North Carolina Annual Conference of The Methodist Church*, Tables 1A.

liminary study, the salaries in 1952 ranged from \$100 to \$13,500 with a median of \$2,760. This means that 252 pastoral charges pay less than \$2,760 each to the salary of the pastor. Twenty-four charges pay less than \$1,000, while 22 charges provide \$6,000 or more for pastoral support.

Table 25 shows that the 10 charges paying the highest salaries rank highest in membership, evangelism, and per capita giving but lowest in percentage attendance at Sunday school activities. The 10 medium salary charges were best in educational work, median in membership, and lowest in evangelism and stewardship. The 10 charges paying the lowest salaries were smallest in membership and median in evangelism, education, and stewardship.

TABLE 25

Membership, Evangelistic Ratio, Percentage of Sunday School Enrollment in Average Attendance and Amount of Per Capita Contributions to the Current Budget for the Ten Charges with the Largest Salary Paid the Pastor, the Ten Median Charges, and for the Ten Charges with the Smallest Salary Paid the Pastor in the Western North Carolina Conference for 1952.

Pastoral Charge	Salary	Membership	Evangelistic Ratio	Percentage Attendance	Per capita Contribution
Ten charges with highest highest salaries	9,090	2291	47	49.6	40.39
Centenary, Winston-Salem	13,500	3126	34	58.6	38.06
West Market, Greensboro	13,500	3057	57	45.7	24.24
Wesley Memorial, High Point	10,300	2122	47	55.8	37.12
First, Charlotte	8,000	3048	42	40.2	41.79
Main Street, Gastonia	8,000	1796	53	50.3	35.24
Myers Park, Charlotte	8,000	1554	49	47.8	100.32
Central, Asheville	8,000	2337	37	45.0	27.15
Dilworth, Charlotte	7,200	2049	60	66.9	42.70
First, High Point	7,200	1380	43	43.1	29.98
Hawthorne Lane, Charlotte	7,200	2446	34	42.3	27.26
Ten median charges	2,751	511	82	63.1	13.52
Denton Circuit	2,760	574	21	63.6	14.68
Marion Circuit	2,753	341	13	59.5	17.67
Landsi Circuit	2,751	359	46	51.5	17.37
Advance Circuit	2,750	768	51	72.8	8.12
Balls Creek Circuit	2,750	666	83	60.3	9.39
Bethesda-Tabernacle Circuit	2,750	274	8	68.3	25.18
Bostic Circuit	2,750	464	464	57.0	9.41
Candler Circuit	2,750	361	52	56.3	15.20
Cleveland Circuit	2,750	776	65	54.0	6.69
Cool Springs Circuit	2,750	525	20	87.7	11.45
Ten charges with lowest salaries	603	150	49	61.3	16.10
Cherokee, Waynesville	100	80	11	44.7	31.45
Lockingham, Greensboro	500	166	83	69.9	7.49
West Side, Asheboro	600	16	2	47.2	41.06
Stowah-Horse Shoe	637	118	118	47.9	10.27
Green Valley	694	370	11	51.3	3.50
Very Creek	700	106	106	51.3	6.60
Huntersville	700	102	102	51.4	11.96
Herwood, High Point	700	83	3	43.5	37.11
Geon Valley	700	268	18	89.6	5.67
Moone Circuit	700	194	24	96.4	5.87

No report.

Source: Computed from *The Journal of the 1952 Session of the Western North Carolina Annual Conference of the Methodist Church*, Tables 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B.

Preliminary Studies

Preliminary studies have been conducted in several other fields, although the data are not ready for complete reporting. One of these fields was the number of changes in pastoral appointments. During the past 10 years nearly 1500 changes have occurred. Under the assumption that the 101 new pastoral charges added

since 1943 were distributed equally throughout the 10 years, about one-third of the pastors have moved every year on the average. Methodist pastors move from one place to another nearly twice as often as the total inhabitants of the state. It is hoped that this study can be completed by relating these changes to salary, membership, and the three measures of performance used in these studies.

A second preliminary study shows that the 504 pastoral charges contain 1097 churches. Two hundred sixty-three of these churches are station charges while 834 of them are on circuits. There are 416 churches, 38 percent of the total, with memberships of 100 and under. Churches with 200 members and under numbered 762 or 70 percent of the total while 82 percent of all churches have 300 members or fewer. Ninety-one pastors serve stations with fewer than 300 members. The average size of membership per church was 219 in 1952.

A third introductory study shows that the number of pastoral charges increased by 92 from 1944 to 1952 while effective Conference members increased by only 40, leaving the gap to be filled by an increase of 56 supply pastors. During this same period of time there had been a decrease of eight in the number of chaplains and other special appointments. The discrepancy in these totals is doubtless due to the number of associate pastors.

It is difficult to summarize the relationship between these measures of performance without considerable refinement of data and computing coefficients of correlation. Even at this crude level, however, it is easy to see that the largest group of charges by membership do not rank first in any of the measures. The top charges in evangelism are, also, top in stewardship, while the top groups in education are lowest in all other measures. The charges doing the best job in stewardship are, also, doing the best job in evangelism and are the largest in membership.

These general relationships lead to the suspicion that the percentage of the Sunday school enrollment in average attendance is not as good a measure of educational activity as the other two are of evangelistic and stewardship efforts. Indeed, methodological studies need to be pursued for the purpose of discovering the particular characteristics which measure most consistently and accurately various levels of performance.

Finally, these studies may guide in the selection of particular charges with high, medium or low records for intensive case studies to determine the variety of factors most generally found accompanying these levels of operation. It is only in this type of detailed local church and community analysis that the full implications of these broad summarizing measures of performance can be explored. Here, too, can the results of such investigations be brought to bear most directly on planning and program building at local church levels, the only place where these records can be improved.

Part IV

Conclusion and Suggestions

These studies may be summarized briefly. The Western North Carolina Conference is growing faster than the white population but not as rapidly as the Southern Baptist Convention of North Carolina or the Presbyterian Church, U. S. in the state. The membership is strongest in the piedmont counties, but the fertility ratio is highest in the mountains. On the basis of the composite measure used in Part I, Methodist churches perform better, on the whole, in rural counties which are growing slowly or declining.

Without accounting for travel allowances, more than half the charges pay salaries less than the present minimum salary, and more than two-thirds of all charges pay less than the amount estimated as required for minimum necessities for a family of four. It is not surprising, therefore, to find widespread support for the minimum salary program, with suggestions that it be increased and based on a variety of factors related to financial needs and job performance. The cost of owning and operating an automobile has become one of the major items in the expenses of pastors.

The Conference ranked above the whole Church in the percentage of the Sunday school in average attendance and in the per capita contributions to the current budget and below it in the evangelistic ratio. There was wide variation in the performances of the districts and charges as shown by these three measures.

More than half the pastors served charges of less than 394 members, and the average size of church membership for the Conference was 219 in 1952.

From such exploratory studies it is unwise to draw conclusions except of the most tentative and general nature. Additional investigations and further refinements of these data would, doubtless, provide the basis of more concrete and specific guides to strategy and planning. Yet it seems possible to support the following conclusions:

1. Most of the population growth during the past decade has been in and around towns and cities. The fact that Methodist performance, in relationship to population growth, with some exceptions, has not been outstanding in the most rapidly growing and urban counties points to the need for a re-evaluation of strategy here. In this connection, the record of Mecklenburg County might provide clues.

2. The declining rural areas have forced Methodism into a type of "rear guard" action to hold together weak and struggling congregations which have little prospect of growth yet minister to people with the highest birth rates in the Conference.

3. The unusually large number of children born since 1945 presents the greatest evangelistic opportunity which the Conference has had in many decades. Ecclesiastical strategy should be geared to this opportunity during the next 10 years.

4. Since the Church is weakest in counties with highest fertility ratio, it would appear wise to re-appraise efforts to strengthen the program in these mountain counties.

5. The median size of membership in charges and the salary paid the pastor are both low. One way to increase the salary would be to increase the size of the charge, while another would be to increase the per capita contribution to the current budget. It is likely that both approaches could be made to the problem in many situations.

6. The number of supplies has risen with the increase in the number of pastoral charges. The traditional pattern of Methodism was local preachers working under the supervision of, rather than taking the place of, Conference members. It is likely that a return to this historic practice with an increase in the size of about half of the charges in the Conference and the increased use of lay speakers would bring ministerial supply, support, and responsibility into better balance. Certainly, on the basis of these studies, as a general proposition, any charge with fewer than 400 members would need to justify itself in terms of high per capita giving, scattered membership in several churches, being a new charge with unusual potential for growth, or in other ways. Yet over one-half the charges of the Conference have fewer than 394 members.

Actually, few studies have been made to give guidance to administrators as to the minimum-maximum size of charge for optimum performance. Part III of this report is a step in that direction, but further analysis is required before conclusions can be reached.

7. Based on these introductory studies, additional areas of research should provide further and more detailed guidance to administrators and personnel in Conference agencies, districts, and local churches. In addition to the suggestions already made at various points in this report, the following might be made here.

(a) Performance studies should be continued, using records over 10 years rather than one year. The evangelistic ratio of a pastoral charge might be due to a combination of favorable or unfavorable circumstances during any given year and these items would average out over 10 or 15 years. Refinements in analysis would doubtless support predictive possibilities in a way not attainable on introductory analysis.

(b) These studies could be intensified on the district or county level so as to provide detailed help to superintendents and groups of pastors and laymen in the procedures of planning.

(c) Such studies should be made on a charge and church basis. This is the most fruitful level of study, although the most expensive in time and money. It is not too much to expect that pastors of all churches and charges will lead their people in a competent analysis of their church and community situation as a guide to intelligent planning and devoted churchmanship.

(d) These local church and community studies would seem to be imperative before new churches are established, new charges set up, or charges combined and churches discontinued.

(e) A study of all charges receiving Conference funds of any sort should be required periodically to justify either the beginning of such payments or their continuation.

Business and industry have found that research into the conditions and pressing problems facing them not only pays for itself but leads to greater profits. Perhaps modern research could further benefit the Church in its ecclesiastical and spiritual mission.

APPENDIX A

Evangelistic Ratio, Percentage of the Sunday School Enrollment in
Average Attendance, and Per Capita Contribution to Current
Budget by Districts and Pastoral Charges, Western
North Carolina Conference, 1952

<i>District and Pastoral Charge</i>	<i>Evangelistic Ratio</i>	<i>Percentage Attendance</i>	<i>Per capita Contribution</i>
All Districts	35	58.7	\$ 20.77
Asheville District	34	59.8	20.47
1 Acton-Oak Hill	26	47.6	13.85
2 Asheville: Abernethy	15	43.3	21.86
3 Asbury Memorial	46	75.5	20.07
4 Biltmore	28	56.3	27.24
5 Central	37	45.0	27.15
6 Emma-Riverview	62	79.9	15.39
7 French Broad	96	48.8	12.98
8 Haywood Street	54	47.2	26.52
9 Oakley	17	50.6	29.85
10 St. Paul	24	76.9	19.86
11 West Asheville	116	41.9	22.37
12 Asheville Circuit	25	56.6	15.43
13 Avery's Creek	0*	—**	6.60
14 Bald Creek	40	73.2	6.73
15 Balfour	342	64.2	16.90
16 Bethesda-Tabernacle	8	68.3	25.18
17 Black Mountain	33	54.6	21.27
18 Brevard	20	50.6	19.31
19 Burnsville	56	48.0	19.18
20 Candler	52	56.3	15.20
21 East Flat Rock	20	60.2	15.85
22 Ecusta	0	70.1	20.11
23 Edneyville	0	47.2	21.25
24 Etowah-Horseshoe	0	47.9	10.27
25 Fairview	44	74.5	9.69
26 Fletcher	44	61.1	23.82
27 Francis Asbury	72	53.5	27.58
28 Hendersonville	67	58.4	25.94
29 Hot Springs	58	67.3	72.98
30 Ivy	24	63.3	10.35
31 Leicester	162	115.2	7.41
32 Marshall	0	58.8	25.09
33 Mills River	26	57.7	20.80
34 Montmorenci	29	68.5	33.85
35 Newdale	22	73.6	12.33
36 Pisgah	49	88.4	10.55
37 Reeve's-Brown's View	7	54.4	19.21
38 Rosman	33	73.1	15.38
39 Saluda	11	75.5	42.10
40 Sandy	97	82.0	5.89
41 Skyland	0	53.3	21.51
42 Swannanoa	22	45.0	24.27
43 Swannanoa Circuit	47	60.7	18.07
44 Tryon	0	51.7	24.55
45 Weaverville	52	61.1	20.91
46 Weaverville Circuit	12	75.8	9.64
Charlotte District	45	58.0	28.17
1 Ansonville	196	65.2	9.91
2 Asbury-Oak Grove	53	47.6	15.58
3 Bethlehem	56	53.8	18.07
4 Camp Ground	48	69.0	9.84
5 Charlotte: Belmont Park	40	54.5	15.57
6 Bethel	8	59.8	9.37
7 Big Spring	24	51.0	26.91
8 Calvary	13	49.8	15.76

	<i>District and Pastoral Charge</i>	<i>Evangelistic Ratio</i>	<i>Percentage Attendance</i>	<i>Per capita Contribution</i>
9	Central Avenue	66	45.1	22.98
10	Chadwick	63	69.1	20.67
11	Cole Memorial	57	51.1	4.78
12	Commonwealth	20	56.1	23.15
13	Dilworth	60	66.9	42.70
14	Duncan Memorial	10	44.8	26.25
15	First	42	40.2	41.79
16	Hawthorne Lane	34	42.3	27.26
17	Kilgo	22	48.3	28.35
18	Memorial	33	57.9	27.15
19	Morris Field	36	52.9	35.86
20	Mouzon	19	58.6	32.69
21	Myers Park	49	47.8	100.32
22	Purcell	22	39.7	47.33
23	St. James	23	43.9	35.04
24	St. John's	16	52.2	26.83
25	St. Paul	53	52.6	27.96
26	Spencer Memorial	36	49.3	14.79
27	Wesley Heights	38	65.4	35.80
28	Davidson	38	53.1	27.01
29	Fairview	48	39.1	16.28
30	Harrison	63	66.8	20.65
31	Hebron	19	74.8	5.55
32	Hickory Grove	64	56.3	18.00
33	Homestead	36	56.1	26.25
34	Huntersville	102	51.4	11.96
35	Indian Trail-Stallings	45	72.2	11.67
36	Lilesville	42	54.5	12.36
37	Marshville	24	64.9	17.72
38	Matthews	60	54.1	29.11
39	Mineral Springs	33	72.3	17.28
40	Monroe: Benton Heights	28	89.1	39.80
41	Central	54	44.7	23.82
42	North Monroe	15	71.7	33.28
43	Monroe Circuit	0	77.2	5.51
44	Moore's Chapel	50	60.0	21.98
45	Morven	109	60.2	9.01
46	Mount Zion	57	65.2	13.31
47	New Hope-Bethel	29	62.3	14.73
48	Peachland	19	66.0	10.02
49	Pineville	54	54.8	22.94
50	Pleasant Grove	14	66.4	21.07
51	Polkton	26	66.6	14.47
52	Prospect	39	93.0	9.10
53	Thrift	61	58.8	39.69
54	Trinity	63	52.9	27.38
55	Unionville	36	59.6	8.87
56	Wadesboro: First	39	46.7	23.81
57	Waxhaw	31	47.9	24.34
58	Weddington	58	59.8	12.55
59	Wingate	146	68.4	29.99
	Gastonia	30	56.3	20.00
1	Asbury	22	55.8	16.11
2	Belmont: Ebenezer	29	49.1	29.34
3	First	0	54.3	38.18
4	Park Street	32	62	21.57
5	Belwood	39	73.7	8.74
6	Bessemer City: Bethea	5	47.0	22.96
7	J. M. Odell Memorial	30	52.5	21.90
8	Boger City	17	57.4	29.05
9	Cherryville: First	10	56.6	24.10
10	Cherryville Circuit	22	54.9	9.19
11	Cleveland	65	54.0	6.69
12	Concord-Mary's Grove	32	46.4	13.47
13	Cramerton: Cramer's Memorial	24	46.4	18.06

	<i>District and Pastoral Charge</i>	<i>Evangelistic Ratio</i>	<i>Percentage Attendance</i>	<i>Per capita Contribution</i>
14	Crouse	70	57.9	13.30
15	Dallas	20	56.4	22.08
16	El Bethel	22	46.0	11.49
17	Fallston	40	84.6	10.07
18	Gastonia: Bradley Memorial	21	58.8	35.37
19	Faith	24	52.0	31.36
20	Main Street	53	50.3	35.24
21	Maylo	54	59.7	25.36
22	Myrtle	28	61.6	26.69
23	Smyre	19	48.6	41.60
24	Trinity	12	56.0	28.86
25	West End	12	41.6	17.63
26	Kings Mountain: Central	29	45.1	23.84
27	Grace	17	70.6	24.20
28	Lincoln Circuit	108	63.1	13.77
29	Lincolnton: First	39	61.1	30.33
30	Rhyne Heights	37	69.0	30.59
31	Lowell	55	17.2	15.28
32	Lowesville	20	56.5	9.92
33	Maiden	30	67.1	14.71
34	McAdenville	50	50.5	36.38
35	Mount Holly	50	42.7	22.58
36	Pisgah-High Shoals	70	68.5	19.62
37	Polkville	84	51.6	10.74
38	Riverbend	9	67.7	23.79
39	Rock Springs	24	67.6	10.81
40	Sharon	92	72.1	26.44
41	Shelby: Central	50	51.8	27.79
42	Hoyle Memorial	56	47.8	30.43
43	Lafayette Street	69	68.0	19.36
44	Martin Street	0	69.9	56.56
45	South Fork	96	64.3	8.49
46	Stanley	20	46.6	16.01
47	Sulphur Springs	34	60.8	14.97
48	Vale	22	54.2	7.84
	Greensboro District	30	55.1	23.21
1	Bethlehem	69	65.9	16.75
2	Draper: First	13	74	20.36
3	Flat Rock	44	58.9	6.45
4	Friendship	19	58.5	24.42
5	Gibsonville	40	56.9	20.78
6	Greensboro: Bessemer	26	52.1	16.17
7	Bethel	26	69.4	26.64
8	Calvary	49	58.5	25.83
9	Carroway Memorial	32	74.9	24.89
10	Centenary	55	52.3	23.68
11	College Place	33	36.9	23.78
12	Glenwood	27	41.7	24.60
13	Grace	64	41.7	32.06
14	Groometown	11	60.5	31.46
15	Hinshaw Memorial	28	60.2	27.41
16	Mt. Pisgah	28	64.3	30.36
17	Muir's Chapel	13	47.9	24.59
18	Newlin Street	97	40.3	32.67
19	Proximity	64	63.4	20.04
20	St. Paul's	17	55.5	21.94
21	West End	22	65.8	22.03
22	West Market	57	45.7	34.24
23	Guilford Circuit	50	55.4	15.28
24	Haw River	86	67.5	8.55
25	Hickory Grove	20	69.6	40.68
26	High Point: Calvary	35	50.9	17.46
27	First	43	43.1	29.98
28	Highland	51	54.6	15.85
29	Lebanon	58	47.8	26.54

	<i>District and Pastoral Charge</i>	<i>Evangelistic Ratio</i>	<i>Percentage Attendance</i>	<i>Per capita Contribution</i>
30	Lindsay Memorial	25	56.7	34.03
31	Main Street	35	55.4	27.73
32	Oakview	8	52.9	24.97
33	Rankin Memorial	32	56.9	28.68
34	Sherwood	3	43.5	37.11
35	Ward Street	16	53.6	33.26
36	Welch Memorial	96	62.6	21.41
37	Wesley Memorial	47	55.8	37.12
38	Jamestown	16	60.5	28.17
39	Leaksville	18	52.2	26.08
40	Lee's Chapel	62	61.2	22.86
41	Madison	62	52.9	19.82
42	Mayodan	38	56.1	35.78
43	Mt. Herman-Meadow View	13	78.3	12.88
44	Mitchell's Grove	33	59.3	25.19
45	Moriah	0	53.6	25.98
46	Mt. Pleasant	41	45.8	10.33
47	Mt. Pleasant Circuit	28	58.2	12.42
48	Oakdale	16	50.0	24.60
49	Oak Ridge-Community	148	59.7	24.53
50	Pelham-Hickory GGrove	15	64.7	12.83
51	Pleasant Garden	56	54.1	17.00
52	Rehobeth	23	57.4	10.69
53	Reidsville: Lindsey Street	58	41.8	27.09
54	Main Street	34	61.9	25.60
55	Reidsville Circuit	24	73.2	9.38
56	Rockingham	83	69.9	7.49
57	Ruffin	20	97.9	24.24
58	Sandy Ridge	24	59.2	12.75
59	Spray	176	69.8	31.08
60	Stokesdale	55	51.1	11.95
61	Stokesdale Circuit	16	48.7	6.77
62	Stoneville	223	70.8	22.25
63	Summerfield	17	62.5	9.43
64	Tabernacle-Julian	17	53.4	11.85
	Marion District	41	59.8	17.21
1	Avery	272	63.8	7.41
2	Avondale-Alexander	153	52.1	23.64
3	Bakersville	230	66.2	16.35
4	Boone	50	44.3	3.38
5	Boone Circuit	24	96.4	5.87
6	Bostic	464	57.0	9.41
7	Broad River	293	69.6	9.16
8	Cliffside	32	53.4	25.97
9	Connelly Springs	20	67.8	23.04
10	Creston	28	62.5	6.58
11	Drexel	56	55.9	14.05
12	Elk Park	62	67.9	11.29
13	Forest City	71	58.2	32.50
14	Friendship-Shady Grove	60	76.2	11.32
15	Gilkey	13	65.0	11.15
16	Glen Alpine	34	56.1	19.06
17	Green Valley	11	51.3	3.50
18	Henrietta	33	71.2	17.40
19	Hildebran-Mt. Harmony	65	76.9	17.40
20	Kona	0	65.8	53.47
21	Linville Falls	0	51.9	6.94
22	Marion: Cross Mills	90	54.0	15.17
23	East Marion	15	56.8	38.49
24	First	45	49.1	25.65
25	Marion Circuit	13	59.5	17.67
26	McDowell	103	78.7	6.33
27	Mill Spring	0	78.7	10.46
28	Morganton: First	32	59.9	25.64
29	North Morganton	0	53.8	18.88

<i>District and Pastoral Charge</i>	<i>Evangelistic Ratio</i>	<i>Percentage Attendance</i>	<i>Per capita Contribution</i>
30 St. Matthews-Zion	14	66.2	17.78
31 Morganton Circuit	55	61.7	10.45
32 Nebo-Clinchfield	50	48.0	15.89
33 Old Fort	0	47.4	22.86
34 Old Fort Circuit	186	51.8	10.26
35 Pleasant Grove	38	55.6	18.48
36 Red Hill-Tipton Hill	62	65.5	8.69
37 Rutherford College	36	59.5	22.83
38 Rutherfordton	50	53.7	32.94
39 Spindale	70	41.4	28.77
40 Spruce Pine	62	59.0	34.98
41 Sunshine	49	66.4	5.79
42 Table Rock	13	49.2	12.89
43 Todd	35	54.6	13.44
44 Valdese	18	63.5	28.21
45 Watauga	128	58.3	8.65
Salisbury District	35	58.0	22.15
1 Albemarle: Central	55	51.6	37.00
2 First Street	31	53.5	23.75
3 Main Street	37	66.0	29.35
4 Parkway	27	62.9	24.33
5 Albemarle Circuit	63	70.9	15.67
6 Badin-New London	36	65.0	19.47
7 Bethany	15	61.0	29.89
8 Bethel	38	65.9	18.43
9 China Grove: First	19	58.5	16.71
10 South China Grove	5	63.7	8.88
11 Concord: Ann Street	48	70.3	22.92
12 Central	40	57.9	52.07
13 Epworth	42	63.1	21.89
14 Forest Hill	29	60.0	22.68
15 Harmony	10	65.7	29.46
16 Kerr Street	37	35.7	18.73
17 Westford	41	61.9	18.08
18 Concord Circuit	20	66.4	15.56
19 Friendship-Tabernacle	21	58.9	20.81
20 Gold Hill	472	71.9	16.80
21 Granite Quarry	65	58.9	13.45
22 Kannapolis: Bethpage-Shiloh	23	60.8	13.61
23 Jackson Park	22	51.0	26.70
24 Memorial	28	54.5	30.99
25 Midway	33	73.6	35.12
26 Mt. Mitchell	49	63.9	13.92
27 North Kannapolis	32	54.8	14.00
28 Trinity	54	49.7	24.87
29 Landis	46	51.5	17.37
30 Long Street-Yadkin	20	49.9	15.89
31 Midland	34	73.0	12.00
32 Mt. Olivet	57	55.6	20.30
33 Mt. Pleasant	46	62.0	14.80
34 New London	21	67.0	9.83
35 Norwood	76	61.3	21.95
36 Norwood Circuit	92	67.9	7.24
37 Pfeiffer	22	58.0	14.73
38 Roberta	0	53.8	19.85
39 Rocky Ridge	23	53.7	25.89
40 Rowan	0	61.0	21.05
41 Salem	105	72.9	24.25
42 Salisbury: Coburn Memorial	36	59.0	17.86
43 First	48	46.2	38.19
44 Main Street	49	63.9	24.05
45 Park Avenue	24	59.2	13.89
46 Spencer: Central	55	46.8	21.55
47 Stanfield	33	70.9	12.38
48 Woodleaf	620	58.4	11.40

<i>District and Pastoral Charge</i>	<i>Evangelistic Ratio</i>	<i>Percentage Attendance</i>	<i>Per capita Contribution</i>
Statesville District	38	59.2	17.29
1 Balls Creek	83	60.3	9.39
2 Catawba	29	58.8	10.63
3 Centenary	167	63.7	16.43
4 Claremont-Shiloh	35	57.7	19.19
5 Cool Springs	20	87.7	11.45
6 Dudley Shoals	156	63.6	7.45
7 Elmwood	22	66.8	12.46
8 Fairgrove	14	84.4	12.62
9 Grace Chapel	30	57.8	11.57
10 Granite Falls	46	60.2	24.28
11 Harmony	43	60.5	12.34
12 Harpers	15	72.7	6.31
13 Helton	59	62.3	8.36
14 Hickory: Bethel	60	60.3	18.02
15 First	50	47.2	22.72
16 Highland	22	68.2	17.67
17 Westview	46	56.2	17.14
18 Hiddenite	44	68.7	14.59
19 Hudson	9	59.4	25.98
20 Jefferson	50	49.5	10.33
21 Lenoir: First	230	45.9	29.55
22 S. Lenoir-Olivet	40	68.0	17.18
23 Littlejohn-Gamewell	14	55.7	13.98
24 McKendree	29	55.9	10.28
25 Miller's Creek	24	66.6	10.42
26 Monticello-Rose Chapel	14	58.4	17.74
27 Mooresville: Broad Street	118	73.1	19.03
28 Central	80	53.9	19.60
29 Jones Memorial	32	50.4	11.60
30 Moravian Falls	64	48.8	6.67
31 Mt. Bethel	22	67.3	8.21
32 Nathan's Creek	52	100.0	5.64
33 Newton: Aberneth Memorial	94	48.8	24.69
34 First	33	45.6	22.40
35 North Wilkesboro	34	60.8	31.08
36 Olin	46	57.8	7.01
37 Pisgah	89	65.3	8.01
38 Rhodhiss	14	68.2	27.57
39 Shepherds	172	54.1	12.06
40 Statesville: Boulevard	45	55.8	11.21
41 Broad Street	49	50.9	35.72
42 Race Street	34	48.0	17.75
43 Statesville Circuit	104	66.0	7.83
44 Stony Point	102	62.0	17.15
45 Taylorsville	69	58.3	16.47
46 Trinity	13	68.9	8.51
47 Triplett	27	63.5	32.65
48 Troutman	44	59.3	14.55
49 Union Grove-Zion	26	79.4	11.84
50 Warrensville	25	81.5	6.85
51 West Jefferson	41	59.7	32.45
52 Whitnel	286	54.7	16.80
53 Wilkesboro	356	54.0	22.98
Thomasville	37	63.1	16.21
1 Advance	51	72.8	8.12
2 Archdale	77	63.7	21.15
3 Asheboro: Calvary	7	59.3	39.64
4 Central	40	50.7	25.92
5 First	82	62.0	27.10
6 West Bend	54	56.7	18.48
7 West Side	2	47.2	41.06
8 Asheboro Circuit	26	61.5	12.98
9 Bethany-Gray's Chapel	56	68.4	9.24
10 Bethel-Shiloh	34	55.7	8.81

	<i>District and Pastoral Charge</i>	<i>Evangelistic Ratio</i>	<i>Percentage Attendance</i>	<i>Per capita Contribution</i>
11	Cid	22	72.1	7.00
12	Coleridge	46	68.4	17.54
13	Cooleemee	43	58.1	15.46
14	Davidson	132	59.5	9.22
15	Davie	66	56.9	8.08
16	Denton: Central	41	76.4	17.92
17	Denton Circuit	21	63.6	14.68
18	Dulins	211	78.0	8.32
19	Eldorado	36	64.4	7.22
20	Fairfield	52	86.5	21.30
21	Farmer	13	77.5	11.26
22	Farmington	136	62.0	11.95
23	Greer-Mt. Carmel	35	58.6	7.77
24	Lexington: Erlanger	104	65.3	16.84
25	First	40	50.2	31.67
26	Trinity	28	41.4	12.47
27	Liberty: First	17	64.1	24.56
28	Liberty Circuit	36	67.4	12.10
29	Liberty-Concord	33	73.1	13.67
30	Linwood	29	62.5	11.82
31	Midway	68	59.7	14.78
32	Mocksville: First	31	63.8	20.88
33	Mocksville Circuit	61	58.2	7.03
34	Mount Vernon	52	71.2	13.14
35	New Mount Vernon	77	71.8	18.00
36	North Davidson	27	71.2	15.72
37	Old Union-Mt. Lebanon	44	58.5	29.18
38	Pleasant Grove	160	68.9	22.41
39	Ramseur-Franklinville	43	60.6	24.06
40	Randleman: First	14	53.1	21.54
41	Randleman Circuit	12	69.0	10.10
42	Richland	23	70.1	9.44
43	Seagrove	82	65.7	10.35
44	Shiloh	87	62.3	9.87
45	South Davidson	45	57.2	5.95
46	South Randolph	45	72.3	6.42
47	Thomasville: Fair Grove	17	77.4	16.67
48	First	31	59.3	20.65
49	Memorial	57	53.2	37.61
50	Trinity-Bethel	42	67.8	17.03
51	Unity	11	53.8	15.95
52	West End	39	68.5	15.30
53	Thomasville Circuit	53	68.5	5.85
54	Trinity	78	52.3	16.87
55	Welcome	22	68.7	10.18
	Waynesville District	34	61.0	16.43
1	Andrews	77	54.8	23.10
2	Bethel	38	70.0	23.16
3	Bryson City	30	55.5	33.24
4	Canton: Central	41	64.5	24.81
5	First	14	44.9	15.01
6	Cherokee	11	44.7	31.45
7	Clyde	108	88.0	20.50
8	Crabtree	60	56.3	11.41
9	Cullowhee	39	67.9	27.93
10	Dellwood	48	50.9	10.58
11	Fines Creek	11	66.2	6.63
12	Franklin	42	52.3	16.88
13	Franklin Circuit	0	79.3	8.51
14	Hayesville	16	70.8	8.86
15	Haywood	11	68.7	14.27
16	Hazlewood	34	53.5	15.93
17	Highlands	27	80.4	16.30
18	Junaluska: Long's Chapel	19	87.6	20.65
19	Macon	71	59.4	6.62

	<i>District and Pastoral Charge</i>	<i>Evangelistic Ratio</i>	<i>Percentage Attendance</i>	<i>Per capita Contribution</i>
20	Morning Star	34	48.7	20.64
21	Murphy	39	59.2	32.61
22	Murphy Circuit	21	56.5	10.86
23	Pigeon Valley	18	89.6	5.67
24	Robbinsville	50	60.0	37.85
25	Rockwood	30	59.7	22.46
26	Shady Grove	25	79.7	9.73
27	Shooting Creek	96	107.4	6.19
28	Sylva	62	44.4	23.18
29	Waynesville	36	55.0	24.58
30	Webster	236	71.5	8.18
31	West Macon	205	55.5	12.86
32	West Murphy	22	59.0	7.16
33	Whittier	21	53.2	8.33
	Winston-Salem District	38	61.4	21.12
1	Allegheny-Grayson	21	71.4	10.41
2	Concord-Sharon	145	74.9	11.58
3	Crews	26	67.2	23.94
4	Danbury	57	69.9	14.48
5	Dobson-Mountain Park	29	62.8	16.06
6	East Bend	258	59.2	7.26
7	Elkin: First	33	69.7	39.21
8	Elkin Circuit	92	89.3	11.29
9	Forsyth-Stokes	418	70.8	9.37
10	Hanes	27	45.0	14.60
11	Jonesville	90	61.6	26.81
12	Kernersville: Main Street	18	62.4	27.56
13	Kernersville Circuit	20	64.5	14.28
14	Level Cross	32	55.8	12.66
15	Lewisville	21	54.7	18.67
16	Maple Springs	48	64.5	33.13
17	Marvin	73	55.9	29.83
18	Mount Airy: Central	22	55.2	46.86
19	Franklin Heights	0	61.8	17.44
20	Rockford Street	27	65.9	17.60
21	Mt. Carmel	71	63.8	22.82
22	Mt. Pleasant	61	58.4	14.93
23	Mt. Tabor	81	59.4	21.97
24	New Hope	14	55.2	28.60
25	New Hope Circuit	276	61.4	8.51
26	Oak Grove	24	85.8	7.34
27	Oak Summit	18	63.3	20.09
28	Ogburn Memorial	46	52.7	15.38
29	Pilot Mountain	0	54.6	38.97
30	Pine Grove	24	56.2	14.09
31	Pinnacle	90	58.1	6.63
32	Rural Hall	41	63.9	20.49
33	Salem	0	76.6	19.91
34	Sedge Garden	28	68.1	14.82
35	Shoals	80	51.9	14.46
36	Smithtown	16	63.2	9.65
37	Sparta	27	55.5	29.58
38	St. Pauls	26	59.2	5.76
39	Stokesburg-Pine Hall	42	46.4	21.77
40	Surry	43	80.8	9.65
41	Virginia Circuit	35	68.4	8.67
42	Walkertown: Love's	45	52.0	22.55
43	Morris Chapel	38	66.8	22.63
44	West Forsyth	122	47.9	14.56
45	Winston-Salem: Ardmore	39	52.6	23.22
46	Burkhead	53	58.4	20.64
47	Centenary	34	58.6	38.06
48	Central Terrace	64	60.6	15.87
49	First	41	91.4	14.13
50	Green Street	38	60.5	23.39

<i>District and Pastoral Charge</i>		<i>Evangelistic Ratio</i>	<i>Percentage Attendance</i>	<i>Per capita Contribution</i>
51	Trinity	12	49.2	47.46
52	Union Ridge	37	70.6	20.69
53	Yadkinville	25	69.8	9.40

Charges with 0 reported no professions on faith, but in computations the evangelistic ratio was considered equal to the membership.

* No report for this charge.

Source: Computed from *The Journal of the 1952 Session of the Western North Carolina Annual Conference of The Methodist Church*, Tables 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B.





D01117699Y

Date Due

MAY 31 '59			
MAY 2			

