The Hind Report:Theological Education and Cross Sector Partnerships

Author: Gary Wilton

Return to vol. 7 no. 1 index page

> We hope for...a maximising of the potential of the partnership with universities and church colleges of higher education, enabling students and staff to derive full benefit from these arrangements.... (Hind Feb 2002, p.69)

Theological education in the Church of England is currently in a state of organisational flux. During 2002/2003 it was the subject of a 'fundamental review' chaired by the Bishop of Chichester John Hind. The review report recognised that there were 1360 ordinands and 1192 readers in training spread across over 80 small or very small training institutions (Hind 2003, p.14). It recommended the creation of eight Regional Training Partnerships (RTPs) and aspired to a 'more mature and mutually beneficial partnership between the Church's ministerial and lay training establishments and UK higher education (Hind 2003, p.136). The subsequent *Final Report on the Regions* time-tabled the launch of the new RTPs for Sept 2006. (Chelmsford 2004, p.27). This has been delayed until Easter 2007.

Hind commented that much of the Church's provision for ministerial education is already 'in a substantial and creative partnership with UK universities and church colleges of higher education' (Hind Feb 2002, p. 9). Partnerships take a variety of forms. In some more historic contexts, Church training institutions are actually part of the university structures. In others, ordinands study for the university under-graduate theology degree alongside an in-house vocational programme. The most common relationship involves HE institutions validating and accrediting programmes developed by Church training institutions.

The working party observed that during the last decade (a) the traditional universities had become more open to partnerships with institutions of ministerial education, and (b) the church colleges of higher education had continued to develop expertise in vocational training. In the final edition of the report they stated most boldly: We think every opportunity for co-operation with other churches and with the universities and Church colleges should be taken (Hind,April 2003 p.vii).

This was significant departure from the caution of earlier Sagovsky (1991) report, which pointed out that:

> The difference in aim and approach between the teaching of theology in the Universities and in theological Colleges and Courses has been well documented (Sagovsky 1991, p.58).

Yet from the outset the Hind working party wished 'to investigate if the Church can enter into further, mutually beneficial, partnership with the HE sector' (Hind Feb. 2002, p.17). The interim report did not continue the investigation nor propose how and when it should take place. More seriously it is not entirely clear whether the investigation proposed is conceptual and theoretical or more pragmatic and logistical. This was despite the stated intention that the review was 'fundamental'. However the very title of the interim report?'The structure and funding of ordination tr aining'?is a clear indication of its pragmatic orientation. Even some significant questions were identified:

> There may be further issues here in terms of evaluating which sector or sectors of HE are the most useful partners for the Church.What weight should be put on research or teaching excellence, expertise in vocational training or on the Church affiliation of partner institutions? (Hind Feb 2002, p. 17).

Late in 2004 Ballard observed:

> Perhaps the weakness of 'Hind', however, has been that too little attention has been given to the models and appropriateness of the university connections proposed, both their strengths and weaknesses. Each location will inevitably have its own peculiar set of arrangements, administrative and academic. A deal of attention needs, however, to be given to the desired intentions in such a collaboration from partners who may have very different approaches to the theological task.... (Ballard 2004 p.336).

The purpose of this paper is to investigate whether 'the Church can enter into further, mutually beneficial, partnership with the HE sector by giving attention to the 'appropriateness of the...connections proposed' between Universities, Church Institutions of Higher Education and Church Training Institutions. To do so it deploys Kelsey's 'Athens' and 'Berlin' models of 'excellent' theological education to analyse the aims and approaches of theological education offered by the three different types of institution within the Church of England context.

In the early 1980s the US Protestant theological community entered into an extensive debate about the nature of theological education. Much of the argument focused on the question 'What is theological about theological education?' Kelsey mapped the debate in two key works: ***To Understand God Truly: What's Theological About a Theological School? (1992) and Between Athens and Berlin: The Theological Education Debate***

(1993) in which he fully developed his Athens/Berlin analysis.

Kelsey's distinctive contribution was to identify two distinct educational paradigms at work within U.S. theological education and to map them within the contributions of others. He argued that they are present and deeply embedded in every theological institution and that most have negotiated 'some sort of more or less implicit negotiated truce'. Kelsey[1] noted:

> Christian theological education in North America is inescapably committed to two contrasting and finally irreconcilable types of models of what education at its best ought to be.They are normative models, models of 'excellent' education. For one type I shall suggest 'Athens' be the symbol, for the other 'Berlin'.... Each type of excellent education has definite implications regarding a number of features of theological education, such as the relation between teachers and students, the characteristics looked for in an excellent teacher, what the education aims to do for the student, what the movement of the course of study should be, and the sort of community the school should be (Kelsey 1993, p.6).

Within an exclusively 'Athens' community, teachers and students would normally share a similar faith commitment. Regular attendance of community worship services would be expected of teaching staff and students alike, whilst 'spiritual' growth would be an explicit aspiration for both. Academic study is likely to be valued and undertaken with energy and commitment as an expression and outworking of the shared faith meta-narrative. Some aspects of the faith meta-narrative are likely to be deemed authoritative and beyond question. Part of the role of teaching staff is to offer spiritual support and to model a mature outworking of their own faith commitment.

Within an exclusively 'Berlin' community teachers and students may or may not uphold a personal faith commitment. Attendance of any acts of worship organised within or without the department or institution would be optional, and likely to be the object of rigorous and critical study. Where a 'Berlin' community was responsible for ministerial training, public worship and other aspects of Church life would be the source of theory used to inform professional practice. The key task of teachers would be to develop the critical scholarship of students?all aspects of faith would be subjected to rigorous questioning. Teachers' roles would be restricted to developing research/ academic knowledge and skills.

Athens

The 'Athens' paradigm is rooted in the culture of ancient Greece where Paideia was a process of 'culturing' the soul or forming of the whole person. Clement of Rome wrote to the Church in Corinth in AD 90 'Christianity's not so alien; it's a paideia like yours, aiming at the same goal, but superior in the way it does so.'(Kelsey 1993, p.11). In the 1980s Edward Farley proposed that his concept of **_Theologica_** 'purports to promote a Christian paideia.' (Farley 1983, p.xi). Within paideia Kelsey observed four recurrent features from Plato onwards to create 'an ahistorical construct, a type of excellent education'.

The **first** feature was the knowledge of the 'Good' itself?inquiry into a 'single, underlying principle of all virtues, their essence'.

The **second** feature was that the Good related to the highest principle of the universe?the divine. The goal of **_paideia_** was thus religious as well as moral.

The **third** goal was less about the transfer of information and more about knowledge of the Good through contemplation, leading to intuitive insight. Here teachers can only aid students indirectly by offering disciplines that may or may not be helpful in their expansion of insight.

The final and **fourth** feature of *paideia* involved a 'conversion', a turning around from pre-occupation with outer appearances to focus on deeper reality?the Good. Such conversion was a slow process. It required the support and nurture of belonging to a community.

'Education as *paideia* is inherently communal and not solitary' (Kelsey 1993, p.9).

The 'Athens' paradigm can be summarised as in statement 1:

Statement 1

> Theological education is a movement from source to personal appropriation of the source, from revealed wisdom to the appropriation of revealed wisdom in a way that is identity forming and personally transforming...To be sure study focuses on various subject matters. However this study is ordered to something more basic, the students' own personal appropriation of wisdom about God and about themselves in relation to God... The learning is in one way 'individualistic'...Yet by definition it cannot be solitary. Teachers and Learners together constitute a community sharing the common goal of personally appropriating revealed wisdom (Kelsey 1993, p.19f)

Key points:

- Theological education is about personal ownership of revealed wisdom.
- This wisdom shapes people's lives and values.
- Study covers a wide number of theological subjects.
- The main purpose of study is to feed an individual's relationship with God.
- Individual learning is supported by teachers who also seek to be shaped by the revealed wisdom.

Berlin

In contrast with the ancient pedigree of the 'Athens' paradigm, the 'Berlin' paradigm belongs to the modern era. Kelsey roots it in the controversy about the establishment of a faculty of theology within the newly founded research University of Berlin in 1810. Theology was only included in the curriculum after an extended dialogue about the nature of research. The approach to research adopted by the new institution was *Wissenschaft*?orderly, disciplined and critical. *Paideia* was also recognised to be critical, in that 'it involved testing what was studied for clarity, logical validity, and coherence'. But the approach to research within the 'Berlin' paradigm was more fundamentally critical, testing all alleged bases of authority or truth. Declarations of revelation/ divine inspiration could not be beyond critical inquiry. The 'Berlin' paradigm further understood inquiry to be disciplined and self- conscious of the methods used to establish 'truth'. The 'Berlin' paradigm thus constituted a fundamental challenge to the traditional status of theology:

> From the rise of the institution of the university in the Middle Ages onward, because of its base in divine revelation, theology had been the highest and dominant faculty, superior to the faculties of arts and sciences and to the faculties of law and medicine, for theology was the 'queen of the sciences' whom all other inquiries ultimately served (Kelsey 1993, p.15).

But 'Berlin' did not recognise overarching authority from any quarter including that of theology. This was embedded in a culture of academic freedom. 'Freedom to learn'? *Lernfreihei*?*and* 'Freedom to teach'? *Lehrfreiheit*?were its mottos.

Schleiermacher proposed that theological education should be included in the new institution's provision because it constituted 'professional education'. He argued that every human society had sets of practices dealing with physical health, social order and religious needs. Such practices were vital for the health and vitality of human society. Practitioners thus required proper trained and educated leadership. It was argued that because Christian theology was historically and philosophically based it could be subject to historical research and philosophical analysis. 'Historical theology' and 'philosophical theology' constituted legitimate *Wissenschaft* forms of critical inquiry, the results of which could determine the rules and practices of professional Christian ministry or 'practical theology'. The 'Berlin' paradigm can thus be summarised as in statement 2:

> **Statement 2**
> Theological education is a movement from data to theory to application of theory to practice... *Wissenschaft* for critical rigour in theorising; 'professional' education for rigorous study of the application of theory to practice... Critical inquiry focuses simultaneously on questions about the subject being researched and on questions about the methods of research...to discover as directly as possible the truth about the origin, effects, and essential nature of 'Christian' phenomena. [Teachers are appointed less for their] personal capacities to be midwife of others' coming to an understanding of God and of themselves in relation to God as ... the ability to cultivate capacities for scholarly research in others (Kelsey 1993, p.22f)

Key points:

- Theological education is about critical study of the Faith phenomena.
- Where students are preparing for professional ministry it involves researching data to develop theory and application of theory to practice.
- Theological education is as much about developing the skills of rigorous scholarship as it is about the content of study.
- Teachers are appointed because of their ability to help others develop research skills.

Kelsey commented that both paradigms were present in every institution of theological education to greater or lesser extents?often with some degree of internal dissonance. I became interested in Kelsey's work when I was Director of Studies at my previous institution. There I was concerned by the emergence of a fault line within the theological education offered, not least because different parts of the curriculum are recognised by different external bodies, e.g. church history, biblical studies, doctrine, were university validated; whereas retreats, human relations training and communication in worship were in-house units approved by the Ministry Division of the Church of England. In response, students accorded different value to different parts of the curriculum. Prior to validation in 1995 students placed most emphasis on vocational and personal development, whereas from 1995 onwards students tended to give increased attention to the credit-bearing university validated modules. Amongst my colleagues there was ongoing and unresolved discussion about the balance of resources and status accorded to learning either side of the fault line.

The Hind aspiration for 'further, mutually beneficial, partnership with the HE sector' catalysed this concern into a research project. Its purpose was to enquire from a theoretical perspective 'How well founded was this aspiration for strengthened cross-sector partnerships?' Using an interpretive/qualitative approach informed by Glaser and Strauss's 'Grounded Theory', I tested how each type of institution/sector related to Kelsey's 'Athens' and 'Berlin' paradigms. This was achieved by interviewing representative members of teaching staff and students from the three different types of institution within the geography of two potential Regional Training Partnerships?one in the northern province of the Church of England and one in the south. The interviews included the Head of Dept/Institution, a Member of Teaching Staff and a Student at each institution. The institutions included two universities, two Church institutions of

higher education and two Church training institutions.

Respondents were invited to read and comment on summaries of Kelsey's 'Athens' and 'Berlin' paradigms. The summaries were unattributed and simply identified as Statements 1 and 2. Recognising that some respondents might want to discuss a combination or middle way I developed a hybrid Statement 3:

Statement 3
Theological education is constituted by two parallel and related movements. One movement is from revealed wisdom to the appropriation of revealed wisdom.The other is a movement from data to theory to application. This double movement develops an individual's skills of critical scholarship as well as being identity forming and personally transformative. Students move to and fro between self-conscious detachment and personal engagement. Knowledge about God and of God, as well as about what other people think about God, are all developed.Teaching and learning is thus both an individual and communal activity.

Key points:

- Education is about developing both critical skills and personal wisdom
- It is about moving to and fro between detachment and personal ownership
- It is concerned with knowledge about God, of God and what other people think about God
- Teachers need to be able to nurture the integration of personal faith and rigorous academic study

After reading all three statements interviewees were each asked:

- How do you respond to them?
- Which statement is nearest to your own view? And why?
- How would your colleagues' response relate to your own?

Interviewees who identified statement 3 were asked a number of supplementary questions to identify any underlying preference for Statements 1 or 2.

All interviewees engaged with the statements with considerable energy. The majority voluntarily identified their department/institution in relation to one of the statements. A small minority were more cautious and offered a more nuanced response. Here close analysis of the transcripts usually exposed some underlying affinity or preference.

Responses by Institution/Sector

University Department in the North [UN]

Preference for Statement 1 Athens	Preference for Statement 2 Berlin	Preference for Statement 3 Athens/Berlin hybrid			Other
		Underlying Preference			
		1	2	3	

Head of Department [UNH]		4P				
Member of Teaching Staff [UST]				4P		
Student [USS]		P		4		

P denotes the interviewee's anticipated preference of his/her peers

University Department in the South [US]

	Preference for Statement 1 Athens	Preference for Statement 2 Berlin	Preference for Statement 3 Athens/Berlin hybrid			Other
			Underlying Preference			
			1	2	3	
Head of Department [UNH]		P	4			
Member of Teaching Staff [UST]		4P				
Student [USS]		4				P

P denotes the interviewee's anticipated preference of his/her peers

P denotes the interviewee's anticipated preference of his/her peers Even at first sight there is a clear pattern of preference for the 'Berlin' paradigm in both departments. The Head of Department [UNH] indicated that 'nobody would see our mission as being adequately encompassed in statement 1'. 'Statement 2 [is] much more germane to what actually can or does happen in a department of Theology and Religious Studies like ours'. In the department teaching staff were appointed exclusively for their 'scholarly ability and their ability to cultivate critical understanding'.

As an individual he might have some sympathy with the more holistic approach of statement 3, but as Head of Department it was essential for him to sustain and promote statement 2: Indeed there would be 'a real resistance to being thought by the rest of the university to be operating under statement 1....'

Although the member of teaching staff chose statement 3 again statement 1 was excluded. This was confirmed by the experience of the student: 'There's room for the personal side of things to develop, but it wasn't promoted or anything?I wasn't taught in that way'. He excluded statement 1, 'It wasn't nurtured by the staff. I don't think that was th eir job....' In response to statement 2 he replied, ' I think this is probably quite close to my experience...'

It is clear that the department self-consciously works with a statement 2 or 'Berlin' based paradigm. Some contributions may be permitted from a statement 3 viewpoint but formally and publicly this department functions within a dominant 'Berlin' paradigm.

The university department in the south offered a similar profile to that of the north, in that the 'Berlin' paradigm expressed in statement 2 was again clearly the dominant paradigm. At the same time the interviewees offered some very significant and critical reflections on the hegemony of 'Berlin'.

The member of teaching staff and the student both unequivocally identified statement 2 as the recognised paradigm of theological education within the department:

In terms of what I do here, it is basically statement 2...Certainly the one that seems most suitable here will be statement 2. Statement 1 seems completely inappropriate and statement 3?the problem really is revealed wisdom?the outcome of formation here is to produce well rounded arts students, not well-rounded theologians [UST].
...this department would say that it corresponds very much to statement 2 [USS].

The member of teaching staff also believed that most of his colleagues 'would have gone with statement 2'. The Head of Department confirmed that:

...my colleagues who are dealing with Christianity would, I think probably go for statement 2, but I suspect most of my colleagues? not all?would be wary of the notion of practice ...There would be quite a strong resistance, therefore to [this] theme in all statements, certainly statement 1 would be very weird to them, statement 2 on the element of practice would be uncomfortable but otherwise quite good [USH].

In addition to this, both the Head of Department and the student had strong personal critiques of the dominant paradigm within the department. In particular this led the Head of Department to express a preference for statement 3 and then statement 1 within statement 3, whilst at the same time still wanting to retain academic rigour writ large in statement 2:

At one level, I think we don't do any theology?with some *ad hoc* exceptions.What we do as a Department is the history of religions, the phenomenology of religions, linguistic and literary study of texts. But in terms of Theology defined as a kind of believing community being self-reflective, I don't think Theology is done.... [USH].

Although recognizing statement 2 as the dominant paradigm within the department, the representative student recognised some underlying tensions:

... although this department would say that it corresponds very much to statement 2...the teachers are (I can't speak for them all) genuinely interested in the development of the students in their own Christian lives morally and spiritually... at the same time I don't see that as incompatible with the basic need for good, critical analysis [USS].

Overall representatives of the two secular universities confirmed the 'Berlin'dominant paradigm in both institutions?formally and practically. At the same time it also emerged that some teaching staff might offer some of the elements of statement 1 included in statement 3 but usually did so informally and in addition to statement 2. The representatives clearly understood the different statements, and recognised the different models of theological education offered within them.

Church Institution of Higher Education Department in the North [CHEN]

	Preference for Statement 1 Athens	Preference for Statement 2 Berlin	Preference for Statement 3 Athens/Berlin hybrid			Other
			Underlying Preference			
			1	2	3	

Head of Department [CHENH]		4P			
Member of Teaching Staff [CHENT]			4	P (Spectrum around this)	
Student [CHENS]				4P	

P denotes the interviewee's anticipated preference of his/her peers

Church Institution of Higher Education Department in the South [CHES]

	Preference for Statement 1 Athens	Preference for Statement 2 Berlin	Preference for Statement 3 Athens/Berlin hybrid			Other
			Underlying Preference			
			1	2	3	
Head of Department [CHESH]		4P				
Member of Teaching Staff [CHEST]	P					4
Student [CHESS]			4			P

P denotes the interviewee's anticipated preference of his/her peers

Here replies to interview questions again indicated some tension between personal preference and professional responsibilities. The relationship between context, ethos and theological education was a persistent theme. The Head of Department expressed a personal preference for statement 3, but when speaking of the role of Head of department stated:

> ...if I am looking at the public discourse about God, which I take to be the prime purpose of this department, then I am going to be dealing with statement 2...the team requirement for this post is to engage with statement 2 [CHENH p.4].

Other contexts offered opportunities to make contributions from statement 1. The member of teaching staff also stated that most colleagues would favour statement 2. However most of 'my colleagues engage with their students' personal questions. Very few of them would think that they weren't things that were proper to address in the classroom and outside of it'[CHENT p.3].

He chose statement 3 as closest to his practice. When asked the supplementary question designed to draw out whether there was an underlying preference in favour of statement 1 or 2 he responded:

> I'm here to do a job and the statements drawn from statement 2 are the measurable criteria of getting a degree, and I want to live with people and for them elements of statement 1 are important. I think that a real and not entirely given purpose of education including tertiary education is to help people become fully human, as in line with statement 1 but we do it by fixing the criteria of statement 2. So, we develop the critical skills and consequently help them to examine themselves [CHENT p.3].

This was to some extent mirrored in the responses of the student interviewee, which although much less developed and less reflective, testified to statement 3 as the best fit to his own values and experience at the college. He also confirmed that amongst his student peers 'there would also be a greater empathy with statement 3 than statement 1 or 2'.

Although each of the respondents pointed out statement 3 as their personal choice, it would seem that statement 2 represents the underlying approach to the core work of the department with different members of staff managing the tensions in different ways.

The Head of Department at the southern institution was reluctant to respond to the statements in isolation and:

...would want to know whether we are talking about theological education in a faith context or institution with an avowedly Christian faith foundation, or one without such, as I think theological education is not the same in the two [CHESH p.4].

However he then went on to reveal some key ingredients within his and his department's approaches:

> ...I would be keen to have critical skills included, I think we would be a little reticent to talk too strongly about a revealed wisdom, though individuals might when speaking from their own perspective, but in curriculum statements I don't think we would very much, if at all [CHESH p.4].

Here there is the beginning of a preference for elements of statement 2. When thinking of criteria for the appointment of members of teaching staff, the Head of Department sought to amplify the statement 2 reference to 'the ability to help others develop research skills' by the addition of reason, knowledge and understanding.

The interview with the member of teaching staff struggled to locate the department's approach to theological education in relation to the three statements. He recognised that statements 1 and 2 expressed something of the tension within Christian theological education in the modern period. He reflected that:

> ...perhaps the essential problem for theological education is to have these two together, and obviously if one is seeking ... validation for programmes it tends to be through its formal processes that statement 2 gets focused upon and statement 1 is more troubling to the thought processes that Universities have established.... [CHEST].

Despite a sympathy for both statements, it is apparent that statement 2 represents the dominant and public paradigm within the department. The research orientation of the department was confirmed by the statement 'I think that it is one of the tasks of all academics, to ask the question ?How is the next generation to do research??'. The interview also returned to the theme of context. The interviewee recognised that he would change the balance between statements 1 and 2 according to the context in which he was working.

When anticipating the views of his colleagues the member of teaching staff said, 'I think a lot of my colleagues would be much happier with 1.' If this is so, there may well be an unresolved tension between the personal values and practices of individual teachers and the public stance of the department. It may be that staff accept that the main thrust of their work is within statement 2, but also offer elements of 'added value' from statement 1. The interviewee closed by saying:

> I suppose I'm struck by these statements and I want to say something very supportive in relation to statement 2, but not about its movement from data, to theory, to application...the

criticality of critical theology is I think really important.... [CHEST].

Despite the individual's nuanced struggle with different statements the predominance of the 'Berlin' paradigm had again emerged. This was confirmed by the student interviewee, who believed that the department's purpose was 'not to feed the individual about his or her faith'. This was in clear contrast to his own preference.

When viewed together the departments of Theology and Religious Studies of the two Church Institutions of Higher Education both function within variants of the 'Berlin' paradigm. Within the context of maintained Higher Education the critical stance of both departments must be seen to be fulfilled. At the same time members of staff from both departments to a greater or lesser extent seek to permit or even nurture elements of the 'Athens' paradigm as expressed in statement 1, as long as they do not compromise the critical standing of the departments. In non-validated or church contexts teaching staff seem to value the opportunity to work with a different balance between 'Athens' and 'Berlin'.

Church Training Institution in the North [CTN]

	Preference for Statement 1 Athens	Preference for Statement 2 Berlin	Preference for Statement 3 Athens/Berlin hybrid			Other
			Underlying Preference			
			1	2	3	
Head of Department [CTHN]	4		P			
Member of Teaching Staff [CTNT]	4		P			
Student [CTNS]			4		P	

P denotes the interviewee's anticipated preference of his/her peers

Church Training Institution in the South [CTS]

	Preference for Statement 1 Athens	Preference for Statement 2 Berlin	Preference for Statement 3 Athens/Berlin hybrid			Other
			Underlying Preference			
			1	2	3	
Head of Department [CHESH]					4P	
Member of Teaching Staff [CHEST]					4P	
Student [CHESS]			4P			

P denotes the interviewee's anticipated preference of his/her peers

Here again, even a preliminary viewing of the above results evidences a clear pattern in favour of 'Athens'. The Head of the Church Training Institution in the north of England commented:

> [I am] particularly struck by statement 1 which seems to fit my own prejudices about theological study: I was particularly struck by the terms of forming and transforming and wisdom.... [CTNH p.4].

When asked to anticipate the preferences of his colleagues he imagined 'that there would be a general consensus about the centrality of formation' i.e. statement 1. This was confirmed by the member of teaching staff. Running throughout was a consistent and deep commitment to personal formation of the 'Athens' paradigm in statement 1. He found statement 2 the 'least attractive' because it omitted:

> what seems...to be an essential dynamic namely, what it is to live in a community of faith and therefore the reality of church as a key controlling influence in the project of learning theology... [CTNT].

The interview with the representative student followed a very similar vein to that of the teaching staff. His response to statement 1 was very sympathetic to the 'Athens' paradigm. The key words being 'wisdom', 'intuitive' and 'revealed':

The one word that sticks out for me is 'wisdom'?it seems to be a quite intuitive understanding of theological education; it seems to recognise that it is about applying revealed truths to everyday life and learning how to do that. It certainly seems to be quite an emphasis and an element of what I would call 'Christian Spirituality' in statement 1. I think it would certainly apply to a place such as this.... [CTNS p.2].

His stated preference for statement 3 enabled the student to engage with critical study without letting go of the 'Athens' paradigm in statement 1. However when asked whether he placed more emphasis on the elements in statement 3 drawn from statement 1 or statement 2 he was unequivocal:

> ...my initial response is to place both on statement 3 but ultimately I think statement 1 overrides it [CTNS p.3].

Emerging from the three interviews at the Church Training institution in the north is a consistent and passionate commitment to the 'Athens' paradigm as expressed in statement 1. Here there is a powerful sense of a faith community nurturing and forming individuals and community life within the wisdom of a revealed tradition. The institution does take the academic criticality and rigour of the 'Berlin' paradigm seriously but wants to negotiate with 'Berlin' from a secure base within 'Athens'.

The Head of the Church training institution in the south set the scene very clearly:

> We are accompanying people on their journey of formation....The key elements are associated with the notion of formation so in the broader sense...here are people who are going to be priests and readers and such, and what are the ways in which theology has significance for them as individuals but also as people who have formed into those ministerial [roles].... [CTSH]

This led him to state that statement 3 was where he 'felt comfortable' because the theological education they offered included 'academic rigour' and 'belonging to a community of faith' in a kind of balance which will enable people to grow and change.' When questioned about whether his emphasis within statement 3 was on the elements drawn from

statement 1 or statement 2 he stated that 'statement 3 is a balance of the two'.

The responses of the member of teaching staff were consistent with those of the Head of Institution. When asked about which statement was nearest her own view the member of teaching staff confirmed her earlier response: 'I think we would want to have equal emphasis on statements 1 and 2'. Then she added a significant nuance:

> It has to be said that if we were pushed to choose between them, then in our sort of theological education, we'd be wanting to go more for the transformed life?for the practice [CTST].

Both the Head of Institution and the member of teaching staff were consistent about their choice of an equal balance of the elements of statements 1 and 2 within statement 3. However this final nuance reveals something significant about the underlying motivation of the staff concerned. They are happy to work with the balance of statement 3 but underlying this, their motivation is drawn from statement 1. This would make sense of the Head of Institution's opening statement, 'We are accompanying people on their journey of formation'.

Again the student's responses appeared to follow those given by the two members of teaching staff. When discussing statement 3 she stated:

> I think that this is probably the place where I would put my theological education...it is about head knowledge and heart knowledge and I think it is very about what you learn, how you apply it and how it affects you. And I think that theological education is about...formation and how we are being formed...the academic side informs that [CTSS p.3].

The student had a clear concern that theological education should be strong on formation drawing from 'Athens' and strong on application, drawing on the theory to practice pole of the 'Berlin' paradigm more than the research/scholarship pole. When asked whether she placed more emphasis on the elements in statement 3 drawn from statement 1 or 2 she replied that she would 'place the greater emphasis on statement 1 because for most people relationship with God is a natural everyday thing.'

When viewed together the two Church training institutions are distinctive because of their positive treatment of statement 1. The representatives of the Church training institution in the north of England were consistently and passionately committed to theological education within the 'Athens' paradigm. They wished to take seriously the issues of academic criticality and rigour raised by the 'Berlin' paradigm. But they only wished to negotiate with them from the foundational security of 'Athens'. The representatives of the Church training institution in the south were much more concerned to work with the balance of 'Athens' and 'Berlin' paradigms in statement 3. Nonetheless they approached the balance with an underlying motivation drawn from 'Athens'.

	Statement 1 'Athens'	Statement 2 'Berlin'	Statement 3 'Athens'/ 'Berlin' hybrid
University Departments		Dominant paradigm within institution	Individuals may make contributions outside the dominant paradigm
Church founded Institutions of Higher Education		Dominant paradigm within institution	Actively making contributions using both paradigms in a variety of contexts

Church Training Institutions	Potential dominant paradigm with some value given to insights from 'Berlin'		Attempts to work with both paradigms, but underlying motivation comes from 'Athens'

Concluding Comments

All eighteen interviewees engaged actively with the 'Athens'/'Berlin' paradigms and voluntarily made links with their own experience of theological education. Some clear themes have emerged from the data:

- Kelsey's 'Athens'/'Berlin'paradigms are an engaging tool of analysis in an English context.
- English secular universities and Church institutions of higher education are dominated by the 'Berlin' paradigm
- The universities in particular are uncomfortable with the 'Athens' paradigm.
- Individual members of university and Church institutions of higher education teaching staff may offer contributions within the 'Athens' paradigm.
- Departments of Theology and Religious Studies may work with the 'Athens' paradigm outside of their institutions.
- Church training institutions are motivated primarily by the 'Athens' paradigm.
- Some Church training institutions have adopted 'Athens' as their dominant paradigm and negotiate with 'Berlin' from within that paradigm. Others seek to achieve a more equal balance between 'Athens' and 'Berlin'.
- Church training institutions would be unlikely to adopt 'Berlin' as their dominant paradigm.

So my response, at a theoretical level, to the question 'How well founded is the aspiration of the Hind Report for *a maximising of the potential of the partnership with universities and church colleges of higher education*?' is somewhat nuanced.

Any aspiration for tri-partite partnerships based on 'Athens' territory is unlikely to be well founded. There is not sufficient shared crosssector territory within 'Athens' on which to build 'structured and effective partnerships', although there is potential for individual higher education staff and for departments of Theology & Religious Studies in Church institutions of higher education to enter into 'Athens' based projects away from normal 'Berlin' based higher education validation processes.

Where partnerships have the most potential to develop is in the common research/critical scholarship areas of the 'Berlin' paradigm, which underpins both types of H.E institution, and which to a greater or lesser extent contributes to the self-understanding of the Church training Institutions. To date there is much anecdotal and empirical evidence that such partnerships have increased and developed considerably during the last ten years. This paper confirms that such partnerships have not been incompatible theoretically. Indeed awareness of a shared theoretical basis may provide the foundation for new and existing partnerships to develop yet further.

Bibliography

- ACCMOccasional Paper No 22 - *Education for the Church's Ministry: The Report of the Working Party on Assessment* (London: CHP, 1987).
- Ballard P., 'Reflections on Professional Theological Education Today', *Theology* Sept/Oct 2004.
- Banks R., *Reenvisioning Theological Education - Exploring a Missional Alternative to Current Models* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999)
- Clarke P., Linzey A. & Moses J. (Eds), *Theology, the University and the Modern World - Robert Runcie*

(London: Lester Crook, 1988).

- Gladwin J. [chair], 'Formation for Ministry within a Learning Church: The Final Report on the Regions', **GS Misc** 745 (London: Church House Publishing, May 2004).

- Groves M., 'Locating Theology', **Journal of Adult Theological Education**, Vol 1.2, Dec 2004 pp.147-159.

- Heywood D., 'A New Paradigm for Theological Education?' **Anvil** Volume 17 No 1, 2000.

- Hind J. [chair] **The Structure and Funding of Ordination Training - The Interim Report**, (London: Ministry Division of the Archbishops' Council, Feb 2002)

- Hind J. [chair] **Formation for Ministry Within a Learning Church - The draft final report of the working party on the structure and funding of ordination training**, (London: Ministry Division of the Archbishops' Council, Nov 2002)

- Hind J. [chair] 'Formation for Ministry within a Learning Church' **The Structure and Funding of Ordination Training GS1496**, (London: Church House Publishing, April 2003).

- Kelsey D.H., **Between Athens & Berlin - The Theological Education Debate**, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans1993)

- Kirk J.A., **The Mission of Theology and Theology as Mission** (Valley Forge: Trinity 1997)

- Khun T.S., **The Structure of Scientific Revolutions 3rd edition**, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press [1st edition 1962]1996).

- Lindbeck G.A. 'Spiritual Formation and Theological Education' **Theological Education**, 24, supplement 1, 1988 pp.10-32.

- McCarthy J., 'Deepening Connections between the Church and the Theological School: Implications for Theological Education', **Journal of Adult Theological Education**, Vol 1.2 Dec 2004, pp.175-183.

- Pears A., 'The Study of Christian Theology in the British Academy: From Truth Giving to Critical Engagement', **Journal of Adult Theological Education**, Vol 1.2, Dec 2004 pp.159-174.

- Sagovsky N. [chair] **Integration and Assessment ? An interim Evaluation of College and Course Re sponses to ACCM Paper 22**, (London: ABM, 1991).

- Ward K., 'Why Theology should be taught at Secular Universities', **Discourse: Learning and Teaching in Philosophical and Religious Studies**, Vol. 4, No.1, Autumn 2004, pp22-37.

Endnotes

1 Banks R., Reenvisioning Theological Education Eerdmans Grand Rapids 1999: 'the fullest analysis to date comes from David Kelsey, Between Athens and Berlin' p.19

Created on: July 18th 2008

Updated on: August 19th 2010