Theological Education: Developing Leaders for the Church

From the Editor
By Laurie D. Bailey

In many areas of the world—Asia, Africa and South America—the church is growing at a phenomenal rate. With this growth comes a commensurate need for mature, well-trained leaders. Over the past century the church has relied heavily on formal theological education for developing pastoral leadership. Although theological schools have adopted new strategies for reaching more students, such as Theological Education by Extension, satellite campuses, correspondence and later on-line classes, this mode of education cannot meet the increasing demand for pastors, teachers and missionaries. Local churches around the world need more trained leaders than these institutions will ever be able to produce.

In addition, formal theological education has been found wanting in several areas. Attending seminary often requires students to leave their homes and ministries for extended periods of time. Studies show that many of these students do not return to their communities to serve. If they do go back, formally trained leaders often feel out of place and have difficulty relating to their former congregations. Their education has not prepared them to address the realities of life in their communities and congregations such as poverty, injustice, tribalism, Islam and traditional religions,

and the breakdown of traditional social values.

However, institutions and individuals in all of these contexts are looking for new ways to meet the challenge of developing leaders for the church. In this issue you will hear from some of the people on the forefront of this movement. Articles by Burt Braunius and Cynthia Brown apply leadership development theory to the local church practice. These pieces are followed by two articles on theological education in Africa. Rich Starcher presents research on the desired design for an African theological doctorate program. George Janvier discusses a way to contextualize teaching by appropriating existing cultural learning tools. Michael Cooper, drawing on the literature of management and leadership, explores issues in contextulizing leadership for the church in post-communist Eastern Europe. The final two articles address alternatives to the current seminary model. Linda Cannell discusses some existing and potential ways of reframing theological education to meet the needs of the church. Richard Cotton proposes a model for restructuring both the content and process of the traditional seminary curriculum.

There is much food for thought in this issue. As always, your responses are encouraged. Send them to editor@commongroundjournal.org.

About the Editor

Laurie D. Bailey, Ph.D. is editor of *Common Ground Journal.* She has over 20 years experience as a Christian educator in two Illinois churches, and enjoys acting as a bridge between the academic community and the church through consulting and freelance editing. She lives in Park Ridge, Illinois and has three grown children.

Top of Article   Table of Contents   Printing Tips

Church Education: Freire Style
By Burt D. Braunius

Church education-related teachers and educational administrators, it seems to me, typically function according to their past practices, church culture, seminary education, or acquired habits. My own approach has been significantly influenced by the writings of Paulo Freire (1921-1997), and especially by his journal article "To the coordinator of a `cultural circle.'"

The material that follows is an adaptation of this article. The first section is written in the form of a letter to professors at a non-formal seminary. They are referred to as *Group Facilitators*. The second section is a memo to church educational administrators. These are those who lead education committee and team meetings. They are referred to as *Leaders of Problem Solving Groups*. The final section of this document is a bibliography of works by Paulo Freire.

I use these materials for the orientation and training of education leaders. As you read them, reflect upon advice that you would give to such leaders. What concepts would you affirm? What would say differently?

Letter to Group Facilitators

As you prepare to lead one of our learning groups, I appreciate this opportunity to share a few words of advice with you about being a Group Facilitator.

Group Facilitators Focus on Transformation

Your goal is to work with God for the transformation of lives. Education is more than the transmission of information. It is for life-change. Paul refers to this sort of thing when he says, "Be transformed by the renewing of your mind" (Romans 12:2).

Learners experience transformation as they are developed according to the unique gifts and abilities with which they have been endowed by God. Some of these are just beginning to emerge and you have the privilege of midwifing them into birth. Your role in this process is to guide, encourage, and coach in such a way that an interdependent community of Christ-like learners emerges; a community in the process of transformation as they participate in the challenges of life and ministry. Be careful not to create dependency or be manipulative or controlling.

Group Facilitators Build Community

Your group should not be like many of the teacher-centered, traditional seminary classes that you have taken. Leaders tend to teach according to the ways in which they have been taught. You should avoid this and aim for approaches to teaching and learning that are rooted in a biblical view of learning.

Traditional classes have a tendency to be cerebral and academic. Professors are convinced of the veracity of the information that they have amassed. They see themselves as directive dispensers of doses of doctrinaire data to their docile and dependent subjects. Student success is typically measured in relation to being able to regurgitate that which was received.

Our learning groups contain elements of instruction and training but they do so within a climate of dialogue and ministry-related learning activities--activities in which everyone has experience, some more than others. Everyone can read. So, you should dispense only the information that is necessary. Your job is to guide the group in reflecting and acting upon that which is being learned.

You are facilitating learning that takes place as individuals are dialogical agents of their own development and hence of their own transformation. This kind of change takes place as you guide and encourage them to accomplish their learning tasks and demonstrate their learning outcomes. This kind of learning emerges from your own faith commitments to God and to your group.

Group Facilitators are Persons of Faith

Your teaching should reflect your faith. By faith I mean that you have a personal relationship to Jesus Christ. He is the only basis for the forgiveness of your sin, for your participation in the kingdom of God, and for your hope of eternal life. You have a personal commitment to live in obedience to the Gospel and to model this life-commitment to your group.

As a person of faith you have relationships that are both vertical and horizontal. Vertical relationships are expressed through an upward-inward faith that is the result of being justified through the saving work of Jesus Christ. Horizontal relationships are manifest by means of an inward-outward dimension of faith that is demonstrated through your commitments to others, especially the learners in your group.

As God is faithfully active in the lives of his people, so too facilitators are faithfully involved in the learning activities of the participants in their groups. This means believing in the persons in your group, loving them, and freeing them to learn. You are full of confidence that through participation in your learning group individuals will change and be catalysts of change, that they will grow and nurture growth in others, and that they will be transformed and be agents for the transformation of others.

Group Facilitators Involve Their Groups in Participatory Learning

Much of traditional seminary education is professor-centered. He or she is primarily a presenter of information. In professor-centered education, no one can really tell if students understand a lecture; if they are making progress in accomplishing the learning objectives of the course; how the material is effecting their character, values, and spirituality; or the degree to which they are being enfolded into the group as a community of learners.

Your job is to insure that everyone participates, to make sure that communication is open, to facilitate honest and authentic relationships, to encourage group members to work hard at their tasks, and to create a climate of warmth and acceptance. When you ask questions, ask them of the entire group. Have the goal of developing balanced participation but feel free as well to direct questions to specific individuals who you believe need personal attention. Where necessary, help those who are overly talkative to learn to be good listeners.

The process of participatory learning involves the use of teaching methods that are relational and interactive. In addition to the content that you provide, include methods such as discussions, panels, listening groups, simulations, demonstrations, role playing, case studies, and journaling. Make sure that everyone completes their accountability journals and hands them in at the end of each group meeting. If you like, I can provide you with additional information and orientation about the use of participatory learning methods. The approaches that you use to facilitate learning should be expressions of who you are, of how you communicate, and the relationships that you want to cultivate.

Group Facilitators are Life-long Learners

Even though you are leading the group and have a mature understanding of the topics under discussion, do not be a slave to your interpretation of them. Do not force the group to conform to your preconceptions, anticipated outcomes or foregone conclusions. Allow breathing space for the work of the Holy Spirit. Respect the significance that the group attaches to a topic and be willing to learn from them. When group members are dealing with a ministry situation, they will discuss it from their own existential experiences, which may not be yours as the leader. Respect their perspectives. Your role is to help them deepen their understanding of life and ministry, self and society, Scripture and service in order that they may be transformed according to the Word of God. Don't be surprised if you begin experiencing some transformation as well.

Group Facilitators are Persons of Integrity

You should model in your life that which you expect to see in the lives of learners in your group. You expect group members to be punctual, so you should begin and end class on time. You ask group members to turn in assignments when they are due, so you should return assignments in a timely manner. Return them within a week of when they are received and interact with these assignments as if you are talking with the students themselves. Provide written corrective comments and more importantly, identify strengths and include words of encouragement.

Do not limit the group to the pursuit of intellectual matters. View group meetings holistically. The life of a healthy group includes the elements of learning, love, outreach, and service. You should look for expressions of these four components. Naturally, the greatest amount of attention is to be given to learning. Jesus Himself said, "Learn from me" (Matthew 11:29). But always remember that in the church, learning is normally within the context of loving relationships. Our Teacher said, "Love one another" (John 13:34-35). This love results in outreach: "Go and make disciples" (Matthew 28:18-20). This love also results in service: "Faith by itself, if it is not accompanied by action, is dead" (James 2:16-17).

Group Facilitators are Servants

You should relate to learners from the perspective of a humble servant-leader. Knowledge "puffs up" and can create attitudes that are contrary to the sacrificial nature of Gospel ministry. Treat each

person with grace, warmth, and dignity. Show respect for each person by recognizing him or her personally. Remember things about her or him and refer to each person by name. Compliment and encourage. You are not leading the group for your own gratification but for their development. Believers have a "continuing debt to love one another" (Romans 13:8).

Group Facilitators are Positive

Learning is a constructive experience. It should be filled with hope, discovery, and new awareness. Insure that participants leave each meeting having been enriched. No matter what the topic under consideration, little is accomplished by overwhelming students with too much information, confusing them with poorly organized materials, or intimidating them with overly difficult content. Help the group reflect on a topic so that they are not only informed, but also inspired, encouraged and strengthened. Bring closure to each meeting in ways that leave members with positive perspectives on the topics that were discussed, on themselves, and on the world to which they are being sent as God's messengers. As a result of class time, they should be strengthened and encouraged in the faith (I Thessalonians 3:2). This is education that transforms. I am grateful for your partnership in it.

Memo to Leaders of Problem Solving Groups

In order to be a good leader:

- You need, above all, to have faith in human kind, to believe in people's potential to create, to change things. You need to love.

- You must be convinced that the fundamental effort of education is liberation (freedom, empowerment, self-actualization), and never domestication (control, manipulation, dependency).

- You must be convinced that this liberation takes place to the extent that women and men reflect upon their relationship to the world in which and with which they live.

- You must be convinced that education takes place to the extent that these individuals commit themselves to raising their consciousness or self-awareness to the point of inserting themselves into their problematic situations as agents of change.

Problem solving groups should not be like traditional academic classes. In traditional schooling, teachers, convinced of their wisdom, which they consider absolute, give classes to pupils, passive and docile, whose ignorance they also consider absolute.

Problem solving groups are for live and creative dialogue in which everyone knows some things and does not know other things. They are learning experiences in which all seek, together, to know more.

This is why you, as the leader, must be humble; so that you can grow with the group, instead of losing your humility and claiming to direct the group once it is animated.

During discussions, do all that you can to ensure that the entire group participates. Know the names and personalities of group members. Avoid merely coordinating a discussion. Rather, address members by name with warmth and respect.

When you ask a question, always direct it to the group, unless it is meant to motivate one of the less active members. In any case, ask the question first and only afterwards direct it to the person who you hope to stimulate.

During the discussion, use answers to formulate questions for the group. Become a part of the group. As much as possible, make yourself one of the members. Never talk much about your personal experiences, except when these experiences offer something of value to the discussion. Don't be an exhibitionist. Your leadership should not be focused on your experiences but on helping

the group in the formulation of a shared learning experience.

Even if the issue under discussion is familiar to you, do not be a slave to your interpretation of it. Do not force the group to conform to your preconceptions or anticipated outcomes. This means that you must respect the significance that the group attaches to a topic, not first of all the significance that you attach to it. It is almost certain that the group, faced with a situation, will start by describing it in terms of its own existential experiences, which may or may not be yours, the leader. Your role is to seek, with the group, to deepen the analysis until the situation presented is studied as a problem and is critiqued in relation to the lives of group members and the learning community that they represent.

Do not move ahead of the group in critiquing and applying materials that are being discussed. Your task is not to analyze for the group, but to coordinate the discussion.

In any group, there are some who talk excessively and others who speak very little. Stimulate both to reach equilibrium.

It is important, indeed indispensable, that you be convinced that each group meeting will leave both you and its members enriched. For this, it is necessary that you seek to have a reflective posture. The more you and your group are inclined to study situations as problems, the more your reflection will enable you to develop and improve yourselves, your group relationships, and the situation with which you are dealing. This reflective posture will overcome a self-serving consciousness, which loses itself on the periphery of problems as you become convinced that you have arrived at their essence and the implications for change.

Paulo Freire: A Bibliography

Paulo Freire, a Brazilian educator, is among the most influential educational thinkers of the late 20 th century. This article was modeled after Freire's circular letter *To the coordinator of a "cultural circle"* (1972). Those reading Freire for the first time might start with his most well known work *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970). For additional information on Freire an his work visit http://www. paulofreire.org.

Freire, Paulo. 1970. *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Seabury Press.

Freire, Paulo. 1972. To the coordinator of a "cultural circle". *Convergence.* 4 (1):61-63.

Freire, Paulo. 1973. *Education for critical consciousness.* (1 st American ed.) New York: Seabury Press.

Freire, Paulo. 1975. *Cultural action for freedom.* Boston, MA: Harvard Educational Review.

Freire, Paulo. 1978. *Pedagogy in process: The letters to Guinea-Bissau.* New York: Seabury Press.

Freire, Paulo. 1987. *Literacy: Reading the word & the world.* Boston, MA: Bergin & Garvey Publishers.

Freire, Paulo. 1989. *Learning to question: A pedagogy of liberation.* New York: Continuum.

Freire, Paulo. 1993. *Pedagogy of the city.* New York: Continuum.

Freire, Paulo. 1995. *Pedagogy of hope: Reliving Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* New York: Continuum.

Freire, Paulo. 1996. *Letters to Cristina: Reflections on my life and work.* New York: Routledge

Freire, Paulo. 1997. *Pedagogy of the heart.* New York: Continuum.

Freire, Paulo. 1997. *Teachers as cultural workers: Letters to those who dare teach.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

About the Author

Burt D. Braunius holds MA degrees from Trinity Evangelical Divinity School and Michigan State University as well as a Ph.D. from Michigan State University in Non-Formal Education. He has served as college professor and Academic Vice President, Executive Director, Seminary at Boca Raton, and Executive Pastor. He is currently Director of Educaton Ministries at Fifth Reformed Church, Grand Rapids, Michigan.

Double Loop Learning: Developing Critically Reflective Leaders for a Changing World

By Cynthia L. Brown

Rationale for Double Loop Learning

Church staff who are developing leaders in the church need to consider the world in which the church functions. The world is constantly changing. The volume of information continues to escalate. Leaders in the church do not know how to assess all this new information and cope with this rapid change. Instead, they often blindly believe what authority figures tell them without knowing why they believe as they do. Often they want to retain traditional ways of doing things because these ways worked in the past. Sometimes, in light of changing people and conditions, they want to adopt programs from other churches without assessing if those programs are suited to the needs and purposes of their congregation.

How can church leaders survive in a constantly changing world? How can the church survive if its leaders do not know why they believe and act as they do? If leaders in the church try to rest comfortably and presume that the assumptions and mores they or others have used in the past will work, they may be headed for a rude awakening. To cope with rapidly changing conditions, leaders must be able to reflect critically upon their beliefs, attitudes, and actions and the rationales they use for justifying those beliefs, attitudes, and actions. They must be able to scrutinize the validity of the assumptions upon which their church and personal lives are founded (Brookfield 1990b, 20-21). They must be able to make paradigm shifts and to respond proactively (Marsick and Watkins 1991, 75). How can pastors and educational ministers equip church leaders to do so? In part, the answer is found in double loop learning. Double loop learning helps adults be equipped to respond to change and thus lead more effectively when serving in the church. Double loop learning may be a key component in leadership development in that it helps leaders and future leaders develop skills in critical reflection in order to function in a changing world.

Description of Double Loop Learning

Chris Argyris and Donald Schon originally used the terms "single-loop learning" and "double-loop learning" in conjunction with organizational learning. As they describe it, single-loop learning is the organization's response to changes in environments and detection and correction of errors in order to retain the organization's theory-in-use. Double-loop learning, according to Argyris and Schon, involves inquiry into and reflection upon errors in an attempt to restructure organizational norms and possibly the assumptions and strategies underlying those norms (Argyris and Schon 1978, 18, 21-22). However, as used in this article double loop learning has a different connotation.

In its most simplified sense, double loop learning (as used in this article) is a symbolic description of a learning process that addresses both the "what" and the "why." The first step (or loop) entails exposure to and examination of paradigms, perspectives, attitudes, actions, and the like (the "what") in order to understand them. In essence, it is the process normally followed in education wherein concepts are considered through methods like lecture, reading, paraphrase, and discussion in order to help students through the levels of cognitive learning such as those as suggested by Benjamin Bloom in his taxonomy of educational objectives. The second step (or loop) addresses the "why" of the "what." It entails calling into question the assumptions underlying these paradigms, perspectives, attitudes, and actions—a process also known as critical reflection. It also entails viewing situations from various perspectives, comparing and contrasting paradigms, and seeking alternative ways of thinking and acting. Because of this questioning, the person becomes ready to think and act differently (Brookfield 1987, 1; Brookfield 1990b, 20). The second loop is akin to perspective transformation proposed by Jack Mezirow, critical thinking as described by Stephen Brookfield, and reflective practice as portrayed by John Peters (Brown). Categorically it is closely connected to transformative learning.

In order to understand how people can question their assumptions, one must first understand how people acquire perspectives and behavior patterns. During socialization, people assimilate ideas, values, and behaviors from others; these ideas, values, and behaviors define the world and how it functions (Mezirow 1985, 21; Yinger 1980, 16). People then tend to describe themselves in terms of these internalized ideas, values, and behaviors. They, however, are not aware when they inherit distorted ones—ones that are imprecise, vague, or even faulty. As a result, they live in the comfort of the familiar and are not aware that they are held captive by distortions. Their very lives function according to vague or faulty perspectives, and they may have little hope of change. Furthermore, they do not know fully what they believe and value nor do they know why they believe, value, and behave as they do. Additionally, they are not even aware that they should know why (Mezirow 1985, 21; Brookfield 1986, 19, 125). The two-fold goal of double loop learning, then, is (1) to help adults uncover and question the assumptions underlying the ideas, values, perspectives, and behaviors they hold in order to validate acceptable ones and discern distorted ones; and (2) to provide alternative ones that they can adopt.

Facilitating Double Loop Learning in Leadership Training

Much of Christian education in the church is in the form of recitation of facts and information by the teacher while adults passively take in that information. The goal of such teaching is exposure to and memorization of information. This means of education focuses on, but ends with, the first loop in the double loop learning process. Because adults are trained, therefore, to receive information passively from authority figures like pastors, educational ministers, and Sunday School teachers, they tend to adopt passive learning as their preferred means of education (Tama 1989; Hirose 1992, 2). As a result, training church leaders to engage in double loop thinking is not easy. When faced with teaching methods that force them to use their mental energies, some adults resist. Furthermore, teaching in line with double loop learning takes more time than does mere lecture. Often, delays in the progression of the lesson will occur. However, the rewards for leading adults—in particular church leaders—to engage in double loop thinking far outweigh the negative factors involved.

Unfortunately, people do not become double-loop learners on their own. Without prompting from others, adults tend to retain their paradigms without considering other paradigms and thus become stranded in traditional ways of viewing things and doing things. Consequently, they need the assistance of others, like pastors and educational ministers, often because they do not realize why they act and believe as they do (Mezirow 1985, 21; Marsick and Watkins 1991, 82).

In order for church leaders to receive the best assistance from others in questioning their assumptions, the person who does leadership training must redesign the learning environment. For questioning of assumptions to occur, the learning environment must take on a new nature—that of a community. The most common elements of the proper learning community are support, mutual respect, freedom, equality, negotiation, collaboration, and challenge. To create this milieu, both the

teacher and the students must be viewed as learners and as full partners in the learning experience. Thus, no member of the leadership training class—not even the teacher—can be construed to have exclusive possession of insight. Thus, teachers must view themselves as co-learners and accept the fact that they can learn from their students. Once this partnership is formed, then the other elements of the community learning experience can be fostered. Within this learning environment, adults can be exposed to alternative ways of thinking and living. In such an environment, both learner and instructor prompt double loop learning and challenge one another to explore and test their assumptions and beliefs. As the group develops community, members will challenge one another to scrutinize their ways of thought and conduct. Within that learning environment, adults can make a commitment to adopt other paradigms because they have analyzed and thought through them (Rose 1992, 5; Marsick and Watkins 1992, 12; Mezirow 1994, 226; Cranton 1992, 151; Mezirow 1985, 21; Galbraith 1991, 3, 9, 21; Marsick and Watkins 1991, 82; Brookfield 1986, 19, 286).

Once the right climate for double loop learning has been established, the teacher can guide learners to engage in double loop learning. Because of the reader's familiarity with the first loop in double loop learning—exposure to and examination of the "what"—that part of double loop learning will not be considered in the remainder of this article. Instead, the second loop, the one that addresses the "why" of the "what," will be the focus. In the second loop, the teacher's goal is to guide learners to (1) identify the assumptions underlying normal, habitual ways of thinking, valuing, and acting; (2) to challenge the validity of those assumptions, and (3) to provide students with alternative perspectives or paradigms so they can consider, assess, and perhaps adopt those alternative perspectives.

The teacher can use a number of different teaching methods that foster double loop learning. Among the suitable methods are case study, critical incident, debate, discussion, metaphor analysis, questioning, role play, role reversal, and simulation. In the past, many of these methods have been used in conjunction with an examination of content (the "what"). Each of the teaching methods listed above will now be described with the modifications necessary to facilitate the second loop in the double loop learning process.

Case Study

Confronting experience through activities that resemble personal life or everyday experiences leads to new insights. Teachers in leadership training classes can give adults case studies of imaginary scenarios that are similar to ones they may confront in their leadership roles in the church. The characters in the scenario should be at the point of making an important leadership choice. After reading the case study, adults are instructed to list the assumptions they believe are the foundation of the characters' decisions and choices. Then adults investigate how the characters could probe some of the most common assumptions to determine if they are accurate and valid (Brookfield 1992, 14). To promote reflection on assumptions, the teacher can describe the process to students in simple format by means of this question: why is the character believing or behaving this way? Using terms like "rationale" can help students understand the idea of "assumptions." Sometimes having students think in terms of the character's hoped-for results from his actions can help them focus on the "why" of the behaviors. If learners are unable to identify any assumptions, the teacher should identify one and share it with the students. Often an example can help students understand what they are to do. Even with this assistance from the teacher, students may focus on how the character should act and may focus on resolving problems and suggesting solutions. Therefore, the teacher constantly must redirect adults toward the task of uncovering and critiquing the characters' assumptions.

Critical Incident

The use of critical incident exercises helps people recognize their assumptions by analyzing direct experience. The critical incident exercise is one of the most important teaching methods for helping learners to engage in the second loop of double loop learning, because it allows adults to reinterpret and reframe their experience (Brookfield 1992, 14, 18).

A report of a critical incident is necessary as the foundation for assessment of assumptions. Church leaders and potential church leaders who are involved in leadership training must choose an incident from their life that was especially meaningful to them and that entailed them leading in some way. Then they are to write a one to two paragraph description of that incident. That description must include four elements: (1) when and where the event occurred, (2) who was involved in the event (using roles or titles rather than personal identities), (3) the quality that made the incident significant, and (4) the adult's actions. Once the report is written, a copy is distributed to the instructor and to each adult in the class. The adult's fellow classmates then attempt to uncover the assumptions by which they believe the adult operated during this particular incident. The result is that the adult is helped to see the assumptions behind his or her actions in order to reaffirm those assumptions or consider alternative assumptions if those assumptions prove to be invalid (Brookfield 1992, 18; Galbraith and Zelenak 1991, 126). This particular method is well suited to apprenticeships when adults are applying what they learned in the classroom. It is also beneficial for ongoing training with adults who are actually holding leadership positions.

Debate

Normally in debate, adults are allowed to argue for a side to which they agree. In order to facilitate double loop learning, a variation must be made in the debate process. Adults must be required to develop arguments for positions with which they disagree. In so doing, they examine their actions and assumptions from an unfamiliar perspective and step out of their frames of reference to view their assumptions through the eyes of another. Usually adults will not agree to argue for a side that is in opposition to their own viewpoints. Therefore, instructors may find it helpful to ask for volunteers in the debate, allow them to choose a side to argue, and then require them to argue for the other side instead. Obviously, adults will protest; so the educator must then stress the value of arguing against a perspective one normally holds in that it is beneficial to see the assumptions behind other perspectives. As adults engage in debate of this nature, they will experience psychological discomfort, which is a normal result of double loop learning. Hopefully this discomfort will lead to them questioning the assumptions they hold upon this particular issue (Brookfield 1992, 14; Brookfield 1990b, 129; Tama 1989).

Discussion

To facilitate discussion that helps one uncover and question assumptions, the discussion group should contain between ten and twenty people. The group should be as heterogeneous as possible in order to encourage varying viewpoints. In terms of double loop learning, discussion has three results. First, discussion can help adults explore a diversity of viewpoints as they listen to the perspectives others hold. Second, adults can find new perspectives by entering the frameworks of people with differing viewpoints only if they carefully listen to others and are willing to be open to different points of view. Third, adults uncover the assumptions that underlie their habits and behaviors because they are forced to support and explain their positions and in so doing reveal their assumptions (Brookfield 1990b, 93-95; Brookfield 1990a, 200; Galbraith and Zelenak 1991, 105-107).

Metaphor Analysis

To facilitate metaphor analysis, the instructor must select the concept to be addressed. Students then suggest several metaphors that can or that have been used with that concept. Following this, adults select one of those metaphors to unpack. In the process of unpacking, adults (1) describe how the metaphor relates to the concept that is being addressed, (2) reflect upon the beliefs, values, and assumptions that are inherent in each of the metaphor's meanings, (3) question the validity of each meaning by comparing it to personal life experiences, information, value systems, or belief systems that either confirm or deny the meanings gleaned from the metaphors; (4) formulate new metaphors that express what is to be emphasized now concerning the primary subject that is being considered. and (5) ponder implications for belief, attitude, or action that stem from the new metaphor (Deshler 1990, 299-300; Cranton 1992, 169-170).

Questioning

Instructors in leadership training classes need to encourage their adults to think through problems, to analyze, to conceptualize, to pose questions, to be questioned, and to reflect on the effects of their beliefs. In order for adults to gain skills in double loop learning, teachers must ask questions that are more open-ended. They need to ask "why," "how," and "what if" types of questions and help learners through the process of answering those questions (Hirose 1992; Tama 1989).

Role Play

Role playing can be defined as the spontaneous acting out of a particular incident. Role play allows learners to see different viewpoints, explore interpersonal relationships, or discover theoretical or philosophical ideas (Galbraith and Zelenak 1991, 111). Role play grants participants "a greater appreciation for the particular mix of thought processes, habitual reflexes, assumptions, unquestioned attitudes, perceptions, and emotions informing people's actions in crises" (Brookfield 1990b, 123).

Facilitating role play is complicated, and persons involved often find it intimidating. When it is successful, however, it integrates the cognitive and affective aspects of learning. It helps learners to see the strengths and weaknesses of certain behaviors or attitudes as well as the consequences of those behaviors or attitudes. It helps learners become more appreciative of different thought processes and unquestioned habits, attitudes, perceptions, assumptions, and emotions that people exhibit (Brookfield 1990b, 123).

Role Reversal

The process of role reversal begins with giving people roles to play with which they often come in contact but which they themselves have never held. After the players have acted out the assigned scenario, debriefing occurs wherein actors reflect upon the roles they played and on the behaviors of the other actors. They identify the assumptions they normally take for granted. They share how they felt and explain their impressions and reactions. Because of the role reversal experience, people can see themselves as others see them and can reflect upon the assumptions by which they and others normally function (Galbraith and Zelenak 1991, 112; Brookfield 1990b, 128-29; Brookfield 1987, 106).

Simulation

Simulations involve adults in the act of creating within the classroom those crises, problems, and dilemmas they have experienced or are experiencing in the real world. In simulated experiences, people must make an immediate decision in order to work through contrived situations. To facilitate double loop learning, learners must justify their decisions so that they become aware of their own assumptions. They must have opportunity to reflect upon the assumptions and the reasoning process used in making the decision (Brookfield 1990b, 116; Galbraith and Zelenak 1991, 107).

Crisis-decision simulations are especially helpful in fostering reflection. In these situations, people are prompted to imagine that they are in a situation wherein they are forced to choose between a few uncomfortable options without clear guidelines as to what is culturally acceptable or morally correct. After making their decision, adults are required to elaborate on and defend their rationale for selecting this action instead of another action. In the process of justifying their action, their assumptions and moral values should be revealed. Indeed, simulations help people pinpoint, explore, and question assumptions that lay behind their seemingly instinctual, common sense, and habitual decisions. Because of the simulation and subsequent critical reflection, change in beliefs, attitudes, and behavior can occur (Brookfield 1990b, 117, 121; Brookfield 1992, 14; Galbraith and Zelenak 1991, 108-9; Brookfield 1987, 107).

Naturally, other methods can be utilized to foster double loop learning. These methods must be selected based on the purpose for which they are to be used. In terms of the goal of double loop learning, they are to help adults engage in questioning their assumptions so they can function better as a leader in the church.

Expected Response to Double Loop Learning

Often educators assume that helping people undergo double loop learning will result in liberation and excitement. They think that adults will be ever grateful toward an educational minister or a pastor who has helped them become free from the "shackles of distorted perspectives and invalid assumptions" (Brookfield 1990b, 47). Unfortunately, this is not always the case. People's assumptions are a part of them. They define themselves through them. Asking them to question their assumptions is akin to asking them to question who they are. Because of this, helping learners to question assumptions is not an action that is always met with open arms. Asking people to take the risk of questioning their assumptions may prompt anxiety, heighten tension, and even produce resistance as persons feel threatened (Rose 1992, 49; Mezirow 1978, 105). Because of the discomfort adults experience, often they may resent the teacher who has jerked them out of a life of certainty (Brookfield 1990b, 47). Hence, it is extremely important that students be given alternative paradigms or perspectives so they have something to grasp onto when they can no longer cling to their previously held ones. Simultaneously as students question the assumptions behind their own perspectives, they can be led to question the assumptions behind other perspectives to which they do not hold. In so doing, they will see the validity in another viewpoint and be able to understand the assumptions behind that other viewpoint so they can gradually move toward it as they leave their own behind. Furthermore, teachers should offer support and encouragement and be willing to listen to the students express their feelings of anxiety and disequilibrium. If teachers show love toward students, they will be expressing genuine care for the students that surpasses concern for development of double loop learning skills. Students are more likely to strive toward learning to question assumptions if they realize their teacher has their best interests in mind.

Educational ministers and pastors could easily avoid inflicting this pain upon adults. They could avoid presenting alternatives and questioning givens and allow leaders in the church to operate as they have in the past—following tradition, blindly accepting ideas from authority figures, or adopting practices and programs from "the big church down the road." But educational ministers and pastors are not always to operate according to the felt needs of adults. Educational ministers and pastors are responsible to help adults question their assumptions and consider alternative ways of thinking and behaving (Brookfield 1986, 125; Brookfield 1990b, 48). Hopefully, when it is all over, adults will understand that they were learning a skill—that of questioning assumptions—a skill that will serve them well not only in church leadership but in life in general.

Conclusion

By implementing double loop learning principles, educational ministers and pastors can serve a significant role in the lives of church leaders by helping them to see new ways of thinking and acting and to question their current ones. Moreover, what a privilege it is to work toward helping church leaders grow and change, to help them prepare for leadership in a shifting world, and to help them be able to formulate their philosophy and substantiate their beliefs. Because of jointly engaging in double loop learning, educational staff and church leaders together can work together to enhance church life and thus contribute toward the betterment of the Kingdom of God.

Reference List

Argyris, Chris, and Donald A. Schon. 1978. *Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Brookfield, Stephen. 1986. *Understanding and facilitating adult learning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brookfield, Stephen. 1987. Developing critical thinkers: Challenging adults to explore alternative ways of thinking and acting. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brookfield, Stephen. 1990a. Discussion. In *Adult learning methods: A guide for effective instruction*, ed. Michael W. Galbraith. Malabar, FL: Krieger.

Brookfield, Stephen. 1990b. *The skillful teacher: On technique, trust, and responsiveness in the classroom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brookfield, Stephen. 1992. Uncovering assumptions: The key to reflective practice. *Adult Learning* 3 (January): 13-14, 18.

Brown, Cynthia L. 2005. Preparing students for ministry leadership through double loop learning. *Christian Education Journal* (Spring): forthcoming.

Cranton, Patricia. 1992. *Working with adult learners*. Toronto, Ontario: Wall & Emerson.

Deshler, David. 1990. Metaphor analysis: Exorcising social ghosts. In *Fostering critical reflection in adulthood: A guide to transformative and emancipatory learning*, ed. Jack Mezirow and others. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Galbraith, Michael W. 1991. The adult learning transactional process. In *Facilitating adult learning: A transactional process*, ed. Michael W. Galbraith. Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Co.

Galbraith, Michael W., and Bonnie S. Zelenak. 1991. Adult learning methods and techniques. In *Facilitating adult learning: A transactional process*, ed. Michael W. Galbraith. Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Co.

Hirose, Shannon. 1992. *Critical thinking in community colleges*. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges. 1. Digest. ERIC. ED 348128.

Marsick, Victoria J., and Karen E. Watkins. 1991. Paradigms for critically reflective teaching and learning. In *Facilitating adult learning: A transactional process*, ed. Michael W. Galbraith. Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Co.

Marsick, Victoria J., and Karen E. Watkins. 1992. Continuous learning in the workplace. *Adult Learning* 3 (January): 9-12.

Mezirow, Jack. 1978. Perspective transformation. *Adult Education* 28 (Winter): 100-110.

Mezirow, Jack. 1985. A critical theory of self-directed learning. In *Self-directed learning: From theory to practice*. New Directions for Continuing Education, ed. Stephen Brookfield, no. 25. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mezirow, Jack. 1994. Understanding transformation theory. *Adult Education Quarterly* 44 (Summer): 222-32.

Rose, Amy. 1992. Framing our experience: Research notes on reflective practice. *AdultLearning* 3 (January): 5

Tama, M. Carrol. 1989. *Critical thinking: Promoting it in the classroom*. Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills. Digest. ERIC. ED 306554.

Yinger, Robert J. 1980. Can we really teach them to think? In *Fostering Critical Thinking*. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, ed. Robert E. Young, no. 3. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

About the Author

Cynthia L. Brown, Ph.D., is Assistant Professor of Religion at East Texas Baptist University in Marshall, Texas. Her dissertation work included an experimental study with a group of adults in a local church in order to test the suitability of perspective transformation theory within the context of the church—a theory that is akin to double loop learning. She continues to apply double loop learning as she teaches courses in Christian education in the college setting and teaches adult Sunday School in the local church. Her husband is a pastor and they have two teenage sons.

Designing a Contextualized Theological Doctorate *In* and *For* Africa
By Richard L. Starcher

Within the milieu of higher theological education in Africa there is a great demand for highly educated nationals to staff a growing number of theological colleges and seminaries. Historically, Africans desiring theological doctorates have pursued higher studies in Europe and North America. The same pattern is common in other non-Western contexts. However, this practice is perceived as producing certain undesirable side-effects (e.g., brain-drain, reintegration difficulties and contextually inappropriate training).

Problem Statement

Convinced of the need for theological doctoral study opportunities in majority world contexts, numerous seminaries outside the West are starting their own programs. For example, in April of 2001 eight Chinese theological graduate schools sent representatives to Hong Kong for a consultation on theological doctoral programs. Four of the schools recently had introduced Doctor of Ministry (D.Min.) programs, either in collaboration with an American seminary or modeled after a particular program in the West. One school, Trinity Theological College of Singapore, was in the process of launching a British-style Doctor of Theology program. The Baptist Theological Seminary of Hong Kong had designed a D.Min. program and was considering offering a Ph.D. sometime in the future. Shortly after the consultation, China Graduate School of Theology published its strategy for initiating doctoral studies in two to three years.

In like manner, graduate schools of theology in India, the Philippines and Costa Rica are launching doctoral programs. Some Western theological educators have expressed concern over the rapid growth of non-Western seminary doctoral programs, particularly those established in collaboration with North American institutions. For example, Linda Cannell (2001) wrote,

> In the past couple of years, some seminaries in various international contexts (notably Africa, Latin America, and Asia) have begun to think about establishing their own Ph.D. programs. It is well known that the most substantial growth in the church is taking place in these countries. This growth is spawning scores of Bible institutes with the corresponding need for teachers. The more established seminaries, realizing the need for qualified teachers, are considering Ph.D. programs…. To take advantage of the desire of these schools to have a Ph.D. presence in their countries, groups in North America are beginning to design resources or programs that are *sent* to these schools often without consideration of the cultural context. In many cases, faculty from North American schools are sent into these areas to "lecture" or courses are packaged and delivered to students without careful attention to contextual issues. This is not an effective way to develop the world church. (Personal communication)

Theological graduate schools in non-Western settings need contextualized doctoral programs.

Some schools appear to be adopting, uncritically, Western models or, worse, simply facilitating transplanted Western programs.

Purpose of the Study

In light of disproportionate Western influence on theological doctoral program design in majority world contexts, it is particularly important to listen to the voice of *local* stakeholders capable of informing the design decisions. Hence, the purpose of this grounded theory study was to discover and describe African stakeholders' perceptions of a contextually appropriate theological doctoral program in Africa for Africans.

Research Approach

Key African stakeholders in this study are defined as African doctoral students (past, present, and prospective) and leaders of African theological colleges and seminaries that represent potential employers for future African doctoral graduates. Data were collected primarily through qualitative interviews with the 33 stakeholder-participants. Sixteen were institutional leaders representing twelve schools in five African countries. Of these 16, only five did not also participate in the study as past, present or prospective theological doctoral students. A total of eight participants were prospective theological doctoral students; eleven were pursuing a theological doctorate; nine were recent graduates. Eight African countries, four Anglophone and four Francophone, were represented in the study. Data were analyzed using grounded theory procedures, resulting in a unified understanding of the central phenomenon: the design of a theological doctoral program *for* Africans *in* Africa. Data also were collected from institutional publications, websites and personnel. Because the study sought to give voice to particular stakeholders, the findings naturally represent their understanding of the theological doctoral program Africa needs.

This article reports key African stakeholders' perceptions. It first summarizes the central theme emerging from an analysis of data collected from 33 stakeholder-participants. Second, it answers, in summary form, the eight questions that directed the research. Finally, it concludes with some points of application.

African Doctoral Program Design

Contextual Pragmatism is the central theme that unifies stakeholders' perceptions and informs theological doctoral program design in and for Africa. It explains the nature of the content of each of four principal *Profiles* emerging from the data Student, Graduate, Program and Institution.

Student Profile

Africans in pursuit of a theological doctorate describe themselves as pragmatic. They see the enhanced competence and increased access resulting from doctoral studies largely as a means to an end: usefulness. They are motivated by a desire to be useful in Africa and to the African Church. They also make pragmatic decisions with regard to the choice of a doctoral program. They desire relevant, credible programs in their field of interest, but demonstrate a willingness to compromise the ideal for the practical, even to the point of changing disciplines in their pursuit of a doctoral degree. They choose programs perceived as achievable based upon their fiscal and familial situations.

Graduate Profile

The graduate profile also manifests pragmatic traits. The preferred products of an African theological doctoral program are not first and foremost research scholars but teaching faculty who meet the practical demands of African theological colleges and seminaries in the real world context. They are first and foremost skilled teachers who not only are knowledgeable in their field of

specialization, but also function satisfactorily outside its narrow confines. They are men and women of integrity apt to mentor students preparing to serve the Church. Finally, they are destined to serve as administrative leaders because, regardless of their qualifications, their institutions assign them important managerial responsibilities.

Program Profile

The program profile emerged as the centerpiece of this study's data analysis. It elucidated stakeholders' understanding of the vital characteristics of a theological doctoral program for Africans in Africa.

First, the desired African theological doctoral program has practical value in and for the African context. Hence, it not only facilitates Africa-relevant research but also provides relevant preparation for the *real* work that awaits African doctoral graduates. Second, African students find this ideal program achievable because it is affordable, not overly long, and utilizes delivery systems that permit them to manage the realities of life in Africa. Finally, the program reflects an appreciation for the practical importance of international recognition by being duly accredited and by conforming as closely as possible to globally accepted standards of quality in terms of faculty resources, research capacity, and student excellence.

Institutional Profile

Contextual Pragmatism also explains the important themes emerging under the rubric *Institutional Profile*. In order to deliver a contextually useful, demonstrably achievable, and internationally credible program, an African seminary must take practical steps to provide certain goods and services. First, the institution must update continuously its research resources by increasing library holdings, facilitating the exploitation of information technology, and collaborating with other theological libraries. Second, it must ensure adequate access to competent, experienced doctoral faculty. Finally, its leadership must adopt a student-centered, stakeholder-sensitive management philosophy allowing adequate flexibility for delivering the kind of program stakeholders desire.

Research Questions

Question One: Who are the Africans in pursuit of a theological doctorate?

Africans in pursuit of a theological doctorate are mature, experienced men and women, most of whom have (nuclear and extended) family responsibilities. They are troubled by the problems that plague their nations and continent. They also are ecclesiastically connected and view the Church as a vehicle for social aid and reform, as well as a venue for individual spiritual growth. They come from poor countries and rarely have the resources to pursue doctoral studies without some form of financial aid. However, they also are highly motivated individuals who already have succeeded, against almost overwhelming odds, in reaching the highest level of an educational system fraught with pitfalls.

Question Two: What are Africans in pursuit of a theological doctorate looking for in a doctoral program?

Because they are motivated by a desire for usefulness in and for their context, students favor a program that equips them to address the needs of Africa and the African Church by enhancing their competence and expanding their opportunities. African problems and concerns (HIV/AIDS, poverty, ethnic strife, theology applied to African issues) preoccupy African theological students. This preoccupation is noteworthy and prompts me to wonder if a desire for contextual usefulness is common in other cultural settings. For example, do American students pursue a theological doctorate principally to equip themselves to tackle problems plaguing American society? African

students appear more motivated by contextual concerns than their American counterparts.

While Africans in pursuit of a theological doctorate desire relevant programs that prepare them for useful service, they show themselves willing to compromise relevance for achievability. An achievable program is, first and foremost, affordable.

Affordability is undoubtedly a concern of students all around the world. However, it takes on different overtones for theology students planning to work in a majority world context, particularly those preparing to teach in theological colleges and seminaries. Most African graduates will never earn salaries justifying (in monetary terms) the cost of a theological doctorate. Most are dependent on financial aid, and because most receive financial aid equal to the price of their doctoral degree, they are not as concerned about the actual cost of the program as they are about finding enough financial aid to see them through their studies. Hence, available funding sources (sponsorships, scholarships, work opportunities) are a priority because African students are looking for a program they see they can complete.

Question Three: What should be the targeted graduate profile of an African theological doctoral program?

In response to stakeholders' pragmatic bent, an African seminary's doctoral programs must target a graduate profile that reflects the realities that await theological doctoral graduates. Doctoral graduates who are employed by theological colleges and seminaries will be engaged as teachers in one or another of the theological disciplines (Old Testament, New Testament, Biblical Theology, Church History, Missions, and Christian Education). They also will be expected to teach outside the confines of their discipline. While they will be given little opportunity or encouragement to engage in scholarly research and writing, their research skills will help them prepare new courses, particularly outside their strongest area of expertise. Further, doctoral graduates will be thrust into leadership roles where their critical thinking skills will prove invaluable. As teachers and leaders preparing men and women for Church-related ministry, theological colleges and seminaries will expect integrity of character from theological doctoral graduates. Seminaries must recruit men and women of integrity, enhance their domain-specific expertise, hone their research skills, and provide instruction in teaching methods and leadership/administration.

Question Four: What should be the admission requirements?

Determining appropriate admission requirements promises to be problematic for an African seminary drawing students from various contexts. On the one hand, the program profile calls for student excellence. On the other hand, students in pursuit of a theological doctorate come from diverse academic backgrounds. (All appear to hold some sort of master's degree in theology or divinity, but equivalencies are difficult to establish.) Therefore, it appears desirable for an African seminary to admit students on the basis of aptitude and necessary competencies, as well as academic credentials. Students with aptitude, but lacking certain competencies, could be admitted to a M.Th. or M.Phil. program and later upgraded to the Ph.D. program, as is common in the British system.

Further, it appears inadvisable for an African seminary to require an American-type M.Th. for admission to its doctoral program. The most common theological doctorate matriculation degree in the U.S. is the M.Div. (At least 30 of 38 ATS-accredited schools admit M.Div. graduates to their Th. D. or Ph.D. in Bible and Theology programs.) Seminaries in the U.K., France, and elsewhere also admit M.Div. holders. British universities also admit M.A. holders, as do some U.S. seminaries, albeit often on the condition the students complete remedial courses to pursue certain Ph.D. degrees. Hence, requiring the M.Th. would attract unfavorable comparisons and unnecessarily limit qualified applicants.

Question Five: What should it cost students to participate in an African theological doctoral program?

Table 1 represents estimated four-year costs for Ph.D. studies supplied by various seminaries and graduate schools. The total includes tuition, a two-bedroom apartment (or equivalent), food, clothing, and daily necessities for a family of four. Not included were books, gasoline, car insurance or other transportation costs.

Table 1. Estimated four-year costs for Ph.D. studies.

Institution	Country	4-Year Total
South Asia Institute for Advanced Christian Studies (SAIACS)	India	$6,000
Asian Graduate School of Theology	Philippines	$16,000
Catholic University of Eastern Africa	Kenya	$48,800
University of Natal	South Africa	$51,877
University of Pretoria	South Africa	$65,433
University of Stellenbosch	South Africa	$67,105
University of Aberdeen	Scotland	$92,350
London Bible College	England	$93,294
Dallas Theological Seminary	U.S.A.	$120,460
Princeton Theological Seminary	U.S.A.	$122,060
Trinity International University	U.S.A.	$125,220
Fuller (School of World Mission)	U.S.A.	$133,900
Fuller (School of Theology)	U.S.A.	$138,376
University of Edinburgh	Scotland	$138,456
Oxford Centre for Mission Studies	England	$145,664

Naturally, a given seminary will need to analyze its costs and determine its doctoral tuition charges accordingly. Such calculations are beyond the scope of this study, which seeks to give voice to stakeholders' concerns. Nevertheless, based on estimated costs at various institutions around the world, it would seem reasonable to expect the total price of an African theological doctorate outside South Africa, inclusive of living costs for four years in residence, to be less than $60,000.

However, the critical issue for students is affordability rather than cost. Low tuition is only one factor affecting affordability. Also important are flexible delivery systems that allow students to control cost factors and employment opportunities that permit students to earn as they learn.

Question Six: Which model or models (British, French, or American) should inform program design at an African seminary?

Elsewhere, I have compared in detail British, French, and American models of doctoral program design. (See: Starcher, R. L. and Stick, S. L. (2003) "Preliminary Considerations on Theological Program Design in an African Context," *Christian Higher Education* 2(2): 97-124.) Each has its strengths and weaknesses.

The British Model. The British model is wholly research-based. In most cases, students' doctoral education is almost entirely in the hands of their faculty mentors. However, British-type schools

often admit doctoral students first to a lower program (M.Th. or M.Phil.) which not only serves as an apprenticeship in research but also, in some cases, includes coursework. A doctoral studies model incorporating an M.Phil. or M.Th. that developed students' research skills and domain-specific expertise could address important needs expressed by stakeholders.

The French Model. The French model includes a small taught component--the *Diplôme d'Etudes Approfondies* (D.E.A.), which is primarily designed to hone research skills--followed by dissertation work directed by a mentor (akin to the British system). The D.E.A. regularly involves a year of coursework directed by various instructors. However, the period of study can be extended to two years if the student needs additional preparation for undertaking doctoral research.

Incorporating a D.E.A.-like component into an African doctoral program would address the need for more training in research methods. Further, the D.E.A. could be expanded and redesigned to augment students' domain-specific expertise. A two-year D.E.A. followed by a research-only doctoral program would resemble closely an American program with two years of coursework followed by dissertation work. The chief advantage of this modified French model would be ABD (all-but-dissertation) doctoral students would receive a credential for their advanced studies. Unfortunately, the French D.E.A. is virtually unknown in Anglophone Africa. Hence, its introduction in such a context undoubtedly would cause confusion.

The American Model. The American model includes a large taught component that not only provides instruction in research methods but also enhances both depth and breadth of domain-specific expertise. Hence, it offers many advantages. Nevertheless, very few American theological doctoral programs intentionally prepare graduates to serve as teachers and administrators in institutions of higher education. Therefore, it appears the doctoral model best suited for Africans in pursuit of a theological doctorate is closest to the American system but differs from all three mentioned above, because the program must prepare skilled teachers and administrators, as well as sharpen research skills and enhance depth and breadth of domain-specific expertise.

Question Seven: What delivery system(s) would be most appropriate in the context?

The best delivery system is one that allows students to manage important cost and lifestyle factors. A fulltime, residential program helps students escape the distractions of work and ministry, but an in-service approach renders the program more accessible and affordable.

A semi-residential delivery system utilizing seminars and modular courses would best serve Africans in pursuit of a theological doctorate and help an African seminary manage costs through the use of adjunct professors. Students able to afford to devote themselves to fulltime study could be permitted to advance more quickly. Those needing to remain gainfully employed could negotiate short periods of time away from work and still finish in a reasonable number of years. However, in the case of the latter, provision should be made for students to spend sufficient time on campus to advance their studies lest the pressures of work and ministry prevent them from finishing.

Question Eight: What resources are needed to offer a quality doctoral program?

Stakeholders spoke of three chief areas of concern: 1) research capacity, 2) doctoral faculty, and 3) institutional leadership.

Stakeholders viewed research capacity primarily in terms of library resources. They recognized, however, libraries in most majority world contexts could not compete with their counterparts in the West. They suggested three ways of compensating. First, they viewed information technology in general, and Internet access in particular, as a viable means of supplementing research resources. Second, they identified interlibrary collaboration as a means of augmenting research capacity. Finally, a few stakeholders proposed a sojourn abroad at an institution with a large library as an approach (albeit expensive) to making research resources available to majority world doctoral students.

Stakeholders identified erudition, experience, and availability as necessary characteristics of a credible doctoral faculty. Due to perceived nature of doctoral study as mentor-intensive faculty availability emerged as a very high priority.

Creative leadership emerged as an important theme largely because of stakeholders' perceptions of the kind of theological doctoral program needed in Africa. Only bold, creative leadership could design and launch a truly relevant, contextually appropriate program. Answering stakeholders' cry for a program responsive to their needs required sailing uncharted waters because no theological doctoral program in South Africa or the West met the chief usefulness criteria that emerged from stakeholder input.

Conclusions and Applications

Contextual pragmatism has two faces. It yearns for an Africa-relevant doctoral program that prepares graduates for the *real* roles they will play in the African setting. At the same time, it requires a program sufficiently conformed to accepted norms to ensure international credibility. The non-negotiable bottom line for a Ph.D. program anywhere in the world appears to be the equipping and credentialing of scholars capable of independent and original research in a recognized field of inquiry. *Contextual Pragmatism* calls for creative compromise without providing clear guidance on how to reach it. Nevertheless, it indicates the program must be useful, achievable, and credible.

1. *Usefulness:* The ideal African Ph.D. program must facilitate Africa-relevant research by empowering and equipping students to explore questions of importance to Africa and the African Church. At the same time, it must prepare scholars with domain-specific expertise who are ready to assume the *real* roles that await them in African theological colleges and seminaries, i.e., post-secondary teaching and administration.

2. *Achievability:* The inclusion of instruction in teaching and administration must not unduly lengthen the program. Students should be able to finish in four years of fulltime study after the M.Div. (or its equivalent).

3. *Credibility:* The Ph.D. must conform to the global standard that defines the Doctor of Philosophy degree as a credential for scholars capable of independent and original research.

Creating a contextually pragmatic doctoral program requires a careful balance of usefulness, achievability, and credibility. Some compromises among program components are inevitable. However, it appears feasible to keep each component within acceptable parameters while attending to them all. For example, research requirements (including dissertation) of between 25 and 40 percent of the total program of studies in an American Ph.D. are an indicator of a strong academic orientation. Assuming a Ph.D. program comprising 60 semester total credit hours beyond the M. Div., and assuming 24 credit hours (or 40 percent) devoted to the research component (inclusive of research tools), 36 credits hours remain available for coursework that broadens students' domain-specific expertise and prepares them for service in Africa's seminaries and theological colleges. Even 12 of those 36 credit hours devoted to instruction in teaching and leadership/administration would represent substantial, intentional preparation for the *real* roles that await African theological doctoral graduates.

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ABD	Doctoral students who have completed all but their dissertation
ATS	Association of Theological Schools (North American accrediting body)
DEA	*Diplôme d'Etudes Approfondies* (coursework prior to French doctorate)
D.Min.	Doctor of Ministry

M.Th.	Master of Theology (also written Th.M.)
M.Div.	Master of Divinity
M.Phil.	Master of Philosophy
Th.D.	Doctor of Theology

About the Author

Rich L. Starcher, D.Min., Ph.D., is Dean of Extension Studies at the Nairobi Evangelical Graduate School of Theology, and teaches in the area of Christian Education. He has served for 18 years as a missionary in Zaire, Central African Republic, and Kenya. Eight of those years he served as Africa Director of the Evangelical Free Church Mission.

Developing Leaders by Using Cultural Skills to Maximizie Learning
By George Janvier

Many of the teachers in African seminaries come from the West. We tend to use Western approaches to learning in this non-Western context, which does not maximize learning. We do not need to abandon our model of education, but should appropriate indigenous cultural learning tools to maximize learning. Teachers working interculturally need to be aware of how culture conditions the learning environment before students enter the classroom. This can cause learning to increase by using cultural skills (tools), which have existed for centuries, to assist in learning. These cultural skills (or "tools") exist already, and when put to work help a student learn better according to every day learning patterns. For example, in the West, a scientific world view, specialization, availability of information, and a reading culture help to boost overall learning speed and impact. The development of the intellect is highly valued. Westerners can organize information systematically and pick up abstract ideas quickly from the printed page. These skills are learned early in life and are reinforced every day.

People from a non-Western setting have a different set of cultural tools available to them for increased learning speed, effectiveness, and impact. These every day learning skills need to be incorporated into our teaching when working interculturally. One conclusion of The International Theological Education for the 21 st Century consultation in Nairobi, Kenya, June 2004 was "We must move beyond lecturing to more effective modes of teaching" (personal notes). But what modes are effective and how are they implemented?

When Western teachers go to a non-Western seminary, we usually study the text but not the context in our approach to teaching. We are prisoners of our own world view. We assume people use the same cultural skills (tools) to learn as we do. We teach as we were taught. For example, Paul tells Timothy to "remind them to not wrangle about words" (2 Timothy 2:14). Wrangling about words is a teaching technique used in some seminaries. But to wrangle about words or ask more philosophical questions than suggest answers is a fast way to creating doubt and uncertainty in the minds of students who approach life from a more concrete way of thinking.

To a teacher who believes education is imparting information, the use of culture does not affect the approach to the lesson plan. This is because the teacher sees lessons as transmission of information and universal for any setting. But to a teacher who believes education is transformation, culture will have a greater impact on the lesson. That means a lesson might have a greater result in

one setting than another due to the way culture establishes the learning experience before a student even enters the classroom. The use of existing cultural skills in educational philosophy will help a lesson to have a greater impact beyond that designed by the teacher.

Seminary teachers would be wise to capitalize on learning skills, which already exist in the host culture by asking what familiar learning tools, and priorities are there already. This is a better approach to contextualized education than assuming students learn according to western patterns. This proposal is not an argument to throw away the academic priorities of the seminary, but a plea to adjust our classroom approach in a way that should help students become more productive learners. The need for a new model is not as important as adjusting the teaching methods in the traditional model. This is done by using cultural aspects which speed up the learning process and are more familiar to the learner. Usually we tweak the curriculum hoping for a more effective program rather than looking at adjusting teaching-learning styles in what is already taught.

Africa in general will be discussed with examples largely from Nigeria. Africans have many different cultural learning tools available to them to help maximize their learning. But only three will be examined here. They are (1) a religious world view, (2) community mindedness, and (3) learning by participation (doing).

Developing the Inner Life

The African world view and context is religious. African life and traditional religion have left the people with a sincere belief that life has a strong supernatural aspect. The development of the inner life (spiritual formation and character development) may be the central goal of a seminary, more than the development of a large body of knowledge. *The Manifesto on the Renewal of Evangelical Theological Education* was started in Chongoni, Malawi in 1981 for the purpose of drawing up a set of parameters to identify quality theological education. The manifesto stated, "Firstly, our educational programmes must deliberately foster the spiritual formation of the student" (ICETE). Church members would prefer to be under a godly leader who was less scholarly than a scholarly leader who was less spiritual. The integration of the two is ideal but not easily achieved.

In an environment that has a religious world view, students need less convincing to budget time and energy for spiritual development. I took a survey among students at the seminary where I teach and asked what part of seminary they liked best. I was expecting them to identify certain outstanding classes, powerful teachers, or exciting books in their answers. But the vast majority of the students said chapel was their favorite experience at the seminary. Western seminaries would probably not get the same response. But in a culture that has a deeply religious world view why not emphasize spiritual growth in better partnership with intellectual growth? Let the lesson content emphasize spiritual aspects as well as the renewing of their minds through normal academics. Why force an apologetic mentality on people who have a high view of the Bible and who God is?

Jesus developed piety by role modeling prayer, following Kingdom purposes, and revealing the Father to His students through His life and teachings. In seminary, every class can begin with a mini prayer meeting praying for local and Kingdom needs. Secondly, teaching about Kingdom purposes lift students eyes to a higher level than their daily situations. Finally, lessons need to end with the question, "What do we learn about God in this lesson?" That is the guiding question for developing a lesson plan. When people come from a world view which is religious it is an easy link to develop piety through academics and the renewing of the mind. The orientation and interest in spiritual things is already there. Teaching becomes revealing God. Why take people who have a strong sense of the presence of God and make them skeptics?

Classes are approached more from the spiritual point of view rather than the informational point of view. Information is important but so is the spirit. Lessons are not devotionals or preaching but contain some of the elements of both. Some realities are learned from teachers and some you only get from God. Jesus said, "The Holy Spirit will teach you all things" (John 14:26). Our lessons easily point upward in a culture that is already oriented in that direction. King David said, "I have more insights than all my teachers" (Psalm 119:99). Some spiritual realities come in non-academic ways.

Developing Community

Community is the heart of African survival. The individual finds his or her significance within the community. The natural communities of Africa are the home, the extended family, the village, the language group, and the religious background (Christian, Muslim, or traditional). Groups were used historically to pass on religious traditions, tribal secrets, and general information to the next generation. Life is communal and learning is maximized in groups. Jesus was always in community except in times of spiritual solitude with His Father. His life was a life of community. This is true for Africa as well. Church members would love a pastor who develops a caring community in the church. That often means to de-tribalize the different groups in the church and make the body of Christ truly one. In poverty stricken and persecuted countries community means survival. The ICETE 1990 Manifesto stated, "Our programmes of theological education must demonstrate the Christian pattern of community." So why take group learners and make them individual learners?

A second cultural principle of education is learning in groups. A non-Western seminary can find several purposes in using groups. First, we begin to de-tribalize the Church by forming seminary students into groups from the first day. These groups are not based on tribe but occupations such as pastors, teachers, and missionaries. Each group is responsible for all the members of that group. For example, a new class of seven pastoral students from different areas of Nigeria formed themselves, voluntarily, into a learning-support-prayer group. This community has continued to exist even after graduation.

Secondly, in the classroom, every class can have groups, which re-explain the teacher's lesson. I am sometimes amazed at the lack of understanding of what I thought was a clear and powerful lesson. When students re-teach the lesson to their peers they are forced to articulate the lesson in their own words. This leads to clarity and group understanding of the lesson. Group academic work follows familiar cultural patterns. Each student in the group becomes responsible for the growth of all group members. Students are to study in groups but demonstrate individual writing skills for their own development.

Seminary education can be a model of community by tapping into what already exists in the culture. Academic responsibility is individual but growth can be developed in community. The individual is responsible before God for his or her life but that does not have to extend to individualism in the church and seminary. Students are individually responsible for learning but their learning can be better developed in community groups usually known as small groups. Small groups are not a magic formula for all settings. But in Africa, people are comfortable with learning in groups. I like to tell students that you will gain insights and mutual support by working together, but write your papers individually. Small groups are also good for contexts with limited written resources and with students who are less adept at finding them. The will help each other in discovering source materials.

Learning increases in speed and effectiveness when linked to group activities. I have seen these groups pull up the weaker member just like they do in normal village life. Community groups are a free teacher's aid, which is a familiar learning tool in the culture. African church leaders are at their best when they pass on community. If the culture and the seminary model community then it will show up in the church.

Developing Ministry Skills

Africans say, "To know is to do." The third cultural principle of education is learning by doing. Why take theology students who are from a *doing* culture and make them hearers only? Academics are foundational but how they are presented is important. The Accrediting Council of Theological Education in Africa (ACTEA) states, "As in the West, African curricula focus on the intellect to the neglect of character and skills development" (ACTEA). Seminaries need to have a greater sense of mobilization for ministry through skills development. African traditional education is based on observing an activity, imitating it, and then fully participating in the activity (Fafunwa 1982). Very few tradesmen or musicians have learned other than by observation, imitation, and participation. This is

the norm for the culture. One evangelism team leader said, "Our students are challenged by what they see." This needs to be added to what they hear and read in the classroom.

Our academics do not contain enough ministry participation. Assignments are built on books only. The need is to move to the world of ministry. Often our assignments remove the students from their cultural tools of observation, imitation, and participation. How we engage new knowledge is important. If knowledge sits in the brain it rots. A wise teacher would link assignments to real life situations. Due to a lack of books or other written materials, ideas from people often become original source material. Research techniques of face-to-face interviewing put students in contact with those engaged in ministry. Rather than write a library paper on the topic of prayer, students could begin in the library (with books) and then move to the field where observation, imitation, and participation are used. Students are often surprised at how little people know about Biblical prayer. Their eyes are opened and they are more excited about writing a current understanding of prayer by engaging knowledge with activity.

The world of needy people is vast. At the doorstep of the average seminary in Africa are poverty, prisons, hospitals, persecution, Muslims, street children, AIDS, the sick, widows, orphans, and church ministry. When we do not encourage students to engage these needs through their traditional learning patterns, but require them to use our cultural set of learning tools, some of the impact of our teaching effort is lost. One student who was involved in a gospel outreach team said, "I have discovered principles of evangelism and counseling that are not in the books." Leaders are developed by giving them a chance to lead in real life situations. One student told me, "I was posted as a pastor to a small church in a Muslim area and when I got there I knew exactly what to do as I had been a member of the gospel team."

Assignments which lead to doing will tap into the tools that are already exist and help to speed up learning in its depth and impact. In a survey on leadership skills I asked students how the seminary can better train leaders. In favor of the traditional approach, a small percentage of students identified workshops, teaching, and better materials, as a part of the way to leadership skills. They identified courses or materials that would stimulate their thinking. But the overwhelming majority identified ministry involvement as the path to leadership skills. Putting students into serious leadership roles was the major answer given for developing skills. The words participation, mentoring, small groups, ministry responsibilities, and godly examples came up throughout the responses. We have the process reversed when we give a lot of teaching and only a small amount of opportunity for skills development.

Church leaders are successful when they mobilize members for the work of the ministry (Ephesians 4:11-12). The Apostle Paul would say, "The things you have learned from me, practice these things, and the God of peace will be with you" (Philippians 4:9). Learning and practice go together. This can be reinforced by the culture and the seminary for better church ministry.

Conclusion

Teachers working in an intercultural setting need to be aware of how culture conditions the learning environment before students enter the classroom. To teach for transformation culture needs to be consulted. Three aspects of culture that will help teachers and students alike are tying into the world view of the people, incorporating students into numerous community learning groups, and giving more attention to skills development. This will cause learning to increase by using cultural skills (tools), which have existed for centuries, to assist in learning. I am not arguing for a new seminary model but looking for ways to make the one we have more effective. The goal has been to argue for developing leadership patterns and abilities in the seminary that one would want to see in the church. Graduates will teach as they were taught and use these teaching-learning skills in the church.

These suggestions are not an all-encompassing solution to problems of developing workers for the church but speak for a more sensitive use of culture in education.

Reference List

ACTEA. Summary Report of BEST/NEGST Consultation 2004. http://www.theoledafrica.org/ACTEA/Forum/Forum002_200408Aug.asp.

Fafunwa, A. Babs. 1982. *History of Education in Nigeria*. London: George Allen and Unwin.

ICETE. Manifesto on the Renewal of Evangelical Theological Education. http://www.worldevangelical.org/icete_manifesto.html.

About the Author

George Janvier (Ph.D., Trinity International University) has spent three years in the Far East, two years in the Middle East and the last nineteen years in Africa. He is an SIM International missionary and head of education at an evangelical seminary and graduate school in Nigeria, West Africa. He is also a major author of textbooks for Africans.

Cultural Consideration in Contextualized Leadership in Post-Communist Eastern Europe
By Michael T. Cooper

Introduction

This study will look at cultural issues in contextualized leadership in the context of post-communist Eastern Europe. In order to accomplish this task, an understanding of not only post-communist, but also communist culture and leadership is necessary. Culture and leadership in post-communist Eastern Europe did not arise out of a cultural vacuum. Therefore, we must look at the effects of communism on the current social situation. In order to determine what constitutes contextualized leadership, an examination of cultural constraints in relationship to leadership values is necessary. In so doing, a contextual leadership should find points of continuity within the current cultural context of Eastern Europe.

While the fall of communism brought political change, this essay suggests that leadership styles have remained the same. This is not to be understood as a judgment statement because the characteristics of communist leadership styles were necessarily bad. At the same time, it is very true that communist leadership became corrupted, but the general cultural constraints continue today. One key to a contextualized leadership in post-communist Eastern Europe is to eliminate the "dark-side" of leadership while preserving and adapting a culturally acceptable leadership style.

Post-Communist Eastern Europe

In order to understand post-communist Eastern Europe we must first try to understand communist Eastern Europe. Definitions of Eastern Europe are somewhat subjective. While it is true that Soviet bloc countries were once considered Eastern Europe, the break up of Soviet control necessitates a more precise definition. As such, Eastern Europe can be understood as that geo-political area encompassing former Soviet bloc countries east of Hungary and the countries of the former Soviet Union west of the Ural Mountains. To further differentiate Eastern Europe from the Baltic States and

Central Europe, this study considers the religious element essential. Therefore, for the purpose of this study, Eastern Europe is also that geo-political area where Orthodox Christianity is the predominate faith. By this definition, Eastern Europe includes Armenia, Belarus, Bulgaria, Georgia, Moldova, Russia, Romania, Serbia, and Ukraine.

Characteristics of Communist Leadership

Karl Marx's vision of a new political philosophy would work to politically and socially transform Eastern Europe until 1992. He motivated people to follow that vision and he organized them in such a way that they were loyal to his cause. As Leighton Ford notes, Douglas Hyde once remarked,

> Marx concluded his Communist Manifesto with the words "You have a world to win." Here is a tremendous aim. In material terms one could hardly aim higher. The belief that the world is there to be won and that Communists can win it is firmly implanted in the mind of every Communist cadre. It is with him all the time. (Ford 1991, 107-108)

One of his followers, Vladimir Ilich Lenin (1917-1922) took his vision and overthrew the czarist regime in Russia in February of 1917. For the next 85 years the Soviet Union would have an additional seven leaders who all shared similar leadership styles. Soviet leaders were characterized by an authoritarian to a totalitarian style of leadership that was patrimonial, transactional and intolerant of differences and change. While these characteristics will be apparent in the descriptions of various communist leaders, patrimonial leadership generally is that style of leadership that attempts to solidify a committed constituency of faithful followers and rewards the constituency for their faithfulness. As such, Soviet leadership sought to ensure unity and cohesion to a one-party government (Carter 1986, 38).

Joseph Stalin (1922-1953) was a prime example of patrimonial leadership. He systematically removed people from office in order to appoint those who were loyal to him (Hughes 1996, 586). Not only this, he endeared himself to the people by deifying Lenin even though he did not agree with Lenin's philosophy (Bryant 1996, 17). Mikhail Gorbachev (1985-1991), like Stalin, endeared himself to the people by assuring them that his *perestroika* was a direct result of Lenin's 1917 revolution (Smith 1998, 326). After years of being hidden, Soviet documents revealed a different side of Lenin. He was a cruel man who led the attacks on clergy and peasants. He was the instigator of Bolshevik concentration camps, executions, and mass terror (Smith 1998, 327). He could not tolerate differences from his ideal political philosophy.

Yuri Andropov (1982-1984) was known as a ruthless yet effective leader. He was widely feared and respected because of how he treated critical moments in Soviet politics. He restored morale in the KGB and crushed the 1956 crisis in Hungary (Carter 1986, 32). Andropov's transactional leadership of the Soviet Union was passed down to Konstantin Chernenko (1984-1985) and to Gorbachev and is demonstrated by the number of economic experiments throughout the country, some successful, some not (Carter 1986, 36-37).

Soviet patrimonial leadership, where trusted followers were placed in key positions to ensure loyalty, was a model for other East European countries. Nicolae Ceau sescu (1967-1989) of Romania filled many of his key positions with family members. The intolerance of Soviet leaders also characterized other East European leadership. Tudor Zhikov (1971-1989) insisted that Bulgarian Turks change their Muslim names to reflect their Slavic residence. Slobodan Milosevic (1989-1999) took away Kosovo's autonomy in March of 1989 because of a threat to Serbian nationalism. In his 1971 study, Geert Hofstede showed that the former Yugoslavia had a strong affinity to authoritarianism, collectivism, and intolerance unequalled anywhere else in Europe (Hofstede 1996, 162). Communist leadership has been characterized by abuse. They manipulated followers for their own personal gain. In most cases, they arrived to power only to take advantage of their followers (Luthans et al. 1998, 186).

Characteristics of Post-Communist Leadership

The so called "velvet revolution" of 1989-92 that spread throughout Eastern Europe promised wide-spread change because of a "modernization vacuum" and the incongruence between reality and idealism (Goralczyk 1995, 154). However, the change that is being experienced is not the change that was anticipated. In fact, some would say that there has been little change, especially in the political leadership of post-communist Eastern Europe. Vladimir Tismaneanu states,

> In the former Soviet Union and the Balkans, the ex-communists have created gigantic networks of influence, preserved or restored many of the old patterns of hypercentralized state controls over the economy and the media, and embraced nationalism as a convenient ideological substitute for the defunct Leninism. (1998, 3-4)

Yet one thing is certain, the former communist regimes that once plagued the region are not coming back, but they are not totally retired either (Aksyonov et al. 1996, 11). The longer it takes to establish a market economy and democratic transformation, the more likely it is that the countries of Eastern Europe will become nationalistic and leadership will become authoritarian (Goralczyk 1995, 145, 148). Quoting Tismaneanu again,

> Post-communist nationalism is thus a political and ideological phenomenon with a dual nature: as an expression of an historical cleavage, it rejects the spurious internationalism of communist propaganda and emphasizes long-repressed national values; on the other hand, it is a nationalism rooted in and marked by Leninist-authoritarian mentalities and habits, directed against any principle of difference and primarily against those groups and forces that champion pro-Western, pluralist orientations. (1998, 7)

Leslie Holmes enumerates three developmental stages in post-communism: "dream, rude awakening, more realistic balanced position" (Lane 1999, 450). This has raised a number of questions about the viability of East European transformation. George Sanford asks if Eastern Europe is in a transition to democratic capitalism or in an unpredictable and chaotic development where the only clear change has been the abandonment of a communist political monocracy and a command economy (Sanford 1997, 507).

There is indication that change has occurred in the mentality of business leadership, which has direct bearing on this study. For example, in a survey of 40 Russian entrepreneurs, McCarthy, Puffer, and Shekshnia (1993) found that most adopted very opportunistic strategies in their new ventures (Kaufmann et al. 1995, 43). However, a change has not occurred in leadership style. While the atrocities and terror of communist leadership are forever gone, the fundamental principles of how leaders lead are still the same.

In their survey of 292 Russian managers, Puffer, McCarthy, and Naumov discovered some interesting insights into these managers' beliefs about work. First, they found that managers viewed their occupations as meaningful, satisfying and a way of self-expression. Furthermore, they discovered that managers felt that work should provide opportunities for using one's abilities, experimenting with new ideas, and seeking new experiences (Puffer et al. 1997, 261). These managers have been motivated by the rewards that they received. This signifies the transactional style of leadership that was practiced during communism.

Second, they found that managers believed that working with a group and the contribution to a group was more important than working alone. To the managers, a group was the most important entity in an organization. This collectivist orientation was prevalent during communism and was characterized by a patrimonial style of leadership. Third, they found that while Russian managers were collectivistic, they were also individualistic. At first appearance this seems to be a contradiction, but people had to be self-reliant in order to survive under a totalitarian communist regime (Puffer et al. 1997, 262).

Fourth, they found that Russian managers took a more authoritarian posture in decision-making. They favored a clear separation between those with authority and those without. The Russian idea of strong leadership is consistent with the managers surveyed. Fifth, Russian managers were less likely to value leisure time. This is consistent with their work ethic. Sixth, they found that Russian

managers neither endorsed nor dismissed Marxist-related beliefs. They did not feel that "workers" were exploited nor did they feel that "workers" did the most important work (Puffer et al. 1997, 263).

Puffer's study clearly demonstrates that post-communist leaders share similar leadership styles to their communist predecessors. The primary difference is that post-communist leadership is not as intolerant of change as was communist leadership. However, the threat of the rise of nationalism is very real and intolerance is a prime characteristic of the threat (Kuzmic 1993, 7). The implication of these characteristics is that leadership styles have not significantly changed over time.

The majority of East Europeans subscribe to Orthodox Christianity. Just as in communist and post-communist leadership, authoritarianism, collectivism and intolerance can also characterize the Orthodox Church's leadership. The authoritarian character of the Orthodox Church is seen in the Church's dogmatic stance that it is the one true, infallible church (Clapsis 1990). It is further demonstrated in the role of the priest. He and he alone is the administrator of God's grace through the sacraments. The collectivistic character of the Church is seen in its stance on the councils; whether ecumenical or not, whenever the Church gathers together and makes a decision, it is infallible (Florovsky 1994, 117-118). Similarly, the view that East Europeans are emphatically Orthodox gives further credence to a collectivist mindset. The intolerance of the Orthodox Church is seen in its view of "schismatic" churches. These churches cannot experience God's grace because they have departed from Orthodox Christianity (Clapsis 1990). Likewise, intolerance is demonstrated by the Orthodox Churches' attempts to become state churches.

Evangelical churches are not all that dissimilar. Authoritarianism and collectivism can also characterize them (Kuzmic 1993, 7). By their nature, evangelical churches are not necessarily intolerant; however, intolerance toward the Orthodox Church is seen by their continual evangelization of Orthodox people and their belief that the Orthodox Church is heretical. Many of the influential leaders of the East European evangelical church are those who grew up under communism. Typically they are authoritarian and therefore hold most of the ministry responsibilities of the church.

Cultural Constraints and Contextualized Leadership in Post-Communist Eastern Europe

Just as Scripture, leadership must be contextualized in order to provide culturally relevant forms that maintain biblical functions. Cultural constraints in relationship to leadership styles provide helpful insights into contextualization of church leadership. Research that has been conducted on characteristics of leadership suggests that Eastern Europe and the United States are on opposite ends of a spectrum with regard to these characteristics. Yet modern mission efforts in Eastern Europe have seemingly not adopted East European cultural values. Leadership is often taught from an inherently western perspective. The present essay asserts that cultural constraints must be taken into consideration for contextualized leadership to be effective in the East European church.

Cultural Considerations

In his 1971 study of 64 national subsidiaries of the IBM Corporation, Geert Hofstede of the University of Limburg in Maastricht, Netherlands found that cultural constraints in management theories were quite prominent. Administering 116,000 questionnaires to managers and employees, Hofstede analyzed four dimensions that allowed some predictions on the way the IBM society operated in relationship to management (Hofstede 1993, 89-91). The first dimension of the study is *Power Distance*, defined as the extent to which a culture will consider the separation between the general population and its authority as normal. A culture with a large *Power Distance* would see leadership as autocratic or authoritarian and consider it normal, whereas a country with small *Power Distance* would be more consensus oriented. Detelin Elenkov notes, "It suggests that a society's level of inequality is endorsed by the followers as much as by the leaders" (1998, 135).

The second dimension of *Individualism* is understood as the difference between a society's preference to act individualistically or to act collectivistically. Hofstede comments, "In collectivist

societies a child learns to respect the group to which it belongs, usually the family, and to differentiate between in-group member and out-group members" (1993, 89). The third dimension is labeled *Masculinity* and is defined by values that are associated with the role of men. These values, notes Hofstede, include "assertiveness, performance, success and competition" (1993, 90). Its converse is associated with the role of women. *Femininity* is characterized by attitudes of caring and concern. The fourth dimension, *Uncertainty Avoidance*, is understood in terms of a culture's need for structure as exhibited in rules and traditions versus an unstructured culture characterized by risk taking (Hofstede 1993, 90).

Hofstede asserts that cultural values must be taken into consideration in order to assure effective leadership. He notes, "I only protest against a naïve universalism that knows only one recipe for development, the one supposed to have worked in the United States" (Hofstede 1993, 88). Hofstede, arguing from cultural characteristics found in indigenous literature, hypothesized that Russian society has an extreme degree of inequality among the population of the country. The society is less individualistic and is inclined towards values of maintaining relationships and solidarity (femininity) rather than competition and assertiveness (masculinity). Hofstede evaluates Russia as rigid rather than flexible, valuing clear rules whether written or tradition. Finally, Russian society is inclined towards an orientation on the past and present that is exemplified by holding tradition and social obligation highly (Hofstede 1993, 87-88).

While Hofstede acknowledge that the statistics for Russian values "have been estimated based on imperfect replications or personal impressions" (1993, 90), Daniel Bollinger (1994) utilized his questions to empirically study leadership in Russia. He administered the questions to 55 executives and directors from the Higher Commercial Management School in Moscow who "more or less matched with IBM employees" (Hofstede 1996, 162). Bollinger's study of Russian executives and directors as well as Hofstede's study of IBM employees in Serbia, Croatia and Slovenia show that East European society has a large degree of inequality between leaders and followers which is viewed as normal. This indicates that authority positions are held in high regard. Bollinger notes that, "In this type of culture, employees expect an autocratic management style, offset by the support given to the subordinate's family" (1994, 53). The society is less individualistic and more collectivistic while being inclined towards values of maintaining relationships and solidarity rather than competition and assertiveness.

The studies indicate that Eastern Europe is rigid rather than flexible, valuing clear rules whether written or tradition leading to an orientation on the past and present, "like respect for tradition and fulfilling social obligations" (Hofstede 1993, 91). Hofstede suggests that these values in East European society are due to the influence of the Byzantine Empire that now resides in the Orthodox Church (1996, 162).

Since Hofstede's hypothesis (1993) and Bollinger's study (1994), others have applied his methodology to confirm the initial hypothesis. Alexander Ardichvili acknowledges that not only Bollinger (1994) but also Naumov (1996) and Elenkov (1997) verify Hofstede's hypothesis that Russian leaders demonstrate autocratic leadership as well as collectivism in the manner in which support is directed to families of employees (Ardichvili, 2001).

Table 1: Cultural Dimension Scores for Five Countries.

	Power Distance	Individualism	Masculinity	Uncertainty Avoidance
France	68	71	43	86
Germany	35	67	66	65
Russia				
Hofstede* (1993)	**95**	**50**	**40**	**90**
Bollinger (1994)	**76**	**26**	**28**	**92**
Elenkov (1998)	**88**	**45**	**59**	**80**

Serbia	86	25	43	92
USA	40	91	62	46
*Estimated				

These cultural constraints are significant for developing a style of leadership that is culturally relevant. One model of leadership that is capable of bridging the cultural constraints is the transactional-transformation leadership paradigm (Bass 1997; cf. Cooper 2005). Bernard Bass (1990) suggests that transformational leadership is most effective in collectivistic cultures like those of Eastern Europe (Luthans et al. 1998, 185). Transformational leadership focuses on instilling a sense of pride in people for what is being accomplished by motivating them through communicating high expectations while treating people with respect (Bass 1990; Cooper 2005). Because of the high degree of *Uncertainty Avoidance*, East Europeans look for strong leaders in whom to place their faith (Luthans et al. 1998, 188). Effective leadership requires a charismatic leader. More specifically for Eastern Europe, a charismatic leader must personify freedom and justice (Askyonov 1996, 10). Yet, there is a danger in charismatic leadership.

Jay Conger points out that authority in charismatic leadership tends to be highly centralized. This tendency potentially weakens the authority structures of an organization due to its limiting the number of leaders. As would be expected, it potentially creates a leadership vacuum after a charismatic leader departs (1990, 55). Authoritarian leaders also have a tendency to manipulate employees for personal gain. Their vision for the company is more personal than strategic. Their communication tends to distort reality for personal recognition. Their management style is impulsive and autocratic and tends to alienate others (Conger 1990, 44, 51-52). Because of the high degree of *Power Distance*, East Europeans are much more susceptible and vulnerable to "dark" leaders (Luthans et al. 1998, 189).

Contextualized Leadership in Post-Communist Eastern Europe

In order for leadership to be effective in the context of Eastern Europe it must reflect the constraints of the culture. Hofstede's study demonstrates that the cultural constraints associated with the United States are vastly different from those of Eastern Europe. This indicates that leadership styles should be expected to look different. Unfortunately, many a missionary has taught that biblical leadership is reflected in servant leaders without consideration that servant leadership is an American cultural expression (Cooper 2005).

If history is a testimony to the continuity of characteristics of leadership, then leadership in Eastern Europe should exhibit the characteristics outlined in this essay if it is to be contextual. An East European contextual leadership could be characterized as authoritative, collectivistic and focused on maintaining relationships (as seen in patrimonial leadership) as it values clear standards (as exhibited by intolerance). Naturally, thinking in terms of biblical leadership, one would want to be certain that these characteristics are evident in the life of the early church. In this, our attention is drawn to Jesus.

Jesus was unquestionably a model leader. From his life and example we have an understanding of biblical leadership. Many such as Ford (1991), Cedar (1987) and Sanders (1967) have focused on Jesus as a transformer and servant, describing what they believed to be spiritual leadership. However, do we not see Jesus in other ways? For example, there was very little tolerance in Jesus' teaching on the law. On several occasions Jesus asserts, "You have heard that it was said . . . . But I say to you . . ." (Matt 5:21-22, 27-28, 31-32, 38-39, 43-44). If consideration is given to what Jesus taught concerning being a disciple then his authoritative force is felt, "You therefore must be perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect" (Matt 5:48). Jesus left little room in his call to an absolutely committed life of discipleship.

Matthew's gospel gives a clear picture of what it means to be a disciple. When Jesus calls Peter and Andrew he tells them "follow me and I will make you fishers of men" (Matt 4:19). A verse later he calls James and John (Matt 4:21). Jesus' call was very specific and had specific expectations. If

a person is a disciple of Christ then there is a necessity of at least three things. Being a disciple of Jesus Christ necessitates a commitment to *obedience* that is exemplified in *missions* and involves *sacrifice*. There is no ambiguity in this call to discipleship. Jesus demanded absolute commitment to a life of discipleship by the narrow gate (Matt 7:13-14). This life was recognized by its fruit (Matt 7:15-20) that was a result of obedience to the Father's will (Matt 7:21-23). This, according to Jesus, was a wise person who acted on his words (Matt 7:24-27).

Jesus' authority and intolerance was uniquely balanced with a deep commitment to his disciples. Nevertheless, we cannot say that these characteristics are any less spiritual than those found to be favored by American missionaries. Characteristics such as servant and shepherd are essential spiritual qualities of a leader. However, just as there was a "dark-side" to leadership under communism there can also be a "dark-side" to the application of these less-talked-about characteristics of Jesus' leadership. As Christians we must keep in mind that leading as Jesus requires living as Jesus.

Application in East European Christian Organizations

Bollinger asserts three implicit implications for his study of Russian executives and managers that might serve in applying cultural values in leadership for Christian organizations. First, consideration must be given to the way in which organizations are led. Leadership should take into consideration the expectations of those who are being led. Therefore, leadership is not simply applying a particular style as much as it is adapting the style to the people who are being led. In the case of Eastern Europe, due to large *PowerDistance* and low *Individualism* people expect to be led by strong leaders who care for them more than they care for achieving an objective. Bollinger comments, "Therefore, a system of management by objectives, which presupposes the confidence and independence to negotiate with one's boss, a shared desire among bosses and subordinates to take risks and a desire to achieve, is incompatible with Russian culture" (1994, 53).

Second, leadership in Christian organizations should motivate people to believe in what they are doing. Since Eastern Europe is characterized by the dimension of *Femininity*, motivating people should focus on caring for them and their families. Adding numbers, whether of new converts or membership in the organization, is not a motivating factor in Eastern Europe. Bollinger notes, "For this group of countries, security and a sense of belonging are the strongest motivators" (1994, 53).

Finally, the structure of Christian organizations should reflect the culture. Since Eastern Europe has a large *Power Distance* decision-making should be centralized. Congregational forms of church that emphasize democratic values, for example, will struggle in the culture. Similarly, due to the high degree of *Uncertainty Avoidance*, organizations should have clearly defined objectives and goals so as to not cause stress or insecurity about the future. "High power distance combined with high uncertainty avoidance gives rise to a pyramid-shaped bureaucratic structure, which is both formal and centralized" (Bollinger 1994, 54).

Conclusion

This essay has looked at issues confronting post-communist East European leadership in the church. By looking at communist leadership principles the essay had a basis for comparison of post-communist leadership styles. The essay suggests that there is little difference in their styles while the methods departed significantly. Then, the essay demonstrated that cultural constraints significantly affect leadership and must be taken into consideration when contextualizing leadership. What can be concluded from this is that these cultural constraints act amorally and therefore are acceptable in contextualizing New Testament church leadership in Eastern Europe. However, the possibility for corrupting leadership styles is real. With very little compromise, strong charismatic leadership that is authoritarian, collectivistic and focuses on values as set out in Scripture appears to be a potentially successful method of contextualized church leadership. At the same time, the body of believers that respects the authority of church leadership has a great responsibility to assure that leadership does not turn "dark."

Reference List

Aksyonov, V., et al. 1996. Four ways to look at post-communism. *World Press Review* 43 (2):10-11.

Ardichvili, A. 2001. Leadership styles of Russian entrepreneurs and managers. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship* 6 (2):169-188.

Bass, B. M. 1997. Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist* 52 (2):130-139.

Bass, B. M. 1990. *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research and managerial applications*. 3d ed. New York: The Free Press.

Bollinger, D. 1994. The four cornerstones and three pillars in the "House of Russia" management system. *Journal of Management Development* 13 (2): 49-54.

Bryant, C. 1996. Remains of the deity. *New Statesman* 126 (4346):17-18.

Carter, S. 1986. Soviet leadership profiles. In *Leadership and succession in the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and China*, ed. Martin McCauley and Stephen Carter, 29-39. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Cedar, P. 1987. *Strength in servant leadership*. Waco, TX: Word.

Clapsis, E. 1990. The boundaries of the church: An Orthodox debate. *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 35 (2):113-127.

Conger, J. A. 1990. The dark side of leadership. *Organizational Dynamics* 19 (2):44-55.

Cooper, M. T. (2005 in press). The transformational leadership of the apostle Paul: A contextual and biblical leadership for contemporary ministry. *Christian Education Journal*.

Elenkov, D. S. 1997. Differences and similarities in managerial values between US and Russian managers: An empirical study. *International Studies of Management and Organization* 27 (1):85-106.

Elenkov, D. S. 1998. Can American management concepts work in Russia? A cross-cultural comparative study. *California Management Review* 40 (4):133-156.

Ford, L. 1991. *Transforming leadership*. Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity Press.

Florovsky, G. 1994. The authority of the ancient councils and the tradition of the fathers. In *Eastern Orthodox theology: A contemporary reader*. Daniel B. Clendenin, ed., 115-124. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.

Goralczyk, B. 1995. Post-communist challenges: an attempt of identification. In *Pursuit of Europe: Transformation of Post-communist States*, B. Goralczyk, W. Kostecki and K. Zukrouaska, eds., 142-156. Warsaw: Publisher unknown.

Gregersen, H. B., A. J. Morrison, J. S. Black. 1998. Developing leaders for the global frontier. *Sloan Management Review* 40 (1).

Hofstede, G. 1993. Cultural constraints in management theories. *Academy of Management Executive* 7 (1):81-94.

Hofstede, G. 1996. Images of Europe: Past, present, and future. In *Managing across cultures: Issues and perspectives*, ed. P. Joynt and M. Warner, 147-165. London: International Thomsom Business Press.

Hughes, J. 1996. Patrimonialism and the Stalinist system: The case of S.I. Syrtsov. *Europe-Asia Studies* 48 (4):551-569.

Kaufmann, P. J., D. H. Welsh, and N. V. Bushmarin. 1995. Locus of control and entrepreneurship in the Russian Republic. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 20 (1):43-57.

Kuzmic, P. 1993. Problems and possibilities in European ministry today. *East-West Church & Ministry Report* 1: 7.

Luthans, F., S. J. Peterson, and E. Ibrayeva. 1998. The potential for the 'dark side' of leadership in post-communist countries. *Journal of World Business* 33 (2):185-202.

Mendenhall, M., B. J. Punnett, and D. Ricks. 1995. *Global management*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.

Naumov, A. I. 1996. Hofstede's measurement of Russia: The influence of national culture on business management. *Management* 1 (3):70-103.

Puffer, S. M., D. J. McCarthy, and A. I. Naumov. 1997. Russian mangers' beliefs about work: Beyond the stereotypes. *Journal of World Business* 32 (3):258-277.

Sanders, J. O. 1967. *Spiritual leadership*. Chicago, IL: Moody.

Sanford, G. 1997. Post-communism: Four perspectives. *Europe-Asia Studies* 49(3):507-511.

Smith, T. J. 1998. The collapse of the Lenin personality cult in Soviet Russia, 1985-1995. *The Historian* 60 (2):325-344.

Tismaneanu, V. 1998. *Fantasies of salvation: Democracy, nationalism, and myth in post-communist Europe*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Press.

About the Author

Michael T. Cooper is Assistant Professor of Biblical Studies and Christian Ministries in the School of Biblical and Religious Studies at Trinity International University. After serving 13 years in ministry in Eastern Europe he teaches Bible and Intercultural Ministries to undergraduates. His current research is on the resurgence of Paganism in Western society. Address: 2065 Half Day Road, Deerfield, IL 60015 USA. E-mail: mcooper@tiu.edu.

Opportunities for 21st Century Theological Education
By Linda M. Cannell

Theological schools cannot graduate the number of leaders necessary for a church that is growing rapidly in many parts of the world. Neither can they meet the challenges of developing leaders for the church in all its varied contexts and circumstances today.

The purpose of this article is not to offer further critique of conventional theological education, but to

consider alternatives. Your response to this presentation will be determined by whether or not you believe there is crisis; but my personal assessment is that formal theological education, globally, is at a crossroads. This article is based on that conviction.

Categories of Alternatives

For purposes of this article I have categorized the alternatives in three areas: 1) church-based efforts, 2) changes within formal or conventional theological education, and 3) efforts to fashion synergies with the schools and other agencies.

1. Church-Based Efforts

Increasingly, theological educators and church leaders attribute the disconnect between theory and practice and lack of relevant leadership development, at least in part, to an ineffective partnership between the church and theological schools. I am aware that the need for alternatives that do more to ground theological education in the church may seem odd to those of you in denominational traditions where this is already the case.

Church-based theological education. Reasoning that theological schools are not only dubious centers for ministry development, but that they take students/leaders out of the very contexts where their skills and awareness need to be enriched, the growing church-based theological education movement sees its mission as developing leaders in context. The more mature expressions of church-based theological education are concerned about a biblical ecclesiology rather than simply developing leadership skills for an institution. The most obvious vulnerability in the church-based efforts is the tendency to bypass the seminary as a place for equipping leaders for today's church. While I sympathize with the concern that seminary faculty are often disconnected from the church and its mission in the world, not to mention disconnected from one another, supporters of the church-based efforts flirt with the danger of losing the depth, and missing the vital questions that a *true community of scholars* brings to the development of the whole people of God. A community of scholars *in some form* is desperately needed by churches that tend to base decisions about leadership, organization, and ministry on other than biblically informed principles.

In-ministry models of theological education. The in-ministry approach is related to the church-based approach but doesn't necessary require a shift from the seminary to the church. The resulting model of theological education is oriented to the whole people of God (not just to the training of clergy), involves learning in-ministry, may entail a "coming apart" for a time, and requires a closer relationship between the church and seminary. Study is integrative and collaborative. Faculty and students are together involved in ministry. The movement of the curriculum is toward personal formation, theological reflection, and ministry.

Multiple sectors for theological education. Ted Ward suggests that theological education may split into two sectors: the more academic and longer programs for those churches that feel they need leaders with advanced masters' degrees and doctorates; and the more functional shorter programs that will serve the majority of churches. The formats of theological education may well be reshaped into three distinct, but mutually permeable categories: 1) *church-based theological education*--holistic educationally, concerned with the development of leaders in context, intentional in the inclusion of professional ministers and laity in learning experiences; 2) *apprenticeship of the scholar*--men and women with significant gifts in scholarship (to be distinguished from formidable feats of memory), affirmed by the church and connected with the church and society, are brought into relationship with mature scholars in various disciplines who are likewise connected with the church and society; and 3) *professional development of the leader*--utilizing his or her context, as well as experiences away from that context to shape capacities and enable reflection on authentic practice.

2. Changes Within Formal or Conventional Theological Education

As theological schools face the challenges of declining finances, enrollment, and confusion of purpose, they experiment with alternatives.

Distance education. Distance learning is not the solution to financial problems, as many schools have discovered; and the concern that educational technology will foster that which we care least about in education is certainly a valid concern. However, recent literature affirms that quality distance learning affirms three elements: it is interactive, promotes higher order thinking, and sustains learning in community, even at a distance. The more effective efforts emphasize face-to-face learning and consultations *supported* by technologically mediated networks. As these efforts move away from being technologically driven to being learning driven, they could broaden our understanding of the nature of learning and education. Clearly, as students increasingly construct their educational experiences from formal schooling, non-formal learning experiences, and distance learning, the arbitrary boundaries between these modes are blurring.

Institutes and centers alongside the seminary. Of interest are the institutes and centers that are developing alongside the theological school's program. Increasingly, these centers are started by faculty attempting to find a way around a hopelessly overcrowded curriculum. If paradigm shifts develop from the fringes, then we should watch these developments with interest.

Niche seminaries. As institutions realize that their survival is threatened by trying to maintain a large number of programs, and realizing that passing burgeoning financial deficits onto students is seriously depleting enrollment and creating unacceptable, ministry-threatening financial indebtedness for graduates, niche seminaries could emerge--each with a particular specialty. Whether this will exacerbate an already fragmented curriculum remains to be seen.

Communities of discernment. The notion of the seminary as a community of discernment recalls a former emphasis that the seminary is the intellectual center of the church. This notion has a long history and is not without merit. It challenges the notion that all the information a person will need must be acquired in a degree program, with education seen in relation to the number and types of courses offered. Seminaries as communities of discernment engage in two primary activities: critical reflection and purposeful activity which Bender describes as issuing out of obedience to God.

Breaking down silo-bureaucracies. As schools realize that education is more than training the mind, they give attention to spirituality, personal development, the arts, skill development, and so on. Few would argue that theological education is *solely* about the development of rational processes. However, the legacy of history is such that the development of rational processes is precisely what the institutional structures support. John Harris argues that organizing higher education around administrative and disciplinary silos (isolated, non-communicating compartments) is increasingly problematic at a time when interaction and integration is required. He maintains that silo bureaucracies are seriously limited in dealing with change, student differences, and in helping students make connections between fact and value. Was the assumption that a faculty member's Ph.D. concentration required a corresponding department and curriculum division a mistake? Is it necessary to organize theological education around disciplines? Have we weakened a person's grasp of knowledge by moving them through defined curricular boxes? Is our allegiance to the almighty credit hour, and writing faculty contracts in relation to credit hours taught, actually hindering what we profess to be about in theological education?

Interdisciplinary education. While the disciplines still frame the curriculum, increasingly deans are encouraging faculty to teach and interact across their specializations. The common definition of a discipline is that it has its own literature, its own questions, and a particular subject matter. However, in reality, most disciplines are shaped by other disciplines and are in their very DNA interdisciplinary. If the disciplines are naturally interconnected, what academic and curricular structures will help students make vital connections? Departments may be more effective if envisioned as learning teams of scholars working in partnership with students or assisted by students in the learning task. Rorty once said that the problems of society are not contained in discipline-shaped blocks. Most of us spend our lives dealing with ill-structured problems. Seldom do students and faculty learn how to deal with these ill-structured problems in classrooms. However, integration of subject matter is difficult and could well frustrate faculty efforts. It may be necessary to ground interdisciplinary experiences in something other than subject matter from the disciplines as

we know them. In other words, the way forward may not be to attempt to integrate fields of knowledge, or to have faculty members from different divisions in the same classroom speaking about their respective subject matter. It may be necessary to establish the curriculum on a different footing altogether. For example, if the curriculum were organized around church practices, or service, or problems, the faculty from the various disciplines would then, together, become a resource for learners who are working intensively with issues, problems, and well-considered tasks that comprise the curriculum. Perhaps new groupings of scholars in newly constituted disciplinary structures are needed—oriented not around some notion of integrating disciplines, but of enabling disciplines to work together in relation to a larger project or quest germane to the tasks of theology and ministry. Surely, faculty from the same specialization can organize opportunities for conversation with one another without being permanently isolated in a specialized department.

Attempts at curriculum reform. Boyatzis et al. suggest that among the top challenges for the 21 st academy is managing curriculum change. Most of us are familiar with review processes that do little more than tinker with the curriculum. Are present curricular structures working for your school? Why? Why not? Funded study of case studies of institutions experimenting with different educational design models is a more promising direction. Theological education is a two-fold concept: the nature of theology and the nature of education. Much of the contemporary literature on theological education has focused on the meaning of theology in *theological* education. It is time to consider the meaning of education in theological *education*.

Thinking differently about assessment. Assessment is the forgotten aspect of curriculum reform. Boyatzis once asked, What if education were about learning? Similarly we could ask, What if assessment were about learning? An increasingly common concern is that higher education is not packaged in ways that would be optimal for learning. The compartmentalized structures of schools tend to serve the institution not the learner. Similarly, course divisions often benefit the faculty and institution more than the student or the outcomes we desire in theological education. Harris, in conversations with representatives of seminaries and the Association of Theological Schools, suggests that theological education would be better served by changing the focus from eligibility for the degree to a determination of how a program is developing proficiencies in some area of endeavor or knowledge building. These changes would change the way faculty and administration, and students, view assessment. In reality, he asserts, grades don't correlate with much of anything except other grades; and there is no empirical evidence that credentials correlate significantly with anything. The assignment of a grade on the basis of perceived performance on tests is recognized as one of the most flawed aspects of education.

Ward suggests that assessment of learning is more effective as the assessment of the products of *whole learning experiences* rather than isolated segments taken out of context. Similarly, assessment of the effectiveness of the program is more important than assessment of the student. Alternative forms of assessment are possible and credible, but difficult to implement because parents, employers, and the gatekeepers of the next level of schooling believe that grades are synonymous with competency and knowledge of the field. Rather than toughen up something that is flawed to begin with to address grade inflation, consider the possibility that the very practice of giving grades for student performance is itself flawed.

Milton (1986), following a national study of assessment practices in American colleges, offered five recommendations to address the problems of testing: (1) Clarify the purpose of testing. Does it promote learning and teaching, or does it simply rank order students? (2) Improve the quality of test construction. Many faculty know very little about how to construct effective tests. (3) Supply more information than just the letter symbol to students. Provide information about their performance on tests and in other academic exercises. (4) Reduce the number of grade categories. The ranking of A +, A, A-, and so on, gives only the illusion of precision. (5) Abolish the Grade Point Average (G.P. A.). For this misleading statistic to have meaning it must be described in reference to the grading policies of every school represented in the student body, to the testing skill of every faculty member giving a grade in a similar course, and to each course for which a grade was given. Also, Milton noted that it is less arithmetically defensible to go from a less differentiated metric (A, B, C, D) to a more differentiated metric (numbers). He recommends that transcripts be redesigned to reveal patterns of personal, professional, and academic development across the student's academic career.

3. Efforts to Fashion Synergies Between Theological Schools and Other Agencies

A trend toward forming synergies among various sorts of agencies is evident.

Partnerships with multi-campus churches. In North America, theological institutions are aligning themselves with external providers (large, corporate-style churches, for example) to offer programs that were once part of the theological curriculum. However, the large church external providers represent a small proportion of churches in North America, and their corporate philosophy tends to be only one perspective on the nature of the church and its ministry. Men and women trained in these venues will have made some gains in their ministry capabilities; however, in the long term they may be no more able to serve the church in the world, than those trained in existing programs that are criticized for being out of touch with the world. Admittedly, the real work of this century is for churches to retake responsibility for education and mission--tasks it outsourced to schools and mission agencies a century ago. A related task is for the church to come to understand its identity as the people of God and to live in relation to that identity.

Professional schools alongside the seminary. Most fields of inquiry have a subcategory concerned about education that examines regularly the efficacy of the learning and research processes that equip men and women for the profession. For example, engineering has a sub-category called engineering education. A major purpose of engineering education is research into issues that affect the practice of engineering. Theological education is deficient in these processes. For example, accreditation is not a persisting process but is a sudden burst of activity just before a site visit. Also, even though seminaries are in the business of equipping leaders, and even though the M.Div. degree is considered a professional degree, it is studied and taught in the manner of a liberal arts degree, i.e., with an emphasis on the academic, a course driven curriculum, and minimal supervised experience. To what extent should the seminary be a professional school? A recent denominational magazine featured testimonials from several pastors bemoaning the fact that on graduation from seminary they were unable to do the work they were expected to do in the church. The implied criticism, of course, is that seminary education is not effective. However, to what extent is any graduate of any profession able to conduct the work of the profession immediately upon graduation? Most professional fields have *extensive* periods of internship, residency, and apprenticeship before the initiate to the field is deemed capable. Perhaps the more appropriate way to think of the involvement of the seminary in professional education is not as preparatory but as developmental. In other words, since the curriculum is already hopelessly mired with courses, the curriculum could be reconfigured to allow an appropriate sequence of courses while other courses are removed from the curriculum to become part of the lifelong learning component of the graduate's experience. Professional education, except in ministerial education, presumes that the development of the professional capacity takes place over several years--and continuance in the profession is contingent upon regular and continuing education where the individual interacts with other professional fields and is guided in reflection-on-practice. We may do better to strip the multitude of quasi-professional programs out of the theological curriculum and surround the seminary with institutes and non-formal experiences able to offer the best of professional development. To finish the picture, those engaged in professional learning experiences and scholars and scholar-apprentices would interact non-formally concerning problems, issues, and significant questions.

It should be added that any consideration of ministerial professional education must also observe that the nature of leadership for congregations is fundamentally different from the professional notion of leadership. Kelsey proposes that church leadership is not consistent with many of the sociological characteristics of a profession. For example, many, if not most, professional activities of clergy could also be carried out by laity. So, as we think of the future, the development of professional theological education should consider the reality that ministry is the obligation of the whole people of God.

International partnerships. To what extent is effective theological education for the whole people of God possible without the equitable partnering with many cultural groups? We cannot truly understand something if we see it only from one perspective. Until we develop genuine partnerships or consortia of schools internationally, with a curriculum that offers reciprocity in what constitutes

experience and knowledge, we will make little headway in addressing the challenges of leadership development for the church and its mission in the world. The explosive growth of the church in Africa, parts of Asia, and Latin America demonstrates that formal theological education in its present form cannot provide for these churches. If leaders are needed, the seminary cannot manufacture sufficient quantities; if depth in biblical and theological perspective is needed, academic scholars are often unavailable to assist the church.

Numerous voices are calling for multinational, intercultural partnerships among churches, schools, mission enterprises, and development work. Regardless of the sending country, the temptation to send faculty to another country, without much expectation that the faculty member will actually engage the culture and learn something from that engagement, is to be resisted. The temptation to establish programs in direct competition with national efforts is inappropriate. The 21 st century task is learning how to connect and share resources. Rather than competition, consider partnerships that give students the option of not having to leave their home countries for advanced degree work; that provide opportunity for faculty and students to become more competent interculturally; that allow dialogue about critical issues internationally. There is no reason today why the traffic of international students and the flow of resources cannot be a two way stream. One way patterns of dependency are neither desirable, nor necessary. To what extent should churches worldwide copy educational patterns envisioned by a previously dominating Christian culture? Varieties of non-formal theological education are emerging in many countries. Since there will never be enough seminaries to assist with the task of leader development for the church, productive partnerships between formal and non-formal agencies of education are essential.

Alternative Processes for a New Century

Theological education will change. Successful change will require that it be international in scope, learning-focused, deeply concerned about theological education in relation to a biblical ecclesiology, committed to service within society, and increasingly decentralized in structure and affiliations. In other words, just as education is not synonymous with schooling, so theological education need not be synonymous with theological schools as we know them. The schools will continue; however, theological schools will be one manifestation of theological education--and not necessarily the most extensive manifestation in terms of participant numbers and global presence. In the future we will find ourselves negotiating new decisions:

• *Not anti-institution, but not serving the institution for institution's sake*
The more important matter is the extent to which institutional forms are accomplishing essential purposes and accommodating the inevitable processes of change.

• *Not anti-knowledge, but not knowledge for knowledge's sake*
Mere rationalism is not sufficient for the challenges that confront the mission of the church in the world. A sense of the holism of learning, a less restrictive view of the role of both formal and non-formal modes of education, and accreditation and assessment in the service of learning are essential as theological education evolves. Predetermined curricular patterns, lock-step time tables, and large classes, hinder the extended reflective and relational time needed for the cultivation of wisdom. Preoccupation with content transmission obscures the important learning to be found in dialogue, debate, reflection on experience, and critical inquiry necessary for the development of wisdom.

• *Not anti-technology, but not using technology to drive education*
Educational institutions are rightly incorporating technology, but much of the educational design is being driven by technologists (and those who mistakenly see in technology a way to make money) rather than by educators--no matter what their discipline. The more effective use of technology is to *supplement* face-to-face interaction in different ways and places.

• *Not anti-theology, but not theology for theology's sake*
Though suggestions as to what theology might become if not defined by a cluster of often disconnected subjects are few, there seems little objection to the notion that theology is somehow responsible to the church and society. If ministers need to know theology, why do they need to

know it? Why is it important for the whole people of God to be able to assess life and experience theologically? What will come out of the growing dialogue of theologians from different countries and cultures?

• Not anti-ordered learning but not organizing learning exclusively in relation to specialized disciplines

The decision to organize knowledge by knowledge categories, shaped in turn by institutional dynamics, and focused more or less on rational outcomes, created academies that are now the objects of persisting critique. Assuming that it is still valid to bring scholars with differing areas of expertise together in localized settings such as schools, what role will these scholars play? What differences would result in curriculum and instruction if knowledge were also viewed as an important resource for virtue and purposeful action; and if communities of faith and learning were the context?

• Not anti-theological education, but not equating theological education with formal schooling

In many instances, those who are rightly critical of schooling, have a limited repertoire of ways to promote and assess *learning* and a limited understanding of the variety of contexts that enhance learning. The issue is not to do away with schools, necessarily, but to understand the nature of learning, to develop a better sense of when, where, why, and how to use various approaches that foster learning, and to take context more seriously. Once we accept that theological education is not simply about school-like activities, then we are free to envision other venues for theological education. Collaboration with churches and non-formal ventures becomes possible.

• Not anti-professional but not equating practice simply with skills or methods

Kelsey, Volf, Dykstra, and Coakley represent alternatives to a view of practices as merely skills, methods, or programs. Practices are inherent in beliefs and vice versa; they are inherent in one's spiritual journey toward knowing God; and they are congregational practices. For Kelsey, if theological education is irrevocably linked to the articulation and outworking of the practices of congregations, then the disciplines that inform learning experiences will be mandated by those practices. Tasks appropriate to theological education, then, are to uphold the character of congregational practices, examine them against the long history of the church, and situate them in societies and cultures. By identifying the practices of congregations with the theological quest to know God truly, matters of faith (theory) and practices are seen as one whole; both theology and the social sciences are mandated; inconsistency between belief and behavior is addressed in a prophetic voice; and concerns about organizational patterns and leadership style are not permitted to devolve to the pragmatic concern for what works.

The Life Long Learner: A Spiritual Vision for Theological Education

Lifelong learning is predicated on the understanding that 2-4 years of formal theological education is not sufficient to understand a field of inquiry or to develop competency in ministry--yet the structures of formal theological education are based on the premise that the years that proscribe a degree are sufficient. The habits of thoughtful reading, careful research, dialogue that is more than just talk, writing, critical thinking and analysis, reflective practice, conceptual reasoning, spiritual reflection, the ability to ground knowledge in a disciplined theory base, the ability to access and use resources, communication, social interaction, justice and reconciliation, and so on, are the habits of a lifetime. The challenge for theological education in the 21 st century is to foster these habits within degree programs, to provide graduates with opportunities for continued learning that are more than conventional continuing education courses, and to create access to multiple modes of learning for the whole people of God. A functional team that includes faculty, church leaders, learning specialists, and other appropriate personnel, designs learning, articulates the values that under gird learning, and encourages the development of sustainable habits for a life time. In much of the world, and increasingly in North America, the economic resources to support traditional schools are depleting rapidly. It is becoming apparent that the only way forward is to seek productive relationships among formal and non-formal educational ventures where individuals and communities have access to learning opportunities for all of life. In this way, the intolerable situation in theological schools of a hopelessly crowded curriculum could be alleviated. It is no longer necessary for schools to teach all that is needed for a profession or for an academic specialty

during the brief years of a degree program. If schools partner with non-formal ventures in planning for and supporting life long learning opportunities, they can be much more selective and intentional about what to include in a curriculum.

Embracing lifelong learning as normative for theological education is actually consistent with the deepest values and commitments of Christian faith. Many academic habits and artifacts were, for the most part, created by the forces of institutionalization, rationalism, and professionalism and not the values of Christ and the gospel. Conventional curricula, educational forms, assessment processes, and credentialing are largely inadequate to serve the mission of the church in the world. If Christians, committed to what Nietzsche described as the "long obedience in the same direction" embraced the life of a disciple with its attendant obligation of a life of learning, all our educational enterprises would be transformed. At present, the development of skills and attitudes necessary for lifelong learning is not a priority in conventional theological education. Wisdom is not cultivated easily in a few semesters. Understanding does not mature in a short burst of formal education. Theological education can no longer simply be a course of studies in a seminary. The future of theological education is found in a commitment to life long learning for the whole people of God.

Conclusion

We are long past the day when the seminary could do all that is expected of it. It is likely that the pressure from congregations, non-formal initiatives and developments in distance learning will force the shift from an instructional paradigm to a learning paradigm, and mandate the internationalization of the curriculum. It seems inevitable that the understanding of theological education as that which takes place *only* in a college or seminary in a specified period of years, and in classroom formats, will change significantly. It seems inevitable that commitment to justice and dialogue will be the future coinage of theological education as we confront power issues, the nature of knowledge, ways of knowing, and the relationship of the individual to the larger web of humankind. It seems inevitable that theological education has to be both centralized and decentralized. It seems inevitable that, in the development of theological education broadly conceived, collaboration between churches, other theological academies, parachurch agencies, and marketplace agencies will become necessary. Craig Dykstra suggests that the way forward is to seek to discern where *God* is working and ask three basic questions: What is God doing in the world? What do churches have to be like that are responding to what God is doing in the world? What is theological education doing to equip leaders for the church that is responding to what God is doing in the world?

Reference List

Bender, Ross. 1997. *Education for Peoplehood: Essays on the Teaching Ministry of the Church*.

Elkhart, IN: Text Reader Series 8, Institute of Mennonite Studies.

Boyatzis, Richard, Scott Cowen, David Kolb, and Associates. 1995. *Innovation in Professional*

Education: Steps on a Journey from Teaching to Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Coakley, Susan. 2002. Deepening Practices: Perspectives from Ascetical and Mystical Theology.

In Miroslav Volf and Dorothy Bass (eds). 2002. *Practicing Theology: Beliefs and Practices in Christian Life.* Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Dykstra, Craig. 1991. Reconceiving Practice. In Barbara Wheeler and Edward Farley (eds).

Shifting Boundaries: Contextual Approaches to the Structure of Theological Education. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press.

Dykstra, Craig. 1991b. Looking Ahead at Theological Education. *Theological Education*. 28 (1) Autumn: 95-105.

Dykstra, Craig and Dorothy Bass. 2002. A Theological Understanding of Christian Practices. In Miroslav Volf and Dorothy Bass (eds). 2002. *Practicing Theology: Beliefs and Practices in*

Christian Life. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Garrison, D.R. and Terry Anderson. 2003. *E-Learning in the 21st Century: A Framework for Research and Practice*. New York: RoutledgeFarmer.

Kelsey, David. 1992. *To Understand God Truly: What's Theological About a Theological School?* Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox.

Kelsey, David. 1993. *Between Athens and Berlin: The Theological Education Debate*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Latchem, Colin and Donald Hanna. 2001.*Leadership for 21 st Century Learning: Global Perspectives from Educational Innovators (Open and Distance Learning). New York: RoutledgeFarmer.*

Milton, Ohmer, Howard Pollio, and James Eison. 1986. *Making Sense of College Grades: Why the Grading System Doesn't Work and What Can Be Done About It.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Volf, Miroslav. 2002. Theology for a Way of Life. In *Practicing Theology: Beliefs and Practices in Christian Life.* Miroslav Volf and Dorothy Bass (eds). Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

About the Author

Linda M. Cannell is director of the Ph.D. in Educational Studies at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School in Chicago, Illinois. She is also director of iComm, Inc: An International Community of Christian Leaders (www.candospirit.org).

Toward A New Curriculum for Theological Education
By Richard A. Cotton

Introduction

By the time the typical seminary student graduates, he or she has some pretty high expectations. Many of these expectations are placed on the student during the program of study at the seminary. Having listened faithfully to all the professors and chapel speakers, the seminary graduate might conclude that something like the following is expected of the godly pastor:

- An hour of prayer in the morning before breakfast
- An hour of Bible study in the morning before breakfast
- Breakfast with his or her family (with devotions)
- Exegetical study all morning from the Hebrew or the Greek
- Sermon preparation all morning using church history, theology and contemporary situations

(for three or more different sermons or teaching settings per week)
- Complete availability for counseling, phone conversation and community service
- Lunch with one or two for discipleship
- Afternoon visitation of the sick, the imprisoned, the poor, the widows, etc.
- Collaboration with other area pastors, with hours spent in prayer together
- Supper with a church family and his or her own family
- Evening meetings with the church board, committees, prayer groups, small groups, discipleship groups, local school groups, missions task forces, evening classes, etc.
- Weekend retreats, sports outings, visitation of families, outreach events, etc.
- All day church related meetings and appointments on Sunday

During the seminary years, students hear so many admonitions and imperatives, that they may feel they need to be supermen or superwomen to do it all. Professors tend to be focused on their own area of expertise and therefore have high expectations of the students in that discipline. But when the expectations of all the specialists are combined, students can become overwhelmed and not understand how these areas should be blended in actual ministry. It is difficult for the students to see how all these very important subjects and commitments will fit into their ministry days and weeks.

However, if you could spend a whole day or week with a professor or chapel speaker, you would learn that these highly respected leaders cannot even carry out all the implied expectations of the curriculum. The New Testament professor may not spend any time counseling or leading small groups. An Old Testament teacher may give very little thought to church history or children's ministry. The expert in youth ministry may never open a Hebrew text or refer to a book on systematic theology. Living out the ideals of the seminary curriculum is much harder than the student may be led to believe.

Seminary students need to see with their own eyes that those in ministry are finite humans. Professors need food and rest. Some days go well; other days go poorly. That's life! How do you handle it? How do you integrate what you are learning from the Bible and from each other, from theology and from life? Because we are finite, we have to make choices. These subjects do not normally come up because we chop up our seminary curriculum into tiny little pieces. We need to have life to life contact between teachers and learners so that the kind of life modeled during seminary can be continued after seminary. Seminary should establish a pattern that can be carried on beyond the years spent in the curriculum.

In this paper, I will suggest an alternative to the way most theological education is structured. I will propose a curriculum designed to provide a more holistic and integrated approach to the education of ministers for the church of Jesus Christ. But first, allow me to put forth the basis of the curriculum.

The Basis of the Curriculum

I believe God exists and that he has given a written revelation of himself to humankind. The sixty-six books of the Bible are the Word of God. These Scriptures are the basis of understanding all things according to God's perspective. Because the Bible is God's Holy Word, theological education must be based firmly on the Scriptures. The effective graduate must be able to handle the Word of God with skill, know its God personally, and use it to help the people to whom he ministers. The Bible must be central in the curriculum in order for it to be central in the churches.

Every person is made in God's image. Yet at the same time, people are all sinful and in need of a savior. God graciously redeems those who believe in Jesus Christ. Our theological education must encourage appreciation for God's grace, dependence upon the new life he gives the learner (and the teacher), and desire to see others experience new life in Christ. God gives the Holy Spirit to teach and sanctify the believer (both students and teachers).

Education should involve the whole person: heart, soul, mind and strength. No one person can be truly holistic or create holism alone. We are all too finite. The only way that we can approach holism is to do it together. With all the parts working together, we can experience the fullness God

intended. Being in a right relationship with God is not just an individual endeavor. Instead, God has given us to one another to live in community (the church). Theological education should model and promote collaborative learning.

Theological education should integrate obedience to the Great Commission and the Great Commandment. We are to reach out in love to all the peoples of the earth, enabling others to become worshipers of the living God.

There is not just one best way to educate. Just as one person cannot create holism, neither can one educational approach be the only way to help learners become all that God intends them to be. We need one another in the body of Christ and we need one another in the theological education community. We need schools that educate scholars in New Testament, Systematic Theology and other academic disciplines. We need apprenticeship programs where kinesthetic learners can watch experienced pastors in action and do what they do. But we also need communities of praxis where theory and practice interact.

One of the reasons we need more than one approach to theological education is that people do not all learn the same way. Some are highly visual learners, others auditory. There are kinesthetic learners and those who love books and lectures. For this reason, a good theological education curriculum will use a variety of approaches to provide opportunities for those with all kinds of learning styles.

Common to all learners is the need to be engaged in what they are learning. The passive learner is not really learning. Even lectures must be engaging. People learn by experience and therefore must be helped to experience the cognitive, affective and purposeful action elements of the curriculum.

People are not just containers which we fill with knowledge. Therefore, we must reject the "banking model" of education. There are times we must give the learners information, but there must be an intentional opportunity to do something with that information. The learner must think about it, work with it, evaluate it and apply it to make it their own.

When the theological graduate ministers among God's people, he or she will not be encouraging the flock to compete with one another. For this reason it is best to avoid competition in theological education. Instead, since the church must be encouraged to collaborate, theological education should also encourage its learners to work together. Helping one another learn is more appropriate than seeking to achieve the highest grade in the class. Therefore, our curriculum must reward collaborative learning.

We often think of going to school *to learn* but we really need to value *learning how to learn*. Because we will spend our whole lives learning, it is essential that we know how to learn and that we be continually relearning how to learn in each new time period.

The rail fence analogy is very helpful in theological education. The top rail represents the content, the universals, the truth, knowledge, etc. The bottom rail represents experience, the context, application, practice, etc. The fence posts represent that which facilitates interaction between the top and bottom rails, namely praxis (reflection-action-reflection-action-and so on). Our theological education should provide content and experience with reflection on the relationship between the two.

We must avoid disintegrating the theological curriculum into little pieces that never get put back together. Instead, we must hold various ideas and activities in tension, allowing them to remain integrated. In order to survive and attempt to control our world, we tend to analyze and compartmentalize. But God values unity, integrity and wholeness. We must strive to do the same, sacrificing control and perfectionism for the sake of letting God be in control. It is usually better to have a teacher who can integrate the Bible and life than one who knows every detail about his or her academic discipline.

If we want our grads to lecture, we should lecture. If we want them to lead small groups, we must lead small groups. If we want them to integrate, we must integrate. The methods we use and the

emphases we make repeatedly will probably dominate our learners' approach to ministry. Because learners are likely to reproduce the processes they go through, it is essential that they be led through the kinds of experiences appropriate for them to use with others.

What we assess shows what we value. How we assess reveals how we think. Rather than merely checking to see what someone has learned, assessment should also help us understand where someone is when they start the program or course. It should also help that person understand themselves better. Assessment should not merely check to see if a person has memorized certain information, but it should evaluate higher levels of learning. Cognitive, affective and purposeful action should all be included in assessment. Methods of assessment should be appropriate to the purpose at hand and be as close to reality as possible.

Adult learners enter with prior experience and knowledge, with immediate needs, with the ability to engage in learning different from children. We must treat theological education students with the respect they deserve. They should be involved in shaping the educational process.

Having the right kind of teachers is very important. I would almost go so far as to say the teachers are the curriculum. They need to embody the philosophy of education, the biblical perspective, the Christ-likeness and the pioneering capability to make this all happen. They control the curriculum at the micro level (hour-by-hour) where the real education takes place. If the teachers can pull off an approximation of the integration aimed at in the curriculum, the program will be a success. If the teachers revert to traditional teaching methods or cannot figure out how to make the new approach happen at the micro level, the program will not succeed (at least not as envisioned). Jesus said, ". . . everyone who is fully trained will be like his teacher" (Luke 6:40b). No wonder the teacher is held to a higher standard than others (James 3:1). Because people often follow their leaders and imitate their teachers, we must be careful to live and teach in the way we want our students to live and teach.

Methodologies must not be locked into classroom, lecture, writing papers and tests. Perhaps the greatest temptation for all teachers is to hang on to the comfort of the classroom. We feel comfortable with tables and chairs, white boards and AV screens, lack of interruptions and captive students. However, learning must not be limited to the classroom. We must choose the best setting for learning to take place. This will often NOT be a classroom. It may be a church or the marketplace, a car en route to some destination or a hospital. We must break out of a classroom-only mentality.

Curriculum Design

Here is what a new theological education curriculum might look like, based on the above foundational concepts.

Overview

I envision a curriculum that allows for maximum flexibility and maximum integration. Rather than chopping each semester into little pieces of segregated subjects, the curriculum would be set up with large blocks of time in which there could be full integration of cognitive, affective and purposeful action with a team of teachers. Scripture would be integrated with the theological themes that arise from the text and contemporary themes that arise from the participants (both learners and teachers). Lecture, dialogue and experiential learning would be blended in a manner not controlled by one specific location or portion of the day. There would be every attempt to involve the learning community in the actual ministries of life while reflecting on cognitive input.

Desired Experiences and Outcomes

The process is just as important as the outcomes of the curriculum, and perhaps more important. The reason I say this is that the way we are educated often determines how we will relate to others

upon completion. This curriculum seeks to make the process harmonious with the rhythms of life and ministry. For this reason, entire afternoons and days will be spent together, allowing the community to experience the kinds of progress made in a normal day of life. God's Word, problems and issues, needs and responses, reflections and actions can all arise when an entire day is engaged as a learning community. I believe this is a superior context for true-to-life learning than the artificial segments of a traditional school.

The desired experiences and outcomes include the following:

1. Participants are strengthened in their walk with God.

2. Participants are encouraged by the image of God seen in their lives.

3. Participants grow in heart, soul, mind and strength.

4. Participants grow in their love for God, their love for his Word, and their understanding of his Word.

5. Participants spend time in evaluated ministry of the Word of God.

6. Participants learn to notice themes that arise from the Word of God.

7. Participants understand how to interpret and apply biblical themes to life and ministry today.

8. Participants grow in their appreciation for the church of Jesus Christ.

9. Participants spend time involved the church of Jesus Christ according to their own giftedness.

10. Participants increasingly grow in love for other believers and for non-believers as well.

11. Participants become involved in the world mission of the church.

12. Participants grow in faith, hope and love, and encourage others around them to grow in these virtues as well.

13. Participants grow in dependence upon the grace of God and the Holy Spirit.

14. Participants learn how to learn for a lifetime of learning.

15. Participants understand God's heart for all peoples and exhibit a desire to include all believers of all nations in the fellowship of the church.

16. Participants wrestle with sin and its effects, working to establish healthy habits of dealing with personal sin, sin in the church and sinful patterns in society.

17. Participants experience collaborative learning that they can carry on and promote for the rest of their lives.

18. Participants gain skills useful for ministry in their own areas of interest.

19. Participants are able to distinguish between cultural distinctives and supra cultural absolutes in Scripture.

20. Participants learn to regularly engage in useful forms of assessment.

21. Participants value both content and application, theory and practice, text and context, universals and cultural values, as important in all of life and ministry.

22. Participants learn to engage with other people in learning together in every area of life: whether eating or drinking, traveling or sitting at tables, walking or playing sports.

23. Participants engage in conflict resolution, problem-solving and every other normal activity of life– all informed by the truths of Scripture and the wisdom of the believing community.

24. Participants are involved in the church as they learn, as opposed to being removed.

25. Participants are better prepared for meaningful, biblical, loving, capable, holistic ministry in the church of Jesus Christ.

Organizing Principle

The Bible will serve as the organizing principle for the curriculum due to the fact that our relationship with God is the most important thing about us and God reveals himself in his Word. God's perspective is desired on every subject and his Word has been given to equip the person of God for every good work. The Word is to be the central textbook of the curriculum and likewise central in the ministry of the graduate. Every book of the Bible will be read and allowed to inform our perspective on every area of life. The Bible will be used as the overarching grid running through every other area of the curriculum matrix.

Matrix

I envision blocks of time in which teams of teachers involve the learners in a variety of learning experiences that encourage the integration of Scripture with these kinds of crisscrossing elements: Theological Themes, Contemporary Themes, Ministry Contexts, Spiritual Life, World Connections, etc. The organizing principle (The Bible) will serve as the overall structure upon which everything else will be hung. Themes will be allowed to arise from the text and from the learners and from the teachers. Some themes will be required of all students and other themes will be pursued at the election of the student. The structure is intended to allow for maximum flexibility, maximum inclusion, maximum integration, and maximum involvement.

Teaching Teams

Rather than having departments or specializations, professors will teach in teams. Because the content is integrated, there will be no Systematic Theology department or professors, no Christian Education department or professors, no Bible department or professors, no New or Old Testament department or professors, etc. Instead, each team of teachers will be responsible for facilitating learning of Bible, theology, ministry, spiritual life, etc. Every area of life and ministry will be kept together rather than being separated out. Therefore, professors must be willing to focus more on integration than specialization.

The teaching teams will need to meet for preparation between gatherings of the community of learners. The schedule allows for this, since the learners gather only on Monday afternoons and Tuesdays. Preparation will require a great deal of work, coordinating the integration of important Bible, theological themes, contemporary themes, ministry contexts, world connections, spiritual life, etc. Since the group will not be bound by classrooms, there will be extra work setting up where the group will be, how it will get there, how the time will be used wisely, etc. The team will have to plan for proper balance and sequence between content and experience, with each member of the team taking responsibility for a part of the work.

The Process

The process is very important in this curriculum. For by the process, the learner is to be helped along his or her way on the journey of life. This journey is marked by relationships, joy, prayer, learning, suffering and glory. Therefore, I am proposing a curriculum that is more life-like, interactive, prayerful, joyful, collaborative, integrative, praxis-oriented, and flexible. It is more church-like than school-like. This is appropriate because most graduates will serve in churches, rather than schools. The process begets the product.

Macro Structure

The M.Div. curriculum is envisioned to consist of nine (9) major blocks of twelve (12) credit hours each spread over a period of three (3) years. In a calendar year, one major block will be offered September through December, a second major block January through April and the third major block May through August. The major blocks might be labeled as follows:

Block	Tentative Title	Credit Hours
1	Foundations for Life and Ministry	12
2	Deepening Understandings of Life and God	12
3	Life's Struggles, Joys and Wisdom	12
4	God's Judgment and God's Promises	12
5	Listening to God and Showing Mercy	12
6	Knowing Christ and Making Him Known	12
7	The Church of Jesus Christ	12
8	Servant Leaders of the New Covenant	12
9	Living for God in the Last Days	12
	TOTAL CREDIT HOURS	**108**

Major Block 1: Foundations for Life and Ministry. *12 credit hours*
In the first major block of the curriculum, participants will read, study and apply the books of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. Theological themes arising from the text may include such topics as creation, the Creator, sin, death, marriage, God's purposes, covenants, blessings, the Law, and Israel. Contemporary themes may include such topics as origins, epistemology, the nature of God, the nature of humankind, world religions, social issues and politics. The block will also integrate spiritual growth, ministry in various contexts, world connections and Hebrew (after an introduction, further Hebrew study will be optional based on the student's ministry goals and aptitude for languages). Hermeneutics and Bible Study Methods will also comprise a significant part of major block one.

Major Block 2: Deepening Understandings of Life and God. *12 credit hours*
In the second major block of the curriculum, participants will read, study and apply the books of Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1 Samuel, 2 Samuel, 1 Kings, 2 Kings, 1 Chronicles, 2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther. Theological themes arising from the text may include such topics as Israel, war, the nature of God, relating to the nations, material possessions, the promised land, sin, government, idolatry, spiritual life, the sovereignty of God, and prayer. Contemporary themes may include such topics as war, land ownership, politics, sinful structures in society, materialism, Israel's role in history, and the occult. The block will also integrate spiritual growth, ministry in various contexts, world connections and Hebrew (for those who desire further study).

Major Block 3: Life's Struggles, Joys and Wisdom. *12 credit hours*
In the third major block of the curriculum, participants will read, study and apply the books of Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Song of Solomon. Theological themes arising from the text may include such topics as prayer, the attributes of God, wisdom, poverty, wealth, success, and meditation. Contemporary themes may include such topics as music, art, poetry, worship, success, emotions, mysticism, sex, and suffering. The block will also integrate spiritual growth, ministry in various contexts, world connections and Hebrew (for those who desire further study).

Major Block 4: God's Judgment and God's Promises. *12 credit hours*
In the fourth major block of the curriculum, participants will read, study and apply the books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, and Ezekiel. Theological themes arising from the text may include such topics as Israel, prophecy, God, suffering, judgment, repentance, the needy, the nations, Messiah, idolatry, and prayer. Contemporary themes may include such topics as worship,

Churchianity, syncretism, faithfulness, the gift of prophecy, anxiety & depression, and preaching. The block will also integrate spiritual growth, ministry in various contexts, world connections and Hebrew (for those who desire further study).

Major Block 5: Listening to God and Showing Mercy. *12 credit hours*
In the fifth major block of the curriculum, participants will read, study and apply the books of Daniel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. Theological themes arising from the text may include such topics as persecution, suffering, listening to God, God's judgment, God's mercy, faithfulness, repentance, obedience, and the nations. Contemporary themes may include such topics as youth, listening to God, showing mercy, obedience, church leaders, and marriage. The block will also integrate spiritual growth, ministry in various contexts, world connections and Hebrew (for those who desire further study).

Major Block 6: Knowing Christ and Making Him Known. *12 credit hours*
In the sixth major block of the curriculum, participants will read, study and apply the books of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, and Acts. Theological themes arising from the text may include such topics as Messiah, the virgin birth, the incarnation, miracles, the atonement, discipleship, the Great Commission, understanding the Old Testament, the New Covenant, and the person of Jesus Christ. Contemporary themes may include such topics as unitarianism, universalism, annihilationism, healing, health care, politics, hypocrisy, the poor, the needy, missions, discipleship and the Trinity. The block will also integrate spiritual growth, ministry in various contexts, world connections and Greek (after an introduction, further Greek study will be optional based on the student's ministry goals and aptitude for languages). Hermeneutics and Bible Study Methods will also comprise a significant part of major block six.

Major Block 7: The Church of Jesus Christ. *12 credit hours*
In the seventh major block of the curriculum, participants will read, study and apply the books of Romans, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 Thessalonians, and 2 Thessalonians. Theological themes arising from the text may include such topics as the church, church unity, church purpose, church discipline, communication in the church, family, Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit, spiritual gifts, faith-hope-love, and the one-another commands. Contemporary themes may include such topics as marriage, evaluation of church fads, racism, gender issues, how to have a contemporary and biblical church, pride, lawsuits, universalism, homosexuality, and Christian maturity. The block will also integrate spiritual growth, ministry in various contexts, world connections and Greek (for those who desire further study).

Major Block 8: Servant Leaders and the New Covenant. *12 credit hours*
In the eighth major block of the curriculum, participants will read, study and apply the books of 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon, Hebrews, and James. Theological themes arising from the text may include such topics as pastoral ministry, elders, teaching, the New Covenant, wisdom, widows, slavery, prayer, worship, angels, and materialism. Contemporary themes may include such topics as wealth, poverty, church leadership, oppression, favoritism, relating to elderly people, and the nature of authority. The block will also integrate spiritual growth, ministry in various contexts, world connections and Greek (for those who desire further study).

Major Block 9: Living for God in the Last Days. *12 credit hours*
In the final major block of the curriculum, participants will read, study and apply the books of 1 Peter, 2 Peter, 1 John, 2 John, 3 John, Jude, and Revelation. Theological themes arising from the text may include such topics as God, suffering, worship, holiness, character, love, eschatology, the church, government, marriage and Jesus Christ. Contemporary themes may include such topics as cults, heresy, marriage, hypocrisy, worship, postmodernism, the relationship of eschatology to how a church functions, and extra-biblical literature on the future. The block will also integrate spiritual growth, ministry in various contexts, world connections and Greek (for those who desire further study).

Meta Structure

Within each block of twelve (12) credit hours, learners will meet together with the team of teachers

for a period of one and one half (1.5) days per week. The block will continue weekly for a duration of fifteen (15) weeks. Time between the close of one block and the start of the next block will be considered time for completing assignments, rest and reflection. For example, if the first block begins on September 7, the fifteen week period would end on December 14. There would then be a break between December 14 and the day the second block began in January.

The weekly one and one half (1.5) days of time will probably be set up for Monday afternoon and all day Tuesday, allowing students to be involved with church ministry Wednesday through Sunday each week. This will also allow the teachers to meet together and work separately as needed to prepare for teaching Wednesday through Friday. It is expected that teachers will also be involved in church ministry to some extent.

Between gatherings, students will carry out assignments. Some of these will focus on knowing (cognitive), like reading or writing or reflecting. Others will pertain to being (affective and conative), like prayer or attitude checks or repentance. Still others will require doing (purposeful action), such as teaching or serving or witnessing. As much as possible, these assignments will dovetail with the learner's life and ministry. For example, the student may be a pastor or lead a worship team or have a small group Bible study or work in an urban mission. Whatever setting the learner operates within can become a place to integrate what is being learned.

Each student will be required to develop at least one learning partner in his or her church. On a regular basis, students will interact with learning partners to discuss what is being learned, to seek God together and to get feedback on how the ministry is going. This is intended to provide another point of contact between what is being learned and the life of the learner. Both the church partner and the learner will benefit from this partnership.

Micro Structure

The structure of the time spent together each week will be determined by the teaching team. When the community of learners gathers on Monday afternoons and all day Tuesday, the structure will not be like a traditional school. There will not be classes with professor A from 8am to 9:30am and chapel from 9:45 to 10:30am and class with professor B from 10:45am to noon followed by lunch on your own, etc. Instead, the team of professors will plan ahead on how the day will be used, outlining general subsets of time allotted to various learning experiences. Some of these experiences will involve the entire team of teachers, while others might involve just one or two. Some will involve all the learners together in one place, while other learning experiences are best accomplished when the learner are divided into smaller groups. The time will not be limited to traditional "learning" alone. It will include eating together (at least one meal per week), traveling together (sometimes) and ministry together (often). Every effort will be made to engage in the fullness of life together with the broadest possible range of experiences while at the same time thinking biblically and critically about everything that we do and are.

Assessment

Initial Assessment. As the learner is being considered for the program, he or she will prepare a portfolio as required by the admissions process. This portfolio will include past learning and experiences in a number of areas such as relationship with God, family background, education, church background, ministry experience, key questions the applicant desires to find answers to, key qualities the applicant desires to develop, key skills the applicant desires to acquire, etc. The portfolio is intended to serve as a baseline for the student's progress at the point of entry and as a tool for customization of the curriculum.

Formative Assessment. Assessment is ongoing throughout the program. Part of the reason for this is that assessment is an important part of life. We want to encourage the regular use of appropriate methods of self-assessment and evaluation by those around us. In addition, the educational process requires ongoing assessment so that the curriculum may remain on track and the learner may progress in a manner suitable to the amount of time and money being invested.

Formative assessment in this new curriculum will not focus on testing and the writing of papers. These methods are not particularly harmonious with the requirements of daily life. I cannot remember the last time a parishioner gave me a written test but I can recall lots of times they asked me oral questions on the spot that I had to answer off the cuff. This is one of the kinds of formative assessment that will be done regularly. Other forms of assessment will include observation, interviews, speeches, and skill evaluation. The foci will encompass attitude, relational abilities, helpfulness, wisdom, and ministry effectiveness. Methods will be used that promote the learning being sought rather than only ones that are easy to conduct or objectify.

Grades will not be used in a traditional sense. Progress reports will be qualitative. Areas of importance will be listed and an evaluative mark will be given according to an appropriate range of options. For example, the progress report might read: "Understands the biblical text, S" (for satisfactory); "Demonstrates a healthy walk with God, S+" (for very satisfactory); and "Able to apply biblical concepts in church ministry, N" (for needs improvement). Specific feedback would be added to support the generalizations made. This is the kind of written assessment that might be given by the professor and would be added to the student's portfolio.

Likewise, the student would add his or her own self-assessment along the way. At the close of each major block of the curriculum students would answer a few key questions about their own progress. This too would be added to the portfolio.

In addition, peer review would play a part. Each student would ask a different classmate to fill out a review and sit down to go through it. Wisdom would be used to determine what is written down and what is only communicated orally. A wise peer may wish to confront a brother or sister on a matter but not have it added to the official file. Other times it would be essential that professors be told what has been talked about.

Learning partners and others from church would also be involved in assessment when appropriate. Learning partners would be required to submit regular progress reports. Other people from one's ministry would be involved in evaluation when appropriate (such as sermon evaluation, teaching evaluation, witnessing evaluation, community service evaluation, etc.). Each item of feedback would be added to the portfolio.

Work that the student is doing would be added to the portfolio as well. Sermons prepared, lesson plans, a plan for an outreach party, a paragraph about an urban missions experience with a photograph, a note from someone who appreciated a visit, other ministry artifacts, etc. All this makes it possible to gain a broader perspective of who the learner is and how he or she is progressing.

Summative Assessment. At the end of the entire program of study, it is vital that the professors give a final assessment of the student. They should meet together with each student to review the time spent in the program and to reflect on the learning that has taken place. The portfolio should be used as a reminder of what has transpired and as a record of what God has done. Time should be taken to thank God together for this precious student and for God's work in and through them.

Each student will be given an appropriate recommendation upon graduation. The options might be something like this:

> Recommended for ministry (specify if necessary) with no reservations

> Recommended for ministry (specify if necessary) with the following reservations (specify)

> Not recommended for ministry at this time (specify)

Because this kind of summative assessment is much more specific and potentially inflammatory, it will be necessary to have the applicants sign a legal form indicating their agreement to be evaluated in this way. However, it is essential that churches be given a clear evaluation of potential ministers. Rather than being lied to, churches and students alike must be told the truth about where they

stand. This approach is much more helpful to churches and to learners than a letter grade or a grade point average. (At the end of each year along the way, students should be informed concerning which of these three summative evaluations they seem to be headed for.)

Upon satisfactory completion of the 108 credit hours, the student will receive an M.Div. degree.

Selection and Training of Teachers

Probably the most important factor in the successful implementation of this curriculum is the selection and training of the right kind of teachers. Here are the kinds of qualities needed:

Teachable

Humble

Flexible

Driven to help people learn to be good ministers

Willing to work in a team context

Longing for integration of Scripture and life and ministry

Knowledgeable in the Scriptures

One who walks with the Lord

Having capability in ministry

Willing to try new things

One who relates well to other people

Selected teachers will then go through a time of orientation to the curriculum and training concerning many of the key approaches required. The training will be conducted in the same manner the teachers will be expected to carry out the curriculum. This way the teachers will experience the format and method first hand.

Selection and Orientation of Learners

Second only to the selection of teachers is the selection of learners. Here are the kinds of qualities needed:

Teachable

Humble

Flexible

Driven to become a good minister

Willing to learn in a team context

Longing for integration of Scripture and life and ministry

Wanting to know the Scriptures

One who has begun to walk with the Lord

Having shown some capability in ministry

Willing to try new things

One who relates well to other people

Does this list look familiar? Yes, it is nearly the same as the list of qualities sought in a teacher. The difference is that the teacher should be further along in the journey, yet both must be willing to learn.

New students must be oriented to the unique approach taken in this curriculum. Literature sent to them, web pages and learning community orientation must all be sure to promote full awareness of what this program is as well as what it is not. Potential students (after the first incoming group) should be encouraged to visit the learning community to see for themselves. Care must be taken to accurately compare and contrast this curriculum with other existing programs. The program must not be oversold, but honestly reveal its potential strengths and weaknesses. Students seeking a traditional academic degree should be steered in that direction. Those wanting a full apprenticeship should be encouraged to find that elsewhere. Only those students wanting an integration of both rigorous cognitive learning and rigorous experiential learning should be encouraged to enroll. Learners should not expect this program to be utopian.

Facilities

If this curriculum were to be started by an existing seminary with a campus, it would probably be set up with the existing campus as a base of operations. However, this would require greater vigilance to avoid falling into the existing rut of classroom education, lecture domination, grades, traditional course work, departmentalization, etc. Pioneering on an existing campus could be done only with a strong commitment to the uniqueness of this program.

If this curriculum were to be started without a campus, there would be great flexibility of location. There may be the need for offices for the professors and the dean in one central location with perhaps three large conference rooms. This could be rented in a strip mall or other business park. Relationships would need to be established with local churches and ministries to allow for involvement of the learning community in their facilities as needed. The group could either meet together at the rented space, or at a church, or at a place where that week's experiential learning will take place. Most likely it would be all of the above, with a restaurant thrown in the mix for lunch together (or the group could brown bag lunch together wherever they happen to be at lunch time). Access to a theological library would need to be obtained.

Feasibility

If there is an existing campus, most likely the cost of tuition would be far higher than if starting without any pre-existing overhead. However, an existing campus would have a library and other systems in place to assist students and professors (admissions, records, business office, financial aid, etc.). If there is not an existing campus, overhead costs would likely be lower and hopefully systems could be streamlined to avoid unnecessary red tape or bureaucracy. Tuition could be kept lower and both full and part time professors could be hired to participate. This is an area that will require a complete study and evaluation.

Potential Pitfalls

Specialization/Departmentalization. Over time, professors in this new system could attempt to simplify their lives by specializing in one or two areas. It might be tempting to focus just on Spiritual Life or Hebrew or New Testament, especially if this is the professor's own educational background. However, professors must resist this temptation and remain committed to interdisciplinary education.

Classroomization. Most professors will have been trained in classrooms and will find this to be very comfortable. Classrooms are quiet, they are organized, there is a minimum of distractions, control is easier. But if we are to equip learners for real life, we must engage in real life. We must remain committed to going out into the places where ministry will take place in order to best learn how to minister.

Lecture-only mode. There is no easier educational method than lecture, especially for those who love to teach. But we must focus not on teaching but on learning. We must promote methods we want our students to use in ministry. There is a place for lecture, but it must not become the only method used. We must involve the learners in investigation, dialogue, leading, speaking off the cuff, counseling, helping those in need, planning, moderating, music, worship, prayer, evangelism, etc. Professors in this new curriculum must remain committed to promoting learning experiences.

Giving up. Because it is hard to adjust to the new curriculum, there will be a temptation to quit. It may take a few years to get the bugs out and really make this new approach work. The professors must be willing to commit themselves for several years of hard work to make it succeed. Students will learn a great deal by watching how their professors handle adversity.

Trying to include everything. Just as in traditional seminaries, there will be the temptation to add more and more content, and more and more experiences in order to include everything. We must realize that no curriculum will ever include everything. As long as the most important content and very suitable experiences are included, we must trust that God will accomplish what he desires in the lives of the learners. Better to do what you do well than to try to do everything. Encouraging life-long learning will reinforce the fact that this curriculum is not exhaustive.

Making students all do the same thing. The curriculum is intended to allow for freedom and customization. One student may be a gifted preacher and will graduate having prepared dozens of sermons. Another student may have talents in music and may not prepare more than one or two sermons. However, he or she may have written dozens of songs that express the heart of God as communicated in the Scriptures. The professors must remember that each student will be given freedom to put their learning into practice in their own way. Some content and experience will be required of all students, but there will be many opportunities for personalization of assignments.

Laziness. Nothing would sink the ship of this new curriculum more quickly than lack of preparation or lack of hard work in facilitation by the professors. Because of the curriculum structure, professors will be given both the freedom and responsibility to prepare for the time to be spent with the community of learners. Wednesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays must not be seen as merely "free time" but as time allotted to prepare well for the following week. It takes hard work to prepare learning experiences and hard work to facilitate them properly.

Side-by-side content rather than true integration. Given a day and a half to involve the students with certain Scripture, themes, connections, etc. it might be tempting to silo the content and experiences rather than mix them. The professors might want to focus on Genesis only for the first hour, anthropology for the second hour, worship ministry for the fourth hour, and so on without ever connecting them together. This is not the intention of the curriculum at all. Instead, the topics and experiences are to be integrated. Worship and anthropology should flow from the text of Genesis. Other literature should be introduced to add insight or to stimulate discussion, always leading back to the text of Scripture and resulting in action at the appropriate times.

Trying to make all professors the same. The dean, or whoever supervises the professors, will need to allow the professors freedom to be themselves. Each professor will have strengths and weaknesses, yet will be required to seek integration. If professors are strong in New Testament, they should be allowed to serve in that portion of the curriculum. However, they may be required to introduce students to ministry among the poor, for which they may not have any experience. They should be encouraged to make every effort to be faithful in the area where they do not excel, although they should be allowed to lean on other team teachers and area church leaders.

Interpersonal conflict. Working in teaching teams always creates the potential for conflict. Trying to do it with a new curriculum that is rather open-ended magnifies the potential. Professors will need to

be prayerful, communicative, forgiving, unity-maintaining, etc. There will be conflict. Each participant must be willing to commit themselves to resolving conflict under the leadership of the Lord Jesus. Conflict should be expected among the learners as well. How the professors handle conflict should be a good learning experience for the students. This is a valuable part of the curriculum because it is an ongoing ministry in the churches.

Lack of academic rigor. This curriculum may be criticized by outsiders as lacking academic rigor. If that means the graduate has a deeper spiritual life and greater skill in ministry than the average seminary graduate, that would be a compliment. But if it means that the learners are not gaining important biblical, theological and contemporary content, it should be incorrect. This curriculum will integrate academic content in such a way that learners will have an understanding of the Bible, theology and contemporary sources that will often surpass graduates of other schools. Much presented by lecture alone is forgotten; integrated learning is more memorable. However, the program must not be allowed to degenerate into experiential learning that ignores important academic learning. Professors must be wise in maintaining a balance of academic content and ministry experience, always connected by the fence posts of praxis.

Conclusion

I believe the proposed new curriculum for theological education would help reduce the fragmentation found in most current seminary programs. Students would be engaged in a more life-like process of learning that could be continued after graduation. Blocks of time and content integration would help learners and teachers see the world more holistically. There would be freedom and flexibility to customize time spent together to fit the needs of the learners.

I would appreciate your feedback. Do you think the proposed approach to theological education has potential? If so, would you be interested in helping to shape this curriculum? I am seeking like-minded educators to help pilot this curriculum and a setting in which to do so.

Reference List

Banks, Robert. 1999. *Reenvisioning theological education: Exploring a missional alternative to current models.* Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Downs , Perry G. 1994. *Teaching for spiritual growth: An introduction to Christian education.* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.

Elliston, Edgar J. 1999. *Teaching them obedience in all things: Equipping for the 21st century.* Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library.

Farley, Edward. 1988. *The fragility of knowledge: Theological education in the church and the university.* Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press.

Ferris, Robert W. 1990. *Renewal in theological education: Strategies for change.* Wheaton, IL: Billy Graham Center.

Fink, L. Dee. 2003. *Creating significant learning experiences: An integrated approach to designing college courses.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Harkness, Allan. 2001. Deschooling the theological seminary. *Teaching theology and religion* 4, no. 3: 141-154.

Huba, Mary E. and Jann E. Freed. 2000. *Learner-centered assessment on college campuses: Shifting the focus from teaching to learning.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Kemp, Roger. ed. 1994. *Text and context in theological education.* Australia: International Council of Accrediting Agencies for Evangelical Theological Education.

Knowles, Malcolm. 1973. *The adult learner: A neglected species.* Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Company.

Knowles, Malcolm. 1980. *The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy.* Chicago, IL: Follett Publishing Company.

Kolb, David A. 1984. *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Palmer, Parker J. 1993. *To know as we are known: Education as a spiritual journey.* San Francisco, CA: Harper Collins.

Pazmiño, Robert W. 1994. *By what authority do we teach?: Sources for empowering Christian educators.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.

Pazmiño, Robert W. 1997. *Foundational issues in Christian education: An introduction in evangelical perspective.* 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.

Plueddemann, James E. 2003. *Readings in revitalizing global theological education.* Deerfield, IL: Trinity Evangelical Divinity School.

Roozen, David A., Alice Frazer Evans and Robert A. Evans. 1996. *Changing the way seminaries teach: Globalization and theological education.* Hartford, CT: Center for Social and Religious Research, Hartford Seminary.

Slattery, Patrick. 1995. *Curriculum development in the postmodern era.* New York, NY: Garland Publishing.

Tyler, Ralph W. 1949. *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Vella, Jane. 2001. *Taking learning to task: Creative strategies for teaching adults.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

About the Author

Richard A. Cotton has been a pastor, educator and missions mobilizer in Michigan, Texas, California and North Dakota. He is now pursuing his Ph.D. in Educational Studies at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School while living in Grand Rapids, Michigan. He and his wife Christy have three children.