
Theological Education

New Perspectives on Theological Education

Volume 34
Number 2
Spring 1998

ats

Theological Education

New Perspectives on Theological Education

Volume 34
Number 2
Spring 1998

ats

THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION
Volume 34, Number 2
Spring 1998

DANIEL O. ALESHIRE	Executive Editor
MICHAEL A. FAHEY	Issue Editor
NANCY MERRILL	Managing Editor
MARY McMILLAN	Production Assistant

Theological Education is published semiannually by
The Association of Theological Schools
IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA
10 Summit Park Drive
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15275-1103.

For subscription information or to order
additional copies or selected back issues,
please contact the Association.
phone: 412-788-6505
fax: 412-788-6510
e-mail: ats@ats.edu
website: <http://www.ats.edu>

© 1998

The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by means of any information storage or retrieval system, except as may be expressly permitted by the 1976 Copyright Act, or in writing from the publisher.

Permission is hereby granted without charge for the reproduction and distribution of this work, or any of its parts, for educational purposes by the faculty or administration of member institutions of The Association of Theological Schools, provided that no fee or compensation is charged for copies, use of, or access to such information beyond the actual cost of reproduction or access, and that the copyright notice is included intact.

Requests for permission for all other uses of any part of this work should be addressed in writing to the Managing Editor, The Association of Theological Schools, 10 Summit Park Drive, Pittsburgh, PA 15275-1103.

This periodical is indexed in *Religion Index One: Periodicals*, *Religion Indexes: RIO/RIT/IBRR 1975- on CD-ROM* and *ATLA Religion Database on CD-ROM*, published by American Theological Library Association, 820 Church Street, Evanston IL 60201-5613; E-mail: atla@atla.com; WWW:<http://atla.library.vanderbilt.edu/atla/home.html>.

Contents

Introduction	v
<i>Michael A. Fahey</i>	
Seminary Sabbatical: A Guide to Interdisciplinary Travel	1
<i>Elaine Cathcart Nocks</i>	
When Professors Become Counselors: Ethical Land Mines in the Seminary	9
<i>Mark Davies</i>	
Training Church Musicians: What Are the Appropriate Methods?	17
<i>Edward Foley, Capuchin</i>	
Wisdom Communities: Models for Christian Formation and Pedagogy	25
<i>Mary Margaret Pazdan</i>	
Who's Mentoring the Mentors? The Discipling Dimension of Faculty Development in Christian Higher Education	31
<i>Shelly Cunningham</i>	
U.S. Hispanics/Latinos and the Field of Graduate Theological Education	51
<i>Manuel Jesús Mejido</i>	
Black Theology on Theological Education	73
<i>Dwight N. Hopkins</i>	
Educational Assessment for Future Consideration	85
<i>Evelyn A. McDonald</i>	
The Vision, Values, and Vocation of a Development Officer in a School of Theology and Ministry	93
<i>Vincent Cushing, O.F.M.</i>	

Continuing the Conversation

Theological Education invites short responses to articles published in this issue to encourage and promote conversation among its readers. Reader responses should be fewer than 1500 words and may be edited for length. Please send responses to Managing Editor, ATS, 10 Summit Park Drive, Pittsburgh, PA 15275-1103 <merrill@ats.edu>.

ATS Communications Advisory Committee

Elizabeth C. Nordbeck, Chair

Michael A. Fahey

Alan Hayes

Paul R. House

Roy Larson

Rex D. Matthews

Robert J. Wister

Theological Education, the journal of The Association of Theological Schools, is devoted solely to issues and ideas in graduate theological education in North America. The journal supports the mission of the Association by: (1) providing a forum for scholarly discourse on current issues and trends in graduate theological education in the United States and Canada; (2) addressing the contemporary issues facing the community of theological schools; (3) sharing models of critical analysis and effective practice in theological education; and (4) recording the changes and advances in theological education.

Introduction

Michael A. Fahey

Marquette University, Department of Theology

For this issue of *Theological Education* we are fortunate indeed to draw upon a rich variety of experiences from different ministerial programs across North America. First we hear from two voices rooted in the discipline of psychology who ventured into theological studies. Elaine Cathcart Nocks of Furman University in Greenville, South Carolina, after teaching undergraduate psychology for some twenty-five years, embarked on “interdisciplinary travel” during a sabbatical year of seminary study at Duke University Divinity School and then with a subsequent enrollment in the M.Div. program at Candler School of Theology. She describes the navigational lessons she learned in what for her was an uncharted discipline and the new perspectives she gained for her own discipline of psychology. Here she illustrates how her ingrained theoretical assumptions from the social sciences were broadened by her seminary sojourn. Finally, she identifies three critical tools she has taken from theological study for use in psychology: contextual analysis, narrative analysis, and imagination. She closes with a provocative question: could not such a journey be taken in reverse, from theology into psychology, with a similar widening of knowledge?

From the Canadian context, Mark Davies of Edmonton Baptist Seminary, a chartered psychologist, examines what he calls an ethical “land mine.” He has in mind situations where professors in the seminary become counselors to their students. Acknowledging the multiple roles that faculty members serve as teachers, administrators, counselors, and confessors, he notes that often they have little training in the fine points of professional ethics. He suggests that schools often lack a clearly articulated process by which ethical standards are consistently communicated and enforced. He then explores three critical concerns for professors and students entering into a counseling relationship: how the power imbalance renders the student vulnerable, issues of confidentiality, and the need for responsible care by a competent counselor.

Two subsequent articles focus on pedagogical perspectives in theological education. Capuchin Father Edward Foley of Catholic Theological Union in Chicago, Illinois, proposes appropriate methods for training church musicians. He argues that the “theory-practice” approach of ecclesial and musical training is inadequate. What is missing is the interface of musical and theological training that requires the mutual, critical correlation of musical-ecclesial practice and musical-ecclesial theory. Practical theology and “ethnomusicology” are, in his view, the two principal methods for the adequate formation of church

musicians. Practical theology where there is mutual regard for theory and practice involves methods promoting critical and constructive reflection. For church musicians this necessitates attending to and reflecting on current practice to shape the faith and theology their music wishes to foster. An ethnomusicological methodology, he reasons, recognizes the power of music in ritual and likewise draws on North America's rich cultural diversity.

Mary Margaret Pazdan, associate professor of biblical studies at the Aquinas Institute of Theology in St. Louis, Missouri, shows how she has labored to create "wisdom communities" among students in theological education. She considers wisdom communities to be not only essential to the life and growth of the church but also for theological education and individual ministerial formation. Pazdan shares with readers the methods and approaches she has used to promote a wisdom community of learners. Students are asked to share a "personal inventory" of specific theological areas and learning goals. They are encouraged to compare their personal experiences and goals with those of the course objectives, and to identify essential attitudes for critical dialogue. She suggests that personal experience is the first horizon for interpretation of assigned readings. The second involves critical inquiry into the tradition, followed by reappropriating the texts in light of critical inquiry with hermeneutical lenses. She concludes with illustrations from a recent syllabus.

Shelly Cunningham of Talbot School of Theology in La Mirada, California, in her article "Who's Mentoring the Mentors?" offers a faculty development perspective. She draws upon the results of a survey among full-time, tenure-track faculty members in a coalition of Christian colleges. She explores the benefits of effective mentoring relationships, but also the barriers. She defines and distinguishes the terms "mentoring" and "discipling," noting that they differ primarily in the areas of goal, content, and authority. One aspect of her survey has been to determine whether faculty teaching in a Christian college, where the biblical principle of discipleship is promoted, had different views or experiences of mentoring from those at public educational institutions. Her study shows that, while ninety-three percent of respondents believe that senior faculty have a responsibility to mentor younger faculty, only one-third reported ever having engaged in mentoring. Because eighty percent of those responding reported that their mentoring relationships were formed voluntarily, she urges institutions to create settings in which mentoring relationships can be encouraged and nurtured.

A further study is offered by Manuel Jesús Mejido, a doctoral student in the Graduate Division of Religion at Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia. He provides a demographic perspective on Hispanics in the United States and in theological education. He notes that whereas in 1996 Hispanics made up 10.3% of the U.S. population, they remained the most underrepresented racial/ethnic presence in the ATS member institutions, namely only 2.4% of faculty and 2.7%

of students during the fall of 1996. With the Hispanic population expected to become the single largest minority group in the U.S. (an anticipated 25.6% of the total population by the year 2050), he urges theological education to open itself to the particularities and vicissitudes of Latino students to prepare them to serve the religious needs of this rapidly growing segment of the U.S. population. In his opinion, this would involve dynamic engagement in the external societal environment and the internal structure of the theological school. This requires not only increased efforts to recruit Latino faculty and students, but also development of offerings that reflect the changing religious needs in the U.S.

Dwight N. Hopkins from the University of Chicago Divinity School offers an African-American perspective on theological education. Drawing from the insights of a black theology of liberation, he argues that theological education does not have a neutral stance, but is compelled to work for the liberation of all creation, beginning with the most marginalized of society's members. Drawing upon the Exodus narrative as proof of God's care for all people and citing a variety of African-American religious folk sayings, he illustrates how the Bible witnesses to humanity's liberation from suffering. He reasons that God's liberating presence must be embodied in the tangible, where people of faith are called upon to transform the world and to provide an equitable sharing of resources. Theological education needs to attend, through its methodology, to an integration of the practical and cognitive experiences of a diverse student body and the integration of compassion with intellect. Knowledge, he argues, arises only within the interchange between and among diverse voices.

Student perceptions of their theological education at one ATS member school provide the basis for reflection on the assessment of the school's institutional and educational effectiveness. Evelyn McDonald of Memphis Theological Seminary describes how her institution, while preparing its self-study, examined graduating students' perceptions of the effectiveness of master's level programs in relation to the theological goals enumerated in the seminary's mission statement. Helpful information was also gleaned from student comments about diversity and ecumenical awareness, transformative experiences and what contributed to them, and the challenges of educating a student body that is diverse in its denominational backgrounds, ages, and prior career experiences. McDonald suggests that theological schools should employ an assessment methodology more qualitative than quantitative so as to gain a more accurate picture of the supports beneficial to today's students.

The final contribution to this issue is written by the senior administrator and educator, retiring president Vincent Cushing of the Washington Theological Union. As an experienced chief administrative officer in a theological school, he shares his views on the critical role of the development officer. He draws upon his experience of two decades as a seminary president to stress the importance of strong collaboration and honest communication between the advancement officer and the president. He argues that equally

important are the development officer's commitment to the school's overall mission, familiarity with the school's strategic plan and needs, and the ability to articulate the institution's past, present, and future finances. For him, development work is essentially offering devout Christians opportunities to promote values they support and to share with an institution in preparing community builders and the meaning-makers of tomorrow.

We wish our colleagues pleasant reading and fruitful reflection!

Seminary Sabbatical: A Guide to Interdisciplinary Travel

Elaine Cathcart Nocks
Furman University

ABSTRACT: Apart from its traditional purposes and outcomes, seminary education can provide some unique and unexpected benefits for those originally trained in other disciplines. The article provides a description of such cross-disciplinary engagement as experienced by a social scientist. An effort is made to identify the particular ways in which the theoretical and methodological assumptions of social science are challenged and necessarily broadened by theological education.

It is increasingly evident that seminarians are a heterogeneous group, pluralistic in appearance as well as in purpose. More and more, the first day of class invitation to describe one's call to ministry evokes nontraditional responses. Certainty about the goal of ordination is far from universal for those entering, as well as for those exiting, seminary classes. Whether the changing face of seminarians is a matter for concern or for rejoicing will be affected by the particular perspective of the reader. My intention, however, is to highlight some implications of this potentially widening vista for those on both sides of theological education—those who teach in the seminaries and those who may enter theological study from vocations outside traditional ministry and who may or may not return to those callings.

Before I attempt to identify the powerful and unexpected ways in which theological education can engage those entering from other disciplines, I must first identify my particular perspective. I am a social psychologist with more than twenty years of college teaching experience. In 1991, with what must have seemed to my colleagues rather unorthodox professional purposes, I spent a sabbatical year in seminary study at Duke University Divinity School. After that I continued teaching psychology to undergraduates, but two years later, at the end of my rotation as department head, I returned to seminary. I enrolled, this time committed to completing the Master of Divinity degree, having been granted a leave of absence by my university for that purpose. Thanks to the amazing flexibility of my employer and my family, and aided by a grant from the Robert W. Woodruff Foundation, I graduated from Candler School of Theology of Emory University in May of 1996.

Like my seminary colleagues, I was on a personal and vocational quest that sought the resources of biblical study, theology, and pastoral training. Unlike many of them, I carried the fruits of my seminary education back to my prior calling—the teaching of college psychology. Though I did not change professions, there is no question but that I returned a changed person. New learning always requires intellectual reintegration, but theological study demands even more. It challenges one's whole approach to the human experience and offers a depth of personal fulfillment that is not confined to the academic realm.

But it *was*, for awhile, a visit to another continent for me, and there were some important navigational lessons to be learned. I cannot begin to share the substance and content of all I learned in seminary, but I can share the gist of the lessons involved in navigating an unknown discipline, and the new perspectives I gained on the familiar terrain of my own discipline “from a distance.”

Convince Me: The Lesson of Humility

When I first began my theological studies, I naturally enough approached them from the “outside”—as a psychologist critically examining the assumptions and methods of theology while seeking to discern the “acceptability” of the content. In my favor, I had already recognized some of the limitations of science and had always considered myself to be a person of faith. However, as a liberally educated person, I was set to resist any hint of indoctrination or any apparent compromising of reason. From that defensive position, I immediately found myself in a tense dialogue with the material, not to mention with my companions in learning. The problem was not that I held a critical attitude; it was that I entered expecting theology to prove itself to me—to a psychologist. I did not seem to consider that *I* had anything that needed proving or examining. Such, I think, is often the assumed prerogative of science in our culture: “Convince me.”

It is, incidentally, a very wise thing to take courses for academic credit, even if there is not official reason to do so. Under the evaluative norms of papers, tests, and final exams, it becomes embarrassing not to do well, and one is much more likely to take the perspectives of the new discipline and its resources seriously. What I quickly discovered was that I was a stranger and a child on the foreign ground of theology. I might be a knowledgeable and experienced psychologist, but I did not know how to speak or understand the language here. Neither did I understand the maps that guided exploration, nor the criteria that limited intellectual imperialism, and these are essential parameters to know about any discipline.

My first lesson on this interdisciplinary journey was thus *humility* (not accidentally my first lesson in faith as well).

The Second Lesson: Getting Close Enough to Touch

Before entering seminary, I had been part of interdisciplinary teaching teams that occasionally offered courses involving both psychology and religion. *Then* it had not seemed so difficult to place the two disciplines into critical conversation. By contrast, in the seminary classroom, the flow and direction of the conversation between psychology and religion was not under *my* control. Neither did I find myself in a relatively tolerant buffer zone of cross-disciplinary intellectual exchange, but rather deeply within the territory on the “other side.” It was an important reminder for me that *who is in charge* makes a big difference in the content and direction of academic interchange.

No longer simply a border guard on one side or a tourist passing through the other side, I had committed to at least temporary residence in the new discipline, and this I have come to believe is a very important step to genuine interdisciplinary understanding. Another discipline cannot be engaged with integrity by standing apart and viewing from a distance, any more than can be another ethnic group or another individual. To know another authentically, it is necessary to move in “*close enough to touch*”—a rich metaphor provided me by the Rev. Susan Leonard-Ray in a sermon on Matthew 9:20.

Thus the second lesson for me on the interdisciplinary journey was the necessity of going inside, allowing myself to become personally engaged, *getting close enough to touch*.

Lesson Three: The Boundaries Are Real

The terrain looks different inside. For example, although it may sound naïve to my colleagues in both disciplines, it had not occurred to me from the outside that there might really be a place of genuine and legitimate *conflict* between the perspectives of religion and psychology—a place where conversation would inevitably end, and a commitment would have to be made to one side or the other. Both my personal faith and my view of science had been trained to tolerate the ambiguities that each introduced for the other. Before crossing the border, I was pretty sure that psychology could be *integrated* with religion (notice the apparent order of authority) in ways that would enhance both. I am still not ready to concede that conflict is inevitable or integration impossible. Maybe someday the basic assumptions that separate the disciplines will give way to others that will ultimately bring them closer together, but I am now not so blind to the implications of those traditional assumptions. Starting points do dictate stopping points—points beyond which one cannot go without reassessing where one has begun.

My prior interdisciplinary work had taken as its purpose to show how science and religion could enhance and supplement each other in the human endeavor to know truth. I sought to find ways to break down the boundaries

posed by what seemed to me to be overly rigid assumptions. I now recognize this goal as deeply embedded in the “conquer-all” presumption of an unquestioned intellectual liberalism. I had never seriously considered whether there were critical limits to tolerance. This was the third lesson of the interdisciplinary journey. It let me know that serious and honest *critical dialogue* rather than premature integration is essential to the truth-seeking process. The boundaries are permeable, but they are real.

Tools and Baggage

The aforementioned lessons are similar to the lessons that must be learned by anyone truly wishing for authentic understanding of another culture. They involve the overcoming of a certain ethnocentrism. If one is able to do that, then it is possible to prepare to enter into more substantive levels of learning. The next steps concern the acquisition of appropriate *tools* and the elimination of unnecessary *baggage*. What one later takes home for future use may turn out to be a mixture of old and new—at least that has been the case for me.

Once I had settled in, I think that I was a little surprised and certainly gratified that I did not need to jettison the basic tools of scientific reasoning (logic and empiricism) in order to do theology. To the contrary, I found insistence upon the “quadrilateral” authorities of text, tradition, *reason*, and *experience*. This approach, however, highlighted for me a necessary critical interaction and mutual self-correction among sources. I became aware of the danger of relying on accumulated knowledge alone (*text*) without recognizing the role that context (*experience*) plays in both origination and later interpretation of textual material. I saw the need for an awareness of *tradition* (or the normative position of those committed to the substance of investigation) in establishing parameters for further exploration and interpretation. And I was encouraged by the high premium placed on *reason* as a parameter (but not the only parameter) of interpretation.

While I could write at length on the liberation of my *theological* questing by the coordinates of the “quadrilateral” sources of authority, my purpose here is to identify the impact of the concrete tools represented by those coordinates on my thinking about scientific method in *psychology*. That impact has been significant and has corresponded with some emergent trends in methodology for the social sciences. I would like to elaborate briefly upon three critical and creative tools that I procured from theological study for subsequent use in psychology: *contextual analysis*, *narrative analysis*, and *imagination*. It will be obvious to some that these tools assume a constructive understanding of knowledge that is only recently finding its way into contemporary scientific discourse.

I learned that *contextual analysis* takes into account not only the circumstances under which texts and knowledge arise, but also takes into account the

contexts under which they are later interpreted and applied. I found especially useful the idea of a matrix of interpretation in which the original and the contemporary contexts are allowed to come into interaction. Thus, for example, one might be asked to consider how the words of the Apostle Paul on the proper role of women in the early church could be interpreted for a contemporary feminist witness. The pivotal idea of contextual analysis, I learned, is that you cannot dismiss either end. You must take seriously the meaning and purpose of the text *as it was written* in order to allow it to speak *now*. Only this kind of approach guards both against misuse of texts for contemporary purposes (e.g., to support oppression) and also against premature suppression of texts that disturb or threaten contemporary values.

As a scientist, I had not spent a lot of time considering the possibility that an empirically derived knowledge base might warrant intentional contextual analysis. Certainly I knew that we had to be aware of possible “observer biases,” “sampling errors,” “response biases,” and “extraneous variables” in the conducting of experiments. But those I understood to be methodological *mistakes*, not inevitable contextual features of any base of knowledge. Now I can see that, even though most of our psychology texts are not ancient, contextual examination is highly appropriate; indeed, it may be dangerous to circumvent.

While I may not name it as such, I have begun to teach my psychology students how to do contextual exegesis of published research. They are required to consider the historical/cultural context of theory and data being put forth for use in the discipline. Moreover, they are asked to look for perspectival biases, omissions, and distortions (e.g., gender and ethnic gaps) that may have affected even the choice of questions being researched. And they are asked to consider and name the context of their own viewpoint.

It is this contextual factor of personal perspective, or the hermeneutic of experience, that tends to create the most difficulty for social science. After all, it smacks of subjectivity—the nemesis of scientific method. Yet knowledge about human behavior and experience should, I have come to see, be understood not only as a gathering of facts but also as an uncovering of stories. In this respect, I found the *narrative* approach to biblical studies remarkably helpful in conceptualizing and justifying the possibilities and purposes of qualitative analysis in the social sciences. Most psychologists recognize that individual stories provide the inductive material for the formulation of theories; however, in social science we often tend to set aside the collection of stories as *preliminary* to the “real” work of data collection.

Narrative analysis has offered three helpful methodological perspectives for my work in psychology. First I have increasing respect for the integrity of *qualitative methods* of data collection, methods in which persons are allowed and encouraged to engage in a self-descriptive process, and to reveal through that process, their own perceptions of beginnings, endings, and motives. Second, I now read even the most pedantic of psychology texts as *authored* works—

narratives in which personal choices are made concerning where to begin, where to end, and what is important to communicate. Even when the purpose is to present the accumulated facts in an area of research, the presenter's purposes intervene and must be critically assessed.

Finally, the narrative tools I acquired in seminary for the purpose of biblical study have offered me a distinctive gift—the gift of *personal interaction* with texts! While my previous literary excursions had evoked some sense of participation in the lives and landscapes of novels and poetry, I had not really thought of my engagement with these or other kinds of texts as *interactive*. I had not been consciously aware that the text forming my own personal story actually *gave shape* to the text I encountered—whether it was the New Testament story of the woman with a hemorrhage or a psychology article on grieving broken relationships. This understanding now demands that I ask critical questions of both the text and my life and continue to seek ways to encourage students of psychology to forge a bond between the texture of their own life stories and the theories offered them by textbooks and articles.

The Tool of Progression: Imagination

When one enters a foreign culture, the initial work concerns abandoning ethnocentrism, learning the new language, and becoming socialized to the customs of that culture. Then, if one resides and works there for awhile, one acquires the tools essential for survival. At last, if all goes well, one is ready to adventure out into more untravelled areas and unaccustomed activities. The work turns toward creativity and vision, and the application of a more subtle tool of knowledge-gathering: the tool of *imagination*.

In theological study I learned that the function of imagination is to fill in the blank spaces of past and future, thereby enabling us to participate in the creation of realities beyond our present knowledge. For example, we may use imagination to hear voices and see faces from the past that we know are there, but that have remained invisible to history. We can, for example, extrapolate mothers, sisters, and daughters where narrative and historical accounts tell only of men. We are clear that this work is imaginative—that it is our creation seeking to understand what might have been.

Imagination also tries to fill in the blanks of what has not yet happened—the future. William Lynch, in his book *Images of Hope*, concludes that imagination, as the ability to visualize a future, is the very essence of hope, and hope is essential to survival.¹ Eschatological theology rests upon this kind of imagination and hope. Closer to home, the literary domain of science fiction has demonstrated that imagination is often the precursor to actual history and can be the mother of scientific progress. It should take even less effort to show that the researcher in the laboratory has imagined at least some of the potential results of the scientific study being conducted, otherwise why begin? Explora-

tion, investigation, and progress are thus never without some envisioned horizon of direction.

I have not yet plumbed the possibilities of how I will highlight the tool of imagination in psychology, but I am fully convinced of its pedagogical value. In the classroom and in the lab, encouragement of imagination can temper some of the potentially stifling effects of organization and structure upon creative thought. In the realm of scientific research, it teaches us how to look for what is missing, for what is yet needed, and for what might be possible. Taken to its limits, imagination enables us to color outside the lines of accepted paradigms and parameters. Surely this is what generates the grand paradigm shifts that compose the forward movement of knowledge.

Epilogue for Interdisciplinary Travelers

It will no doubt be apparent by now that the various aspects of this voyage across disciplinary boundaries have some relationship to one another. Adopting a stance of intellectual humility, getting “close enough to touch,” recognizing boundaries and crossing points, using imagination in the service of creative progression—all these facilitate dialogue among diverse perspectives. All promote a more wholistic search for knowledge and truth.

Finally, this article begs the question: *Could the journey be taken in reverse—from theology into psychology—with the expectation of just as much insight into the ecology of knowledge?* I truly believe that this is the case for these two, and not only these two, disciplines. Edward Farley, in his compelling book on *The Fragility of Knowledge*, reminds us that overcoming disciplinary isolation is key to the self-correction of knowledge and the avoidance of trivialization.² Despite the fact that we can hardly appropriate the information of even one field in sufficient depth, we may be obliged to stretch ourselves beyond our present capacities, if for no other reason than to have more adequate maps of the landscape of knowledge.

Elaine Cathcart Nocks, professor of psychology at Furman University in Greenville, South Carolina, has taught psychology at the undergraduate level for twenty-five years. For a sabbatical in 1991, she completed one year of seminary education at Duke University Divinity School. She received the Master of Divinity degree from Candler School of Theology of Emory University in 1996.

ENDNOTES

1. William Lynch, *Images of Hope* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1965).
2. Edward Farley, *The Fragility of Knowledge* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 48-49.

When Professors Become Counselors: Ethical Land Mines in the Seminary

Mark Davies

Edmonton Baptist Seminary

ABSTRACT: The dual role of a seminary professor, when he or she becomes both teacher and counselor to students, presents special challenges, some of which can be ethical in nature. Among these challenges, the author argues, is the “power imbalance” in the teacher/student relationship. To safeguard both professors and students, the author suggests that institutions involve both groups in discussing, debating, and developing a code of ethics to provide guidelines that can be consistently and meaningfully enforced.

At a recent student forum at Edmonton Baptist Seminary, a first-year student asked if professors were only interested in helping students with their academic problems, or “are they there to help students with personal and spiritual problems?” The dean stated that faculty wanted to participate with students on a personal level. Wisely, he added the caution, “However, it must be remembered that most of us are not professional counselors.” The dean’s response reflected the underlying dynamic that guides many seminaries. It is based on the premise that seminary is not a place where students come merely to master academic subjects, but that it is a place where the character and spirituality of the students are shaped and molded.

The ATS policy statement on “Professional Ethics for Teachers” suggests that ethical behavior on behalf of faculty includes, among others:

- Respecting the students’ integrity and individuality as persons and helping them face personal problems.
- Being concerned for the nurture and maturation of the student’s motivation as a minister.
- Sharing decisions concerning the total academic and/or professional destiny of students with appropriate faculty, colleagues, and committees.
- Protecting professional confidences and information that should remain the sole possession of the administration and faculty.¹

Thus, while faculty may not be “professional” counselors, nevertheless counseling is an important and expected function they perform with their

students. This counseling role presents many challenges for faculty, some of which are ethical in nature.

The Problem

The very dynamics that place faculty in the multifaceted roles of teachers, administrators, counselors, and confessors set up the potential for ethical dilemmas. Yet faculty, while trained in Christian ethics that address issues of personal and social morality, often have little or no training in professional ethics. Trull and Carter² note there is often resistance by Christian professionals to adopting codes of ethics. Often the unspoken underlying assumption is, "because we are Christians, we are ethical." Such an assumption is easily challenged. The problem is compounded by the fact that existing codes of ethics for many seminaries often have a greater focus on academic concerns rather than the professor-student relationship. Such codes often take a largely principled approach, which defines what should be considered in making an ethical decision. Frequently what is lacking are ethical standards that set forth enforceable rules. The result is often an abstract set of principles that individual faculty members may or may not use in interpreting their situation. The result is that the recognition and resolution of ethical problems often become a largely assumed and unconscious process.

Larry Eberlein³ suggested that for a code of professional ethics to be meaningful it must: (1) make individuals sensitive to what the ethical issues are; (2) help make the ethical decision-making process intentional, which often results in multiple solutions; (3) help provide a method of recognizing and dealing with competing values; (4) help provide a decision-making process that is moral in nature; (5) provide a standard of professional norms; and (6) provide a method of consultation. Within the seminary context, the existing codes and the way they are employed may fall far short of these criteria. The frequent result is that students enter into counseling or mentoring relationships with professors who are unaware of the inherent ethical concerns of such relationships. This leaves the student vulnerable and at risk. This article explores three critical concerns for professor and student when they enter into a counseling relationship.

Dual Relationships

Dual relationships are those in which "therapists assume two roles simultaneously or sequentially with a person or persons engaging their professional assistance."⁴ The American Psychological Association's (APA) Code of Ethics is clear that such relationships should be avoided because they might "impair the psychologist's objectivity or otherwise interfere with the psychologist's effectively performing his or her functions as a psychologist, or might harm or

exploit the other party.”⁵ Thus, psychologists must not enter into a counseling relationship with their students as this would constitute an unethical dual relationship. While seminary professors may not be professional psychologists, they should not dismiss the ethical implications that the dual relationship has for them in their own setting.

Seminary professors who act as a student’s counselor or confessor have initiated a dual relationship. In so doing they are confronted with many of the same ethical principles and pitfalls that professional counselors must deal with. However, seminary professors cannot simply avoid such relationships, for it is an inherent part of their role. The relationship between the professor and the student happens within the context of community; whereas psychotherapy does not. The counseling that takes place between professional therapists and their clients has an explicit set of guidelines whereby boundaries, roles, and expectations are clearly defined. The fact that boundaries, roles, and expectations are less clear and less explicit in the seminary setting is an indication that there is an even greater need to think through the ethical dimensions of the student-professor relationship. Because of the greater possibility for exploitation and role confusion, the vulnerabilities of students need to be attended to.

This need is underscored by the fact that professors and students are already in an existing professional relationship. Both have entered into a contract where services (i.e., teaching) have been paid for (i.e., tuition). Legally and ethically students have the right to expect impartial, objective, and fair treatment from their professors. This may be jeopardized by the dynamics inherent in a counseling relationship. Transference, countertransference, confidentiality, and boundary management are all issues that must be managed within any counseling context. These are issues in which many seminary professors may have had no formal training. Faculty may not even understand the basic concepts of these psychological realities and have no awareness of the role they play in relationships.

Thus, for example, the seminarian, who comes to her ethics professor to share some of the grief and struggle she is still experiencing over the abortion she had as a teenager, wonders why her grades in Christian Ethics begin to slide. The professor, who steadfastly opposes abortion and who may not even consciously be aware of his own countertransference in this instance, insists that the marks simply reflect the quality of the student’s work. In an opposite scenario, a student who has experienced a great deal of personal trauma seeks counsel from his professor who is very caring and sympathetic to the student’s plight—so much so that substandard work is given disproportionately high marks.

Underlying these psychological dynamics is the reality of a significant power imbalance that exists between professors and students. Professors can play a very significant role in determining the student’s future. Thus, the student is vulnerable. One of the axioms of Christian ethics is that those in

power must do everything possible to protect the rights and well-being of the vulnerable. Unless there is thoughtful understanding of the ethical issues involved, the underlying psychology of dual relationships, and the inherent potential harm to the student, dual relationships have great potential to result in unethical behavior on the part of faculty.

Confidentiality

It is universally accepted that confidentiality is a key component in any counseling situation. Confidentiality provides the psychological safety necessary for the clients to discuss their problems freely with their therapists. Within the context of a professional counseling relationship, everything is deemed confidential between client and counselor with exceptions that are mandated by law. Yet what is confidential within the seminary community? Professors can find themselves between the competing rights of the student to confidential care and the responsibility they owe to the community of faith to graduate and recommend men and women of moral and religious integrity. Professors can err on the side of considering all material confidential. In so doing, they may be ignoring their legitimate responsibilities to serve and protect the community of faith. On the opposite end of the spectrum, professors can consider everything the student tells them as information that can be shared without the seminarian's knowledge.

The result is often that neither seminarians nor their professors know what will be kept in confidence and what will be shared within the community until it has already been divulged. For example, would a seminarian who struggles with pornography be "safe" in revealing this struggle to a seminary professor without fear of retribution or even expulsion? How can he know for sure? What is the professor to do in the face of such a revelation? What about those students who struggle with their sexual orientation? Can they freely share their struggle with a professor without fear of retribution or exposure? Answers to these questions will undoubtedly vary from seminary to seminary and from professor to professor—which is a significant problem for the student. If there are no explicit standards by which professors conduct their relationships with students, the students are at the caprice of the individual professor. In this scenario there are few safeguards that protect the rights and well-being of the students.

It should be noted that this ethical question is not confined to the counseling situation. Assignments that invite self-exploration and self-revelation are common in seminary settings. As part of course requirements professors often require that students hand in personal reflection papers, and typically they do so without being given any safeguards that protect the students' confidentiality. One can imagine the devastating consequences that could occur to a seminarian who is struggling with his or her sexual orientation, reveals this struggle in a personal reflection paper to a professor who subsequently "outs"

the individual by breaking the student's confidence. The results would likely be profoundly destructive to the spiritual and psychological well-being of the seminarian.

Conversely, seminary professors may feel trapped in a double bind in listening to a seminarian's confession. They may recognize the student's right to confidentiality, yet what has been revealed may be considered by the professor to be morally and spiritually unacceptable for someone training for ministry. In cases where the professor suspects the student is pathological or morally unfit, the professor may be uncertain about what to do. Within the counseling profession it is considered ethical to confer with colleagues regarding certain cases, provided the identity of the counselee is not revealed. Many counseling centers operate under the assumption that counselors will often consult with one another regarding a client. Whenever the counselors are confronted with an ethical dilemma they can typically phone their licensing agency for advice and guidance. Yet with whom does the seminary professor confer? What are the ethical guidelines faculty can use for aid in resolving the dilemma? If a professor were to go to the faculty with the situation of counseling a gay seminarian, could she discuss it without fear that the name of the individual would be demanded by the others? Clearly these are very complex questions and no one answer will suffice. What would be helpful in alleviating much of the problem involved with confidentiality would be for seminary faculties to discuss the issue among themselves and with students. The result could be a set of explicit guidelines about how confidences will be handled and what safeguards exist for the student and professor.

Responsible Care

Principle A of the American Psychological Association code of ethics is entitled "Competence."⁶ Basically the principle states that it is unethical for any psychologist to work in areas in which he or she has not been trained or is not qualified. Generally a guiding principle for all therapists is to "do no harm." Translating this principle to the seminary setting raises the question of the faculty's competence to counsel. What is being suggested here is not that all faculty need to receive psychology degrees in order to be competent. However, they should know enough basic psychology that they are able to recognize conditions like depression, anxiety, eating disorders, and personality disorders. The professor who attempts to cheer up the sad student by assigning positive Scripture verses or suggesting that the student is going through a dark night of the soul (a possibility to be sure) may not be helping, if in fact the student is clinically depressed and suicidal. The professor who uses the Bible to suggest that a female student "submit" to her husband may unknowingly be endangering her life with an emotionally or physically abusive husband. Faculty should have enough knowledge to be able to understand how complex

intrapsychic and spiritual problems can be. This awareness can help professors determine whether or not a student's presenting problem is beyond their level of competency. If the problem is one that deserves professional intervention, the professor should then assist the student in finding the right kind of help. Often times competency is simply knowing when and how to refer a student to a professional.

A second area of competency has to do with ethical behavior in general. Unethical behavior is irresponsible care. With regard to professional counseling ethics, there are three basic actions involved: they are taught; they are mandated; they are enforced. In order to safeguard the students as well as the faculty, a basic code of ethics should be developed, debated, and taught. If students and faculty do not know what their rights and responsibilities are, then they are unlikely to exercise them. The result is a greater potential for unethical behavior resulting in personal harm. However, it is not enough that ethical standards simply be taught and accepted, they must also be enforced. Litigation involving churches in the area of clergy sexual malfeasance has awakened the religious community to the fact that if it does not enforce ethical behavior among its members, the law courts will take on the role of enforcement. If professional ethics are not consistently and meaningfully enforced, they can become theoretical constructs rather than working realities. Thus, it is extremely important that seminaries develop well thought-out procedures for filing, investigating, and responding to ethical complaints. The procedures must be fair and impartial for both students and faculty. For complaints that are deemed significant in nature, it would appear that the most ethical response would be to have the investigation and response done by a third party not directly associated with the seminary. Perhaps representatives of a sister institution or a denominational ethics committee could intervene.

Conclusion

When professors become counselors or simply try to relate to their students on a personal level, they may unknowingly be entering into a whole host of potential ethical dilemmas. Even when professors recognize some of the possible pitfalls of such dual relationships, often they have no standards or methodology to guide them. Thus, the student is at the mercy of each individual professor. Unwittingly the two may have entered into a game in which there are no set rules, except those declared by the professor as the game unfolds. Both the student and professor can potentially lose; however, the student is at far greater risk to lose more.

Often ethical standards compete and must be weighed against one another. Solutions to such dilemmas typically do not fall into the dichotomy of "right" or "wrong," but instead are found along the gradient of "more right" versus "more wrong." Most of us work with implicit assumptions about what we

deem to be right and wrong. Rarely do we stop to question our assumptions in a meaningful and informed way. Indeed, many seminarians do not believe that they need a course on professional ethics—after all, the reasoning goes, “we are going to be ministers.” Yet confronting a class of seminarians with a true ethical dilemma and allowing them to argue it out among themselves is often the quickest route to convincing them that their foundations about what is right and what is wrong are not as certain as they think. Once that foundation is shaken, the path is cleared for creative ethical thinking. This is likely true for seminary professors as well.

Mark Davies is professor of family ministries at Carey Theological College and serves as adjunct faculty at Regent College and Edmonton Baptist Seminary. He is a chartered psychologist.

ENDNOTES

1. The Association of Theological Schools, “Professional Ethics for Teachers” policy statement, Bulletin 43, Part 1 (1998): 177-80.
2. J. Trull and J. Carter, *Ministerial Ethics* (USA: Broadman & Holman, 1993).
3. Larry Eberlein, “The Education of Psychologists in Ethical and Professional Conduct” (University of Alberta Publication, 1989), 1-9.
4. Horace C. Lukens, “Essential Elements for Ethical Counsel” *Christian Counseling Ethics*, 44-56. Randolph Sanders, ed. (Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press, 1997), 44-56.
5. American Psychological Association. “Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct,” *American Psychologist* 47 (1992): 1597-1611.
6. Ibid.

Training Church Musicians: What Are the Appropriate Methods?¹

*Edward Foley, Capuchin
Catholic Theological Union*

ABSTRACT: Church musicians are responsible to the worlds of church and music. As such they need to be trained ecclesially and musically. There are multiple methods available for each of these aspects of the church musicians' vocation. Adequate formation of church musicians requires the employment and acquisition of methods that take the musical-liturgical event seriously as a public, shared, ritualized theological event. Two prime methods for accomplishing this goal theologically and musically are practical theology and ethnomusicology.

Introduction

Church musicians (as implied by the duality of their title) are responsible to two worlds: church and music. As such they need to be trained ecclesially² and musically. There are multiple methods available for each of these aspects of the church musicians' vocation. To the extent that church musicians receive training in both, that training is ordinarily inadequate methodologically because it takes what could be characterized as a "theory-practice" approach to both church and music. Yet, neither church (especially the church's liturgy) nor music are first of all "theories" but rather are practices. The remedy to this inadequacy, therefore, is not only both musical and ecclesial training for church musicians, but musical and theological training which, in their methods and goals, do not assert the priority of predetermined theory over practice, but require the mutual, critical correlation³ of musical-ecclesial practice and musical-ecclesial theory. In short, adequate formation of church musicians requires the employment and acquisition of methods that take the musical-liturgical event seriously as a public, shared, ritualized theological event. Two prime methods for accomplishing this goal theologically and musically are practical theology and ethnomusicology.

Two Underlying Presuppositions

First, *worship is a faith event and theological act of the first order*. The ancient Christian tradition—asserted by Protestants,⁴ Roman Catholics,⁵ and Orthodox⁶ alike in this post-conciliar era—is that the act of worship is the church's first theology and a prized faith expression. The two-edged sword in this realization

is not only that worship expresses the church's faith, but it also creates it.⁷ By consequence, those trained in any liturgical ministry (e.g., presiders, preachers, and musicians) must be equipped to acknowledge and comprehend what faith and belief they are expressing and creating.

Second, *liturgical music is not only in worship, it is worship*. Music, variously wed to text and/or ritual action, is one of the languages of worship. Liturgical music, however, is not only a language spoken "in" the liturgy but is an essential language "of" the liturgy, to use the famous axiom of Joseph Gelineau.⁸ Roman Catholicism goes so far as dogmatically to acknowledge music as the *only* art integral to the church's official worship⁹ and to assert that the very act of liturgical music making is a fundamental expression of the very presence of Christ.¹⁰ Thus, music in the liturgy is never theologically neutral. Church musicians never simply "make" music in the liturgy. Authentic liturgical music (which is not the same as "sacred music")¹¹ like the liturgy itself, it is always about the expression and creation of belief and faith; broadly speaking, liturgical music can be considered a sacramental act.¹² Thus, church musicians must reckon not simply with their artistry, but also with their musical "sacrament" and the kind of faith and belief this music expresses and creates.

General Methodological Considerations

In a recent address,¹³ David Tracy of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago identified what he considered to be the three great separations of modern Western culture. According to Tracy, these three fatal separations are: (1) the separation of feeling and thought, (2) the separation of form and content, and (3) the separation of theory and practice.¹⁴

Tracy convincingly argues that these modern separations were based on an originally helpful distinction that, in modernity, became a separation. Tracy notes the relative ease with which both the ancients and the medievals were capable of making such distinctions, while at the same time insisting that these must not be made into separations. Tracy recognizes that these separations are not the bequest of ancient or medieval thought but of modernity, and he suggests that we must "face and heal these separations which modernity has bequeathed and postmodernity is happily undoing."¹⁵

While it would be valuable to explore all three of these distinctions become separations from the viewpoint of liturgical music, it is the third of these (the interplay of theory and practice) that especially needs to be addressed when considering the formation of church musicians.

Tracy suggested that there are three possible paradigms for the interplay of theory and practice.¹⁶ The first of these he characterized as a theory-practice approach in which the theory is worked out in one arena (for example, music history) and applied in another (for example, worship). Tracy considers this an inadequate model for a variety of reasons. The most compelling of these, from my

perspective, is the critique that in this model the theory is never affected by any practice: an unacceptable perspective from the viewpoint of disciplines as diverse as astrophysics, economics, and liturgical theology—as each continuously asserts the import of actual events or outcomes for shaping theory. Maybe most compelling for any engaged in religion and the arts is the growing awareness that our life perspectives, business presuppositions, artistic paradigms, and religious frameworks are all culturally conditioned. A theory-practice approach, however, that tends toward the universalization of theory disallows such theory to be challenged and critiqued by cultural particularity.

Tracy's second model for the interplay of theory and practice, which he also believes to be inadequate, is one that allows no place for critical reflection. He characterizes this as a practice-practice model. Tracy comments that this model "does not sublimate theory but simply negates it." In this model "concrete actions and commitments to a particular cause supply all the criteria necessary for truth in theology. This second model . . . does correctly affirm the primacy of praxis for theory . . . [but it] fails to see that all praxis, like all experience, is in fact theory-laden."¹⁷ Just as it is inadequate to cede primacy to theory to the exclusion of practice as a credible dialogue partner, so is it unacceptable to validate practice without critical reflection. Musically playing the notes without understanding the construction of a musical work results in unreflective and inadequate performance. While practice is essential to the performer, practice-practice-practice models of training are clearly inadequate.

As Tracy argues that both theory-practice and practice-practice models are inadequate, he concludes by proposing that an authentic model for theology is one that calls for "the mutually critical correlation of the interpreted theory and praxis of the Christian fact and the interpreted theory and praxis of the contemporary situation."¹⁸ This image of a mutually critical correlation calls for a "collaborative dialogue . . . in which each can challenge the other and contribute both descriptive and normative statements, coming to a deeper understanding through their essentially equal dialogue."¹⁹

Mutual Critical Correlation and Theological/Liturgical Methods

Classic methods in theology since the early medieval period and, by extension, emergent methods in liturgics that developed out of classical theology, have generally prized theory over practice, metaphysics over experience, and universal abstraction over the pastorally particular. Recent developments in theology, however, have begun to reverse these trends.²⁰ Not only are an increasing number of late twentieth-century theologians thinking about theory and practice in terms of mutual regard, but some are even attempting to demonstrate that such mutual regard is at the heart of authentic and "traditional" Christian theology.²¹

More particularly, there is an emerging field of theology that prizes, at its center, the mutual regard of theory and practice: the broad umbrella term for this field is practical theology. The methods of practical theology are the appropriate vernacular for liturgists in general and church musicians in particular. This is not practical theology in the sense of applied theology,²² but rather practical theology as defined in the works of David Tracy, Don Browning, James Fowler, Bernard Lee,²³ and others who, in their redefinition of the field, demonstrate that practical theology is a series of methods. It requires critical and constructive reflection. This reflection is done in communities of faith. This reflection takes local practice seriously. This reflection requires the interpretation of normative sources such as Scripture and tradition. Such reflection also requires interpretation of emergent challenges and new situations. This reflection leads to the ongoing modification and transformation of practice. This transformation is to enable a more adequate response to God's call to partnership.²⁴ Furthermore, it is especially practical theology that is capable of systematically making a place for ignored and unheard voices in the theological enterprises²⁵ and for reckoning seriously with cultural context and social location in the critical reflection on practice.²⁶

Church musicians should study church history, the theology of the liturgy, and develop ministerial skills. The metamethod, however, which can most effectively wed these different disciplines together, is a practical theological method, in which church musicians are trained as musical-ecclesial hermeneuts: capable of first attending to present practice, engaging in serious reflection on that practice, and so be better equipped to assess and shape the type of theology and faith their music is creating. My goal in training all ministers for the church—including church musicians—is to train practical theologians.

Mutual Critical Correlation and Musical Methods

It is not only in the theological arena, however, that Tracy's methodological assessment and recommendation of the mutual and critical correlation of theory and practice needs to be addressed; it is also in the musical. Just as it is insufficient for any liturgist to receive training in history and systematics but lack training in hermeneutics, ritual studies, and other practical-theological methods, so is it insufficient for any church musician to be trained in music history, counterpoint, analysis, and the rest, without being trained in the musical disciplines which, beginning with contemporary practice, address the social function and meaning of music—an analog to the ecclesial function and ritual meaning of music in worship. Thus, classical musicological studies need be wed with ethnomusicological studies.

Ethnomusicology can be defined as an

interdisciplinary approach to the study of music, inclusive of the music of all cultures, peoples, classes and repertoires (*folk, popular and classical repertoires) with emphasis on non-Western music. [It] views music as a dynamic aspect of culture and a means of social communication [and] contextualizes musical realities (forms, structures, genres, styles) in the social organization of music and in processes of composition and performance. Music making in ritual contexts is an important focus. Theory and methods [are] drawn from anthropology, musicology, sociology, linguistics, semiotics, history, folklore and emerging cross-disciplinary fields. Field research and analysis are considered primary tools.²⁷

While there are innumerable contributions that ethnomusicological studies can make to current studies of liturgical music, two need to be stressed. The first is the development of a deeper understanding of the function of music in ritual. Like the worship that serves as its context, music (like every symbol) is not neutral: as a powerful cultural medium, it shapes us individually and socially. How many church musicians, however, are trained to consider not what musical practice “should” mean, what function it “should” have, or what results it “should” produce, but what meaning, function, and results it actually produces? Sometimes it is shocking for the church musician to discover what communities actually perceive of their music, perceptions often very different from that of the musician. In one exercise in my seminar on ritual music, for example, I require church musicians to pursue field work in the worshiping communities where they serve. Field observation is wed to interviews on a few basic questions: for example, “What piece of music in today’s worship was the most effective for you?” or “What piece of music in today’s worship did you like the most?”

Students are required to fill out the questionnaire before they interview others. How surprised they are when they discover that the music they perceived to be the most effective, the most beautiful, the most prayerful is not similarly perceived by their assemblies. A little field work can shatter innumerable, unexplored presuppositions.

A second contribution of ethnomusicological training concerns the growing cultural diversity of the U.S., now the second most multicultural country in the world. The Roman Catholic Church in the United States, for example, is currently experiencing an unparalleled expansion in its Hispanic population. Concurrent with this expansion is the development of Hispanic liturgical music. The instinct of liturgical musicians in this country is to judge all such music according to the nineteenth-century compositional standards embodied in most theory textbooks. This ethnocentric approach is heartily challenged by the precepts of ethnomusicology which does not allow for such a bias. As Helen Myers cautions,

“Ethnomusicologists are great egalitarians. They avoid value-judgments that would rank the music of society A over that of Society B. They prefer to report a society’s own ratings of its musicians than to impose judgments from outside.”²⁸ And if one thinks that the music of Hispanic communities provides such a challenge to today’s church musician, consider the music of the Vietnamese, Chinese, and Koreans who are flooding into Christian churches across this land.

Ultimately, a discipline like ethnomusicology, while not removing cultural bias—as such is simply not possible—at least exposes the bias. In the interplay of praxis and theory, it challenges the dangerous universalism to which musicians, like other artists, are prone. Universal, objective standards of “beauty” for example, are simply disallowed, for the ethnomusicologically trained are at least prepared to ask “beauty according to whom”? And if they can do so in view of ethnic and linguistic diversity, maybe they can learn to do so in terms of social and economic diversity as well. Or, as pointedly noted by Nathan Mitchell, “Secretly, many of us believe that God loves the poor, but hates their art. Surely, we suspect, God prefers Mozart to Randy Travis.”²⁹

Summary

Liturgical theology has fundamentally changed over the past thirty years. So has the field of church music. Speaking from my own tradition, there has been a clear reckoning with ritual practice and the liturgical function of music. Thus, official principles for evaluating worship music in this country are not simply concerned with what the music or composer “intends” but what ritually transpires, not simply with the proposed “theory” but with the actual practice.³⁰ Thus, in my view, it is paramount that we attend not only to the topics but also to the methods—not only what we impart but how we impart it—so that church musicians might be not only be artists in sound . . . but sound theologians—ministers of and not obstacles to the church’s worship.

Edward Foley, Capuchin, is professor of liturgy and music at Catholic Theological Union in Chicago, Illinois. Former president of the North American Academy of Liturgy, he has published twelve books and more than 200 scholarly and pastoral articles. He identifies himself as a practical theologian.

ENDNOTES

1. In its original form, this paper was presented at the Yale Institute of Sacred Music.
2. As the term is employed here “ecclesial training” encompasses both “theological” and “ministerial” formation, both of which are essential for the church musician.
3. David Tracy, “The Foundations of Practical Theology,” *Practical Theology*, ed. Don Browning (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983), 76.
4. e.g., Gordon Lathrop, *Holy Things* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 5; Don Saliers, *Worship as Theology* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994), *passim*; Geoffrey Wainwright,

Doxology: The Praise of God in Worship, Doctrine, and Life (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 8.

5. e.g., Aidan Kavanagh, *On Liturgical Theology* (New York: Pueblo, 1984), 3, 8, *passim*; David Power, "Cult to Culture: The Liturgical Foundation of Theology," *Worship* 54:6 (1980) 484.

6. Alexander Schmemmann, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology* (St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1986), 12.

7. For Roman Catholics, this is dogmatically defined in the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* (hereafter *CSL*), which asserts worship as "fount and summit" of the church's life [n. 10].

8. Joseph Gelineau, *Voices and Instruments in Christian Worship: Principles, Laws, Applications*, trans. Clifford Howell (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1964).

9. *CSL*, n. 112.

10. *CSL*, n. 7.

11. For a taxonomy of terms surrounding worship music, see my "Liturgical Music," *The New Dictionary of Sacramental Worship*, ed. Peter Fink (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1990), 854-870.

12. See my "Toward a Sound Theology," *Studia Liturgica* 23:2 (1993) 121-139.

13. David Tracy, "Traditions of Spiritual Practice and the Practice of Theology," address at the dual inauguration of Gary Riebe-Estrella as Academic Dean and the Project on Spirituality and the Vocation of the Theological Educator at Catholic Theological Union, 17 October 1996.

14. While in this address, Tracy employs the language of theory and "practice," in his earlier writings, he draws a contrast between "praxis" and "mere practice" ("The Foundations of Practical Theology," *Practical Theology*, ed. Don Browning [San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983], 61). Technically, "practice" and "praxis" are not synonymous. The great disparity in usage among various writers makes it difficult to generalize with any accuracy about the differences between the two. In general, however, it might be helpful to think of "practice" as virtually any experience; whereas "praxis," in the classic sense given it by Aristotle, is the "action of moral agents guided by some goal of the good and virtuous life and directed to the development of a character possessing phronesis or practical wisdom" (Tracy, "The Foundations of Practical Theology," 75). Fowler's translation of Aristotle's concept of praxis is "a pattern in which action and ongoing reflection continually interpenetrate" ("The Emerging New Shape of Practical Theology," unpublished paper presented at the International Meeting of Practical Theology, Berne, 1995). More recently, liberationists like Gustavo Gutierrez have defined praxis as "the lived faith that finds expression in prayer and commitment to social transformation" (*A Theology of Liberation*, rev. ed., trans. and ed. by Caridad Lnda and John Eagleson [Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1973, 1988], xxxiv). A useful overview of theologies of praxis can be found in David Tracy's article, "Theologies of Praxis," *Creativity and Method*, ed. Matthew L. Lamb (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1981), 35-51.

While we will be employing the language of "practice" in this paper (as Tracy outlines the basic methodological models employing this term), it should be understood in light of the nature of "praxis" with its overtones of reflection and ethical intent.

15. Tracy, "Traditions of Spiritual Practice."

16. Tracy, "The Foundations of Practical Theology," 61-82.

17. Tracy, "The Foundations of Practical Theology," 61-2.

18. *Ibid.*, 76.

Training Church Musicians

19. James N. Poling and Donald E. Miller, *Foundations for a Practical Theology of Ministry* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1985), 31.
20. Edward Schillebeeckx, for example, has noted that the shift from a philosophical to an anthropological approach comprises one of the major changes in sacramental theology in this century. See his *Eucharist* (New York, 1968), 97-101.
21. e.g., Randy Maddox, "The Recovery of Theology as a Practical Discipline," *Theological Studies* 51 (1990) 650-672.
22. In his 1811 publication, *A Brief Outline of the Study of Theology* (*Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums zum Behuf Einleitender Vorträge*), Friedrich Schleiermacher divided the theological disciplines into philosophical, historical, and practical theology. That division gave rise to a standard fourfold division of theological studies that continues today in many seminaries: Bible, church history, systematic theology, and practical (or sometimes pastoral) theology. While this outline represented a radical shift from the past constructions of theological education, this frame yet presents practical theology as a form of applied theology for clerics. See Edward Farley, *Theologia: The Fragmentation and Unity of Theological Education* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), 73-98.
23. Aside from the works of Tracy, Browning, and Fowler already noted, see Bernard Lee, *The Future of Church of 140 BCE* (New York: Crossroads, 1995).
24. This definition, with slight modifications, is drawn from James Fowler, "The Emerging New Shape of Practical Theology."
25. Noteworthy here is the work by James Poling, *The Abuse of Power* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1991).
26. See Robert Schreiter, *Constructing Local Theologies* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1985).
27. Mary McGann, "Ethnomusicology," *Worship Music: A Concise Dictionary*, ed. Edward Foley (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, forthcoming).
28. Helen Myers, "Ethnomusicology," *The New Oxford Companion to Music*, ed. Denis Arnold (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988 [1983]) 1:646.
29. Nathan Mitchell, "Amen Corner," *Worship* 70:3 (1996) 258.
30. The *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* moved away from the ancient tradition of judging worship music as though it were an objective reality that could be virtuous or immoral in and of itself. As late as 1903, Pius X required that music must be holy and "exclude all profanity not only in itself but also in the manner in which it is presented" (*Tra le sollecitudini*, no. 2). Though this directive recognized the possibility of a profane performance, it also presumed that music, apart from any usage, had the potential for profanity in and of itself. From this perspective the only appropriate music for worship was "sacred" (=holy) music. Such has been the standard view of the church since accepting Middle and Neo-Platonic views of music in the patristic period. The result has been an aesthetical approach to evaluating the church's music in which Gregorian chant and the music of Palestrina stand as prime measures of beauty.
A significant departure from this approach, foreshadowed in *Musicae sacrae disciplina* (nos. 34-35), was made explicit in *CSL* which did not rely heavily upon abstract philosophical or theological criteria for evaluating worship music but emphasized the function of such music. *CSL* notes that it is in the wedding of music to words that music forms an integral part of the liturgy (no. 112). Even more significant is the statement that sacred music will be the more holy the more closely it is joined to the liturgical rite (no. 112). While employing the language of holiness reminiscent of Pius X, *CSL* clearly moved toward a functional definition of sacred music, stressing that its holiness is not only or essentially a matter of ontology, aesthetics, or ethics but, instead, is related to music's ability to wed itself to text and rite.

Wisdom Communities: Models for Christian Formation and Pedagogy

Mary Margaret Pazdan

Aquinas Institute of Theology

ABSTRACT: The formation of wisdom communities as a model of graduate theological education is an anomaly and a challenge. Wisdom communities, however, respond to the heart of theological education, i.e., adult formation for ministry that includes rigorous intellectual efforts as well as deepening and expanding the faith of individuals who will be entrusted with the mission of the church. A development of strategies for creating wisdom communities includes the horizons of personal experience, critical inquiry of the tradition, and reappropriation. Illustrations from a syllabus indicate how a wisdom community is formed.

Wisdom communities are neither foreign nor intrusive to human experience. They exist wherever and whenever persons gather intentionally to share life and commitment to Christian values in the presence of the Spirit. Persons gather freely without preconceived expectations or agendas. Roles and responsibilities emerge as the structure of the community evolves organically. Names of participants as well as precise locations and occasions for wisdom gatherings are seldom noted in Christian history. Some models of wisdom communities today may include prayer, discussion, and study that extend a Eucharistic assembly, a neighborhood collective, a social concern.

The formation of wisdom communities, however, as a consistent model of graduate theological education is an anomaly. Instructors and students alike can scarcely imagine what the experience would be like. How can a community develop organically when a mandatory semester time length, sequence, and place have been scheduled a year or more beforehand? Implicit and explicit expectations, objectives, and agendas emerge as instructors introduce a new course syllabus at the beginning of a semester. Expectations continue throughout the course amid multiple world views, experiences, and abilities of participants.

Moreover, it is more comfortable to maintain traditional roles of instructors as providers and students as receivers of knowledge and skills. A dialogical model that includes role reversals can be threatening, especially if participants equate learning with the completion of required assignments and readings. Giving and receiving content is distributing and accepting empirical truth. It is

easier to evaluate the understanding of facts than to develop critical criteria for the dialogue of experience in light of the Christian tradition.

The heart of theological education, however, is adult formation for ministry that includes rigorous intellectual efforts as well as deepening and expanding the faith of individuals who will be entrusted with the mission of the church. Wisdom learning requires equal attention to the tradition and formation of all who participate in collaborative, mutual learning. My experience of teaching biblical studies at the Aquinas Institute of Theology for many years convinces me that the presence and nurturing of wisdom communities are essential for ecclesial growth and integrity.

Shaping a Wisdom Community

How can the challenges of shaping a wisdom community within the context of a semester course be met? Instructors need to be prepared for surprises, resistance, and letting go of traditional expectations and goals. Students, too, need to be flexible, open to unusual invitations for learning, and consciously involved in a process of ongoing evaluation. The challenges of creating and sustaining a wisdom community are greater for large, introductory classes than when students engage in small classes and seminars. Not all instructors and students can expect that a wisdom model will be chosen for all areas of the curriculum. Indeed, a variety of instructional and formational strategies is essential for theological education. Nonetheless, attention to adult andragogy indicates that wisdom models and others that involve dialogical participation are more effective than the traditional lecture style.

For the past several years I have used particular strategies to invite students to create a wisdom community together. The initial class begins with dyadic introductions of students and instructor that include interests, experience, and personal anecdotes. The foundation of each course is based on three convictions that are process-oriented to introduce formative, learning possibilities. First, I invite students to examine their personal inventory. What do they know about a particular area of the theological curriculum? What do they seek as new learning? It is a personal inventory that small groups share with one another while a recorder lists common perspectives and writes them on the board for analysis. Pre-understandings and future goals develop within the dynamic of personal and communal reflection. What is discussed and recorded reflects the challenges of intellectual curiosity as well as faith-seeking-understanding positions.

Second, I distribute the syllabus and ask students to consider the relationships of personal/communal experience and goals to the course description and objectives. Again, it is a personal reading from which some students offer observations to the class. In light of the responses, I comment generally on how the outline of the course offers opportunities for addressing their interests and

goals. Specific details of the syllabus are addressed contextually throughout the course.

Third, I ask students to consider which attitudes are important for participation in a critical dialogue. They are invited to use these qualities of mind and heart for personal study where they assess their own experience in light of readings from the Christian tradition as well as in the dialogue with peers during class. I also raise questions about the relationships of instructor presentations, discussion, and individual questions to promote the common good that includes personal well-being. This third conviction is one that naturally requires additional focus and articulation throughout the course.

To deepen the experiences of the first day throughout the semester according to this sequential pattern, I create individual assignments for each class with three components. There is *reflection on personal experience* through questions that provide an inventory of current experience. The questions precipitate the content of *the role of critical inquiry* through reading and study of particular texts from the tradition. *Dialogue questions* connect personal experience with the tradition. It is the responsibility of the students to engage in the process and be ready to share their experiences in class. The personal process and group dynamics give students a grasp and appreciation for their own experience and understanding as well as an ability to read critically and not be intimidated by authors who are unfamiliar to them. The course stimulates interactive learning through observations, questions, and insights that fuse, or at least juxtapose, diverse world views from students and instructor.

The construction of a syllabus with three components for each class is based on formative, pedagogical convictions that involve commitment to a vision of theological education. *Personal experience is the first horizon for interpretation.*¹ Although I invite students to record their personal inventory, the value of the exercise is sometimes forgotten when they approach assigned readings. They sometimes assume uncritically the values, world views, and attitudes of an author. A presupposition arises from their unexamined presuppositions that language refers to the same reality. It is the horizon of the first naiveté.

Critical inquiry of the tradition is the second horizon for interpretation. Students investigate hermeneutical models and learn how interpreters within the Christian tradition dialogue within the contexts of ecclesial and academic communities. They discover that authorial intention is not the only meaning of a text. Once the ideas of an author are printed, her words take on multiple possibilities, e.g., a surplus of meaning. At this crucial juncture, then, personal presuppositions meet critical analysis.

Reappropriating a text is the third horizon of interpretation. It is a process whereby students reevaluate their experience and presuppositions in light of critical inquiry with various hermeneutical lenses. The heart of this horizon is dialogue. An inner, personal dialogue with the readings through study informs a dialogical conversation in classes. Students reach a second naiveté and discover how the

process is intimately related to rigorous efforts of heart and mind that empower adult faith formation.

Illustrations from a Current Syllabus

The formative roles of personal experience, critical inquiry and reappropriation can become integral parts of a syllabus. My illustrations are from a current semester course in Johannine literature. After an orientation session, the first unit is *Re-imagining Hermeneutical Lenses for Interpreting the Fourth Gospel*.

A. Authors and Literature in Tandem with “The Interpretation of the Bible in the Church” (IBC).² Students are invited to enter into the process. Their directives are: Muse about the title of each text. Read the preface and/or introduction and outline for each text.³ What might be the author’s strategy, context, methodological perspectives? Review the IBC, I: Methods and Approaches for Interpretation. Evaluate each author according to particular criteria. Are there other sections of the IBC that are more apropos at this first stage of meeting the author(s)? The exercise of engaging their personal experience vis-à-vis new interpreters of the Johannine tradition readies them for dialogue. They prepare for communal interpretation within the emerging wisdom community of the class by responding to the question: What can you offer for discussion, critique, and further insight from the initial experience with the author(s)?

B. Personal Inventory. Another part of the assignment invites them to go beyond initial engagement with the authors for deeper reflection on their experience. What hermeneutical lenses do you enjoy? Why? With which ones are you unfamiliar? What assistance can any of the authors offer to give you clarity and confidence in using *new* hermeneutical lenses?

In introducing the role of critical inquiry, I ask them to consider broader connections. Muse on the relationship(s) between hermeneutical lenses and personal prayer, pastoral activity, preaching. Read Craig H. Koester, “The Spectrum of Johannine Readers,” 5-20 in Segovia, ed., *What is John?* What type of reader(s) do you identify with at the beginning of this course? Why? What can you offer for discussion, critique, and further insight in class from the experience of personal inventory?

Another illustration is from a more extensive unit: *Pericopes, Themes, and Multiple Possibilities of Interpretation*.

Prologue (John 1:1-18). This time the students’ reflective exercise begins directly with the text of the Gospel. Read the text three times out loud. What images, words, feelings are created? Create a melody line for verses 1-3. For critical inquiry, study Pazdan, 30-31; Malina and Rohrbaugh, textual notes and reading scenarios; Adele Reinhartz, 561-67;⁴ Howard-Brook, 51-61. Raymond Brown suggests that the Prologue is the fourth Gospel in miniature. What verses, in particular, are a nugget of the whole text? For discussion in class, consider how the authors’ interpretations correspond to personal experience with the Pro-

logue. To begin the session on the Prologue, students offered their instrumental, conch shell playing, original lyrics, and rhythm for John 1:1-3. The musical experience gave them confirmation of how different social locations and talent encourage multiple interpretations.

In addition to the three-part course assignments, examinations and papers are other opportunities to experience a reappropriation of a text, a second naiveté. I offer students a variety of questions to which they respond with short essays for a mid-semester take-home examination. There is a final oral examination for which students have prepared by selecting a few questions composed beforehand to facilitate a dialogue with me. Students are also encouraged to create one of their own questions to substitute for one of my questions for a mid-semester and/or a final oral examination. I do not seek short, factual responses in the examinations. Rather, I present their responses as opportunities for a personal synthesis of study, discussion, observations, and additional questions.

An interpretive paper uses three horizons of interpretation that include methods from different hermeneutical worlds. For *the world behind the text*, the task is reconstruction, i.e., historical criticism (historical-critical and social-scientific methods) because the goal is to determine authorial intention. In contrast, *the world of the text* focuses on the text itself through literary criticism (narrative, rhetorical, and reader-response methods). The world *in front of the text* concentrates on the dynamic of contemporary readers and the text (liberation and ideological criticism). Students select a biblical text and interpret it with their own experience and various critical hermeneutical lenses. Next, they consult scholarly resources for confirmation, challenge, and new possibilities. Finally, they reappropriate the text in light of their study. The shape of the paper is a reflection of how they can creatively invite others to share their learning.

In advanced courses, a panel or a project replaces the oral examination. It is an opportunity to relate the topic of the paper to larger, communal interests of panel members. For example, students in the Johannine literature course often choose topics within ecclesiology, Christology, and Jewish-Christian dialogue.

For several years, our students have achieved first prize recognition for their hermeneutical papers at the Central States Society of Biblical Literature meeting. Many of the participants comment that it was the wisdom community of a particular class that encouraged them to revise course papers for presentation. The students meet with an advisor to construct abstracts that are based on rethinking the topic. When the papers are accepted for the meeting, students meet again to offer observations and comments as their peers present the papers in a formal setting. Performing a text, rather than reading it at others, is another skill that comes from careful, sensitive critique and encouragement. The engagement of students in this professional meeting is an additional way of extending the contribution of wisdom communities to an academic audience of graduate students and professors. The publication of several papers also indicates excellent work that is not achieved in isolation.

Creating and sustaining wisdom communities as the foundation and shape of graduate courses is a stimulating, challenging response to the demands of theological education for the next millennium. Saying yes to possibilities for these communities is saying yes to the invitation that Lady Wisdom offers: life in abundance. Those who have ears to hear welcome her voice. We are eager for her feast: "Come eat of my bread and drink of the wine" (Prov. 9:6).

Mary Margaret Pazdan is associate professor of biblical studies at Aquinas Institute of Theology in St. Louis, Missouri. She has developed courses and workshops from her interest and research in contemporary models of biblical hermeneutics. Creating wisdom communities of learners provides an educational environment and stimulus that parallel the dynamics of the hermeneutical models.

ENDNOTES

1. My formative, pedagogical convictions are adapted from a hermeneutical model of Paul Ricoeur. For description and analysis of texts according to the insights of Ricoeur, see Loretta Dornisch, "Ricoeur and Biblical Research," *Faith and Philosophy in the Writings of Paul Ricoeur*, Problems in Contemporary Philosophy, vol. 29 (Lewiston: Edwin Mellin Press, 1990), 265-97.
2. Pontifical Biblical Commission, "The Interpretation of the Bible in the Church" (Washington: United States Catholic Conference, rpt., 1996).
3. Multitext reading from books, as well as a selection of contemporary journal articles, is required for this course. The major texts are: Wes Howard-Brook, *Becoming Children of God: John's Gospel and Radical Discipleship* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1994); Robert Kysar, *John the Maverick Gospel* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993) rev. ed.; Bruce M. Malina and Richard L. Rohrbaugh, *Social-Science Commentary on the Gospel of John* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998); Mary Margaret Pazdan, *The Son of Man: A Metaphor for Jesus in the Fourth Gospel* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992); "What is John?": *Readers and Readings of the Fourth Gospel*, ed. Fernando F. Segovia (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).
4. Adele Reinhartz, author of "The Gospel of John," *Searching the Scriptures, Volume 2: A Feminist Commentary* (New York: Crossroads, 1994), is the only North American Jewish scholar who has commented extensively on the fourth Gospel. Her inclusion in the multitext readings as well as selections from multicultural essays in journals assists the widening of hermeneutical lenses and approaches when the students approach the task of critical inquiry.

Who's Mentoring the Mentors? The Discipling Dimension of Faculty Development in Christian Higher Education

Shelly Cunningham
Talbot School of Theology

ABSTRACT: Full-time, tenure-track faculty members teaching in Christian higher education were surveyed to learn about how they envision and practice mentoring among themselves. The study was a replication of one conducted at a public university, and it examined who is involved in mentoring, why, under what conditions, what is done, and what faculty desire in mentoring relationships. In addition to discussing the benefits of, and some of the barriers to, developing faculty mentoring relationships, mentoring is defined and compared to the related term of discipling.

“All of us have had mentors or guides, people whose influence lives on inside us. . . . When it comes to our growth in faith and character, our need for another’s guidance is even more pressing.”¹ Mentoring has been the relationship of choice for professional development in the business arena for many years. A mentoring relationship involves a more experienced professional serving as a supportive and guiding role model for another professional less experienced in the field. In the past two decades, mentoring has become a focus in the educational sphere. Graduate students are encouraged to seek out a mentor. New and junior faculty receive similar messages. Female students and female faculty are advised to solicit the help of a mentor to open doors they may be unable to penetrate on their own. The business world has implemented formal and informal mentoring programs. What is happening in academe? More specifically, what is happening, or not happening, in Christian higher education?

In this paper I will first discuss the benefits of, and some of the barriers to, developing faculty mentoring relationships. Next, in preparation for examining the mentoring practices of faculty in Christian higher education, I will define mentoring—and the related term for Christians, discipling—and make some comparisons to help distinguish between these two terms. Finally, I will report on a study that examined the mentoring practices of professors in

Christian higher education and share several implications for faculty development in graduate theological education as a result of the findings.

Mentoring in Academe

Benefits of faculty mentoring relationships

The benefits of mentoring to individual faculty members, rookie and novice alike, and to the institutions they represent include: enhanced teaching effectiveness, increased job satisfaction, scholarly productivity, and faculty retention. For the protégé in academe, mentoring has been found to be associated with "more rapid socialization to campus and with improved student ratings of teaching compared to nonmentored peers."² Intentional and focused mentoring relationships can fulfill a vital role in aiding the successful acclimation of new faculty to academia. D.W. Wheeler suggests that junior faculty need to develop expertise in the following seven areas: understanding institutional roles and expectations, learning how the institution operates in getting things done, finding resources, developing collegiality, obtaining feedback on professional progress, improving skills and performance in professional roles, and finding a balance in work-life expectations.³ Learning techniques and strategies in these areas is crucial to the success and survival of new faculty moving from the preparation phase of their training to the full-time classroom.⁴ Protégés can borrow and adapt successful approaches mentors have already tried and found effective. Studying the success of exemplary new faculty it was concluded that, "Nothing, evidently, will help ensure a strong start more than prearranged networks of support and mentoring. Yet few campuses have implemented programs to provide such networks, despite their practicality, low cost, and desirability."⁵

These mentoring networks are vital as an aid in helping faculty new to teaching and faculty new to a particular university learn about the institution's culture. "Academe is replete with unwritten norms of professional behavior, especially among faculty. . . . The protégé learns what the culture is and so learns how things are done or not done."⁶

Mentoring is not only critical at the beginning of an academic career, it has also been found to play a significant role in the retention of faculty throughout their careers.⁷ This is an important institutional concern as it relates to all faculty, but especially for women and minorities. Further, faculty vitality can be maintained and enhanced at institutions where "sponsor-mentor generative activity" is supported.⁸

Potential barriers to academic mentoring relationships

Although the benefits of mentoring are widely discussed, the actual practice of mentoring among faculty may be hindered for a variety of reasons, many of them unique to the academic culture. At most universities, there are no

specific incentives for faculty to be mentors. If there are promotion requirements that include mentoring, they rarely reward faculty for being “good” mentors or give them any reason for trying to improve their performance.⁹ In contrast, “Scholarly pursuits evidenced in the receipt of a lucrative grant or the publication of a well-received article or a noted book accrue the highest accolades.”¹⁰

Even at universities where mentoring is valued and recognized, it is still up to individual faculty members to take the initiative. In a societal culture, and in an academic culture, where enormous value is placed upon individualism, autonomy, and academic freedom, the communal aspects of mentoring may appear threatening or trivial. “We have pushed the myth of individualism, autonomy, and related notions of strength, competence, and freedom to an edge that now frightens us. This distortion is manifest in the academy where we have pursued individual specialization and achievement to an extreme. . . .”¹¹

Perhaps the most common reason cited for lack of participation in mentoring relationships is that of time. When approached with an invitation to participate in a mentoring relationship as mentor or protégé, busy faculty members may be hesitant to become involved. “Many are already overextended, have unrealistic role expectations for mentoring, or fear the involvement or the risk of dependency.”¹² The risk, or the perceived risk, of dependency is related not only to time factors, but also to the dynamic that may exist between senior and junior faculty.

Too frequently, senior faculty either ignore younger faculty members or treat them with something like paternalistic condescension. Mentoring responsibility does not end once individuals are recruited, hired, and given course assignments and an office. Unfortunately, even the best-intentioned senior professors sometimes fail in this most essential mentoring responsibility. Little direction is given to ‘the politics of tenure.’ Many faculty members are satisfied at merely pointing out that tenure is based upon performance with respect to research, teaching, and service. At the same time, junior faculty members are saddled with the dirty chores of the department and time-consuming committee appointments that may leave little time for research and scholarship.¹³

For some faculty, it is easier to consider their informal contacts with students as their token involvement in mentoring relationships. Others may even pursue an intentional mentoring relationship with a student, but will not invest, at some risk, time, and energy in mentoring a colleague.

Importance of Study

Studies of mentoring practices among faculty in public university settings have found faculty mentoring other faculty. Results of these studies have pointed to both the benefits and potential barriers of mentoring for the faculty involved and for the institution.¹⁴ There has been little documentation, however, regarding the mentoring practices among faculty at Christian higher education institutions.

D. E. Schroeder challenges, "As academicians, entrusted with the spiritual nurturing of the next generation of Christian leaders, we must learn to present a more biblically based model of Christian discipleship and godliness, and provide a way of striving toward such spiritual maturity. . . . Christian faculty members are to be distinguished from secular faculty members by being disciplemakers."¹⁵ The present research offers some preliminary findings regarding the current nature, extent, and perceived or real benefit of mentoring relationships among faculty in Christian higher education.

In 1994 I undertook a study to examine the practices of full-time teaching faculty at member schools of the Christian College Coalition (CCC) to identify who is involved in workplace mentoring and what shape the mentoring relationships take. Coalition institutions are committed to the integration of biblical faith with academics and require a personal Christian commitment from each full-time faculty member. Although member colleges of the CCC are, as institutions, primarily liberal arts colleges, many are connected to graduate schools of theology or have graduate departments in theology. Faculty in biblical and theological studies and religious education at these schools often teach in both undergraduate and graduate departments. As a replication of a study done by researchers Sands, Parson, and Duane,¹⁶ I wanted to expand their findings about faculty mentoring relationships on a public university campus by exploring faculty mentoring relationships on Christian campuses. Would faculty who teach in an academic environment where the biblical principle of discipleship is part of the common culture reflect any different behaviors or opinions with respect to the process of mentoring than faculty in a public university setting?

I believe that encouraging the initiation and nurture of workplace mentoring relationships among faculty members in Christian higher education is crucial. Unfortunately, it is not a prominent component in faculty development. As professors grow personally and professionally, they thrive in their calling as teachers, scholars, and researchers. Studies show that mentoring is a relationship that contributes positively to this growth. Scripture shows that discipling is a relationship among Christians that contributes positively to this growth. Mentoring and discipling are interrelated and both contribute to faculty development. Let me explain by first defining mentoring and discipling, and then by comparing the two terms as used in this study.

Definitions of Mentoring and Discipling Terminology

Mentoring terminology

In this study, a mentoring relationship is defined as an interaction between two people in which one person is guided, taught, and influenced in his or her profession by another member in the profession.¹⁷

Mentoring is a relational process between a mentor, who knows or has experienced something and transfers that something (resources of wisdom, information, experience, confidence, insight, relationships, status, etc.) to a mentoree, at an appropriate time and manner, so that it facilitates development or empowerment.¹⁸

A mentoring relationship involves a more experienced professional serving as a supportive and guiding role model for another professional less experienced in the field. "Mentor" is the word given to describe the more experienced professional and "protégé" or "mentoree" describes the less experienced professional.

Mentoring is characterized by mutual respect and reciprocity. The two primary domains of mentoring attitudes and practices are the areas of career functioning and psychosocial functioning. Career functions include such practices as coaching, sponsoring, providing exposure and visibility, instructing in corporate culture, and offering challenging assignments. In contrast, psychosocial attitudes and practices position the mentor as one who serves as a role model, offers acceptance and confirmation, instructs in people skills, counsels, and serves as a friend to the protégé.¹⁹ In academe, mentoring is sometimes understood as a self-identified senior faculty member supporting and nurturing a junior faculty member by:

(a) stimulating their intellectual growth; (b) pushing junior faculty to write about their ideas; (c) assisting them with research skills and writing grant proposals; (d) assisting them with publishing; (e) helping them to learn the values, customs, and politics of the system; and (f) sponsoring them for various types of advancement.²⁰

Definitions of discipling terminology

A disciple is a learner. A disciple follows another person or another way of life, submits to the discipline of that leader, and adopts the philosophy, practices, and way of life of the teacher.²¹ *Mathetes* (the New Testament Greek word for disciple) was used to describe a person who is bound to someone else (the master or teacher) in order to acquire the master's theoretical knowledge and become an imitator of the teacher.²² In his comprehensive treatment on

discipleship, M. J. Wilkins defines a disciple in both a general and a specific sense.

In the general sense, we may define a disciple as a committed follower of a great master. The general sense of the term has two common applications. (1) It was used generally nonreferentially to distinguish the disciple from the teacher (Mt 10:24-25; Lk 6:40). (2) It was also used to designate the followers of a great leader or movement

In the specific sense, a disciple of Jesus is one who has come to Jesus for eternal life, has claimed Jesus as Savior and God, and has embarked upon the life of following Jesus The term was used most frequently in this specific sense; at least 230 times in the Gospels (e.g., Jn 6:66-71) and 28 times in Acts (e.g., Acts 9:1, 10, 19-20).²³

Closely related to the term *disciple* are the terms discipleship and discipling. "Discipleship is the ongoing process of growth as a disciple. *Discipling* implies the responsibility of disciples helping one another to grow as disciples."²⁴ The word disciple is most commonly found in its plural form, disciples, throughout the Gospels and Acts. "Individual disciples are always seen in conjunction with the community of disciples, whether as Jesus' intimate companions or as the church. Hence, discipleship is a concept that normally occurs within the context of the community."²⁵

The act of discipling involves a variety of practices and methods, looking at Jesus' life as the standard:

Contemporary discipling cannot improve on the method of Jesus. Those who follow the Lord now need to see the life of Jesus lived out in the life of another believer. Discipling . . . simply requires the personal demonstration of the qualities that one hopes to see in the disciple and the willingness of the discipler to explain the reasons for his or her actions. A godly life, a clear explanation, and a glimpse at the passions of one's heart are keys to discipleship.²⁶

One who disciplines is to admonish, teach, challenge, and exhort other disciples to live a life of holiness and obedience to God (Col 1:28; 1 Pt 1:1-25). This is accomplished through imitation, modeling, nurture, and the sharing of personal lives (1 Thes 1:5,6; 1 Thes 2:1-20). Disciples of Jesus Christ pray together and labor together in the service of their master and teacher (Phil 1:1-30; 1 Thes 1-5).

Mentoring and Discipling: A Comparison

In much of the literature dealing with faith development and spiritual growth, mentoring terminology is interchanged, or closely connected, with discipleship terminology.²⁷ In other places, although discipleship is not mentioned, the concept of mentoring is spiritualized. Terms like “spiritual mentor” or “spiritual mentoring” are used.²⁸

Similarities between mentoring and discipling

The practice of discipleship appears to share many characteristics with the practice of mentoring. Both mentoring and discipling are developmental alliances involving someone who is functioning at a more experienced level than the follower or protégé. Followers and protégés are desirous of learning about the way and practices of their “teacher.” This knowledge is not shared in a classroom, but mentoring and discipling use life experience as an opportunity for learning and growth.

Mentoring and discipling are intense and focused relationships. “From the life and example of Jesus, we derive the fundamental concept of mentoring: more time spent with fewer people equals greater lasting impact for God.”²⁹ Much of the intensity is the result of sharing “life-on-life.” These relationships employ the practice of modeling, but not modeling alone. The mentor or discipler must be willing to explain the reasons for his or her actions and be open to scrutiny and to the dimension of personal accountability with the learner.

Mentoring and discipling are generative relationships. “In a mentoring relationship, the one cared for and nurtured later becomes the primary nurturer of another.”³⁰ Likewise, discipleship functions to both nurture and reproduce. In both, relationships are characterized by mutuality and reciprocity with all participants benefiting from a positive and healthy experience. Counterproductive relationships are the result of overdependence, power struggles, and disenchantment.

Differences between mentoring and discipling

Although mentoring and discipling share many relational similarities, especially when both mentor and protégé are Christians, distinctions between the terms do exist. Many of the differences that might be noted between discipling and mentoring fall into the categories of goal, content, and authority.

The goal of discipleship is obedience to Jesus Christ and conformity to His image. The evidence of a healthy discipling relationship is a disciple becoming like Jesus and growing as a Christian. In contrast, a narrow definition of mentoring would establish the goal of the relationship as productivity, career development and satisfaction, and professional advancement for the protégé.³¹

Differences between discipling and mentoring may also be found in the area of content. Discipleship focuses on the commands of Christ as recorded in the Bible. According to Wilkins,³² discipling endeavors should focus on helping disciples become like Jesus. In contrast, mentoring focuses on all the elements related to grasping the skills, jargon, and social environment of the profession. "Functionally, mentors deal more with the development of professional skills."³³

Finally, differences between discipling and mentoring are found in the area of authority. Disciples are not the final authority in the relationship. Their authority and power rest outside of themselves in the person and word of Jesus Christ. In contrast, mentoring authority is dependent upon the status of the mentor or the represented organization. Power may reside within the position of the mentor, or it may rest outside the mentor in the authority levels of the institution, such as the dean or president. Power is reflected from the mentor and shared with the protégé. The emphasis in discipling is not on personal power as a result of different hierarchical levels, but on the authority of Christ and the allegiance and submission due Him.³⁴

Perhaps the differences between mentoring and discipling can best be characterized by understanding mentoring as one aspect of the more inclusive term, discipling.³⁵ While doing theological thesis work related to the relationship between discipling and mentoring, D.Z. Fandey, a student of Wilkins, concluded:

It appears that there is evidence in the biblical data to warrant the use of the term mentor to describe aspects of various relationships. The use of this term helps us to make distinctions between discipleship and mentoring. At this juncture I would say that mentoring is a subset of discipleship. Being a disciple can include a mentoring relationship but it is not a necessary requirement and it does not necessarily make one a more devout disciple.³⁶

This view is helpful in that a recognition of the similarities between mentoring and discipling is acknowledged while still noting the differences.

The question might be raised at this point—"Is it possible for two Christians to mentor and not disciple?" While the career functions of mentoring might remain less noticeably affected by religious commitments, it would seem that the psychosocial functions could be highly shaped by personal faith. In fact, it might be that religious commitments to discipleship should invite increased participation in mentoring relationships as one means to fulfill the Great Commission for Christians to be discipling other Christians. If this is true, evidence of healthy and vibrant mentoring relationships will be found in Christian higher education.

According to Fandey, "Mentoring can be one of the processes in helping a disciple to grow but it is not 'the' way. It can be used as a tool in the process, but

it is more than a tool, it describes a relationship."³⁷ Christian faculty need to learn how mentoring can be an important and revitalizing tool in discipling their colleagues. The purpose of my study is to assist in this process.

Report of the Study

Description of study

The research followed a descriptive design and was a replication of the Sands, Parson, and Duane study conducted at a public university in the Midwest during the late eighties.³⁸ A modified form of the original self-report survey was mailed to 611 full-time faculty members teaching at nine member schools of the Christian College Coalition (CCC) during the spring of 1994. This group represented a stratified random sampling of colleges, based on size of faculty, selected from the CCC directory. The survey was completed by 287 faculty (47% response rate), which was considered adequate to meet the statistical requirements for data analysis.

Results of study

In comparison to the demographics of the university faculty studied by Sands et al.,³⁹ there were both interesting similarities and differences. Of the 282 people who indicated their gender, males represented 65% of the respondents and females represented 35%. Although this does not parallel the almost equal male/female representation in the Sands et al. study, it does reflect more closely the Christian College Coalition percentages of 59% male and 42% female.

Both this study and the Sands et al. study had approximately 40% representation of junior faculty (instructor and assistant professor levels) and 60% representation of senior faculty (associate and full professor levels). Because mentoring relationships most commonly involve an older, more experienced person working with someone younger,⁴⁰ this balance between faculty at the junior level and faculty at the senior level provided a strong base for studying possible existing mentoring relationships and for studying perspectives about mentoring from the point of view of the protégé and of the mentor.

Mentoring is not a foreign concept to professors. Similar to faculty in the Sands et al. study,⁴¹ 212 of the CCC faculty in this study (77% of respondents) could identify someone who had helped them in their academic careers. However, when faculty were asked to recall a specific faculty mentoring relationship while teaching at member schools of the Christian College Coalition, the prevalence of mentoring relationships drops to just 45%. This percentage compares to the 46% of faculty reported by Sands et al. to have been mentored as faculty members.

Even though an overwhelming 93% of the surveyed faculty in this study believe that senior faculty have a responsibility to mentor junior faculty, less

than one-third reported ever having served as a mentor to another faculty member. This could be explained if there were a small percentage of senior faculty represented. However, 60% of total respondents were at the associate or full professor rank level. It would appear that even though close to 80% of faculty have experienced mentoring and, as a result, should be more likely to become mentors,⁴² these relationships are not found among faculty. In open comments, faculty expressed strong sentiments related to the importance for senior faculty to mentor junior faculty by stating the following: "I have maintained this as an important function for senior faculty for some time . . .", "I believe we are obliged to assist young faculty to succeed professionally and to integrate into our institutions in all ways—religiously, socially, academically, etc. . . .", "I feel that it's a very important role. I fulfill it automatically because I enjoy that role and people are open to me. Others may need encouragement . . .", and, "It is essential that each faculty member have a vision for 'growing' other faculty."

Many faculty expressed a desire for such an academic mentoring relationship, but did not know how to facilitate the experience. It is possible that if the primary mentoring faculty have experienced is from non-academic helping relationships, they have not incorporated these practices into the academic setting. Or, if mentoring is brought into academe, faculty think primarily in terms of faculty-to-student relationships. Envisioning faculty-to-faculty mentoring as a natural and necessary extension of one's role as a faculty member may require a paradigm shift for faculty and some external institutional support to encourage and facilitate the process.

This study supported previous research in its finding that mentoring does appear to be a multidimensional activity difficult to categorize simplistically. The survey instrument contained a list of 35 mentoring functions or activities that are commonly associated with mentoring as found in the literature. Twenty-nine of these functions were from the original instrument, and six were discipleship functions added to the instrument for the purposes of this research. All respondents were first asked to evaluate the importance of each function or activity with regard to its place in "ideal" faculty-to-faculty mentoring relationships. Items were assessed using a Likert scale ranging from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (extremely important) and then subjected to a factor analysis statistical procedure. Confirming the findings of Sands et al.,⁴³ four categories of ideal mentoring functions emerged through factor analysis. Descriptions of these categories are provided in Table 1. Three of these factors, identified as "Career Guide," "Friend," and "Intellectual Guide," were also factors in the Sands et al. study. However, one of the significant findings of this research was the identification of a fourth factor, a set of distinct mentoring functions not previously identified in faculty-to-faculty mentoring relationships under the category of "Discipling Guide."

Although aspects of the mentoring functions listed for the Discipling Guide category share some resemblance to the bi-dimensional mentoring subscales of

psychosocial functions and career functions found in the literature, they do not neatly fit into one or the other. It would appear that the mentoring functions identified for this category are unique and distinct. Each of the mentoring functions listed for this factor was characteristic of discipling and discipleship as identified in the literature.

This same list of 35 mentoring functions was further explored in actual mentoring relationships. All faculty who had been mentored as a faculty member at a Christian College Coalition member school were asked to indicate which of the functions they actually experienced as part of their most significant mentoring relationship (see Table 2). Although faculty indicated that discipling activities are important in ideal mentoring relationships, Discipleship Guide activities are not overly prominent in faculty mentoring relationships, nor are they noticeably absent.

The discipleship functions of “help integrating biblical principles with teaching, research, and scholarship” ($n=56$; 43%), “involvement in studying the Bible with mentoree” ($n=17$; 13%), “encouragement to obey the teachings of Jesus Christ as recorded in the Bible” ($n=50$; 38%), and “affirmation about how God is working in mentoree’s life” ($n=50$; 38%) were all reported as being actually experienced in less than half of the faculty-to-faculty mentoring relationships at CCC member schools. Only “prayer support” ($n=70$; 54%) and “caring relationship; agape love shared” ($n=83$; 64%) were experienced by more than half of the respondents, although even these percentages still represent less than 70% of the mentoring relationships.

In this preliminary study of faculty in Christian higher education, faculty acknowledge the benefits, and advocate the development, of mentoring relationships with colleagues, but do not actively participate in such relationships themselves. In the words of one faculty member teaching at a Christian College Coalition school, “I felt like I was employed and tossed in the pool and watched to see if I would sink or swim. There has been no mentoring. I would very much appreciate a mentor, even now.” The practice of forming faculty mentoring relationships, informed and enriched by a Christian’s commitment to discipling, must become a natural part of the academic culture.

Implications

These findings have several implications for Christian colleges, universities, and theological schools:

1. With more than 80% of the reported faculty mentoring relationships examined in this study formed voluntarily, and with faculty stressing the need for mentoring relationships to develop informally and by common interest on the part of mentor and protégé, it is important that institutions, and the schools and departments within those institutions, work to create a nurturing climate in which these relationships can form. The practice of forming faculty mentoring

relationships must become a natural part of the academic culture. The challenge for institutions serious about seeing the development of mentoring relationships evolve on their campuses, is to create a physical and psychological climate in which faculty members have opportunities to interact with one another to such an extent that they can explore personal compatibility and shared goals. This may mean creating a faculty lounge, investing in faculty lunch passes, featuring faculty mentoring pairs in university publications, and accepting faculty endeavors to mentor colleagues as substantial submissions in promotion and tenure applications.

2. Although faculty may have some experience with mentoring and some commitment to discipling, mentoring, as a subset of discipling, does not appear to be practiced to a wide extent on a regular basis in the academic arena. Many faculty expressed a desire for an academic mentoring relationship, but did not know how to facilitate the experience. Faculty need to understand the interrelated terms of mentoring and discipling, the stages of mentoring relationships, the potential benefits and drawbacks, and the functions of both mentor and protégé. Workshops and faculty development initiatives to this end need to be explored by individual institutions.

3. Senior faculty who desire to contribute in a significant and lasting way to the personal and professional growth of a less-experienced colleague need to identify prayerfully a potential protégé. Faculty in this study indicated three primary considerations they would regard as important to guide them in selecting a protégé: personal compatibility, shared professional goals, and shared spiritual growth goals. Mentors should select someone with whom they share common interests, circumstances, and goals.

4. The success of many mentoring relationships is determined right from the start at the initiation stage. Although it is no guarantee that the relationship will continue to develop in a positive manner, protégés should be: junior faculty (in terms of tenure and/or length of time at the institution), teachable, committed to active participation (both “give and take”) in a mentoring dyad, and willing to invest time in the development of an effective mentoring relationship. Mentors should be: senior faculty (in terms of tenure and/or length of time at the institution), effective within their own particular area of gifting (teaching, scholarship, or research), committed to leadership development, skilled interpersonally, and willing to invest time in the shaping of another person's career.

5. Such career pressures as heavy teaching loads, large size classes, committee assignments, and high task-performance expectations may potentially discourage the development of mentoring relationships. Although faculty do not want their institutions to formalize the mentoring process, they could use institutional support to ease the load of some of these career pressures. If institutional administrators and board members desire the intentional personal and professional growth of their faculty, they must also be intentional about adjusting teaching loads, limiting class sizes, limiting com-

mittee assignments and eliminating extraneous ones, and being realistic about performance expectations related to tenure and promotion.

6. The multidimensional picture of mentoring functions that emerged in this study supports the variety of types of mentors found in the literature. The ideal types that this study identified were: "Career Guide," "Friend," "Disciplining Guide," and "Information Source." It is important for faculty who are interested in being mentored to recognize the potential breadth of mentoring practices available (see Table 1) without expecting to receive all of them from any one mentor. It is just as important for faculty who are considering serving as mentors to recognize that they are neither required nor expected to perform all of the functions represented by each of these mentoring categories; however, they should be practicing many of them. To begin, a mentor may want to ask the protégé: "(1) What are your personal and professional goals? (2) How can I help you reach your goals?"⁴⁴ Together, mentor and protégé need to clarify expectations in response to these questions. Using the list of functions (detailed in Table 1) may provide a basis for clarification and goal-setting.

7. Considering the various advantages and potential liabilities of mentoring, researchers have examined these relationships to identify possible factors that might be found consistently in healthy mentoring relationships. Kling and Brookhart⁴⁵ provide the following comprehensive list of suggestions for success in mentoring relationships:

- a. Both mentor and protégé need to have a grasp of the mentorship concept.
- b. Mentor and protégé need to share a commitment to confidentiality.
- c. The mentor needs to be in a non-supervisory position to the protégé.
- d. The protégé needs to accept the role of an active participant in the relationship.
- e. The protégé should confide in, and communicate with, the mentor.
- f. The protégé should demonstrate openness to the mentor's suggestions.
- g. Availability—especially of the mentor for the protégé at critical times.
- h. It is advisable for mentor and protégé to teach within the same discipline if the content area they represent is fairly technical.
- i. Adjust to the changing need levels of the relationship as the protégé grows increasingly independent.

Conclusion

Intentional and effective faculty mentoring relationships formed among Christian colleagues teaching on Christian campuses hold tremendous promise for the growth and development of the institution as a whole, but more importantly, for the growth and development of the participating protégés and mentors. It is hoped that by identifying the importance of mentoring relationships and by exploring some of the factors surrounding their initiation and formation in this study, faculty comments such as the following may be found

Who's Mentoring the Mentors?

in the future to be the prevailing sentiment on Christian campuses of higher learning: "I treasure my past and current mentoring relationships. They account more than any other single human factor (outside my marriage relationship) for my growth as a maturing, caring, professional. I would pray that everyone could experience such depth and love in their relationships."

Shelly Cunningham has been a professor at Talbot School of Theology at Biola University in La Mirada, California, since 1989. She is an assistant professor in Christian education with an emphasis in educational process. She has focused her research in the areas of effective teaching, faculty development, and faculty mentoring relationships and is the director of a faculty mentoring program at Biola University.

Table 1
Faculty Selections of Ideal Mentoring Functions

CAREER GUIDE

- * Advice about research opportunities, grant proposals, or funding sources
- Review of drafts of papers
- Advice about publication outlets
- * Collaboration in research or publications
- * Introductions to persons who could further career
- Help with skill development in mentoree's professional field
- * Fostering of professional visibility
- Introductions to professional network

FRIEND

- * Friendship
- * Emotional support
- Promotion of an equal and collaborative relationship
- ** Caring relationship; agape love shared
- Belief in capabilities

DISCIPLESHIP GUIDE

- ** Encouragement to obey the teachings of Jesus Christ as recorded in the Bible
- ** Prayer support
- ** Affirmation about how God is working in mentoree's life
- ** Help integrating biblical principles with teaching, research, and scholarship
- ** Involvement in studying the Bible with mentoree

INFORMATION SOURCE

- * Information source about formal expectations for promotion and tenure
- * Information source about informal expectations for promotion and tenure
- * Information source about school policies/procedures
- * Informal advice about committee work
- Informal advice about social norms

* item from original study

** added to instrument, not part of original study

Table 2
Functions Experienced
in Faculty Mentoring Relationships

<i>Function</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
Friendship	108	83.0
Belief in capabilities	98	75.0
Emotional support	91	70.0
Constructive criticism and feedback	90	69.0
Role model	88	68.0
Encouragement and coaching	84	65.0
*Caring relationship; agape love shared	83	64.0
Informal advice about people	80	62.0
Intellectual guidance	77	59.0
Information source about school policies/procedures	74	57.0
Promotion of an equal and collaborative relationship	71	55.0
*Prayer support	70	54.0
Help with teaching	64	49.0
Social activities (recreation, cultural events, eating out, etc.)	58	45.0
*Help integrating biblical principles with teaching, research, and scholarship	56	43.0
Information source about formal expectations for promotion and tenure	54	42.0
Information source about informal expectations for promotion and tenure	54	42.0
Informal advice about social norms (dress code, relationships with students, etc.)	54	42.0
Informal advice about committee work	54	42.0
*Affirmation about how God is working in mentoree's life	50	38.0
*Encouragement to obey the teachings of Jesus Christ as recorded in the Bible	50	38.0
Help making difficult career decisions	46	35.0
Help with personal problems	45	35.0
Introductions to professional network	40	31.0
Review of drafts of papers	39	30.0
Help with skill development in mentoree's professional field	39	30.0
Fostering of professional visibility	37	28.0
Introductions to persons who could further career	33	25.0
Help obtaining employment	28	22.0
Collaboration in research or publications	26	20.0
Defense from criticism by others	24	18.0
Advice about publication outlets	22	17.0

Function	n	%
Advice about research opportunities, grant proposals, or funding sources	21	16.0
Nomination for important honors	19	15.0
*Involvement in studying the Bible with mentoree relationships	17	13.0

N=130 (total number of faculty who responded to this question on the survey)
n= (number of faculty, out of 130, who indicated they experienced this
function in their mentoring relationships)

*discipleship function added to original instrument

ENDNOTES

1. T.K. Jones, "Believer's Apprentice," *Christianity Today* 35 (March 1991): 42.
2. R. Boice, "Lessons Learned About Mentoring," *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 50 (1992): 52.
3. D.W. Wheeler, "The Role of the Chairperson in Support of Junior Faculty," *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 50 (Summer 1992): 87-96.
4. M.A. Playko, "What It Means to be Mentored," *NASSP Bulletin* 74 (May 1990): 29-32.
5. R. Boice, "Early Turning Points in Professional Careers of Women and Minorities," *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 53 (1993): 77.
6. K.M. Moore, "The Role of Mentors in Developing Leaders for Academe," *Educational Record* 63 (Winter 1982): 26.
7. J.E. Blackwell, "Mentoring: An Action Strategy for Increasing Minority Faculty," *Academe: Bulletin of the AAUP* 75 (September/October 1989): 8-14; and R.A. Vartabedian, "Recruitment and Retention of Graduate Faculty in the Non-Doctoral Graduate Program," (1993): (CS 508 380). Miami, FL: Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 363 899).
8. S.M. Clark, M. Corcoran, and D.R. Lewis, "The Case for an Institutional Perspective on Faculty Development," *Journal of Higher Education* 57 (March-April 1986): 179.
9. I.L. Cesa and S.C. Fraser, "A Method for Encouraging the Development of Good Mentor-Protégé Relationships," *Teaching of Psychology* 16 (1989): 125-128.
10. S.P. Stratton and J.R. Owens, "Mentoring: Enhancing Values Development Through Intentional Relationships," *Faculty Dialogue* (Winter 1993): 94.
11. S.D. Parks, "Social Vision and Moral Courage: Mentoring a New Generation," *Cross Currents* 40, no. 3 (1990): 362.
12. D. Daniels, "Spiritual Formation in the Seminary Community: Mentoring," *Theological Students Fellowship Bulletin* 6, no. 3 (January-February 1983): 14.
13. Blackwell, "Mentoring: An Action Strategy for Increasing Minority Faculty," 13.

Who's Mentoring the Mentors?

14. Boice, "Lessons Learned About Mentoring," 51-61; A. Bragg, "Is A Mentor Program in Your Future?" *Sales & Marketing Management*, (1989): 54-63; R.J. Burke, "Mentors in Organizations," *Group and Organizational Studies* 9 (1984): 353-372; E.P. Edlind and P.A. Haensly, "Gifts of Mentorships," *Gifted Child Quarterly* 29 (1985): 55-60; M.G. Evans, "Reducing Control Loss in Organizations: The Implications of Dual Hierarchies, Mentoring and Strengthening Vertical Dyadic Linkages," *Management Science* 30 (1984): 156-168; L.S. Hollidge, "The Process of Mentoring: A Close Look at the Context, the Content, and the Influence of Mentoring") Ph.D. diss., Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University, 1990), abstract in *Dissertation Abstracts International* 51 (1990): 2971A; D.M. Hunt and C. Michael, "Mentorship: A Career Training and Development," *The Academy of Management Review* 8 (1983): 475-485; J. Krupp, "Mentoring: A Means of Sparking School Personnel," *Journal of Counseling and Development* 64 (1985): 154-155; J. Lawrie, "How to Establish a Mentoring Program," *Training and Development Journal* 41 (1987): 25-27; D.J. Levinson, *The Seasons of Man's Life* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1978); M. Makarushka, "A Little Help from a Mentor," *Business Month* (August 1989): 15; C.E. Schneier, D. MacCoy, and S. Burchman, "Unlocking Employee Potential: Developing Employee Skills," *Management Solutions* 33 (1988): 9-15; B.W. Speck, "The Manager as Writing Mentor," *Training and Development Journal* 44 (1990): 78-81; M.G. Zey, "A Mentor for All Reasons," *Personnel Journal* 67 (1988): 46-51.
15. D.E. Schroeder, "Faculty as Mentors: Some Leading Thought for Reevaluating Our Role as Christian Educators," *Christian Education Journal* 13, no. 2 (1993): 35, 37.
16. R.G. Sands, L.A. Parson, and J. Duane, "Faculty Mentoring Faculty in a Public University," *Journal of Higher Education* 62 (1991): 174-193.
17. L.A.W. Darling, "'Mentors' and 'Mentoring,'" *The Journal of Nursing Administration* 15 (1985): 42-43.
18. P.D. Stanley and J.R. Clinton, *Connecting: The Mentoring Relationships You Need to Succeed in Life* (Colorado Springs: NavPress, 1992), 40.
19. K.E. Kram, "Phases of the Mentor Relationship," *Academy of Management Journal* 26 (1983): 608-625.
20. R. Williams and R.T. Blackburn, "Mentoring and Junior Faculty Productivity," *Journal of Nursing Education* 27 (1992): 205.
21. W.A. Elwell, ed., *Baker Encyclopedia of the Bible*, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1988); M.C. Tenney, ed., *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1975).
22. C. Brown, ed., *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1986); W.E. Vine, ed., *An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words* (Old Tappan: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1966).
23. M.J. Wilkins, *Following the Master: Discipleship in the Steps of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1992), 40.
24. *Ibid.*, 41.
25. *Ibid.*, 258.
26. A.D. Curry, "Mentoring and Discipling," in *The Christian Educator's Handbook on Adult Education*, eds. K.O. Gangel and J.C. Wilhoit (Wheaton: Victor Books, 1993), 315.
27. B. Biehl and G. Urquhart, "The Art of Mentoring," in *Almost Every Answer for Practically Any Teacher: The Resource Guide*, ed. B. Wilkinson (Atlanta: Walk Thru the Bible Ministries, Inc., 1992), 200-203; R. Fleming, "Disciplemaking: A Life-on-Life Approach," in *Almost Any Answer for Practically Any Teacher!*, ed. B. Wilkinson (Portland: Multnomah Press, 1992), 197-199; H.G. Hendricks, "A Mandate for

- Mentoring," in *Seven Promises of a Promise Keeper*, eds. A Janssen and L.K. Weeden (Colorado Springs: Focus on the Family, 1994), 47-55; L.E. Whitlock, "Increasing Discipleship: A Foundation for Mission" (Ph.D. diss., Hartford Seminary, 1988).
28. T.W. Engstrom, *The Fine Art of Mentoring: Passing on to Others What God Has Given to You* (Brentwood: Wolgemuth & Hyatt Publishers, Inc., 1989); Schroeder, "Faculty as Mentors: Some Leading Thought for Reevaluating Our Role as Christian Educators," 28-39.
29. R.L. Davis, *Mentoring: The Strategy of the Master* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishing, 1991).
30. F.S. Tebbe, O.F.M., "Mentoring as an Image: the Supervision of Adult Religious Educators" (Ph.D. diss., Andover Newton Theological School, 1986), 88.
31. R.T. Blackburn, D.W. Chapman, and S.M. Cameron, "'Cloning' in Academe: Mentorship and Academic Careers," *Research in Higher Education* 15 (1981): 315-328; S.M. Rawl and L.M. Peterson, "Nursing Education Administrators: Level of Career Development and Mentoring," *Journal of Professional Nursing* 8 (May-June 1992): 161-169; Williams and Blackburn, "Mentoring and Junior Faculty Productivity," 204-209.
32. Wilkins, *Following the Master: Discipleship in the Steps of Jesus*.
33. Curry, "Mentoring and Discipling," 317.
34. Wilkins, *Following the Master: Discipleship in the Steps of Jesus*.
35. Taken from personal communication with M.J. Wilkins.
36. D.Z. Fandey, "Toward a Definition and Biblical Concept of Mentoring" (master's thesis, Biola University, 1993), 27.
37. Ibid.
38. Sands, Parson, and Duane, "Faculty Mentoring Faculty in a Public University."
39. Ibid.
40. Burke, "Mentors in Organizations," 353-372; L.R. Gaskill, "Same-Sex and Cross-Sex Mentoring of Female Protégés: A Comparative Analysis," *The Career Development Quarterly* 40 (September 1991): 48-63; Hunt and Michael, "Mentorship: A Career Training and Development," 475-485; Krupp, "Mentoring: A Means of Sparking School Personnel," 154-155; Levinson, *The Seasons of a Man's Life*; M.E. Settle, "Developing Tomorrow's Managers," *Training and Development Journal* 42 (1988): 60-64.
41. Sands, Parson, and Duane, "Faculty Mentoring Faculty in a Public University."
42. J.W. Busch, "Mentoring in Graduate Schools of Education: Mentors' Perceptions," *American Educational Research Journal* 22 (1985): 257-265.
43. Sands, Parson, and Duane, "Faculty Mentoring Faculty in a Public University."
44. B. Biehl & G. Urquhart, *Mentoring: How to Find a Mentor, How to Become One* (Laguna Niguel: Masterplanning Group International, 1990), 4.
45. R.E. Kling & D.A. Brookhart, "Mentoring: A Review of Related Literature," (1991): Report No. SP 033 864. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 346 095).

U.S. Hispanics/Latinos and the Field of Graduate Theological Education

Manuel Jesús Mejido
Emory University

ABSTRACT: The following essay provides a preliminary empirical sketch of the relationship between U.S. Hispanics and the field of graduate theological education in light of the demographic transition that is taking place in the United States, where it is estimated that by the year 2050 the Hispanic population will account for approximately one-quarter of the total U.S. population. The article argues the thesis that graduate theological education must increase its efforts to recruit Latino students and faculty, and must develop programs and courses that reflect the changing religious needs of the U.S. population.

This essay¹ is a prefatory attempt to trace the contours of the relationship between a rapidly changing U.S. Hispanic/Latino² community and the field of graduate theological education.³ Although my primary task will be to provide an empirical sketch of this relationship, my point of departure is a two-pronged normative presupposition about the nature, function, and role of theological education. First, in terms of its relationship to its external environment, I assume that theological education must be engaged and open to the multiplicity of social realities—racial, ethnic, socio-economic, religious, ideological, sexual orientation, gender, and the like; moreover, it must be ready to respond to the diversity of needs that naturally emerge from such a pluralistic context. In this sense, we can characterize the relation between the field of graduate theological education and society as dialectical, where changes in society structure theological education by presenting new problems and issues, and theological education structures society by training those students who will respond to these new problems and analyze these new issues. Secondly, in terms of its internal structure, I assume that theological education must provide the tools and resources that will allow students to become effective and efficacious leaders, i.e., it ought to, as Cornel West puts it, meet the “practical demands of educating refined and relevant Christian ministers. . . .”⁴ But also theological education must create a context for what Karl-Otto Apel has described as the “ideal communication community”⁵ where individuals recognize each other as equals, engaging each other as Other, to use Emmanuel Levinas’s parlance.⁶ Applying these assumptions to the particular case of U.S. Hispanics suggests at least three things: (1) the field of graduate theological education must open itself to the particularities and vicissitudes of

the Latino community, (2) it must provide students with the training and resources that will allow them to serve the needs of a rapidly growing Hispanic population, and (3) it must provide a context where Hispanic students and faculty are able to enter into a conversation free of hegemonic and alienating discourses, a conversation that is germane to Hispanic experiences, world-views, ideas, faith, and the like. My main contention in this paper, then, is that if religion is to continue to play the role it has played as a source of self-identity and a vehicle for the empowerment and liberation of a marginalized U.S. Latino community, it is imperative that the field of graduate theological education respond to the specific needs of this community, needs that are bound to become more visible and poignant, given the demographic transition that is transpiring in the United States where Hispanics are projected to account for approximately one-quarter of the total population and to become the single largest minority group. Specifically this implies that theological education must increase its efforts to recruit Hispanic students and faculty, and it must develop programs, courses, and the like that reflect the changing religious needs of the U.S. population. As I suggested at the outset, my aim here is only to provide a preliminary empirical sketch of the dynamic between the Hispanic community and the field of theological education. The elucidation and interpretation of this sketch I leave for future studies, and for what I hope will be one of the ongoing conversations in our seminaries and universities as we approach the new millenium: viz., What role will Hispanics play in theological education? This essay is divided into two parts: First I will provide a demographic profile of U.S. Hispanics, focusing specifically on the demographic transition that is currently transpiring, the heterogeneous character of the Hispanic population, and its marginalized status. With this as a backdrop, I will then proceed to analyze the relationship between Latinos and the field of graduate theological education. This I do via an analysis of two crucial aspects of this relationship—the enrollment of Hispanic students and the role of Hispanic faculty.

The U.S. Hispanic/Latino Landscape: A Demographic Topography

According to the U.S. Census Bureau Middle Series estimate, on January 1, 1998, the U.S. Hispanic population was 29,123,000. However, the Census Bureau has for some time acknowledged that the 1990 census missed approximately 5.0% of Latinos, and thus these statistics underrepresent this population. In attempting to make allowance for these overly conservative estimates, one research organization maintains that a more accurate projection of the U.S. Hispanic population is 30,480,900.⁷ According to this later figure, Latinos currently account for approximately 11.0% of the total U.S. population. If one places these statistics in the context of the past four decades, the population explosion of

Hispanics becomes evident. As Table 1 indicates, while in 1950 there were an estimated four million U.S. Hispanics, which accounted for 2.6% of the total U.S. population, today there are approximately 30.5 million, which account for roughly 11.3% of the population. This increase of 26 million Hispanics in the last 48 years—an increase of more than 650%—represents 23.0% of the total population growth in the United States during this period.

Table 1
Total U.S. Population and Total U.S. Hispanic Population
Select Years, 1950-1998⁸

Year	U.S. (millions)	Hispanic (millions)	Hispanic (%)
1950	151.3	4.0	2.6
1960	179.3	6.9	3.8
1970	203.2	9.0	4.4
1980	226.5	14.6	6.4
1989	249.4	23.7	9.5
1994	259.3	25.5	9.9
1996	264.8	27.2	10.3
1998	268.8	30.5	11.3

In terms of the geographical distribution of this population, approximately 70.3% of Latinos reside in four states: California, which has 34.4% of the total Hispanic population; Texas, which has 19.2%; New York, with 9.4%; and Florida, with 7.3%.⁹ Furthermore, approximately 76.9% of all Latinos reside in twenty cities, almost half of which (45.4%) reside in the following five: Los Angeles, which has an impressive 20.8% of the total Hispanic population; New York, which has approximately 12.0%; Miami, which has 4.7%; San Francisco-San Jose, with 4.1%; and Chicago, with 3.9%.¹⁰ As these data suggest, the majority of Hispanics live in an urban context and for this reason, as Edwin Meléndez has argued, *el barrio* (the urban neighborhood) must be recognized as “a key conceptual category” for analyzing Hispanic social reality.¹¹

Furthermore, the U.S. Census Bureau projects that the Latino population will continue to increase over the next five decades. For instance, High Series estimates indicate that by the year 2015 there will be approximately 53,686,000 Hispanics, which will account for 15.9% of the total U.S. population and 46.0% of the total population growth. By the year 2050, there will be approximately 133,106,000 U.S. Latinos, which will account for roughly 25.6% of the total population and 68.2% of the total population growth. According to these figures (see Table 2), the Hispanic population is expected to become the single largest minority group in

the U.S., surpassing both the African-American and Asian-American populations.

Table 2
Projections of Minority Populations in the U.S.
as Percentages of U.S. Total Population
Select Years 2000-2050¹²

Year	Latino	African American	Asian American
2000	11.6%	12.2%	4.0%
2005	13.0	12.3	4.7
2015	15.9	12.7	5.9
2050	25.6	13.8	9.1

Indeed, these projections suggest that the “Latinization”¹³ of the United States is imminent, if not already transpiring. Jorge Chapa has termed this demographic phenomenon the “age-race shift,” to describe the process whereby the Latino population is not only predicated to grow very rapidly under most conditions, but in addition, will come to account for a disproportionate amount of the younger age groups and, consequently, will become an increasingly larger part of the U.S. workforce. Chapa goes on to argue that this demographic shift is bound to produce adverse economic repercussions in the U.S. unless the socio-economic conditions of the Hispanic population are ameliorated.¹⁴

In addition to its rapid growth, the U.S. Hispanic/Latino population is also characterized by a tremendous heterogeneity—a heterogeneity that makes statistics like the ones just cited almost absurd, as they do not reflect the nuances and idiosyncrasies that define this population. Fernando Segovia has alluded to this problem of categorization when he suggests that the group termed “Hispanic” or “Latino” reveals a complex twofold character: “on the one hand, it is quite distinct and readily identifiable; on the other hand, it is also quite varied and thoroughly diverse.”¹⁵ Those dubious about the splendid diversity that characterizes the U.S. Latino population need only visit with, for instance, Roberto Goizueta and the community of San Fernando Cathedral in San Antonio, Texas,¹⁶ with Efrain Agosto and the urban communities of the Bronx, Brooklyn, and Boston,¹⁷ or with Ana María Pineda and the Salvadorian and other Central American communities of San Jose and San Francisco, California.¹⁸ Indeed, when we monolithically categorize a Mexican, a Puerto Rican, or a Central American as “Hispanic,” we must be cognizant of the fact that there is a unique history, culture, and religiosity that transcends the category. For this reason Segovia rightly states that “it would be quite improper to regard [the Latino community], whether from the outside or the inside, as a monolithic or uniform entity, except

for specific and clearly articulated analytic or strategic reasons.”¹⁹ With this in mind, then, let us briefly consider the different nationalities of the Latino population as a way of approximating its diversity. The U.S. Census Bureau generally classifies Hispanics under one of five categories: Mexican, Central and South American, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or other. According to this typology, the largest Hispanic group is Mexican, which, in 1998, were 19.6 million in number or 64.3% of the total U.S. Hispanic population. This was followed by the 4.5 million Central and South Americans, which represented 14.6% of the U.S. Hispanic population. The Puerto Ricans and the Cubans were next numbering 3.2 and 1.4 million respectively, accounting for 10.5% and 4.7% of the Latino population.

Table 3
Country of Origin of the U.S. Hispanic Population in 1998²⁰

Nationality	Number (in millions)	% of Total
Mexico	19.6	64.3
Central & South America	4.5	14.6
Puerto Rico	3.2	10.5
Cuba	1.4	4.7
Other	1.8	5.9

In spite of their diversity and rapidly expanding population, U.S. Hispanics/Latinos are a marginalized people, i.e., they have historically been—and continue to be—located at the periphery of the U.S. mainstream.²¹ Three indicators undergird the peripheral location of this group: socio-economic status, educational advancement, and political participation. Poverty, as Ana María Díaz-Stevens and Anthony M. Stevens-Arroyo have recently argued, is increasing among Latinos.²² While during the decade of the 1980s poverty among African-American and Euro-American families increased by less than 1.0%, it increased by approximately 6.0% among Hispanic households. Moreover, according to the U.S. Census Bureau, while between 1993 and 1995 African-American households experienced an income growth of 3.6%, Latino families experienced an income drop of 5.1%. In addition, in 1996, 29.2% of Hispanic families were living in poverty, compared to 28.5% of African-American families and approximately 10.0% of Euro-American families. And during the years 1974-1995, the number of Latino families living below the poverty line increased by 222.2%, while the increase in poverty during this same period among Euro-American households was 49.2%, and 43.3% among African-American families.²³

One of the causes of this adverse socio-economic situation among Hispanics can be traced to employment asymmetries. Indeed, a disproportionate number of Latinos are yoked to the lower tiers of the labor market, earning only subsistence wages, and thus with no real possibility of wealth accumulation—one of the more common paths of upward mobility and perhaps the central presupposition of the so-called “American dream.”²⁴ Consider, for example, the following statistics that undergird this adverse employment situation among Hispanics. In 1979, according to the U.S. Census Bureau, both Latino and African-American workers were approximately at par with 19.1% and 20.7% respectively vis-à-vis the category “full time with low annual earnings”; while a decade later, Hispanics were significantly worse off (27.3%) than African Americans (20.7%). Moreover, in 1995, the median weekly salary for full-time employed Euro-Americans was \$494, and for African Americans \$383, while for Hispanics it was only \$333. The repercussions of these irksome employment figures among Hispanics are exacerbated when we consider, for instance, that the mean U.S. Hispanic family has a larger household size, family size, number of dependent children, and subfamilies as compared to Euro-Americans and other minority groups (see Table 4).

Table 4
Characteristics of Latino & Non-Latino Households²⁵

	Latino	Non-Latino
Mean household size	4.6	3.4
Mean family size	3.9	3.1
Mean number of births	2.1	1.8
Households with children	58.1%	31.4%
Households with subfamilies	6.9%	2.1%

Traditionally, one of the central vehicles for socio-economic advancement has been education. A strong correlation has long existed between levels of education and employment opportunities. This holds *a fortiori* for the so-called Post-Industrial or Post-Modern epoch, where, given the conditions of economic globalization,²⁶ the level of education and technical training required of the average worker are increasing precipitously. But, as recent studies on education suggest, Hispanics have disproportionately low levels of educational attainment and limited success in schools—in a word, Hispanics are undereducated.²⁷ According to Sonia Pérez and Denise de la Rosa Salazar, “Although educational attainment levels have improved somewhat, Hispanics continue to enter school later, leave school earlier, and receive proportionately fewer high school diplomas and college degrees than other Americans.”²⁸ For instance, in 1983, fewer

than half of all Hispanics (46.3%) had completed four or more years of high school, and in the 1990s, 51.3% of Latinos are high school graduates. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, in 1991, 10.0% of Latinos 25 years of age and older had completed four or more years of college; this compared to 8.2% in 1983. In addition, Hispanics continue to account for the largest drop-out rates vis-à-vis all the other major racial/ethnic groups in the country. For instance, in 1990, approximately 37.7% of U.S. Hispanics between the ages of 18 and 24 were high school drop-outs; this compared to 15.1% of African Americans, and 13.5% of Euro-Americans.²⁹ But perhaps the most egregious evidence of the undereducation of Hispanics is their absence at the level of higher education. According to the National Center for Educational Statistics, for example, during 1994-95 only 3.3% of the total number of master's degrees conferred in the U.S. went to Hispanics, while 73.7% went to White non-Hispanics, 6.1% to African-American non-Hispanics, and 4.2% to Asian-Americans/Pacific Islanders.³⁰ Analogous trends exist at the Ph.D. level. For instance, in 1994-95 of all doctoral degrees granted, 2.2% went to Latinos, while 62.6% went to Euro-Americans, 3.8% to African Americans, and 25.1% to foreigners.³¹

Finally, I would like to point to the underrepresentation of the Latino community in the U.S. political process as further evidence of this group's marginalized status. Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, despite its rapid increase, the Hispanic population accounted for less than 3.3% of the total membership in the U.S. Congress. In fact, the proportion of Latino legislators peaked in 1995, in the 104th Congress, with 3.1% or 17 members.³² Moreover, the fact that all Latino seats were in the House of Representatives—and none in the Senate—is also telling. This trend of underrepresentation exists at all echelons of government—federal, state, and local. Consider, for example, the following statistics on Hispanic representation in local government. In 1992, Latinos accounted for only 1.5% of all elected county positions, approximately 1.3% of all municipal offices, roughly 0.17% of all township seats, and approximately 2.8% of all school district offices.³³ But perhaps the most disgruntling signs of the marginal role Hispanics play in the political process is their low numbers both in terms of voter registration and voter turn-out. In 1994, for example, 30.0% of Hispanics were registered to vote during the congressional elections, while only 19.1% actually voted. These percentages are significantly lower than those for both the African-American population, which had 58.3% voter registration and 37.0% voter turn-out, and those for the Euro-American population, which had 64.2% voter registration, and 46.9% voter turn-out.³⁴

Before we move on to our analysis of the relationship between Hispanics and the field of graduate theological education, permit me, by way of transition, to say a few words about the central role religion plays in the Latino community. According to the 1991 National Survey of Religious Identification (NSRI), only about 6.0% of Hispanics reported no religious persuasion, while 67.0% consid-

ered themselves Catholic, and 26.0% Protestant. Among the Protestants, the largest group was Baptist (7.4%); this was followed by the Christian Churches (5.2%), Pentecostal (2.0%), Methodist (1.7%), Jehovah's Witness (1.7%), and Presbyterian (0.7%).³⁵ But the true value of religion for Hispanics transcends the empirical observations and quantitative data of the sociologist. Religion provides a "sacred space" for tradition by both serving as a vehicle for the perpetuation of culture and by acting as a kind of buffer against assimilationist forces. It also serves as an ultimate ground and a medium of communication for what is—as we recall—a heterogeneous Hispanic community. Indeed, religion is essential for the U.S. Latino immigrant who faces the absurdity of an alien and alienating context by providing structure and moral order to a destabilized and vulnerable lifeworld (*lebenswelt*).³⁶ But religion is also central to the U.S.-born individual of Hispanic origin caught in the *nepantla*—or "inbetweenness"—of two lifeworlds, the ancestral/private and dominant/public lifeworlds, by imbuing this *mestizaje* also with structure and moral order, and by providing a transcendental point of reference that can assist in dealing with the existential *angst* associated with this hybrid reality. Indeed, as Díaz-Stevens and Stevens-Arroyo have suggested, "[r]eligion is a particularly powerful wellspring of Latino identity, cultural cohesiveness, and social organization."³⁷

In addition to the role religion plays as a bastion of self-identity and as a kind of *lingua franca* for U.S. Hispanics/Latinos, it can also serve as a vehicle for social empowerment. In this sense, religion helps to nurture a critical consciousness (*conscientização*),³⁸ provides a voice for the voiceless,³⁹ is a reservoir of social capital,⁴⁰ and offers institutional structures for social activism.⁴¹ Otto Maduro has put it this way: "[R]eligion could be—besides, and at times, despite other functions—a possible medium, among others, for the articulation and proactive stimulation of a people's empowerment, that is, for the actualization of their capacity to transform their social environment in consonance with their own interests."⁴² Indeed, religion as a source of identity and as a vehicle for social empowerment, has always played a significant role among Hispanics. If religion is to continue to be a prophetic and liberating force for this group, then an increasing number of religious leaders will have to be trained, organizations and programs established, and curricula developed to respond to the rapidly increasing size, and therefore needs, of the Hispanic community. In this sense, the future of religion among U.S. Latinos will in many ways be contingent upon the willingness of the field of graduate theological education to open itself to the particular perspectives and needs of this rapidly growing population.

U.S. Hispanics/Latinos and the Field of Theological Education

Let me reiterate the two presuppositions about the field of graduate theological education that was stated at the outset of this essay: First, in terms of its relationship to society, we said that theological education ought to be open to the plurality of different realities—historical, cultural, racial, ethnic, and the like—that are found in its external environment. Second, in terms of its internal structure, theological education ought to provide individuals with the resources that will allow them to adequately respond to the needs of a plurality of social milieus, and moreover, it ought to create a learning environment where individuals share with one another their unique experiences and particular world-views. Or stated in a more concrete way: the field of theological education ought to be dynamically engaged with its external environment and its internal structure—that is, the composition of its faculty and students as well as its curriculum ought to reflect this environment. If one accepts these assumptions and considers the specific case of the relationship between the field of graduate theological education and the U.S. Hispanic community, then two things become evident: first, that historically theological education has not adequately responded to the needs of Hispanics; and second, given what was said above about the rapidly growing Latino population, it is imperative that the field of theological education begin to engage and respond seriously to the needs of this population. As a way of further exploring these matters, let us now consider two aspects or components of the relationship between the field of graduate theological education and the Hispanic population—the enrollment of Hispanic students and the role of Hispanic faculty.

Enrollment

Hispanic students have historically been underrepresented in theological education. Statistics provided by The Association of Theological Schools (ATS) undergird this fact. Consider, for example, Table 5, which summarizes ATS statistics on Latino enrollment in ATS member schools. Although we can see a consistent increase in U.S. Hispanic enrollment in the last twenty-five years, when considered as a percentage of total enrollment, the underrepresentation of Latinos becomes clear. In 1972, for instance, there were approximately 264 Hispanics enrolled in ATS schools; by 1997 the number had increased to 1,921, an increase of approximately 728% in 25 years. However, historically, Hispanics have represented less than 3% of the total enrollment. For instance, in 1972, they accounted for less than 0.8% of enrollment; in 1981, 1.9%; and in 1997, 2.9%.

Table 5
Hispanic Enrollment in ATS Member Schools
Select Years, 1972-1997⁴³

Year	Hispanics	Total Enrollment	% Hispanic
1972	264	33,036	.8
1978	681	46,460	1.5
1981	955	50,559	1.9
1984	1,314	56,466	2.3
1987	1,386	55,527	2.5
1989	1,490	56,208	2.7
1991	1,627	60,086	2.7
1992	1,691	63,674	2.7
1994	1,799	65,089	2.8
1996	1,792	65,697	2.7
1997	1,921	65,416	2.9

The underrepresentation of U.S. Latinos in theological education becomes more poignant when considered in light of the demographic statistics provided above. In 1980, for instance, while Hispanics accounted for 6.4% of the total U.S. population, they accounted for less than 2.0% of total enrollment in ATS member schools. This underrepresentation increased throughout the 1980s. For example, a 1995 study that appeared in *Theological Education* reported that the enrollment of Hispanic Master of Divinity (M.Div.) students as a percentage of total M.Div. enrollment increased by only 8.0% between 1986-1991, from 2.5% to 2.7%⁴⁴; this although the percentage of Latinos in the U.S. during that same period increased by 20.8% from 7.7% to 9.3%.⁴⁵ In the 1990s this same pattern has continued. Between the years 1991-1997, for example, the percentage of U.S. Latino enrollment increased by 6.9%, from 2.7% to 2.9%, while the percentage of Latinos in the U.S. increased by approximately 15.5%, from 9.3% to 10.7%. Furthermore, when compared with enrollment statistics for African-American and Asian-American students, it becomes evident that Latinos are disproportionately underrepresented even among minorities. Statistics suggest that Asian Americans are overrepresented in the field of theological education, while African-American and Hispanic students are underrepresented—the first to a lesser degree than the second. For example, as Table 6 suggests, in 1996, Asian Americans accounted for 6.8% of total enrollment, and they represented 3.7% of the total U.S. population. This suggests that the proportion of Asian-American students in theological education is almost twice (1.8) the proportion of Asian Americans in the United States. On the other hand, African Americans accounted for only 8.5% of total enroll-

ment, although they represent 12.6% of the total U.S. population. According to these figures, the proportion of African Americans enrolled in ATS member schools is a bit more than three-fifths (.67) of the proportion of African Americans in the United States. Hispanics, however, are clearly the worst off, accounting for 2.7% of total enrollment and 10.3% of the total U.S. population. This means that the proportion of Latino students is approximately one-quarter (.26) of the proportion of Hispanics in the United States.

Table 6
Percentage of Total Enrollment, Percentage of Total U.S. Population,
and Ratio of Representation by Race/Ethnicity for the Year 1996

Race/Ethnicity	% of Enrollment	% of Population	Ratio
Asian Americans	6.8	3.7	1.8:1
African Americans	8.5	12.6	.67:1
Hispanics	2.7	10.3	.26:1

This disproportionate presence of Latinos in theological education is the result of a combination of factors. In his 1995 National Survey of Hispanic/Latino Theological Education, Edwin Hernández found three factors that he argues has led to underrepresentation: (1) financial need, (2) scarcity of time,⁴⁶ and (3) marginalization.⁴⁷ While it can be argued that the first two factors are the result of the larger socio-economic hardships that Hispanics face, what is perhaps most troubling is the third factor: that the few Hispanics that beat the odds and actually enroll in a graduate theology program complain of marginalization. And in fact, almost a decade ago, Justo González had already made us aware of the difficulties Latinos face throughout the course of their theological education when he wrote that “[m]any Hispanics have experienced their theological education as a struggle to preserve their identity, to discover theological dimensions that were not being presented to them, and to resist various forms of racism and parochialism.”⁴⁸ The findings of Hernandez’s 1995 study substantiate González’s observation. As part of the study, a bilingual 302-item survey, which aimed to explore “topics ranging from demographics to personal experience, from educational struggles and attainment to educational aspirations” was sent to 16,240 Hispanic religious leaders, of which 1,923 responded; this represented the single largest data set of Latino religious leaders to date.⁴⁹ According to the survey, 57.0% of Hispanics reported being discriminated against; 38.0% heard a faculty member make an inappropriate remark about minorities; 35.0% maintained that they had been excluded from school activities for being Hispanic; and 22.0% said that they had been insulted and threatened. Furthermore, 64.0% disagreed with the claim that the faculty and students had been supportive of minorities; 46.0% agreed that

Latinos do not fit in; and 62.0% agreed that theology students in general know little about the Hispanic culture. One of the respondents had this to say about her theological education, displaying the kind of paradoxical world-view exemplified by the logic of the logion Mt. 11: 28-30,⁵⁰ a world-view that enables Hispanics to continue in *la lucha* (the struggle) despite the hardships they face daily: “The only good thing is that this situation [of marginalization] has strengthened my ties to the community and commitment to fighting against institutional racism and trying to make a positive change in the seminary. However, it has been a wearing down process taking a lot of energy away from what I would normally put into my studies. This situation has renewed a sense of activism that did not exist before.”⁵¹

Faculty

It should not be surprising, given what we said above about enrollment, that Hispanic faculty are also underrepresented in theological education. As Table 6 indicates, in 1991 there were only 46 Latino faculty in ATS member schools; in 1994, this number had increased to 61; and in 1997, to 74. According to these statistics, throughout the 1990s the total number of Latino faculty increased by approximately 60.9%. This was greater than the total increase in Hispanic enrollment (13.6%) and almost six times the percentage increase of the number of Hispanics in the U.S (10.4%) during this same period.

Table 7
Latino Faculty in ATS Member Schools
1991-1997⁵²

Year	Latino Faculty	Total Faculty	% Latino
1991	46	2,706	1.7
1992	49	2,788	1.8
1993	57	2,733	2.1
1994	61	2,789	2.2
1995	67	2,817	2.4
1996	69	2,900	2.4
1997	74	2,979	2.5

This precipitous growth in the number of Hispanic faculty in the last eight years is due to a combination of factors. Perhaps the most significant is the coming to the fore of fellowship and networking programs for Latino students such as the Hispanic component of the Fund for Theological Education (FTE),⁵³ the Hispanic Summer Program,⁵⁴ and the Hispanic Theological Initiative (HTI).⁵⁵ Also, profes-

sional associations for Hispanic scholars such as la Asociación para la Educación Teológica Hispana (the Association for Hispanic Theological Education or AETH)⁵⁶ and the Academy of Catholic Hispanic Theologians in the United States (ACHTUS) have forged important “spaces” for Hispanic scholars, serving as valuable community-building apparatuses.⁵⁷ Lastly we must acknowledge the fact that seminaries and universities have begun to recognize the need to diversify their faculty, and have thus begun to make greater efforts to bring Hispanic instructors into their respective programs.

However, as was the case with enrollment, when considered as a percentage of total faculty and when compared to the proportion of Hispanics in the U.S., it becomes apparent that Hispanic faculty still remain substantially underrepresented. As the statistics suggest, in 1991, Latinos accounted for only 1.7% of the total faculty of ATS member schools, and by 1997 this figure had increased only by .8 percentage points to 2.5%. These percentages are significantly lower than both the proportion of Hispanics in the U.S. (11.3%), and even lower than the percentage of total Hispanic enrollment in ATS member schools (2.9%). Moreover, Hispanic faculty are underrepresented even when compared to the other two major minority groups in the United States. For instance, in 1996, Asian Americans represented 2.2% of all faculty in ATS member schools, and—as noted earlier—3.7% of the total U.S. population. These figures suggest that the proportion of Asian-American faculty is approximately three-fifths (.59) of the proportion of Asian Americans in the United States. Similarly, African Americans accounted for 5.3% of all faculty and 12.6% of the total U.S. population. According to these statistics, the proportion of African-American faculty represents approximately two-fifths (.42) of the proportion of African Americans in the United States. In 1996, however, Latinos represented only 2.4% of all faculty, while constituting 10.3% of the total U.S. population. These figures suggest that the proportion of Hispanic faculty accounts for approximately one-fifth (.23) of the proportion of the total Hispanic population in the United States. Clearly, according to these statistics, Hispanic faculty are underrepresented by the greatest degree in the ATS member schools.⁵⁸

Table 8
Percentage of Faculty, Percentage of U.S. Population, and
Ratio of Representation by Race/Ethnicity for the Year 1996

Race/Ethnicity	% of Total Faculty	% of Population	Ratio
Asian Americans	2.2	3.7	.59:1
African Americans	5.3	12.6	.42:1
Hispanics	2.4	10.3	.23:1

This low number of Latino faculty in the field of theological education has adverse repercussions both for theological and religious studies in general, and the Hispanic community in particular. Space permits me to mention only three of these negative consequences here. First, the scarcity of Latino faculty makes it almost an impossibility for courses and curricula to have a genuine Hispanic component. One student expressed this fact thus: "I have taken classes from professors who don't integrate any cross-cultural concern in their courses; the history of the church is the history of the European church and that's all. . . . They never talk to you about your culture or if they do, they just do it in one day or half an hour."⁵⁹ The small presence of Hispanic faculty—and the same can be argued is the case with other minorities—results in a monolithic and ethnocentric education, one that does not provide students with the opportunity to learn about the variety of U.S. religious experiences. For example, how many of our theology students (and faculty for that matter) can say that they have heard a Latina/o lecture on the hermeneutical significance of the Johannine Jesus for the hybrid reality of the U.S. borderlands,⁶⁰ or on the liberative dimensions of the Virgin of Guadalupe.⁶¹ Or how many have heard a Latina/o present on the possibility of Friedrich Schleiermacher's methodology or Karl Rahner's theology for doing *mestizo* or *ajiacó* theology,⁶² or on the need to develop a Hispanic public theology?⁶³

Indeed, by failing to provide a conversation "space" for Hispanic voices, our seminaries and universities are missing out on a valuable component of U.S. religious life. This consequently results in a theological education that remains isolated from the plurality of social realities, one that lacks what Cornel West has argued is essential for training the modern Christian organic intellectual, viz., a "hermeneutical historical consciousness."⁶⁴ On this first point I would finally add that it does not suffice to provide, in the name of "diversity" or "plurality," one or two courses—or perhaps what is more often the case, one or two class periods a semester—for issues of Latino theology and religiosity. If the field of graduate theological education is to make a genuine commitment to the Hispanic community, and if it is going to provide its students with an education that is relevant to the experiences of this community, then it must take steps to ensure that its faculty reflect the diversity of its external environment.

Second, the lack of Hispanic faculty in our seminaries and universities makes it extremely difficult for Latino students to have access to Latino mentors, advisors, or dissertation committee members. One student described this frustration this way: "I never had Latino role models as professors. The experience of not finding your history, culture, and religious ethos being heard in the classroom leaves one culturally naked."⁶⁵ This comment at the very least raises an ethical question for the field of graduate theological education, a question that is bound to become increasingly more germane given the demographic transition that is transpiring. The question could be articulated thus: Do seminaries and religious

studies programs have a responsibility to provide minority students with faculty, mentors, and conversation partners from their own racial/ethnic groups, especially if evidence suggests that this will ameliorate minority students' experiences of "cultural nakedness"?

And third, I would like to point to the relationship between the lack of Hispanic faculty and the scarcity of Hispanic scholarship. It is not surprising, given that the majority of the academic scholarship is produced by faculty, that historically there has been a scarcity of Latino scholarship. Anyone who doubts this need only, for instance, visit the exhibit halls of the American Academy of Religion (AAR) annual meetings to notice that Latino scholarship is egregiously underrepresented. Granted that there has been a relative increase in the production of Hispanic scholarship throughout the 1990s,⁶⁶ but there is a long way yet to go.

Gary Riebe-Estrella expresses the struggle of Hispanic scholars in this way: "Through the efforts of many of the members of this academy, [Hispanic theologians] began to achieve a legitimation for Latino theology within academia itself. We have fought the long battle, not yet won, to establish theology done from a Latino standpoint as theology with no qualifying adjectives attached; a theology valid not just for Latinos, but one with insights that merit serious attention of non-Latinos as well."⁶⁷ This third point is not intended to be a strategic argument where the claim is that Hispanics need to publish more books or articles to be competitive and at par with others groups. Rather, what is at stake here is more substantive in nature: scholarship is an essential component of theological education—it is one of the driving forces behind curricular development, it sets the tone for conversations, symposia, and meetings, for example. In a word, scholarship leads to new questions, creates new discourses, and sets new horizons in an academic field. Given this relationship between scholarship and innovation, if the field of theological education desires to internalize the diversity of its external environment, then it must ensure that the production of theological scholarship also reflects this external environment. What more efficacious way is there of accomplishing this than to ensure that its faculty, and therefore the majority of its scholars, also reflect the plurality of its external environment?

Conclusion

The question is this: Will the field of theological education remain autarchic and choose to ignore the plurality of social realities that make up its external environment—and moreover will it choose to disregard the changes that take place in society, as in the demographic transition that is currently transpiring in the United States? Or rather, will theological education choose to open itself to the plurality of social realities and choose to acknowledge and engage the changes that are taking place in the U.S.? If the first, then the status quo will suffice;

theological education can continue to mirror, and thus perpetuate, the inequalities that exist in society. But if the second, then, as I have attempted to argue in this essay, the field of theological education must respond to the needs of the Hispanic community, needs that are bound to become more visible and poignant given the fact that Hispanics are projected to account for approximately one-quarter of the total U.S. population and become the single largest minority group. Specifically, as I have contended, this implies that theological education must increase its efforts to recruit Hispanic students and faculty and it must develop programs and courses that reflect the changing religious needs of the U.S. population. For only when the field of graduate theological education is willing to engage the reality of the U.S. Hispanic population and only when it allows its internal structure—students, faculty, and curricula—to be shaped by this reality, will Hispanics cease to be mere objects of a “pedagogy of the oppressed” and become active and empowered subjects, who together with other subjects, participate in a genuine theological education, and by so doing also participate in a “pedagogy for liberation.”⁶⁸

Manuel Jesús Mejido is a doctoral student in the Ethics and Society Program of the Graduate Division of Religion at Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia.

ENDNOTES

1. I would like to express my gratitude to the Hispanic Theological Initiative (HTI) for creating a “space” where Latino scholars can engage in conversation—conversations that make reflections such as this one a reality. I would especially like to thank HTI’s Program Director, Daisy Machado, who provided valuable bibliographical and statistical information without which this study would not have been possible.
2. I am in accord with Fernando Segovia that no label used to date adequately describes the group “Hispanic/Latino Americans in the United States.” I agree, moreover, that the nomenclature “U.S. Hispanic/Latino Americans” is the most adequate to describe this group. Fernando F. Segovia, “Introduction: Aliens in the Promised Land,” in *Hispanic/Latino Theology: Challenge and Promise*, eds. Ada María Isasi-Díaz and Fernando F. Segovia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), 15-42. In this essay, however, for stylistic reasons, I will alternate among the most commonly used designations—Hispanic, Latino, U.S. Hispanic, U.S. Latino, and the like.
3. I use the term “field” here analogous to how Pierre Bourdieu has used it, viz., to suggest that graduate theological education is a semi-autonomous microcosm within academia. Pierre Bourdieu and Loïc J. D. Wacquant, *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 97. For conceptual purposes we can distinguish the following five elements as central components of the field of graduate theological education: (1) actors (e.g., students, faculty, administrators, etc.); (2) institutions (e.g., seminaries, university religion departments, churches, etc.); (3) programs (e.g., M.Div., M.A., D.Min., Th.D., Ph.D., etc.); (4) curricula (e.g., biblical studies, theology, history, social sciences, etc.); and (5) scholarship. In short, we can conceptualize the internal structure of the field of theological education as the dynamic interaction among these five elements.
4. Cornel West, “The Crisis in Theological Education,” in *Prophetic Fragments: Illuminations of the Crisis in American Religion and Culture* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993), 273.

5. See, for instance, Karl-Otto Apel, *Transformation der Philosophie*, 2 vols. (Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1973) and Enrique Dussel, "The Reason of the Other: 'Interpellation' as Speech Act," in *The Underside of Modernity: Apel, Ricoeur, Rorty, Taylor, and the Philosophy of Liberation*, ed. Eduardo Mendieta (Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press, 1996), 27.
6. Consult, for instance, Emmanuel Levinas, *Totality and Infinity* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1969).
7. Strategy Research Corporation, *1998 U.S. Hispanic Market* (Miami: Strategic Research Corporation, 1997), 32.
8. *Ibid.*, 34. Adapted from the table, "Total U.S. Population and Total U.S. Hispanic Population 1950-1998."
9. *Ibid.*, 38. These four are followed by: Illinois (4.0%), Arizona (3.4%), New Jersey (3.3%), New Mexico (2.5%), Colorado (1.9%), and Massachusetts (1.3%)—which together make up the ten states with the highest Hispanic populations.
10. *Ibid.*, 36. In addition to the five mentioned, the following make up the twenty most populated Hispanic cities: Houston (3.7%), San Antonio (3.5%), McAllen/Brownsville (2.7%), Dallas-Ft. Worth (2.6%), San Diego (2.3%), Fresno (2.2%), Phoenix (2.2%), El Paso (2.2%), Albuquerque (2.2%), Sacramento (2.0%), Denver (1.3%), Philadelphia (1.3%), Washington, DC (1.2%), Corpus Christi (1.1%), and Boston (1.0%).
11. Edwin Meléndez, "The Economic Development of *El Barrio*," in *Borderless Borders: U.S. Latinos, Latin Americans, and the Paradox of Interdependence*, eds. Frank Bonilla, Edwin Meléndez, Rebecca Morales, and María de los Angeles Torres (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998), 105.
12. Adapted from the table, "Minority Populations of the United States as a Percentage of the Total Population 1995-2050," in Strategy Research Corporation, *1998 U.S. Hispanic Market* (Miami: Strategic Research Corporation, 1997), 49.
13. This term is Frank Bonilla's. See his "Changing the Americas from Within the United States," in *Borderless Borders: U.S. Latinos, Latin Americans, and the Paradox of Interdependence*, ix-xiii.
14. He explains: "Since Latinos' earnings are much lower than average, this [will have] immediate economic implications of decreasing the national level of per capita earnings." Jorge Chapa, "The Burden of Interdependence: Demographic, Economic, and Social Prospects for Latinos in the Reconfigured U.S. Economy," in *Borderless Borders: U.S. Latinos, Latin Americans, and the Paradox of Interdependence*, 71.
15. Fernando F. Segovia, "Two Places and No Place on Which to Stand," in *Mestizo Christianity: Theology from the Latino Perspective*, ed. Arturo J. Bañuelos (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1995), 30.
16. Roberto S. Goizueta, *Caminemos con Jesús: Toward a Hispanic/Latino Theology of Accompaniment* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1995), 30-37.
17. Efrain Agosto, "The Gifts of Urban Theological Education: A Personal and Professional Reflection," *Theological Education* 33, no.1 (1996): 93-105.
18. Arturo J. Bañuelos, ed., *Mestizo Christianity: Theology from the Latino Perspective*, 125.
19. Fernando F. Segovia, "Two Places and No Place on Which to Stand," in *Mestizo Christianity: Theology from the Latino Perspective*, 30.
20. Adapted from the table, "Country of Origin U.S. Hispanic Population 1998." Strategy Research Corporation, *1998 U.S. Hispanic Market*, 53.

21. I by no means pretend to do justice here to this issue of marginalization. I will only provide a preliminary outline to orient the discussion that follows. For a more thorough treatment of this issue see, for instance, Jorge Chapa, Frank Bonilla, Edwin Meléndez, Rebecca Morales, and María de los Angeles Torres, eds., *Borderless Borders: U.S. Latinos, Latin Americans, and the Paradox of Interdependence*; Antonio Darder, Rodolfo D. Torres, and Henry Gutiérrez, eds., *Latinos and Education: A Critical Reader* (Routledge: Routledge, 1998); and Antonio Darder and Rodolfo D. Torres, eds., *The Latino Studies Reader: Culture, Economy & Society* (Malden: Blackwell, 1998). For statistics that substantiate this claim of marginalization among Latinos, consult Louise L. Hornor, ed., *Hispanic Americans: A Statistical Sourcebook* (Palo Alto: Information Publications, 1997).
22. Ana María Díaz-Stevens and Anthony M. Stevens-Arroyo, *Recognizing the Latino Resurgence in U.S. Religion* (Boulder: Westview, 1998), 22.
23. Ibid.
24. The myth of the “American dream,” i.e., the story of the industrious and frugal individual, who accumulates wealth over time and by so doing achieves upward socio-economic mobility, does not take into account the employment asymmetries that result from deep-rooted structural discrimination.
25. Adapted from Table 1.3. Ana María Díaz-Stevens and Anthony Stevens-Arroyo, *Recognizing the Latino Resurgence in U.S. Religion*, 27.
26. For a treatment of the adverse effects of economic globalization on the Hispanic population consult, for instance, Jeremy Brecher, “Popular Movements and Economic Globalization,” *Borderless Borders: U.S. Latinos, Latin Americans, and the Paradox of Interdependence*, 185-193.
27. See, for instance, Antonio Darder, Rodolfo D. Torres, and Henry Gutiérrez, eds., *Latinos and Education*.
28. Sonia Pérez and Denise de la Rosa Salazar, “Economic, Labor Force, and Social Implications,” in *Ibid.*, 48.
29. *Ibid.*, 48-49.
30. Table 269. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, *Digest of Education Statistics 1997*, 299.
31. *Ibid.*, 302. Table 272.
32. Table 6.09. Louise Hornor, ed., *Hispanic Americans: A Statistical Sourcebook*, 111.
33. U.S. Bureau of the Census, *1992 Census of Governments, Popularly Elected Officials*, (GC92[1]-2).
34. U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Current Population Reports*, P20-453 and P20-466.
35. Ana María Díaz Stevens and Anthony Stevens-Arroyo, *Recognizing the Latino Resurgence in U.S. Religion*, 37.
36. The nomenclature “moral order” is Robert Wuthnow’s. See his *Meaning and Moral Order: Explorations in Cultural Analysis* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989).
37. Ana María Díaz-Stevens and Anthony Stevens-Arroyo, *Recognizing the Latino Resurgence in U.S. Religion*, 33-34.
38. Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: Continuum, 1997).
39. Daniel Levine, *Popular Voices in Latin American Catholicism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992).
40. According to Robert Putnam “social capital” refers to “features of social life—networks, norms, and trust—that enable participants to act together more effectively

to pursue shared objectives." Robert Putnam, "Tuning In, Tuning Out: The Strange Disappearance of Social Capital in America," 1995 *Ithiel de Sola Pool Lecture*, American Political Science Association, unpublished manuscript, 2.

41. As, for instance, is the case, John A. Coleman, S.J., argues, with para-denominational groups that help congregations see "concrete strategies for investing their social capital and giving it a determined social face by channeling it into citizenship activity." John A. Coleman, S.J., "Citizenship and Discipleship," unpublished manuscript, 12.

42. Otto Maduro, "Notes Toward a Sociology of Latina/o Religious Empowerment," in *Hispanic/Latino Theology: Challenge and Promise*, 155.

43. *Fact Book on Theological Education* (Pittsburgh: The Association of Theological Schools, selected years).

44. Ellis L. Larsen, "A Profile of Contemporary Seminarians Revisited," *Theological Education* XXXI Supplement (1995): 12.

45. Table 1.01. Louise L. Hornor, ed., *Hispanic Americans: A Statistical Sourcebook 1997*, 3.

46. The scarcity of time was due to work and family-related issues.

47. Edwin I. Hernández, "Hispanic Religious Leadership: Building for the Future," unpublished manuscript, 60. This manuscript summarizes the findings of the already mentioned 1995 National Survey of Hispanic/Latino Theological Education.

48. Justo González, *The Theological Education of Hispanics* (New York: The Fund for Theological Education, 1988), 75.

49. Edwin I. Hernández, "Hispanic Religious Leadership: Building for the Future," 41-42.

50. "Come to me, all you who are *weary* and *find life burdensome*, and *I will refresh you*. Take my yoke upon your shoulders and learn from me, for I am gentle and humble of heart. Your souls will find rest, for *my yoke is easy and my burden light*." Emphasis added.

51. Edwin Hernández, National Survey of Latino/Hispanic Theological Education, 1995.

52. *Fact Book on Theological Education* (Pittsburgh: The Association of Theological Schools), selected years.

53. The Fund for Theological Education (FTE) was founded in 1954 with the purpose of increasing the enrollment of students in theological education, and ultimately, the number of Christian ministers and religious leaders. "Begun in close affiliation with the American Association of Theological Schools, the Fund for Theological Education grew both in scope and size over the next forty years and became a leading force in support of excellence in theological study and the wider inclusion of African-Americans and Hispanics in theological education." In the 1970s, the FTE developed two fellowship programs specifically tailored for Hispanics: the Fellowships for Hispanic Americans Preparing for Christian Ministries, and the Doctoral Fellowships for the Study of Religion for Hispanic Americans. "However, faced with the most severe fiscal crisis of its history in 1995, the Fund for Theological Education was forced to suspend nearly all of its programs after the 1995-96 academic year." Jonathan Strom, "The Fund for Theological Education: A Brief History" (unpublished manuscript). For a treatment of the Hispanic component of the FTE consult, Justo González, *The Theological Education of Hispanics*, 108-116.

54. The Hispanic Summer Program was launched in 1988 by FTE; today it is under the auspices of the Asociación para la Educación Teológica Hispana (or AETH). This program offers courses taught by prominent Hispanic theologians and scholars on

issues of Latino theology and religiosity to Latino theology students and religious leaders in general.

55. The Hispanic Theological Initiative (HTI) was founded in 1996 by a grant from The Pew Charitable Trusts; although it provides scholarships to Hispanic students pursuing graduate theological degrees, it is primarily recognized as a networking and community building program. "The building of a community of Latina/o scholars is critical to the HTI vision. This is based on the recognition that graduate education is most successful when there is a support system provided to the graduate student. Isolation, lack of a supportive environment, feelings of being on the margins of the program as well as the interests of advisors and professors, have been key reasons why some Latino graduate students in theology have not considered doctoral studies or have not completed their doctoral degrees. The HTI seeks to respond to this need for community in a variety of ways." "About the Hispanic Theological Initiative," Hispanic Theological Initiative 1998 Summer Workshop Brochure.

56. The Asociación para la Educación Teológica Hispana (or AETH) was founded in 1991; while open to all Christians, it is primarily a Protestant organization. "Given its focus on theological education, however, its reach is enormous, bringing together individuals and groups from the whole spectrum of Protestantism, both in terms of denominations (from evangelicals and Pentecostals to the mainline or historical churches) and educational institutes (from newly established Bible institutions to long-standing seminaries and divinity schools)." Fernando Segovia, "Introduction: Aliens in the Promised Land," *Hispanic/Latino Theology: Challenge and Promise*, 17-18.

57. The Academy of Catholic Hispanic Theologians in the United States (ACHTUS) was founded in 1988; it provides a "space" for theological reflection and conversation from a Hispanic Roman Catholic perspective primarily through its annual meeting and colloquium. "Given its restriction of full membership to Roman Catholics with a doctoral degree in any of the classical theological disciplines, ACTHUS has witnessed steady but limited growth in numbers." In 1992, ACHTUS began to publish the *Journal of Hispanic/Latino Theology*, a scholarly journal dedicated to the theological and religious issues of Hispanics. "Although obviously Catholic in orientation, the journal was conceived as resolutely catholic in reach, open to contributions from U.S. Protestant Hispanic Americans as well as from non-U.S. Hispanic Americans." *Ibid.*

58. *Fact Book on Theological Education 1997-98* (Pittsburgh: The Association of Theological Schools, 1998), 68.

59. Edwin Hernández, National Survey of Latino/Hispanic Theological Education, 1995.

60. Leticia A. Guardiola-Sáenz, a Ph.D. candidate at Vanderbilt University, is writing her dissertation in this area.

61. Nora O. Lozano-Díaz, a Ph.D. candidate at Drew University, presented a paper at the American Academy of Religion 1998 Annual Meeting in this area entitled, "Ignored Virgin or Unaware Women: Reflections on the Virgin of Guadalupe from a Mexican American Perspective."

62. Carlos Cardoza-Orlandi, Instructor in World Christianity at Columbia Theological Seminary, is interested in the prospects of Schleiermacher's theological method for elucidating the encounter of religions. Miguel Diaz, Ph.D. candidate at the University of Notre Dame and Assistant Professor of Theology at St. Vincent De Paul Regional Seminary, is writing his doctoral dissertation on the emergence of a Hispanic theological anthropology. One of his interlocutors is Karl Rahner. Miguel de la Torre, a Ph.D. candidate at Temple University, is writing his doctoral dissertation on what he has called *ajiac* Christianity and the prospects for a Cuban-exile ethics of reconciliation. He

presented some aspects of his work at the American Academy of Religion 1998 Annual Meeting. His paper was entitled, "Martí, Massacres, and *Mulato* Christianity."

63. Benjamín Valentín, a Ph.D. candidate at Drew University, is doing dissertation work in this area.

64. Cornel West, "The Crisis of Theological Education," in *Prophetic Fragments: Illuminations of the Crisis in American Religion and Culture*, 278.

65. Edwin Hernández, National Survey of Latino/Hispanic Theological Education, 1995.

66. According to Fernando Segovia, the theological production of U.S. Hispanic Americans has burgeoned in the 1990s. See his "Introduction: Aliens in the Promised Land," *Hispanic/Latino Theology: Challenge and Promise*, 19-20.

67. Gary Riebe-Estrella, S.V.D., "Latinos and Theological Education," *Journal of Hispanic/Latino Theology* vol. 4, no. 3 (1997): 6.

68. Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* and Ira Shor and Paulo Freire, *A Pedagogy for Liberation: Dialogues on Transforming Education* (Westport: Bergin & Garvey, 1987).

Black Theology on Theological Education

Dwight N. Hopkins
University of Chicago Divinity School

ABSTRACT: This essay investigates theological education from a black theological viewpoint. It argues for an analytical understanding of how theological education engages the dynamic between critical faith and the equalization of God's gifts for all humanity. This view cuts across denominational allegiances, privileging of academic disciplines, and both an abstract belief and a utilitarian witness. The central claim focuses on a theological pedagogy that recognizes that something fundamental is at stake. That is to say, God has called creation to fulfill a mission of liberation: the process of seeking full spiritual and material freedom starting with the least of society, but encompassing all of creation. To pursue this line of argument, this essay frames its conclusions around the issues of theological stand, method, and viewpoint. With this foundational scaffolding, Christians, in particular, and all people of good faith can play their role in the God-human *telos*—the struggle for liberation and the practice of freedom.

From the perspective of a black theology of liberation, theological education pertains to how people of faith change the world for a communal sharing of resources given to humanity by God. In this sense, the starting point of discourses on theological education is not the important debate over the nature of theological education and religious studies. Nor does one commence the interrogation of the contours of theological education by seeking, discovering, and proclaiming a universal, static meta-means of interpretation. One does not, furthermore, undertake such a religious pedagogy by situating oneself within the confines of any one particular ecclesial tradition. And finally, but not in any completely exhaustive sense, the endeavors to define theological education do not lie in a privatized epistemological faith or in individualistic acquisition of profit—that is, a capitalist prosperity gospel.

Theological education looks beyond the walls of the academy, historically truncated faith genealogies, contemporary institutional communities of believers, and the centering of the self as the ultimate lens of adjudicating reality. In other words, the aim, structure, and criteria of theological education arise from an analysis and experience of the movement for full humanity in the anthropological and ecological interactions in the world.

Theological education, therefore, is the practice of a holistic liberation constituted as a front of struggle and by a creative dynamic toward psychological, social, cultural, economic, political, and linguistic full humanity. If theological education involves reality in the world, then the notion of power occupies a central location and is a highly contested site within theological education itself. Power—who has it, who does not—becomes key because God has created all of humanity to share power equally in a holistically balanced self, community, and world interplay. Again such a totality denotes and connotes full humanity—the communal sharing of all resources at every conceivable level among social relations, with the ecology, and within the self-other particularity.

Theological education looks at the God-human effort in the world wherever Christians and others attempt a strategic effort to sustain and reveal a movement of liberation—a struggle to balance a communal connection of self, society, and creation. For theological education to pursue such a *telos* requires the detection, analysis, and transformation of knowledge regarding power. Theological education means starting with a practice of liberation faith in the world; that is, the striving of humanity to own and share communally the divine gift of resources. Theological education, then, is a pedagogy of equal distribution at every level of life. And, from the perspective of black theology, it signifies a conscientious “stand,” method, and viewpoint with the least in society.

Theological Stand

Theological education does not have a “stand” that is neutral because the story of God’s revelation of divine intent in both the Bible and human social relations indicates and substantiates this claim. Put differently, theological education stands with the interests of the majority of the United States and the world: poor and working-class people and, through them, all humanity. Black theology of liberation derives this notion of stand from both scriptural witness and the ordinary experience of black people: that is to say, divine revelation in scriptural witness as well as in black vernacular modes and styles of life. The issue of “stand” in theological education is constituted by an epistemology grounded in a nexus between ultimate concerns and the pain-resistance dynamic of the least in society. For black theology, this nexus is located in the Bible and black everyday experiences.

We perceive an engaged theological education from black theology’s reading of the Christian narrative. In the biblical story, the primal hope act of God is the exodus story. It signifies the paradigmatic expression of covenantal partnership of divine-human co-constitution of the oppressed self into a new liberated self. Divine intent works with marginalized humanity through liberation to exit out of physical restraints of Egyptian bondage (wherever it exists today) and into material free space undergirded by a spiritual belief in the power of Yahweh and the human community. The spirit of total liberation or holistic

freedom of Yahweh is never in itself, but is always an empowering *ruach* (i.e., breath) for poor humanity. The finger of God is for us, and the divine spirit breathes on us, for us. Thus the decisive nature of a non-colonizing exodus story in the Hebrew scriptures and a decisive mission of Jesus' proclamation and vocation for the poor in the Christian Scriptures reveal the concretization of holy *ruach* and *pneuma* among broken and struggling humanity.

To encounter the identity of God's liberating spirit—the divine face of freedom—we look for what God is doing in the ongoing process of embedded transcendent ethics of holistic spiritual and material humanity. Divine ethics (i.e., the doing of God) do not escape us into invisibility or in a distant space acting on us, absent from us. The work of God is actively present for us in the poor's attempt to construct themselves anew. God for us is always socially situated with the poor communities on this earth. To believe otherwise is to deny and fracture the original covenant of the Spirit's presence for broken humanity. God does wherever and whenever marginalized humanity cries out in the pain and pleasure of forging a new self. Divine activity is the voice of the voiceless fighting to make a way out of no way. *There* is the action of Yahweh and Jesus.

The acts and ethics of God are also in direct response to the monopolizers of power and resources of society who project their fears upon the other (in the instance of black theology, the other is the African-American oppressed community in solidarity with other groups in struggle). Somewhat similar to the Israelites of old, black people today embody the otherness of skewed social relations, not in their favor. For example, in the book of Exodus, the new king who came to power in Egypt stated:

“These Israelites are so numerous and strong that they are a threat to us. In case of war they might join our enemies in order to fight against us, and might escape from the country. We must find some way to keep them from becoming even more numerous.” So the Egyptians put slave-drivers over them to crush their spirits with hard labor. (Exodus 1:9-11, *Good News Bible*)

In today's society, race remains a negative indicator of black evil and untrustworthiness. It serves, for those with resources to propagate such a vision, as a thesaurus for criminality, slovenliness, sexuality, and non-intellectual labor. The social location of racial formation is either outstanding or standing out. The black self is perceived to excel beyond the norm (therefore an outstanding exception) or expected to fail (hence a palpable disaster which, in common sense understanding, is the African-American norm): either an unbelievable herculean success or a predictable collapse beneath the pressures of life. Race matters still in Christianity and American culture as demonic presence and as the two options of standing out or outstanding. As the new king stated in the book of Exodus: “They are a threat to us.”

The projected threat of a defined community marked by color pigmentation then operates at many levels. The monopolizers of power in society define a mission to “crush their spirit with hard labor.” The oppression of African Americans (particularly the poor) is spiritual and material. Material oppression is to extract profit, either by a disproportionate presence of the black poor in the unemployed ranks or by a general asymmetrical income and wealth scale detrimental to African-American workers. On the spiritual plane, the attempt is to crush the memory, vision, and desire to struggle for freedom, thereby anesthetizing marginalized African-American communities into a blurred perception of who has the monopolized power over resources to create a threat with them as the Other, and to implement a systematic locking out of the majority of the black humanity from the earth’s gifts created by God. In contrast and in response, God works with the oppressed black community to co-constitute a new liberated, spiritual, and material humanity. God is a spirit of freedom for us.

The fundamental act of God (i.e., the doing and ethics of the divinity of liberation for us) is earthly emancipation for those in bondage, both spiritual and material, and this act operates in a co-constitution fashion. The poor and broken-hearted are co-agents with divine intent resulting in the fashioning of a new emancipated human self. In a word, God works with us through the act of freedom as we constitute ourselves from oppression to a full humanity of the highest potential for a liberated humanity. God liberates us totally and holistically. The basis of the new self is found in the ethics of divine freeing on earth. As one former African-American slave asserted in faith:

Indeed I, with others, was often told by the minister how good God was in bringing us over to this country from dark and benighted Africa, and permitting us to listen to the sound of the gospel. To me, God also granted temporal freedom, which man without God’s consent, had stolen away.¹

Though sacred power pervades the spiritual dimension as well, the giving of full humanity—the Spirit of liberation for us—is all the time manifest in the temporal realm. For the earth’s dispossessed, “the sound of the gospel” is temporal freedom. We cannot encounter the language of the gospel, the work of Yahweh and Jesus, without it being embedded or embodied in the tangible. The temporality of freedom might be manifest in miniature acts of God or in obvious major divides in the fracturing of restraints that enchain oppressed humanity. In either way, God’s ethics and doing come to us or are granted to us as a sign of divine grace. The gift of the spirit of total liberation is the manifest presence of a holy, omnipotent God whose constancy of being for us is eternal and whose glory appears in mercy, whose patience of working with and for us (despite our frail limitations) reflects the fullness of divine wisdom. The power of God to work on behalf of and with the oppressed never ceases.

God offers a liberating presence. We are not alone, for the covenantal engagement between Yahweh and the oppressed (both on the spiritual and material plane) arises out of the haunting testimony of the enslaved African American poor and the cries of the biblical witness. In the exodus drama, Yahweh proclaims to those in bondage:

I have seen how cruelly my people are being treated in Egypt; I have heard them cry out to be rescued from their slave-drivers. I know all about their sufferings, and so I have come down to rescue them from the Egyptians and to bring them out of Egypt to a spacious land. (Ex. 3:7-8, *Good News Bible*)

The power of God to work for the oppressed is eternal. In the divine time of patience and knowing all about the plight of the poor, Yahweh's demonstrative glory comes as the harnessing of divine might for the "little ones" of this earth. For the marginalized believer, God's acts are real.

In this belief of those without access to resources to live their full humanity, we discover a faith to act on the covenantal promise of Yahweh. The doctrine of God is liberation for those who believe and act on this faith. For instance, having departed from the system of slavery in the old south, Etna Elizabeth Dauphus confessed the following to an interviewer:

In setting forth her reasons for escaping she asserted that she was tired of slavery and an unbeliever in the doctrine that God made colored people simply to be slaves for white people; besides, she had a strong desire to "see her friends in Canada."²

Etna Dauphus exemplifies the co-constitution of the self (e.g., the divine and human agreement of transformation from the old to the new humanity). God provides the faith in liberation (as the divine intent for us) upon which the sufferer is freed with an emancipating belief to act (in response to and in accord with that which is offered by Yahweh) on the word or doctrine of the freedom spirit for us.

The divine gift of God, therefore, is both the active presence of the Spirit for us (i.e., Yahweh acts on the hearing of the cries of the oppressed) and the granting of free agency as liberating common sense to the oppressed. The doing of the Spirit for us is the manifest might of God and the gift to us to act freely with divine purpose. As another fugitive ex-slave penned in his autobiography: "In no situation, with no flowery disguises, can the revolting institution [of bondage] be made consistent with the free-agency of [humanity] which we all believe to be the Divine gift." The intertwining of divine act, human faith, divine gift, and human agency is the empowering covenant for a God-human co-constitution of oppressed humanity.

Moreover black theology's perception of theological education as an enterprise that is not neutral but one that takes a clear stand with the least in society is, in addition to the biblical witness, argued from the fact of black folk's everyday wisdom sayings. Thus theological education as a practice of freedom is resourced by liberating biblical stories and by poor and working class folk's everyday, common sense experience.

Common Sense Experiences

The common sense experiences of poor and working class black folks consist of sayings pregnant with folk theological wisdom. In black vernacular tradition, one hears the following: "God may not come when you call him, but he's right on time." In this expression, the divinity is a time-God, who operates on God's own time. From the human perspective, one could not instruct, nor always understand, the mysterious ways of the All Powerful. But somehow and some way in the vernacular of black faith, God appears "on time" to ease one's "troubled mind, lift your burdens, prop you up on every leaning side, and help you climb the rough side of the mountain." It is this time-God, who "makes a way out of no way."

Similarly, the expression that "God sits high but looks low" images a majestic Being whose providence and ability encompass all of reality. Though this all-powerful One holds the whole world in divine hands, still God knows the individual hairs on each of the heads of society's weak and downtrodden. "Our arms might be too short to box with God" (to paraphrase a slave saying), but this God is never positioned too high to empty the divine Spirit into the human predicament. Indeed, the appearance of God's Word in the form of the human Jesus symbolizes precisely the divine spirit becoming poor in order to ensure suffering humanity's liberation. Referencing the metaphor of "dead to sin/slavery and resurrection to life/liberation," one former black slave witnessed to his new Christian freedom brought to earth by the Spirit. He stated the following:

Whenever a man has been killed dead and made alive in Christ Jesus he no longer feels like he did when he was a servant of the devil. Sin kills dead but the spirit of God makes alive.³

"God don't like ugly," another popular faith statement in African-American vernacular, implies the eschatological certainty that trouble does not last always for the voiceless of society. For example, commenting on God's ultimacy in defeating slavery by bringing on the Civil War, ex-slave J.W. Lindsay proclaimed: "No res' fer niggers 'till God he step in an' put a stop to de white folks meanness."⁴

Though evil might reign in the immediate realm (that is, the penultimate reality), in the end God's will would be done on earth for the sufferers of pain and abuse. Such an expectation of the finality of justice gives poor and working class black Christians hope in a future that would be theirs. Hope engenders the power to keep on struggling—to survive and persist—because their divinity will take care of them through trials and tribulations. The ugliness of life has no dominion and will be defeated someday because the desire of the oppressed for full humanity coincides with the divinity's disdain of evil.

The everyday life experiences of the black folk teach them that though God is on time, looks low, and detests ugliness, oppressed humanity is, nevertheless, a co-laborer with God. We find this belief in another saying: "God helps those who help themselves." As divine creations, the nature of human beings compels them to defend themselves and struggle for full humanity in the course of achieving their fullest creative possibilities. This indicates for the oppressed a fight against material manifestations of evil so that the least in society can help forge their own new humanity. To wait idly on God while evil forces crushed one's spirit, body, and mind exemplified a slow suicide. To the contrary, God summons society's victims to co-labor with God and one another in life's dangerous vineyards in order to produce life's fullest fruit.

Theological Method

In addition to an engaged stand with compassion for the least in society, theological education has to attend to method. For black theology, theological method should be integrative or holistic on several levels.

First, there needs to be an integration between various types of experiences, specifically practical and cognitive. Students bring to the classroom various types of practical experiences of ministry or vocation. Theological education, therefore, should take as its starting point (within the context of our previous discussion of stand in theological education) the variegated life experiences of students. Whether students are coming directly from completing a previous degree, or emerging from involvements such as homeless organizing, explicit women's movements, anti-racist work, lesbian and gay activities, travel abroad, or church ministry, the question is to begin with the reality of the gifts brought by a diverse student body. Moreover, given the growing number of second-career students who are older, theological education has the creative opportunity to speak more directly to other disciplines and walks of life in the public arena represented by these students. In a certain sense the classroom becomes a laboratory of multiple experiences, each grappling with and critiquing its own notion of authority, credibility, and verifiability.

The diversity of the student population, dictated by its varied experiences, affords the professor of theological education the opportunity to offer a multidisciplinary curriculum. This type of teaching or syllabus will require the

professor to risk integrating into her or his explicit theological knowledge pedagogical theories arising from such corners as political science, economics, anthropology, psychology, and cultural studies, for example. Here the argument is twofold. One is to provide intellectual insights and theoretical frameworks appropriate for the actual experiences of the student body. The second is a call for theological studies to be truly public, by which I mean that theology is not primarily a private or a denominational affair. It should gear students to the public, civic realm, and this realm, at least as lived by everyday people, does not distinguish between faith and secular activities, a distinction often represented in the academy.

This is not to say that all citizens are Christians or even religious. It is simply to claim that religion in America, indeed in the world, involves and presents a major presence and factor in life—whether press reports on diverse cults, denominational voting on major issues, or the nature of civic religion in American culture. Religion and faith issues matter in the public realm. The integration of experiences with theories is an epistemology comprised of direct knowledge of the classroom laboratory participants and the indirect insights of accumulated human scholarly constructs.

A further integration is between oneself and the other; indeed, knowledge can only arise with the interchange between and among diverse voices. This implies that everyone in the classroom has vital contributions to make and they must speak and share their voices, however those voices choose to express themselves in self-affirming and constructive ways. This method of integration of self and other is particularly required when a certain political voice consistently dominates conversation. In more conservative intellectual environments, progressive voices should be allowed to elaborate their truth and knowledge claims. Likewise, even in progressive classes, those liberal students need to hear or at least be able to articulate accurately (and not simply in a stereotypical fashion) conservative positions. In the world outside of the academy, all voices are battling for hegemony (that is to say, what they perceive to be in the best interests of the public good, and for progressive Christians this, of course, pertains directly to the least in society).

Each student's voice emerges in her or his capacity to come to terms with the arguments of the other; that other could be someone with a similar or different theological framework. The integration of self and other enables the student to sharpen the ability to hear and reformulate a different position in order to better distinguish the clarity and uniqueness of the student's own voice (e.g., with its claims, evidence, warrants, criteria, and norms). Of course, the other voice includes the voice of the assigned and outside reading texts and the texts of the professor's own arguments, claims, and methods.

Again, this self-and-other dynamic entails the ability to listen both attentively (to such a degree that the self is able to articulate the assertions of the other so that the other can at least say she or he is being heard) and to advance clearly

and accurately the position of the self (even though the self's own perspective might be at an inchoate stage). Therefore, to engage the other is really the advancement of one's own voice in the arena of competing assertions of truths and particularities. In the best scenario, argument for the advancement of the least of society will prevail. However, ultimately, the changing of reality and the impact of theological views flow from the theologian's interaction with people struggling to co-create full humanity and to realize the practice of freedom with God. God dwells in the midst of the majority who are poor or marginalized. And it is there that witness for liberation occurs.

In addition to the integration of practice and theory and self and other, a third integration speaks to the balance or even sometimes tension between criticism and self-criticism. The self-and-other interplay is not a passive, static interchange. On the contrary, the voice of the other has to be challenged for its intellectual clarity and practical implications. The classroom is neither an abstract irrelevant space of disengagement nor is it the worst encounter for the resolution of deep-seated therapeutic issues necessitating professional intervention. The mix of voices is an active, challenging, and critical conversation with classroom participants on the nature of each person's claims.

Appropriate questions for this discussion are: Why does one hold a certain position? And what is the basis of one's beliefs? Criticism means not a purposeless reconstruction, where one is caught up in the rhythm of one's own argument or in listening to one's own voice. Criticism is to assist the other in exploring further and clarifying even more one's role in the conversation. And as indicated above, theological pedagogy has a vocational stand with the poor. This implies that at an important level criticism helps to challenge another person's voice in relation to the outcast.

The other part of the dynamic is self-criticism—the willingness, ability, and art of offering a critique of self-growth. Each person's viewpoints are not stagnant or ultimate Truth. Therefore, when one risks a voice in the communal discussion, one is subject, inevitably, to mistakes in judgment, interpretation of experiences, misuse of theory, or simply fuzziness in presentation. All of these possibilities, and more, give rise to a breakdown in communication when errors of growth are pointed out, but the person responsible for the errors does not perceive self-criticism as a way of enhancing the search for a common vision for the public good; that is, framed by the interests of the least in society. Refusal to participate in self-criticism, as a form of creative growth, tends to calcification of thought, retrograde practice, and individualistic self-aggrandizement.

A final integration necessary for theological education is that of compassion and intellect. Because theological education grounds itself in the well-being or full humanity of society's marginalized (and through them all peoples), a passionate intellect and an intellectual passion are needed. Black theology seeks a most rigorous attempt at academic and intellectual clarity and purpose because learning, as it pertains to faith and witness, is a life and death situation

if it is in the interest of the margins: the homeless, battered wives, the unemployed, the hungry, the diseased, the physically challenged, sexually abused children, the illiterate, the psychotic, and similar sectors shunned and discarded by the norm of a community. The best minds and the best of our minds should be put to the service of pulling together the foremost knowledge that the ages have produced. The mind and the highest development of the mind are gifts from God not to be wasted but used for the common good.

Because the common good includes the overwhelming majority who are without resources, intellectual work has to commence at the bottom of the social pyramid in the United States, indeed the world. Academic work, in this regard, entails focused knowledge production that is attentive to particular social relations, both skewed relationships as well as visions for healthy community interaction. This, however, does not exclude pursuing exploratory academic concerns which, at first glance, might not appear germane to the common good. Indeed, intellectual undertakings allow for speculative exercises, even at times when these exercises appear seemingly irrelevant or “cerebral.” Yet the touchstone for such pedagogical endeavors is ultimately how the life of the mind sustains and enhances individual and collective full humanity.

Nonetheless, all intellectual work should have a degree of compassion for the oppressed other. Compassionate pedagogy is to be in solidarity with the best of the individual self as well as having passion or pathos with the other who does not have the same privileges as oneself. Compassionate pedagogy is to see and experience, at least vicariously, the other. It is to know and to feel that one’s own humanity is at stake in the well-being of the other. This contrasts radically with the bourgeois liberal notion that change occurs by doling out reforms to the poor or indigent. On the contrary, a compassionate theological education pursues the course of structural change both of the individual and the community. Otherwise, one’s own humanity remains trapped in an asymmetrical configuration of power and privilege.

The leading question for compassionate pedagogy is that my own humanity cannot be healed, made whole, and free until the other’s humanity reaches its fullest potential in the creation offered by God to us. For example, in certain indigenous South African languages, the formal greeting one gives upon meeting another is: “I see you and I see your family.” This suggests compassionate social interactions. The other becomes a human being in the full sense of the word, excluding a utilitarian or non-recognition of the human being that is before one’s eyes. Similarly, this South African greeting indicates that the recognition of the other salutes and affirms the well-being of the other in connection to the well-being of communal relationships. It is the old adage, found in certain African cosmologies, that states that I am because you are and the community’s existence is for the well-being of each individual.

Theological Viewpoint

The third and final overarching component of theological education, in addition to stand and method, denotes a definite viewpoint. What is the long-term vision sought by theological education? What are we preparing ourselves for in theological institutions of knowledge production? In brief, theological education exists to work toward and continually reenvision full humanity—a new heaven and a new earth.

On a personal level, full humanity means a healing of personal wounds. Psychotherapy teaches us that we are all suffering as adults due to fundamental scars and unresolved issues from our negative childhood experiences. This covers the range—sexual abuse of children, children of adult alcoholics, low self-esteem, and variegated forms of co-dependency. The individual cannot attain, or even strive for, full potential in relation to community if psychological fractures and ghosts remain to keep us broken and haunted.

If attention is not paid to these particulars, then we simply reenact our projections and insecurities on our children, our wives and husbands, our significant others, our students, our co-workers, and our colleagues. Moreover, for those with power to do so, the disease of childhood skeletons is projected on society and the world. It is the wounded children within us who take over our adult bodies, and when these adult bodies have power and privilege (e.g., racial, gender, sexual, class), the wounded children within us (which some term the “old brain” or parts of the unconscious) can be deadly as they seek to make the world pay for the crimes committed against ourselves when we were children. If the full humanity of the individual is not attended to, then these abusive modes of being become intergenerational, passed on to our progeny.

Furthermore, full humanity, which we strive to realize with divine spirituality, speaks also to the wounds brought against sectors of society collectively set aside as escape goats. Full humanity, therefore, entails providing the conditions for the unleashing of the fullest creativity of blacks, poor and working class people, other people of color, women, lesbians and gays, the physically challenged, the natural growth of a healthy ecology, and others. For example, the full humanity of black Americans would signify an appreciation of black culture and heritage. This latter reality would not be seen as mere contributions to an already existing white norm. On the contrary, black Americans would center the essential core of the very structure of the curriculum and American culture. Black people are not simply additives to America; they are constitutive of what it means to be an American.

Ultimately, the viewpoint of theological education struggles for an integrated vision where the resources of the earth are shared by all of humanity. The ultimate viewpoint, then, is a communal one based on an equality of capital ownership, of participation in space and time, of full expressions of linguistic differences, of political representation with power, and of complete affirmation

of unique cultures and identities. A healthy spirituality, economics, culture, language, everyday ways of being, politics, and faith demarcate the realization of a robust theological viewpoint. And when we reach that balanced full humanity for all, then, black theology as a Christian perspective perceives the second coming of Jesus in the familiar congratulatory words: "Well done my faithful brother and sister, because you have contributed to the full humanity of the least of these, then you have been faithful and accountable to God's vocational imperatives of full humanity itself." For black theology, the stand, method, and viewpoint of theological education is one of liberation and the practice of freedom.

Dwight N. Hopkins teaches theology at the University of Chicago Divinity School. A member of the ATS Faculty Resource Center Advisory Committee, he is the author and editor of seven books on black theology, liberation theologies, and culture and religious reflection. His latest book is An Introduction to a Black Theology of Liberation (Orbis Books, 1999).

ENDNOTES

1. William Loren Katz, ed., *Five Slave Narratives* (New York: Arno Press, 1968), 20.
2. William Still, *The Underground Railroad* (Chicago: Johnson Publications, 1970), 458.
3. Quoted in George P. Rawick, ed., *The American Slave: A Composite Autobiography, God Struck Me Dead*, volume 19 (Westport: Greenwood Publishing Company, 1977), 124-25.
4. Quoted in Charles L. Perdue Jr., ed., *Weevils in the Wheat: Interviews with Virginia Ex-Slaves* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1980), 126.

Educational Assessment for Future Consideration

Evelyn A. McDonald
Memphis Theological Seminary

ABSTRACT: As theological institutions face the challenge of adjusting to a changing student population, the assessment of program effectiveness must also take on new directions. Diverse student populations, which include more women, older students, and many second- or third-career people, bring with them the richness and diversity of their life experiences. In order to offer effective theological education, seminaries must explore ways of conducting educational assessment appropriate to their contexts and students in order to hear from those individual voices. The experience of Memphis Theological Seminary is highlighted here.

An article in *In Trust* magazine not long ago featured four retiring seminary presidents sharing their insights about theological education with Daniel Aleshire of The Association of Theological Schools. William E. Leshner, former president of Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, stated that the two changes that had significant impact on the setting for theological education in his experience were the increase in the number of women students and the admission of students who were second-career people. J. David Hester, former president of Memphis Theological Seminary (MTS), mentioned the twofold increase in the size of the student body at MTS. As many institutions experience similar major shifts in student demographics, it has become clear that there is a pressing need for seminaries to embark on the task of assessing the effect of their educational programs on this new mix of theological students.

For many seminaries, assessment may have been limited in the past to student evaluations of course offerings and professors at the end of each semester, with little attention given to more comprehensive techniques. In response to pressures to show clearer evidence of program effectiveness, it is natural to look to other academic institutions for guidance, such as universities and colleges that have done a great deal of groundwork in this particular area. In searching for an appropriate methodology for carrying out assessment in theological education, however, it is important that theological institutions look inward rather than outward for guidance. Intrinsic to theological study is the understanding of hermeneutics. By applying a contextual hermeneutic to the process, which takes into full account the diversities of the student popu-

lation, seminaries have an opportunity to study more deeply the effectiveness of their programs.

At Memphis Theological Seminary, the area of assessment has already received attention from the community, due largely to its preparation for participation in the joint self-study process of The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada (ATS) and The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). Throughout the self-study process, the need for better methods of assessing the effectiveness of programs offered had become evident. Thus, one area in which the institution continues to be eager to gather information is student perceptions about the education they have received and, in particular, how the education has had an impact on the diverse student body. Through the assessment process, the institution is endeavoring to measure the “fit” of its theological goals with the population of students who now attend the seminary.

Demographics

Since the late 1980s a dramatic change in the composition of the student body has occurred at Memphis Theological Seminary. From an enrollment of 144 in fall 1988, the demographics gathered in fall 1997, reflected a population of 282 students. They represented twenty-five different faith traditions, with 71% men, 29% women, 32% African American, and 68% Caucasian. The mean age of students was thirty-nine. These statistics reflect a continuing pattern of enrollment. In this commuter setting, approximately 60% of the students come from Memphis, while the rest are drawn from many rural areas of Tennessee, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Alabama. Many of the students are second-career people, and most work in churches or in secular jobs while attending seminary. As with other theological institutions today, the challenge facing MTS is to glean information that reflects the strengths and weaknesses of the academic program, so as to be able, in turn, to consider the results and make decisions for improvement through the academic planning cycle.

Theological Goals

As part of the assessment process, MTS asked seniors about to graduate from the master’s level programs to complete a questionnaire that addressed how their seminary journey had been affected by the seminary’s three main theological goals that emerge from the seminary’s mission statement. These goals emphasize and enumerate specifics related to *scholarship*, *piety*, and *justice*, representing the seminary’s commitment to the head, heart, and hands of ministry. In addition, students were asked how the diversity of the student population had affected their outlook on their own faith tradition and their outlook on life in general. Last, the students were asked if they had had any

transforming experience that they felt was connected to their seminary journey. There were twenty-nine responses, complete with biographical information, representing 43% of the graduating seniors. The information received from these questionnaires laid the foundation for future faculty discussions.

The specific goals of *scholarship* for Memphis Theological Seminary are:

- To gain an enhanced body of knowledge and skills for theological research.
- To increase abilities to reflect theologically on the practice of ministry.
- To develop competent leaders who provide resources for the church's life and witness.

The students were asked to indicate how their seminary journey had been affected by these goals. Many replied that their knowledge had indeed been enhanced, that they had not known what they did not know. A number of students who had been active as pastors prior to coming to seminary responded that they had learned how to think theologically and were surprised at what they had previously misunderstood. One student had forgotten how to do research because she had been away from the academic world for eighteen years, while two younger students expressed concern at the lack of academic challenge that they experienced. Another student responded that he believes "seminary education needs a radical transformation, moving from a model dating to yesteryear, and more to development of clergy education that would combine experiential [learning] with traditional."

The personal reflections, especially of women students, frequently mentioned how they had gained confidence, were now able to communicate effectively, were affirmed, and, in one case, "felt no sense of rejection." One student, admitting that he "sounded like a seminary student," said that "seminary has broadened my intellectual horizons without the creation of self-limiting dogmatic structures."

In general, the responses were very positive, with students grateful for the opportunity to venture into new areas of learning. One student summed up his scholastic experience this way: "The loud message I received was that I must lead and enable the people to lay claim to the ministry taking place. Now I regret most that I will not have the same incentive to continue growing in this particular area."

The specific seminary goals concerning *piety* are:

- To promote the knowledge and love of God.
- To increase awareness of Christian spirituality and the need for a balanced life.
- To cultivate a desire for the healing of the world.

In responding to the effect these goals had on them, the majority of students acknowledged a real growth in their knowledge and love of God, and they commended certain courses and professors for the emphasis placed on Chris-

tian spirituality. One student referred to a course called “Merton, Monasticism, and Religious Pluralism” as being one of his best class experiences. It involved an immersion experience at The Abbey of Our Lady of Gethsemane in Kentucky, where Merton lived, in which the student benefited from the experiential learning aspect of the course. Other responses highlighted the use of inclusive texts in courses on liberation theology, African-American theology, and feminist theology as being instrumental in promoting the concept of “healing of the world.” The practical exercise of keeping a journal was hailed by two students as most helpful to them for the development of their own prayer life.

Some of the students reflected on the process of their own spiritual journeys. They identified how they learned not only to be mindful of the spiritual growth of their congregations, but how they had become aware that they must nurture their own spiritual lives. One person noted how he had advanced in his thinking to the point of finding his own spiritual director, and how helpful that had been to him. Addressing the goal that involves “the healing of the world,” a number of responses pointed to concern over the existence of several organizations on campus, namely The Women’s Fellowship and The Black Student Fellowship. Some considered these groups to be counterproductive to a search for unity and wholeness. One student stated that some wanted only “to look inward and upward,” while another acknowledged that she had moved beyond her personal world to a greater understanding of the world in general.

A comment made by one student raises an issue worthy of consideration at a later stage. He said: “ My knowledge of God has been pulled apart and reassembled by this process . . . My spiritual journey, I am embarrassed to say, has in a way been on hold during seminary. ” A more general sentiment was expressed most succinctly by one student: “Through seminary, I have learned much about the inner part of myself and [I] am humbled to know that God loved, saved, and chose me to be an example and channel of that love.”

The specific goals for *justice* at Memphis Theological Seminary are:

- To expand ecumenical cooperation, awareness, and experience.
- To support the ministries of persons of all genders, races, and cultures.
- To increase a sense of interdependence in relation to human need.

This area elicited many strong, positive comments, especially focused on the ecumenical nature of the seminary and the education students had received from being in class and in community with people of different faith traditions. A common theme for many was expressed by the revelation that they had more in common than they had differences, and that they had become more aware of the need “to seek unity and cooperation in the Body of Christ.” One student told the story of having come from a small town that had only one Jewish family. “I knew nothing about Judaism. Here I had the opportunity to study with a rabbi instead of someone who was simply telling me about a different religion.”

Another respondent claimed that denominational barriers block healing and cooperative efforts, while a number of others stated that they now understood the need for inclusiveness of language and the need to hear the voices of the entire community.

In a response that was echoed in a few papers, one student acknowledged that she, like other students, had been “ecumenically correct” at the seminary, but she voiced her concern for the future: “...when we leave I wonder how many men would really stand up for women in the ministry, or how many of us would have the courage to invite someone of a different race to worship with us or preach in our pulpits?”

Diversity

Responses to the question on diversity echoed sentiments expressed by students who talked about the joys of ecumenical awareness. For most, the diverse population of the seminary had proved to be an enlightening, enriching experience. It was described as the “key to my seminary experience,” “a great sense of joy to me,” and one of the seminary’s “greatest strengths.” A student who had previously attended a less diverse seminary acknowledged that his former school “seemed somewhat vanilla” in comparison to MTS.

Students indicated how much they had grown in their understanding of other people, other faith traditions, and how that helped them “become less judgmental,” and “more aware of where I fit in the world and my relation to others.” One student saw the diverse population as having helped in solidifying his understanding of his own faith tradition, while another stated he had “learned how to disagree in an honorable way.”

In thinking of her future, one student stated: “Unfortunately, I see a large gap between the diverse nature [of MTS] and that of Memphis, my church, and the overall world. I am now challenged to bring what I have experienced [here] to other settings.”

Transformation

The transformative experiences recounted by the students varied in accordance with the theories of Jack Mezirow¹ concerning perspective transformation, ranging from disorienting dilemmas to the reintegration into one’s life of a new perspective. One student was made aware of his narrow view of ministry and saw a need for becoming more radical. Yet another stated that his “know-it-all attitude had been adjusted,” while another had found it transforming to discover what she “already knew but could now place in a category.”

A change for one person was in his views on homosexuality. “I am less dogmatic on my views against homosexuality. I can love.” Some saw change occurring in their beliefs, while others saw the change in themselves, with “not

as many fears about ministry," and "accepting who I am." Yet another claimed now to be reconciled with his past. A profound change was demonstrated by the student who stated: "I have developed a new paradigm for viewing the world and the ministry." This same student also stated that the diversity represented at the seminary had enriched his life and had prompted him to incorporate "some new things" into his own tradition "that have been both rewarding and productive."

While it is hard to do justice to the variety of responses given on the questionnaires, one quotation in particular seemed to present a rich metaphor for consideration of the seminarian's journey: "This semester has been the most powerful, most amazing and most transformative for me. I feel sort of like a batter in which all the ingredients have begun to be well incorporated with one another."

Future Considerations

In order to use the information gathered from the graduating seniors, consideration needs to be given to some of the key issues that emerged as a result of their responses. The major issues revolved around the characteristics of the institution, student characteristics, or theories of adult education.

It seems apparent that the diversity and ecumenical nature of the seminary is considered a major strength by its students. Many responses indicated that the students had not been in such a diverse community before, and, as such, the experience had a powerful, transforming effect on their belief systems, their ways of viewing others, and, by extension, their ways of looking at the world. An interesting comment pointed to the community setting rather than the classroom setting as being more conducive to learning from "different" others. As MTS does not offer a residential program, but recognizes the disadvantages this creates for a commuter population, faculty members may wish to explore ways in which more opportunities for informal exchanges could be made available. Rather than the experience of diversity resting so fully on each individual to explore, perhaps more deliberate encounters need to be encouraged.

From the demographic information submitted by each respondent, it can be concluded that age is a factor in assessing the effectiveness of the education received. One student calls the seminary to task for protesting discrimination against gender, race, and culture, but neglecting "to keep in check the discrimination that is placed on those of younger generations." From other, similar responses from younger students, there was an indication that they had, at times, a radically different perspective from older students about the theological education they had received. Because the mean age is thirty-nine, younger students do represent a minority population at MTS. With all that we know from the traditions of adult education and developmental psychology, we

would expect their experience to be different. Educators may need to find effective methods in the classroom of bridging the gap between generations to ensure the learning environment is equally rich for all participants.

The race of respondents did not seem to raise race-specific issues, as matching sentiments were presented by both races present at MTS. Likewise, the gender of students did not present significantly different responses, other than in one area. Many female students talked in terms of the confidence they had gained, and the importance to them of the affirmation they did, or did not, receive. Joan Scanlon, in her chapter entitled "Issues in the Assessment of Women," in *Clergy Assessment and Career Development*,² articulates clearly the responsibility we have in understanding the gender differences in the process of discernment and in psychological development. Most women students are aware of the minority status afforded them in their denominations and the struggle that lies ahead for their voices to be fully heard. The responses that placed emphasis on the importance of building confidence would seem to indicate the need for the seminary community to continue to be intentional about voicing support for women students, both as professors and as promoters of awareness in the church.

The student who decried the use of "methods of yesteryear" at the seminary was not the only voice calling for a change in the educational experience. Others talked of the need for more "hands-on" experience and the validity of learning from putting theory into practice. While some members of the faculty are well-known for their diversity of teaching methods, perhaps a faculty workshop on David Kolb's explanation of four learning styles could address the different methods students have for receiving and processing information.³ Different strategies could be demonstrated as ways of implementing a variety of teaching approaches as part of the learning experience. Instructional methodology, which was once effective for a homogeneous student population, cannot be expected to offer the same level of effectiveness when applied to a much changed and diversified population that learns through a much wider array of methods.

As Memphis Theological Seminary explores more avenues of assessing the effectiveness of its educational programs, the student tapestry produced will reflect more intriguing detail and patterns. It is obvious that such a process of evaluation and discussion needs to occur regularly and in a variety of ways. It will be interesting to know, for example, how the graduating seniors of MTS fare as pastors and peacemakers in the world, and how well their seminary journey prepared them for what lies ahead.

Theological institutions are experiencing major changes, from student demographics to the experiences that students bring with them as they begin their seminary journey. If we are committed to understanding the effectiveness of our programs, we must change the way we gather information about the effects on students. We must look to methodology that is more qualitative in

nature, rather than quick, faceless quantitative surveys. We must find ways to hear the individual voices of students and to monitor the process of transformation so that today's seminary students have the necessary support structures during their journey.

Evelyn A. McDonald is registrar and director of financial aid at Memphis Theological Seminary. She is also a doctoral candidate at the University of Memphis, where her area of study is adult education.

ENDNOTES

1. Jack Mezirow, "Understanding Transformation Theory," *Adult Education Quarterly*, 44:4 (Summer 1994): 222-232.
2. Joan Scanlon, "Issues in the Assessment of Women," in Richard A. Hunt et al, (eds.), *Clergy Assessment and Career Development* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1990), 144-148.
3. David A. Kolb, "Learning Styles and Disciplinary Differences," in A.W. Chickering and others, *The Modern American College* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass , 1981), 250.

The Vision, Values, and Vocation of a Development Officer in a School of Theology and Ministry

Vincent Cushing, O.F.M.

Washington Theological Union

ABSTRACT: The vocation of the development officer, the author suggests, is the biblical imperative to build up the community of Christ. The effectiveness of the development or institutional advancement officer in a theological school is dependent on the extent to which he or she understands and embraces the mission of the institution and is able to interpret it to current and potential donors. Equally important is the quality of the development officer's relationship with the president of the institution. This article was adapted from an address to the development officers of ATS schools at their annual seminar in 1998.

The first thing a president thinks of when asked to speak about the vocation of a development or institutional advancement officer in theological education is this: "What would *I* like to say to an assemblage of fund-raisers for theological education for ministry?" The second question I ask myself is this: "What do *they* need to hear?" The first question ends up with a talk about nuts and bolts, a "what-I-want" approach that I presume you have heard more times than you need. The second approach speaks more to others' personal levels of values, career satisfaction, and long-term service.

Let me offer a few basic clarifications of where I come from, so that you might understand the basics that shape my perspective of this topic.

First, I have never subscribed to the plea of some clergy or academic people who insist that they hate to raise money. I personally enjoy it because the connection between institutional health and fund-raising is as clear to me as the nose on my face. (My idea of a worthwhile use of my time is at least one call a week that has been scheduled with a potential five-figure giver.) Maybe it is because I come from a tradition of mendicant friars who were historically religious beggars in Europe—or because of my earliest exposure to systematic fund-raising where I learned that it was not the force of my personality that was going to raise money, but rather that I was offering a devout Christian the opportunity to support values that he or she believed in and shared with the institution I served.

Nor do I subscribe to the notion that religion is ideology. Religion, when it is healthy—and it is not always that, is the free engagement of the human person with God and the gradual appropriation of the ultimate meaning of this life in the

ethics and community he or she lives out in faith in what we call the church. To teach and understand that meaning, enshrined as it is in the Word of God, and to build that community is the noble enterprise of theological education for ministry in the Church of Christ. Development officers in theological education are key players in that ministry. This is a ministry in which you play a key role as interpreter and as central staff person in the raising of resources for that important endeavor.

The life and ministry of our respective Christian confessions are desperately important because we live in a society that increasingly seems to have lost its moral compass.

Next you need to know that I believe in money, not as a god, not as an idol, but as essential for human existence and as playing an important role in all human enterprises. I believe that as much as I believe that one must be serious about practices of good health or that my car needs oil and gas to operate; without adequate finances our schools will never achieve the mission they were founded to fulfill.

I have spent countless hours during this past quarter-century participating in the accreditation of seminaries of every denominational stripe: mainstream Protestant, Evangelical Protestant, Adventist, Episcopalian, Roman Catholic, and, indeed, Jewish. Money has no denominational loyalties. If you have it, you can work through your other important issues of faculty, scholarships, student recruitment, library, and plant. If you do not have it, you would be surprised how fast the operation closes down. Make no mistake: in the long haul of institutional life, the financial strength of an institution is a key foundation stone and indicator of institutional health.

The vision of the development officer is necessarily conditioned by the relationship of the development officer with the president, by your comprehensive knowledge of the institution, and by your ownership of the mission of the institution you serve. Let's begin on the level of the foundation you build with the president.

Relationship with the President

First, approach the president as one with whom you wish to build a relationship as a colleague. I am not saying as an equal, in case your president is touchy about that, but I am saying as a colleague. In the simplest and clearest terms I mean that you need to get close enough to that person professionally—not necessarily socially—to be able always to get his attention and to have very, very, very honest conversations about prospects, programs, plans, and, yes, problems. (I have never yet met a president who appreciates a nasty surprise!) Realize that the president is precisely that, the chief executive officer of the institution and that he is the person that the board expects to steer the ship. He is responsible for what happens on his watch. You keep him up to speed on what

is happening with fund-raising and public relations, you arrange meetings where he can do the asking for a gift, and you do your research on prospective donors so that he can be prepared at meetings. You also scan the horizon for institutional icebergs. In simple terms, you are (or ought to be) a close staff member who is always concerned about advancing the institution through the use of the president as the chief fund-raiser of the institution. And that is true especially if you have to convince the president that he is *the* fund-raiser of the institution.

In light of that relationship to the president, there are allied areas where you need to be as much up to speed as the president is. Your job requires that you understand both the current and future finances of the institution and that you be familiar with the strategic plan of the school, especially in regard to areas that will need new or increased funding. Those numbers will be streaming into your goals, and you need to know if they are feasible. In that way you understand where the institution is and where it is going. From that vantage point you need to know from the president what is the priority he is placing on specific projects. You need to be working with the CEO hand-in-glove so that you raise the money in the areas that he believes are important. You need to know what comes first and discuss in-depth with the president what he wants to do and if you think it is realistic. Otherwise you are going to find yourself in a cul-de-sac with unnegotiated expectations for performance.

You need to be very honest if you find yourself disagreeing with the president. You need to talk and talk and talk to arrive at a mutually agreeable goal. If that talk is not possible, or if you find yourself in serious disagreement with the CEO, you had better take another look at your resume. Simply stated, there cannot be substantial differences over a period of time between president and the chief development officer. Either he has to convince you as a subordinate staff member of the case, or you have to convince him why a particular fund-raising project is ill-advised or won't work or won't work at this time.

In terms of the current and future finances of the institution, you will benefit from knowing its past, its present, and its future. You need to be able to speak knowledgeably about the past five years. You must know and understand the balance sheet, the income and expense statements, the cash flow situation of the institution. You need to know if there were deficits or surpluses, what the current budget looks like, and what the institutional plans are and what they will cost. You and I both know that no one is going to pay off a deficit, no one is going to pay down a loan, nor is anyone going to give to what is perceived as a hair-brained scheme. As you put together your list for giving, you need to be sure that it makes sense and that it reflects genuine and reasonable institutional needs. You need to be able to sit with the president and talk about funding goals and specific strategies to achieve them in a timely fashion. You need to work out your schedule with his calendar, and do that months in advance.

Not only must you sit with the president, you need to be in conversation with the development committee of the board and be sure that the board of trustees

owns and is enthusiastic about the goals and strategies that the president has set. The president's agenda is your agenda. If there is a significant lack of enthusiasm, that is a yellow caution flag, and you need to be able to speak about that with the president. There is no use in trying to raise money unless there is reasonable ownership of a project throughout the governance structure of the institution. Board members are normally needed to open doors for the president to walk through. If they won't do that, the project may not be fundable. Your job is to do the staff work, sometimes the scutwork, with the board and president to tee up the opportunities where a serious conversation can take place.

In specific academic areas, the president needs to be in conversation with the faculty as well as with the board. You and the president need to discuss how ownership by faculty might best be achieved. Because of the small scale of a theological school's faculty, it is even more important that you assist the president in making the case to the faculty. A lack of faculty ownership can effectively hobble a fund-raising program for specific projects. Admittedly, some faculty can be difficult, but that doesn't excuse you from becoming friends with them, and indeed using them at key fund-raising events and having them participate in meetings where the president asks for funds as part of a plan to benefit the academic enterprise.

Finally, but in this litigious age, realistically, you need to be the early warning system for potential public relations disasters, e.g., a discrimination suit, a sexual harassment charge, a sexual abuse allegation, and the whole nasty and public experience that trails after all of those. These can affect what you realistically can do as a fund-raiser, and if you are battling these, you and the president, and especially the board of trustees, have to agree on how you are going to get out of that swamp. You may be able to ignore it, or you may not. The swamp may have some development-officer-eating alligators in it, and your carcass will be pulled under.

Development Officer and the Mission of the Institution

A development officer is not a skill; he or she does not have a bag of tricks that can be employed no matter what the institutional mission of the school. A sound development officer needs to appreciate, accept, and own the mission of the institution. There is no substitute for that sympathetic and empathetic ownership of the mission, and what it means for the church and for the ministry. If a development officer is able to appreciate and own the mission, then he or she will convey the inner energy to potential givers to support the institution with other benefactors because they subscribe to the values that the institution enshrines in its educational mission approach.

This approach gets to the heart of the matter in fund-raising for a theological school. True, there needs to be systems. True, there is no substitute for organization, files, history of giving. True, there needs to be accountability, order, and good

taste. All of these are givens. But beyond all these and, indeed, as the foundation of all these, there needs to be unqualified support of the mission. People give because they believe in the values that the school presents through the president and you, and because they believe in the integrity of the operation and the accountability of the institution in regard to its finances. In simple terms they say to themselves, this is a good and valuable cause, cared for by trustworthy and honest people.

The question naturally arises at this juncture: isn't what I am saying the most obvious thing in the world? Wouldn't everyone expect the chief development officer and the president to be in solid communication with each other? Doesn't it make sense to insist that the development officer understand the finances and the strategic plan of the institution? Isn't it obvious that a development officer has to appreciate and own, without reservation the mission of the institution? Yes, it does, but in my almost twenty-five years of serving as president, during which I have participated also in about twenty accrediting visits, I have experienced the following: ineffective communication between the president and the development officer; or, equally bad, communication that takes place only at moments of crisis and then is filled with anguished emotion, hand-wringing, and veiled threats about performance; no awareness on the part of the chief fund-raising officer of the real finances of the institution; no sense of the financial priorities of the institution; no strategic or business plan; or if there is one, the development officer either is not part of it or is unaware of it; frequent turnover of the chief fund-raiser because of no agreed-upon goals, the office in disarray, and the staff forever playing catch-up; weak support for the mission of the school by the chief development officer; CEO and development officer hobbled by fear of repressive church authorities. *I hereby confess to guilt in regard to all of the above. I have stayed in this job for such a long period of time because I am a slow learner.*

To sum up: development work is built on collegueship, informed knowledge of the institution, and deep commitment to the mission of the institution. It also involves honesty, maturity, and a sense of one's own worth and dignity.

Vocation of the Development Officer

I turn now to the Christian foundations for the vision that you embrace as a fund-raiser. My focus is on the experience of money and stewardship that we see in the Christian experience of Holy Scripture. We see money and occasionally philanthropy spoken of in the New Testament in a variety of ways: in regard to the concern about first fruits and tithing, the paying of the temple tax, the awareness of the import of the generosity of the widow's mite, and in the practice of a jubilee year. The latter is quite interesting because it spoke of national restoration and the forgiveness of debt. The principle that was at the foundation of the jubilee year was that material blessings exist for the common good.

Early Christianity was familiar with this concept and indeed went beyond it even as it reinforced it. The testimony to the generosity of the common life in early Acts clearly espouses a non-greedy approach to one's possessions. Very interestingly, and seldom commented on, we see Paul's collection for the churches of Asia Minor as an expression of awareness of the role of philanthropy in the life of the community. Donald Senior, C.P., of the Catholic Theological Union in Chicago, tells us that this effort of Paul contains excellent lessons for those of us involved in fund-raising. Money in the biblical perspective was a multivalent symbol: Money was seen as an extension of the self, as an evaluation of one's worth, as a symbol of relationship, and as an expression of our values. In simple terms, money was important.

Allow me to make the following three points: first, money helps build up the community of Christ. This Christian perspective anchors our vision and makes real our concern about values. You and I who work in schools for ministry are participants, indeed co-creators, in preparing the community builders, the meaning-makers of tomorrow. Our task is to keep our eye on the product as well as on the process. We share in the candidates' training in ways that are different from, but no less important than, their professors or spiritual guides. There is no program without a classroom, no study without a library, no forum without a plant, no instruction without a salaried faculty member qualified to open the Scriptures and the tradition to the willing student. Your role is crucial in my experience; your spiritual appreciation of that role is energizing and gives it a depth and nobility that other fund-raisers seldom experience.

Secondly, for the disciples of Christ, the relationship of rich and poor is built on spiritual kinship, and the resultant sharing and generosity flow from love and a sense that the richer needs to help the one with less. You cannot raise money on the basis of what I will say next, but you need to think about it: in the Christian perspective we live under an evangelical imperative—if we have resources—to share them with those who do not. It is not an option; it is a Christian obligation. A sound understanding of Christianity sees that as a folkway, a human law, of Christian discipleship. It is ultimately rooted in the generosity of the Lord toward us, who, even though we were in sin and therefore with no claim on his generosity gave Himself up so that we might live. That level of generosity is at the foundation of our common Christian faith and is the foundation stone of Christian giving.

Thirdly, generosity is a response to God's grace and merits the Lord's love. Almsgiving is the classic term for Christian giving. It is a good (and here I reflect my Roman background) and meritorious expression of Christian discipleship. It profiles how we should live our lives in all aspects of life, and not solely in the economic arena. We are called, as Paul was, to be fools for and with Christ.

Vincent Cushing, O.F.M., has served as president of Washington Theological Union in Washington, DC, for twenty-four years. His experience has convinced him of the importance of strong collaboration between presidents and institutional advancement officers.